

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA:
INCARNATION AND MISSION OF THE LOGOS-SON

Daniel Lee Worden

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD
at the
University of St Andrews



2016

Full metadata for this item is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:
<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:
<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/16500>

This item is protected by original copyright

Clement of Alexandria:
Incarnation and Mission of the *Logos*-Son

Daniel Lee Worden



University of
St Andrews

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree of PhD
at the
University of St Andrews

Date Submitted:
20 June 2016

1. Candidate's declarations:

I, Daniel L. Worden, hereby certify that this thesis, which is approximately eighty thousand words in length, has been written by me, and that it is the record of work carried out by me, or principally by myself in collaboration with others as acknowledged, and that it has not been submitted in any previous application for a higher degree.

I was admitted as a research student in September 2011 and as a candidate for the degree of PhD in 2015; the higher study for which this is a record was carried out in the University of St Andrews between 2011 and 2015.

Date: Signature of candidate:

2. Supervisors declaration:

I hereby certify that the candidate has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution and Regulations appropriate for the degree of Ph.D. in the University of St Andrews and that the candidate is qualified to submit this thesis in application for that degree.

Date: Signature of supervisor:

Date: Signature of supervisor:

3. Permission for publication: (to be signed by both candidate and supervisor)

In submitting this thesis to the University of St Andrews I understand that I am giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. I also understand that the title and the abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be made and supplied to any bona fide library or research worker, that my thesis will be electronically accessible for personal or research use unless exempt by award of an embargo as requested below, and that the library has the right to migrate my thesis into new electronic forms as required to ensure continued access to the thesis. I have obtained any third-party copyright permissions that may be required in order to allow such access and migration, or have requested the appropriate embargo below.

The following is an agreed request by candidate and supervisor regarding the publication of this thesis:

PRINTED COPY

Supporting statement for printed embargo request: I choose an embargo on all or part of print copy for a period of three (3) years on the following ground: publication would preclude future publication.

ELECTRONIC COPY

Supporting statement for electronic embargo request: I choose an embargo on all or part of print copy for a period of three (3) years on the following ground: publication would preclude future publication.

Date:Signature of candidate: Signature of supervisor:.....

Signature of supervisor:

ABSTRACT

Clementine scholarship acknowledges Clement's doctrine of the Incarnation and generally maintains that for Clement the divine *Logos* assumed human flesh. However, because of Clement's complex logology and three passages suggesting a docetic interpretation of Christ's flesh, scholars tend to move away from addressing the Incarnation and treat either the metaphysics of the multiple *logoi* theory or the question of Clement's Docetism, or both. Because of this diversion in research, there remains a gap in the literature around Clement's teachings about the Incarnation.

This thesis begins to fill the gap by explaining Clement's view of the Incarnation, which he connects to the emergent 'exchange' doctrine, envisaged as a divine mission. It situates Clement as an heir of the apostolic tradition while he engages with Greek philosophy and Gnostic belief. The research delineates Clement's gnostic tradition, which he considered faithful to the Old Testament and to the teachings of the apostles. The investigation collates Clement's usage of John 1:14 and the term *ginomai* linked with *Logos*, *anthropos*, and *sarx*. It examines Clement's discussion in *Stromateis* VII.2, where he claims the *Logos* assumed flesh susceptible to suffering, emotions, and physical sensibilities. In Clement's teachings, the *Logos* became both *anthropos* and *sarx* so that *anthropos* might become *theos*. This thesis outlines Clement's usage of the terms *parousia* and *epiphaneia* (appearing), showing they are consequential to the Incarnation. Clement presents the *Logos* as Saviour, who conquers malevolent powers and death to release humankind from corruption through his sufferings from birth to the cross. Clement also presents the *Logos* as a Teacher, who during his *parousia*, interprets precisely the Old Testament, and in his *appearing*, discloses true *gnosis*, which guides *anthropos* to godliness. The evidence demonstrates that Clement bases his path for assimilation to God upon the Incarnation of the *Logos*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude and sincere thanks to my family and friends of The Common Mission. Their support and friendship have encouraged me during my work at the University of St. Andrews.

I wish to thank my supervisors, Dr. Brendan Wolfe and Prof. James Davila, who both challenged me to sharpen the central point of the thesis and clarify the supporting arguments. In addition, I wish to thank the University of St. Andrews for allotting me extra time to complete the document. The additional time gave me opportunity to focus on exploring important topics for enjoyable research. To all of you, I am most grateful for your input into my life and work.

Daniel L. Worden
St. Mary's College
20 June 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
ABBREVIATIONS	viii

INTRODUCTION

A. Thesis and Sketch of the Argument.....	1
B. Clement of Alexandria.....	6
C. Clement's Literary Legacy	12
1. <i>Protreptikos</i>	13
2. <i>Paidagogos</i>	16
3. <i>Stromateis</i>	19
4. <i>Quis Dives Salvetur</i>	22
D. Literature Review	24
E. Assessment and Methodology	42

PART I: INTELLECTUAL CONTEXTS

Chapter One: Platonic and Gnostic Contexts

A. Introduction	45
B. Platonic Context.....	45
1. Platonic Theology	45
2. Platonic Demiurge.....	49
3. Platonic Anthropogony	53
4. Platonic Teleology	55
C. Gnostic Context	57
1. Gnostic Theology	61
2. Gnostic Demiurge	66
3. Gnostic Anthropogony	72
4. Gnostic Soteriology.....	76

Chapter Two: Clement's Theological Context

A. Introduction	80
B. Apostolic Tradition and Succession	81

C. Clement's Gnostic Tradition.....	90
1. Revelatory Agency of Christ.....	96
2. Paul and the Fullness of Christ.....	97
3. Barnabas and Allegorical Interpretation	100
4. Clement of Rome and Gnostic Character.....	103
D. Clement's Theological Context.....	105
1. Clement's Theology	106
2. Clement's Demiurge	115
3. Clement's Anthropogony	118
4. Clement's Soteriology.....	124
E. Conclusion and Summary Table	128

PART II: INCARNATION AND MISSION

Chapter Three: Incarnation and Salvific Mission

A. Introduction	131
B. <i>Logos</i> -Son as Saviour	135
C. Problem: Corruption in Human Existence.....	138
1. Adam and Eve	139
2. Malevolent Powers.....	141
2.1. Death as Tyrant	143
2.2. Serpent and Dragon	145
2.3. Satan and Devil	147
3. Human Beings as Beasts	149
D. Incarnation and John 1.....	150
1. Pre-existence	151
2. <i>Logos</i> -Son as <i>Theos</i> and <i>Anthropos</i>	153
3. Clement's Use of John 1:14	154
E. Incarnation and <i>Stromateis</i> VII.2.....	158
1. Allegation of Docetism	161
2. <i>Logos</i> -Son Assumes <i>Sarx</i>	167
F. Clement and the <i>Stauros</i>	171
G. Conclusion.....	182

Chapter Four: Incarnation and Didactic Mission

A. Introduction	185
B. <i>Logos</i> -Son as Teacher.....	188
C. Problem: Impediments in Human Existence	191
D. <i>Parousia</i> and <i>Appearing</i> of <i>Logos</i> -Son	196

1. <i>Parousia</i>	197
1.1. <i>Logos</i> -Son as Interpreter of Scripture	199
1.2. Gospel and Unity of Scripture	201
1.3. From <i>Propaideia</i> to <i>Gnosis</i>	204
2. Appearing	211
2.1. <i>Protrepikos</i> I.7.1-4	211
2.2. Appearing as Salvific Event	214
2.3. Appearing as Revelatory Agency	215
E. <i>Anthropos</i> Becomes <i>Theos</i>	217
1. Yoked to <i>Logos</i> -Son	217
2. Knowledge Terminology	220
3. Assuming Γνωσις as Λόγος	223
4. Psalms 82:6 and Becoming God	224
F. Likeness to <i>Logos</i> -Son	230
1. Likeness to the Saviour	232
2. Likeness to the Teacher	233
G. Conclusion	234
CONCLUSION	236
APPENDIX A	243
BIBLIOGRAPHY	250

ABBREVIATIONS

Works of Clement

<i>Ecl.Proph.</i>	<i>Eclogae Propheticae</i>
<i>Exc.Thdot.</i>	<i>Excerpta ex Theodoto</i>
<i>Paid.</i>	<i>Paidagogos</i>
<i>Prot.</i>	<i>Protreptikos to the Greeks</i>
<i>Q.d.s.</i>	<i>Quis Dives Salvetur</i>
<i>Str.</i>	<i>Stromateis</i>

Related Works of Clement

<i>Adum.</i>	Cassiodorus, <i>Adumbrationes Clementi Alexandrini in Epistolas Canonicas</i>
<i>Frag.</i>	<i>Fragmente</i>

Translations: Clement, Eusebius, and Scripture

BW	George Butterworth (trans.), <i>Clement of Alexandria</i> (LCL, 1919)
<i>CTE</i>	Simon Wood (trans.), <i>Christ the Educator</i> (1954)
<i>H.E.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Ecclesiastical History</i>
JF	John Ferguson (trans.), <i>Clement of Alexandria: Stromateis Books 1-3</i> (1991)
LXX	Septuagint
NT	New Testament Greek Text: NA28, <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i>
OT	Old Testament

Lexicons

BAGD	Walter Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich and Danker, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> (1979)
LMP	G.W.H. Lampe, <i>A Patristic Greek Lexicon</i>
L&S	H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, eds., <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i>

Platonism

<i>Alcinous</i>	John Dillon (trans.), <i>Handbook of Platonism</i>
Whittaker	John Whittaker (ed.), <i>Alcinoos: Enseignement de Doctrines de Plato</i> (Greek Text)
<i>Crit.</i>	<i>Critias</i>
<i>Epis.</i>	<i>Letters</i>
<i>Gorg.</i>	<i>Gorgias</i>
<i>Phaed.</i>	<i>Phaedo</i>
<i>Phaedr.</i>	<i>Phaedrus</i>
<i>Rep.</i>	<i>Republic</i>
<i>Theaet.</i>	<i>Theaetetus</i>
<i>Tim.</i>	<i>Timeaus</i>

Philo Judaeus

<i>Congr.</i>	<i>De Congressu</i>
<i>Conf.</i>	<i>Confusion of the Tongues</i>
<i>Fug.</i>	<i>On Flight and Finding</i>
<i>Opif.</i>	<i>The Creation of the World</i>
<i>Spec.Leg.</i>	<i>The Special Laws</i>

Apostolic Fathers

CR	Clement of Rome
1Clem	First Epistle of Clement of Rome
EB	The Epistle of Barnabas
Ign.Eph.	Ignatius of Antioch, Ephesians
Ign.Mag.	Ignatius of Antioch, Magnesians
Ign.Smyrn.	Ignatius of Antioch, Smyrnaeans
Ign.Tral.	Ignatius of Antioch, Trallians
Mand.	<i>Shepherd of Hermas</i> , Mandates (Commandments)
Sim.	<i>Shepherd of Hermas</i> , Similitudes (Parables)

Church Fathers

<i>ANF1</i>	<i>Ante Nicene Fathers</i> , Volume I
<i>A.H.</i>	Irenaeus, <i>Against Heresies</i>
<i>Dial.</i>	Justin Martyr, <i>Dialogue with Trypho</i>
<i>2Apol.</i>	Justin Martyr, <i>The Second Apology</i>
<i>ANF2</i>	<i>Ante Nicene Fathers</i> , Volume II
<i>Theoph.Autol.</i>	<i>Theophilus to Autolytus</i>
<i>ANF3</i>	<i>Ante Nicene Fathers</i> , Volume III
<i>Praes.</i>	Tertullian, <i>Prescription of Heretics</i>
<i>ANF5</i>	<i>Ante Nicene Fathers</i> , Volume V
<i>Ref.</i>	Hippolytus, <i>Refutations</i>
<i>NPNF2</i>	<i>Nicene Post Nicene Fathers</i> , Volume II
<i>Soz.H.E.</i>	Sozomen, <i>Ecclesiastical History</i>
<i>NPNF3</i>	<i>Nicene Post Nicene Fathers</i> , Volume III
<i>Hier.Vir.Ill.</i>	St. Jerome, <i>Lives of Illustrious Men</i>
<i>NPNF4</i>	<i>Nicene Post Nicene Fathers</i> , Volume IV
<i>Ath.Inc.</i>	Athenasius, <i>De Incarnatione Verbi Dei</i>
<i>NPNF6</i>	<i>Nicene Post Nicene Fathers</i> , Volume VI
<i>Hier.Ep.</i>	St. Jerome, <i>Letters</i>
<i>NPNF7</i>	<i>Nicene Post Nicene Fathers</i> , Volume VII
<i>Or.</i>	Gregory of Nazianzen, <i>Orations</i>

Nag Hammadi Library (NHL) and Gnostic Tractates

BG	Codex Berlin
NHC	Nag Hammadi Codex
NHL	Nag Hammadi Library
<i>1Apoc.James</i>	<i>First Apocalypse of James</i>
<i>Ap.James</i>	<i>Apochryphon of James</i>
<i>Ap.John</i>	<i>Apochryphon of John</i>
<i>Apoc.Adam</i>	<i>The Apocalypse of Adam</i>

<i>Apoc.Peter</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Peter</i>
<i>Dial.Savior</i>	<i>Dialogue of the Saviour</i>
<i>Gos.Eg.</i>	<i>Gospel of the Egyptians</i>
<i>Gos.Mary</i>	<i>Gospel of Mary</i>
<i>Gos.Truth</i>	<i>Gospel of Truth</i>
<i>Hyp.Arch.</i>	<i>Hypostasis of the Archons</i>
<i>Melch.</i>	<i>Melchizedek</i>
<i>Orig.World</i>	<i>Origin of the World</i>
<i>Soph.Jes.Chr.</i>	<i>Sophia of Jesus Christ</i>
<i>Test.Truth</i>	<i>Testimony of Truth</i>
<i>Treat.Seth</i>	<i>Second Treatise of the Great Seth</i>
<i>Tri.Trac.</i>	<i>Tripartite Tractate</i>
<i>Trim.Prot.</i>	<i>Trimorphic Protennoia</i>

Other Related Works

<i>Dem.</i>	Irenaeus, <i>Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching</i>
<i>Epiph.Pan.</i>	Epiphanius, <i>Panarion</i>
<i>KP</i>	<i>The Preaching of Peter</i>

INTRODUCTION

A. Thesis and Sketch of the Argument

Clement of Alexandria (AD 150-215) travelled the northern and eastern regions surrounding the Mediterranean searching for a Christian teacher who could explain the teachings of the apostles: ‘Peter, James, John, and Paul.’¹ Clement entered north Egypt around AD 182 and found Pantaenus, who hailed from Sicily, but was teaching the knowledge of God in Alexandria.² When hearing Pantaenus elucidate the writings of the prophets and the apostles, Clement made his dwelling in the ‘Pearl of the Nile.’ During this time, Alexandria was home to Middle Platonism, various strands of Christian Gnosticism, and ‘proto-orthodox’ Christianity.³ Clement reports that among the diversity of philosophical and Christian opinions, his teacher was ‘the real Sicilian bee, who upon gathering the flowers from the prophetic and apostolic meadow, engendered in the souls of his hearers an undefiled knowledge.’⁴ Clement pursued and propagated this heritage of divine *gnosis*. However, soon after Clement’s arrival, Pantaenus left Egypt to embark upon a Christian mission that may have reached as far as India.⁵ Clement remained behind and became the leading proponent of Christianity—what he styles as the ‘true philosophy’—in Alexandria.

¹ *Str.* I.1.11.1-3; Eusebius recorded Clement’s witness, *H.E.* V.11.2-5.

² *H.E.* V.11.2; VI.13.2. Eusebius notes that Clement ‘mentions Pantaenus by name as his teacher.’

³ The term ‘proto-orthodox’ refers to Christian teachings or leaders, who set doctrinal boundaries that became creedal orthodoxy in the fourth century. For Clement’s intellectual background in Alexandria, see Claude Mondésert, ‘Chapitre Premier: Le Milieu Intellectuel et Spirituel,’ in *Clément d’Alexandrie: Introduction à l’étude de sa pensée religieuse à partir de l’Écriture*, (Paris, Aubier: Editions Montaigne, 1944), 27-45; S.R.C. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1971); Dietmar Wywra, *Die Christliche Platonaneignung in den Stromateis des Clemens von Alexandrien*, (Berlin, DE: Walter de Gruyter, 1983); R.M. Berchman, *From Philo to Origen: Middle Platonism in Transition*, (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984); David Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*, (Berkeley, CA: UCP, 1992); David Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*, (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1993); Henny F. Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, (Oxford: OUP, 2006); Piotr Ashwin-Siejkowski, *Clement of Alexandria: A Project in Christian Perfection*, (London: T&T Clark, 2008); and Alain Le Boulluec, *Alexandrie Antique et Chrétienne: Clément et Origène*, (Paris: Institut d’ Études Augustiniennes, 2012).

⁴ *Str.* I.1.11.2. Unless noted, all translations from Clement are mine.

⁵ *H.E.* V.10.2.

Central to Clement’s version of Christianity is the doctrine of the Incarnation of the divine *Logos*.⁶ Drawing from John 1:14, Clement taught his fellow Greeks that ‘the Word of God became a human being [ἄνθρωπος].’⁷ In another passage, where he clarifies that humankind was fashioned by God and therefore loved by God, Clement claims: ‘The *Logos* himself visibly became flesh [σάρξ].’⁸ For Clement, the *Logos* entered the sensible region of this world and became both *anthropos* and *sarx*.

Clement also uses the term ἐνδύω, which bears the notion of ‘clothing one’s self with a garment,’ to depict the Incarnation. The divine *Logos* ‘was clothed with humanity for us [ὁ δι’ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπον ἐνδυσάμενος]’ to accomplish salvation.⁹ In a passage affirming that God loves human physicality, Clement asserts that the *Logos*, ‘being clothed with human flesh [ἐνδυσάμενος σαρκὸς ἀνθρωπίνης], had come for the common salvation of humankind.’¹⁰ Once more, in a significant passage on the Incarnation as a mystery and mission, Clement utilizes the verb ἐνδέω, which means ‘to bind to something.’ Hence, the *Logos*, ‘having been bound to flesh [σαρκὶ ἐνδεθείς], conquered the serpent, and enslaved the tyrant, death. And most wonderful of all, man [Adam] who had been deceived by pleasure, who had been enslaved by corruption, was shown to have been loosed by outstretched arms.’¹¹ The imagery of ‘outstretched arms’—made possible by the Incarnation—pictures salvation accomplished through the crucifixion of Christ.¹²

⁶ Mondésert, *Clément d’Alexandrie: Introduction à l’étude de sa pensée religieuse à partir de l’Écriture*, 213. He claims for Clement: ‘l’Incarnation est vraiment le point central dans l’histoire.’

⁷ Jn. 1:14; *Prot.* I.8.4, ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος.

⁸ Jn. 1:14; *Paid.* I.3.9.4, ὁ λόγος αὐτὸς ἐναργῶς σὰρξ γενόμενος.

⁹ *Str.* IV.21.130.2.

¹⁰ *Str.* VII.2.8.1, ἀλλ’ ἐνδυσάμενος [σαρκὸς ἀνθρωπίνης], ἐπὶ τὴν κοινὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐλήλυθεν σωτηρίαν.

¹¹ *Prot.* XI.111.2-3, καὶ σαρκὶ ἐνδεθείς—μυστήριον θεῖον τοῦτο—τὸν ὄφιν ἐχειρώσατο καὶ τὸν τύραννον ἐδουλώσατο, τὸν θάνατον, καὶ το παροδοξότατον, ἐκείνον τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν ἡδονῇ πεπλανημένον, τὸν τῆ φθορᾷ δεδεμένον, χερσὶν ἠπλωμέναις ἔδειξε λελυμένον.

¹² For discussion on ‘outstretched arms’ as a sign of the cross in Gnostic-Egyptian mythology, see D.M. Murdock, *Christ in Egypt: The Horus-Jesus Connection*, (Stellar House Publishing, 2009), 343-350.

Clement's account of the Incarnation includes, what has been labeled in Greek theology, the 'exchange' doctrine. He sets this forth early in his *Protreptikos*: 'The Word of God became a human being [ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος] in order that one might learn from a man, how *anthropos* might become *theos* [ἄνθρωπος γένηται θεός].'¹³ Notably, Clement centers the didactic mission of the *Logos* in his exchange doctrine. He expands this teaching of the exchange, emphasizing that the *Logos* 'came down' and 'put on human nature [ἄνθρωπον ἐνέδυ]. He willingly suffered the things of men [τὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐκὼν ἔπαθεν],' so that, 'after being measured to our weakness [πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀσθένειαν μετρηθείς], he might give to us his power [ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν ἀντιμετρήσῃ].'¹⁴ This perspective of the Incarnation as an exchange yields three points important to Clement's soteriology. Firstly, the *Logos* of God descended into the world to become a human being; he was not something other than *anthropos*. He was human according to the biblical account of the image and likeness of God.¹⁵ Secondly, in the first part of the exchange, the *Logos* descended as Saviour and launched a salvific mission: He was clothed with flesh (our weakness) in order to conquer the powers of evil and rescue humankind from corruption. Thirdly, in the second part of the exchange, the *Logos* appeared as Teacher and inaugurated a didactic mission: He interpreted the Scriptures, and from them, disclosed divine *gnosis*; his teachings lead hearers out of ignorance by yoking them to the knowledge of God, which guides them to become like God.

The doctrine of the Incarnation with emphasis on the exchange formula is not novel to Clement; there are predecessors who laid the foundation and successors who developed its structure. Paul, in his second letter to the Corinthians, makes the claim:

¹³ *Prot.* I.8.4, ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος, ἵνα δὴ καὶ σὺ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου μάθῃς, πῆ ποτε ἄρα ἄνθρωπος γένηται θεός.

¹⁴ *Q.d.s.* 37.3.

¹⁵ *Paid.* I.12.98.2-3.

‘For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that, though he was rich yet for your sake he became poor, so that you by his poverty, might become rich’ (2Corinthians 8:9). In the mid second century, Justin Martyr (AD 100-165) advances this theology, conveying the idea that ‘next to God, we worship and love the Word who is from the unbegotten and ineffable God, since also He became man for our sakes, that becoming a partaker of our sufferings, He might also bring us healing.’¹⁶ Irenaeus (AD 130-202), the likely antecedent to Clement’s exchange doctrine, states it clearly: ‘Through His transcendent love, [He] became what we are, that He might bring us to be even what He is Himself [God].’¹⁷ Over one hundred years after Clement flourished, the Alexandrian bishop, St. Athanasius (AD 296-372), echoes Clement’s teaching in his own enduring work, *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei*: ‘For he [*Logos*] became human [ἐνηνθρώπησεν] that we might be made god [θεοποιηθῶμεν]. He manifested himself through a body [αὐτὸς ἐφάνερωσεν ἑαυτὸν διὰ σώματος] that we might receive the idea of the unseen Father.’¹⁸ Noteworthy, none of these references includes a didactic emphasis with the Incarnation as exchange; this distinction on learning through the Incarnation seems distinctive to Clement. He at times speaks of the Saviour as Teacher: the ‘Saviour was sent as a Teacher and Leader for the possession of the good.’¹⁹

Notwithstanding this, the doctrine of the Incarnation was scandalous in second century Alexandria. Clement, reared in Platonism and learned in Gnosticism, knew that the Middle Platonists considered the notion of the Incarnation of God to be repugnant and absurd; he knew also that, while many Gnostic sects claimed to be Christian, Docetism was a common teaching among them. Irenaeus reports that neither Cerinthus

¹⁶ 2*Apol.* 13.

¹⁷ *A.H. V.Praef.*

¹⁸ *Ath.Inc.* 54.3, ; see also *Ath.Inc.* 17.4; 44.1-6; 45.1; 55.5.

¹⁹ *Str.* V.1.7.8, καταπέμπεται ὁ σωτήρ, τῆς ἀγαθοῦ κτήσεως διδάσκαλός τε καὶ χορηγός.

nor Marcion (nor others) believed that the Word of God became flesh.²⁰ For many Gnostics, Christ only ‘appeared’ to be human, to suffer, and die.²¹ Furthermore, the prevailing theology of the transcendent deity and metaphysical dualism advanced by Platonism and the majority of Gnostic groups did not sanction the possibility that God, who is supramundane and incorruptible, could enter the realm of matter—much less become flesh—which was thought to be evil, temporal, and a cruel prison from which to escape. Nonetheless, in this intellectual context, Clement exhorts the Greeks to ‘trust in him who is both man and God and believe in him who suffered and is worshipped.’²²

Clement engages with these philosophical schools and religious beliefs. On the one hand, some of his works are replete with references to classical philosophy and Platonic thought, showing his fellow citizens traces of divine truth within their intellectual history. Clement intentionally retains philosophical tenets that ‘teach righteousness with pious knowledge.’²³ As part of his preparatory teachings, Clement maintains the encyclical studies—*viz.*, dialectics, astronomy, mathematics, and music—but revamps these disciplines to point toward Christ. Nevertheless, he perceived that Platonism, although a useful philosophy, was not adequate for the salvation of humankind, ‘because it does not give true knowledge of God.’²⁴ Philosophy was the Hellenic tutor leading Greeks to Christ, but no farther.²⁵ Based upon the Incarnation and the disclosure of divine *gnosis*, Clement demotes philosophy (but does not dismiss it), and styles the teachings of Christ, handed down through the apostles, as the ‘true

²⁰ *A.H.* III.11.1-3 (*ANFI*: 426-427).

²¹ For the Platonists, see the objections set forth by Celsus, concerning the Incarnation, R.J. Hoffmann, Celsus, *On the True Doctrine: A Discourse against the Christians*, (NY: Oxford University Press, 1987), 103-105. For the Gnostics, see PHEME PERKINS, ‘Logos Christologies in the Nag Hammadi Codices,’ *VChr.* 35:4 (December 1981): 379-396.

²² *Prot.* X.106.4, πίστευον, ἄνθρωπε, ἄνθρώπῳ καὶ θεῷ· πίστευον, ἄνθρωπε, τῷ παθόντι καὶ προσκυνουμένῳ.

²³ *Str.* I.7.37.6, δικαιοσύνην μετὰ εὐσεβοῦς ἐπιστήμης ἐκδιδάσκοντα.

²⁴ Henri Crouzel, ‘The School of Alexandria and its Fortunes,’ in *History of Theology I: The Patristic Period*, Angelo Di Berardino, ed. et al, (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1997), 152.

²⁵ *Str.* I.5.28.1-3.

philosophy.²⁶ He recalls that ‘the apostle defines the wisdom according to the teaching of the Lord to be the “wisdom of God,” in order to point out that the true philosophy was given through the Son.’²⁷

On the other hand, among the early proponents of proto-orthodoxy, such as Polycarp, Justin, Melito of Sardis, Theophilus, Athenagoras, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Hippolytus, Clement could be credited for wresting the taxonomies of *gnosis* from the so-called Gnostics, such as Basilides, Marcion, and Valentinus. In his works, one can find his portrait of what Clement christens as ‘our Gnostic.’²⁸ Nevertheless, he was aware that the Incarnation and Christ-event were crucial to the knowledge of God. Therefore, unlike most heterodox Gnostics, Clement set the Incarnation and salvific work of Christ—along with the disclosure of *gnosis*—as the pathway to salvation. The Christ-event, especially the crucifixion, was prophesied in Scripture as part of God’s economy, and Clement deems it necessary for salvation.

B. Clement of Alexandria

There is next to nothing contemporary recorded about Clement. The consensus before the fifth century was not fixed concerning his birthplace. Epiphanius (AD 310-403), the orthodox bishop of Salamis, recorded in his *Panarion* (‘medicine chest’) that some thought Clement was an Athenian, but others believed he was from Alexandria.²⁹ Clement was well acquainted with the intellectual heritage and religious customs of Athens; the *Stromateis* attest to his knowledge of the Academy and Platonic philosophy.³⁰ Based on Clement’s brief sketch of his journey from Greece to Egypt in *Stromateis* I.1, current scholarship accepts that he achieved a first-rate education in

²⁶ *Str.* VI.7.59.3, διὰ τῆς τοῦ κυρίου διδασκαλίας ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τῆς ἀληθοῦς φιλοσογίας.

²⁷ 1Cor. 1:24; *Str.* I.18.90.1, «θεοῦ δὲ «σοφίαν»» εἶρηκεν ὁ ἀπόστολος τὴν κατὰ τὸν κύριον διδασκαλίαν, σοφίαν ἵνα δείξῃ τὴν ἀληθῆ φιλοσοφίαν δι’ υἱοῦ παραδιδιμένην.

²⁸ *Str.* II.11.52.7, ὅτι τῶ ὄντι γνωστικός ὁ; *Str.* VII.7.45.4, οὗτος ἡμῖν ὁ γνωστικός ὁ πιστός.

²⁹ *Epiph.Pan.* 32.6.1.

³⁰ For a reconstruction of Clement’s life in Athens and his background leading to Alexandria, see Ashwin-Siejkowski, *Clement of Alexandria: A Project in Christian Perfection*, 19-37.

Athens and then travelled around the Mediterranean seeking a skilled Christian teacher (Pantaenus), whom he found in Alexandria.³¹

In his earlier years, Clement became a *savant* of intellectual history, exploring all branches of philosophy, including the pre-Socratics. He was well educated in the encyclical subjects: astronomy, dialectics, mathematics, and music. His erudition of Hellenistic customs, such as the mystery cult of Eleusis, the venerated gods, and the tragedians was wide-ranging; his knowledge of the poets, such as Homer, and theologians like Orpheus and Cleanthes, and the philosophers Pythagoras, Heraclitus, Zeno, Plato, and Aristotle was extensive. He demonstrated the fluency of his learning in his treatise, the *Protreptikos*, as well as in numerous passages woven throughout the *Stromateis*. The citations are so plentiful that Robert Wilken comments:

Among the early Christian writers Clement is the most Greek, the most literary, a savant so immersed in the high culture of the Hellenic world that he effortlessly cited hundreds of passages from poets, philosophers, playwrights, and historians in his writings. To this day he is an unparalleled source of citations from lost works, including many precious passages from the writings of the pre-Socratic philosophers.³²

Clement preserves this kaleidoscope of intellectual history in his writings to indicate hints of divine truth in universal and cultural knowledge. However, as will be shown, Clement's primary sources for the knowledge of God are the Old and New Testaments, which he reads as a unified whole.

In his later years, Clement became a notable teacher of the Scriptures and a prolific Christian author. His extant works show that he received the law, the prophets, the teachings of Christ and of the apostles as a synthesis of the true philosophy: a new path

³¹ Henry Chadwick and J. Oulton, *Alexandrian Christianity: Selected Translations of Clement and Origen*, (SCM Press, 1954; John Knox Press, 2006), 15-16; Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, 51-61; Ashwin-Siejkowski, *Clement of Alexandria: A Project in Christian Perfection*, 19-24.

³² Wilken, *The Spirit of Early Christian Thought: Seeking the Face of God*, (New Haven, CT: YUP, 2003), 54.

for human existence.³³ He appropriated the Old Testament, including the Apocrypha, to his course of spiritual formation, applying the insights of Moses, David, Solomon, the prophets, and Jesus ben Sirach to his spiritual *paideia*.³⁴ He was at home with the writings of the sub-apostolic period, especially, Barnabas, Clement of Rome, *The Shepherd*, and a treatise, *The Preaching of Peter*. Clement's references to these works are so copious that Wilkens further observes that a

rough calculation indicates that on average there are seven or eight biblical citations on every page of his writings. There are more than fifteen hundred references to the Old Testament alone and close to three thousand to the New Testament. The Gospel of Matthew is cited more than five hundred times, John more than two hundred, the Psalms more than three hundred, the books of Isaiah and Proverbs more than two hundred times.³⁵

There were two major intellectual centres in Alexandria where Clement may have worked: the museum and the library. Scholars of different fields of inquiry conducted scientific research in the museum; the library housed numerous scrolls that contained the glory of Hellenistic culture and the best of Greek erudition. Clement composed most of his works in Alexandria.³⁶

Concerning the 'school of sacred discourses' (διδασκαλείου τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων) in Alexandria, Eusebius records that Pantaenus had charge of the school and that 'Clement was known in Alexandria for practicing [with Pantaenus] the divine Scriptures.'³⁷ The historian also notes that 'Pantaenus was succeeded by Clement, who

³³ *Str.* V.9.56.2-3. That Philosophy was a way of life in Late Antiquity, see Pierre Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of HUP, 2002).

³⁴ *Prot.* VIII; *Paid.* I.7-9.

³⁵ Wilken, *The Spirit of Early Christian Thought*, 56. J.A. Brooks examined the statistics of texts from Stählin's index that are in Clement's works. He concludes that Clement quotes (and alludes to) the OT 1,842 times; he refers 3,279 times to the NT, 71 times to the NT Apocrypha, and 258 times to Patristic writings; see J.A. Brooks, 'Clement of Alexandria as a Witness to the Development of the New Testament Canon,' *SecCent* 9:1 (1992): 47. See also, Riemer Roukema, 'La Tradition Apostolique et le Canon du Nouveau Testament,' in *The Apostolic Age in Patristic Thought*, ed. A. Hilhorst et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 99-100; and Benno Alexander Zuiddam, 'Early Orthodoxy: The Scriptures in Clement of Alexandria,' *Acta Patristica et Byzantina*, 21:2 (2010): 307-319.

³⁶ Carl P. Cosaert, *The Text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria*, *SBL*, Number 9, The NT in the Greek Fathers, (Atlanta, 2008), vii, 13-19.

³⁷ *H.E.* V.11.1-2. See also Ulrich Neymer, *Die christliche Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert: ihre Lehrtätigkeit, ihr Selbstverständnis und ihre Geschichte*, (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 40-43.

directed the instruction [κατηχήσεως] at Alexandria up to such a date that Origen was one of his students.³⁸ Origen was eighteen years old ‘when he came to preside over the school.’³⁹ When his teaching load became too heavy, so that his own studies—especially the translation of the Scriptures—were impeded, Origen gave to Heraclas ‘a share in the task of instructions.’⁴⁰ Moreover, Eusebius tells us that the *didaskaleion* ‘was established in ancient times,’ and was still functioning ‘to our day,’ and he seems to know this because the reputation and operations of the Alexandrian school were concurrent with him early in the fourth century.⁴¹ Annewies van den Hoek follows Eusebius’s account and deduces no reason to doubt his record, especially noting his attention to specific details in each reference.⁴² However, doubting the Church historian’s account and advancing a contrasting view, R. van den Broek claims that the school of catechesis cannot be attested until ‘the second decade of the third century.’⁴³

Unfortunately, the data depicting Clement’s tenure in Alexandria is scant. He arrived there, as an authentic seeker of the apostolic teachings, and departed a teacher of what he thought was true Christian *gnosis*. Since he had an aversion to physical martyrdom—as for him, true ‘Gnostic’ martyrdom was death of the passions—Clement fled Alexandria *ca.* AD 202 in order to elude the pogrom—by which Origen’s father was killed—prompted by Septimius Severus. Clement went to Anatolia and to

³⁸ *H.E.* VI.6.1.

³⁹ *H.E.* VI.3.3, ὃ τοῦ τῆς κατηχήσεως προέστη διδασκαλείου.

⁴⁰ *H.E.* VI.15.

⁴¹ *H.E.* V.10.1. See Karl O. Sandnes, *The Challenge of Homer: School, Pagan Poets and Early Christianity*, (NY: T&T Clark International, 2009), 124; he takes seriously Eusebius’s account.

⁴² Van den Hoek, ‘The ‘Catechetical School of Early Christian Alexandria and Its Philonic Heritage,’ *HTR* 90:1 (January 1997): 59-87; Henri Crouzel, ‘The School of Alexandria and its Fortunes,’ in *History of Theology I: The Patristic Period*, 145-181; and Alain Le Boulluec, ‘Aux Origines de l’«École» d’Alexandrie’ in *Alexandrie Antique et Chrétienne: Clément et Origène*, (2012), 27-57.

⁴³ Van den Broek, ‘The Christian “School” of Alexandria in the Second and Third Centuries,’ in *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity*, (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 197-205. For van den Broek’s antecedents, see Clemens Scholten, ‘Die Alexandrinische Katechetenschule,’ *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 38 (1995): 16-37; and M. Hornschuh, ‘Das Leben des Origenes und die Entstehung der alexandrinischen Schule,’ *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 71 (1960): 1-25, 193-214.

Jerusalem, where he flourished in the ministry with Alexander, his former student. Historians presume he perished *ca.* AD 215.

Regarding Clement's legacy, ecclesiastical figures revered him. For example, Eusebius cites a letter written by Clement's pupil, Alexander, who describes his teacher as the 'holy Clement' and the 'blessed presbyter, a man virtuous and approved, and when he was present here, in accordance with the providence and oversight of the Master, he both established and increased the Church of the Lord.'⁴⁴ Eusebius further remarks that Clement 'unfolded considerable history, providing us with a foundation of much learning of instruction [πολυμαθοῦς παιδείας].'⁴⁵ Later, St. Jerome (AD 347-420) refers to Clement as a 'presbyter of Alexandria' and states that 'in my judgment, [Clement was] the most learned of men.'⁴⁶ In his work, *De Viris Illustribus*, Jerome remarks that Clement was 'the author of notable volumes full of erudition and eloquence, both of divine scripture and secular instruments of literature.'⁴⁷ After reading the *Protreptikos* and the *Paidagogos*, even the learned Photius (AD 810-891), generally critical of Clement, admits that Clement's 'learning [was] remarkable.'⁴⁸ Kindiy reports that Clement 'appears in the early Roman Martyrology and the fourth of December was known even in the Middle Ages as the day of Saint Clement.'⁴⁹ However, in 1584, Pope Gregory XIII dropped Clement's name from the *Martyrologium Romanum*, and later in 1748, Benedict XIV refused to reinstate Clement to the Calendar of Saints.

⁴⁴ *H.E.* VI.14.9, τὸν ἱερὸν Κλήμεντα; *H.E.* VI.11.6, Κλήμεντος τοῦ μακαρίου πρεσβυτέρου, ἀνδρὸς ἐναρέτου καὶ δοκίμου; *H.E.* VI.11.6, ὃς καὶ ἐνθάδε παρῶν κατὰ τὴν πρόνοιαν καὶ ἐπισκοπὴν τοῦ δεσπότου ἐπεστήριζεν τε καὶ ἠύξησεν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἐκκλησίαν.

⁴⁵ *H.E.* VI.13.5; Sozomen speaks of Clement as a 'very intelligent man' (*Soz.H.E.* I.1.12).

⁴⁶ *Hier.Ep.* LXX.4.

⁴⁷ *Hier.Vir.Ill.*, 38.

⁴⁸ Photius, *The Bibliotheca*, codex 110.

⁴⁹ Oleh Kindiy, *Christos Didaskalos: The Christology of Clement of Alexandria*, (Saarbrücken, Germany: VDM Verlag), 32.

The breadth of Christian learning Clement brought to Alexandria is unknown. It is certain, however, that he gathered enough scriptural knowledge prior to and during his travels to the metropolis (and while there) to discern well, according to his own standards, the true prophetic and apostolic knowledge, and the economy of salvation handed down by Christ to the apostles. When Clement entered Alexandria, he brought a plethora of philosophical, cultural, and Christian knowledge with him, which sufficiently equipped him to engage in the intellectual contexts there. Nonetheless, the erudite and sophisticated side of Clement describes only part of this Church Father.

We cannot fully appreciate Clement nor properly appraise his writings if we observe only his intellectual life: That is, Clement the philosopher, theologian, and Christian teacher, proficient in many forms of knowledge. It is worth highlighting that Clement was a man who above all sought knowledge in order to research, experience, and teach the way of salvation. In his writings, which are sophisticated and erudite, he reaches out to humankind, crossing ethnic and gender boundaries with aims to transmit the knowledge of God for the salvific progress of humankind. Concerning Clement's literary intentions, Henri Crouzel observes that 'Clement's purpose is to lead his readers and hearers to the perfection of Christian life; he is first and foremost a man of the Spirit and when he teaches his aim is pastoral.'⁵⁰ Along these lines, upon writing the *Stromateis*, Clement divulged the following personal information:

He that speaks through books consecrates himself before God, crying in writing this way: Not for gain, not for vainglory, not to be vanquished by partiality, nor enslaved by fear, nor elated by pleasure, but only to reap the salvation of those who read, which he does not at present participate in, but awaits in expectation the recompense which will certainly be rendered by him, who has promised to bestow on the laborers the proper reward.⁵¹

⁵⁰ Crouzel, 'The School of Alexandria and its Fortunes,' in *History of Theology I: The Patristic Period*, 150.

⁵¹ *Str.* I.1.9.2.

Detecting this intention, the Italian scholar, Alfredo Brontesi, remarks that when Clement writes, ‘the only purpose is for the salvation of the reader.’⁵² Seen this way, Clement’s literary output was not envisioned an academic product of his philosophical and theological teachings. While these topics permeate his works, the salvation of humankind is foremost in his thinking and, as will be shown, reflected in his compositions. If the knowledge of salvation were removed from Clement’s thinking, then, as Brontesi concludes: the Clementine ‘corpus would not have been written.’⁵³ For this reason, the Titus Flavius Clemens we meet *via* his writings—teaching amidst the intellectual contexts of Middle Platonism and Gnosticism—was expanding a Christian doctrinal foundation in Alexandria by propagating and preserving the Christian teaching of the Incarnation and mission of the divine *Logos*.

C. Clement’s Literary Legacy

Clement’s focus on salvation is in each of his foremost surviving works: the *Protreptikos to the Greeks*, the *Paidagogos*, and the *Stromateis*.⁵⁴ These writings are better read as independent from each other, not as the alleged trilogy.⁵⁵ The notion of a trilogy logically asserts that the *Protreptikos* is an introductory work, an invitation to Christianity; the *Paidagogos* is an intermediate course in Christian morals; and the *Stromateis* are more advanced works, leading to perfection. The limitation of reading

⁵² ‘Se Cl. Al. scrive, l’unico motive è la salvezza del lettore.’ See Brontesi, *La Soteria in Clemente Alessandrino*, (Roma: Università Gregoriana Editrice, 1972), 597.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 597

⁵⁴ For the MSS. Trail of Clement’s extant works, see P. Mordaunt Barnard, *Clement of Alexandria: Quis Dives Salvetur, re-edited together with an Introduction on the MSS. of Clement’s Works*, (CUP, 1897), ix-xix; Otto Stälin, *Clemens Alexandrinus erster Band: Protreptikos und Paedagogus, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der erten drei Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig, 1905), XVI-XLV; Miroslav Markovich, *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus*, (Brill, 1995).

⁵⁵ In the manuscript tradition, the *Protreptikos* (ca. AD 194) is usually bound together with the *Paidagogos* (ca. AD 197); the earliest surviving ms. for *Paidagogos* is AD 914 (Aretha Codex, P), presently in Paris. The *Stromateis* (ca. AD 201) are not with the *Protreptikos* and the *Paidagogos*, but with *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and *Eclogae Propheticae*. In the manuscripts, the three major works are not bound together as a trilogy. See Cosaert, *The Text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria*, 13-14. For a summary of Clement’s three major writings as a trilogy, see Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria*, 5-18; for objections, see W. Wagner, ‘Another Look at the Literary Problem in Clement of Alexandria’s Major Writings,’ (Sept 1968): 251-260.

these volumes as a tripartite literary plan of spiritual development is that the *Protreptikos* could be overlooked as an ‘introductory’ treatise (the first volume of the trilogy) and the *Paidagogos* reduced to a ‘median’ work on moral theology (the second volume of the trilogy). Moreover, this view presses the *Stromateis* into a mold of ‘advanced’ theological discourse (the third volume of the trilogy) that it cannot sustain alone. Clement composed it to be a Miscellany, a composition written to contain but conceal subjects essential to the journey of salvation. Overall, the internal evidence indicates to me that each volume has its own historical occasion distinct from the other works. This construal does not negate Clement’s salvific program that guides believers from conversion to perfection. Clement demonstrates gradation toward salvation in each of these works, including his treatise, *Quis Dives Salvetur?*—a contextual exposition of Mark 10:17-31.⁵⁶ This homily draws attention to Clement’s emphasis on the salvation of the wealthy in Alexandria, and it is replete with poignant phrases of Clement’s soteriology. What follows is a review of Clement’s writings, noting how I read each composition as an independent work and drawing attention to Clement’s emphasis on salvation.

1. *Protreptikos*

Clement’s work known as the *Protreptikos* was entitled by Eusebius as πρὸς Ἕλληνας Λόγος ὁ Προτρεπτικός: *The Hortatory Logos to the Greeks*.⁵⁷ In Antiquity, this literary genre was a persuasive work and its influential element was the author’s aim.⁵⁸ With this in mind, it seems that the addressees in Clement’s *Protreptikos* are lapsed Hellenistic believers, who because of paternal pressure and

⁵⁶ For the critical text of *Q.d.s.*, see P. Mordaunt Barnard, *Clement of Alexandria: Quis Dives Salvetur*, (Cambridge, England: CUP, 1897), xx-xxviii; for English and Greek texts, see G.W. Butterworth, *Clement of Alexandria: Exhortation to the Greeks, The Rich Man’s Salvation, to the Newly Baptized*, LCL, (Cambridge, MA: HUP, 1919, 2003), 265-367. For English only, ANF2: 591-604.

⁵⁷ *H.E.* 6.13.2.

⁵⁸ M.D. Jordan, ‘Ancient Philosophic Protreptic and the Problem of Persuasive Genres,’ *Rhetorica*, 4:4 (1986): 309-333.

spiritual trials, had abandoned God and returned to their former cultural and religious customs.⁵⁹ Clement's aim is to persuade them to return to the *Logos* and complete their salvific journey.⁶⁰

Clement's literary tone is both scathing and sympathetic. On the one hand, in chapters II-VII, he criticizes pagan customs, exposing the murderous sacrifices of the mystery cults and the immorality of the mythical gods.⁶¹ He appraises the poets and philosophers, showing deficiencies in their postulations. As a result, Clement shames the Hellenistic believers for returning—like swine to mud—to 'unclean' pagan customs.⁶² On the other hand, in chapter I, he urges them to return to the salvific work of the *Logos*, the New Song of salvation. Clement portrays the *Logos* as the pre-existing Saviour and Champion who appeared in order to destroy the tyrant death, terminate the reign of demonic tyranny, and restore psychological order to human beings: 'He makes men out of beasts.'⁶³ In addition, chapters VIII through XII appeal to the writings of the prophets and the apostles, exerting intellectual advantage, because the lapsed believers were familiar with the Scriptures. Scriptural exhortations are too frequent and some seem too advanced to make sense to uninformed pagans. For example, Clement alludes to their unwillingness 'to endure the severity of salvation,' because they buckled under 'the *paideia* of the Lord.'⁶⁴ This evidence shows that they were formerly subjected to the instructions of the *Logos*.⁶⁵ Clement exhorts them to return to the only existent God and complete their salvation, by attaining *apatheia* and

⁵⁹ *Prot.* X.89.2.

⁶⁰ For the traditional interpretation asserting that the *Protreptikos* was written as an invitation for pagans to come to Christ, see Wilson, *ANF2*: 167. This set the precedent that many scholars followed, especially Eric Osborn, 'Clement of Alexandria,' in *The First Christian Theologians: An Introduction to the Theology in the Early Church*, ed. G.R. Evans, (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 127.

⁶¹ For a commentary on Clement's *Protreptikos* focused on the classical heritage Clement preserved, see Miguel Herrero, 'The Protrepticus of Clement of Alexandria: A Commentary,' (PhD Diss., Universidad de Bolonia, 2008).

⁶² *Prot.* X.92.4-93.1.

⁶³ *Prot.* I.4.5.

⁶⁴ *Prot.* X.109.1.

⁶⁵ *Prot.* IX.82.1.

becoming perfected in the divine mysteries. These types of exhortations signal that the addressees were neither pagans nor neophytes, but rather, advanced catechumens who lapsed under trial.

Properly assessed, the *Protreptikos* seems a soteriological and theological treatise. Throughout the volume, Clement utilizes the noun σωτήρ nine times, referring to the *Logos* as Saviour; he uses the term σωτηρία no less than forty-one times; he adds the adjective σωτήριος thirteen times; and he employs the verb σώζω seventeen times.⁶⁶ Clement reminds the relapsed believers that ‘nothing but this is the only work for [God], to save humanity.’⁶⁷ Thus, Clement urges the lapsed believers to forsake the worship of the elements, including the celestial bodies, and seek the Creator of all things, because he is the ‘only truly existent God.’

Taking note of Clement’s thesis in chapter I and his conclusion in chapter XII, the advanced character of the *Protreptikos* comes into view. Near the end of chapter one is Clement’s doctrine of the Incarnation as an exchange: ‘Yes, I say, the *Logos* of God became a human being, in order that you also might learn from a man, how *anthropos* might become god.’⁶⁸ Near the close of chapter XII, Clement adds a quote from Psalm 82:6, stating:

It is time for us to say that the godly Christian is both rich and of sound mind, and is of good heritage [θεοσεβῆ Χριστιανὸν πλούσιόν τε καὶ σώφρονα καὶ εὐγενῆ]; and to say and believe that this person is the image of God with likeness [ταύτη εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ μεθ’ ὁμοιώσεως]. Having become righteous and holy with wisdom [μετὰ φρονήσεως] by Christ Jesus, and in a great way [the Christian] is already like God [ἤδη καὶ θεῶ]. Accordingly, the prophet did not conceal this grace while saying, ‘I said that you are gods, all are sons of the most high [ἐγὼ εἶπον ὅτι θεοὶ ἔστε υἱοὶ ὀψιστου πάντες].’⁶⁹

⁶⁶ The verb σώζω is found only in chapters I, VIII-XI.

⁶⁷ *Prot.* IX.86.3, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλ’ ἢ τοῦτο ἔργον μόνον ἐστὶν αὐτῷ σώζεσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

⁶⁸ *Prot.* I.8.4.

⁶⁹ *Prot.* XII.122.4-123.1.

Clement bookends the *Protreptikos* with the exchange formula and the salvific results: *anthropos* has become *theos*, both image and likeness with wisdom. In composing the *Protreptikos* this way, did Clement show, from the second chapter to the end of the book, the journey to deification for relapsed Greeks? Did he provide the steps to renounce their customs, move beyond their *propaideia*, and embrace the knowledge of God in order to fulfil their salvation and become gods? Clement's choice of Psalms 82:6 in the conclusion seems a clue.

2. *Paidagogos*

The *Paidagogos*, known among scholars as the *Instructor* or the *Educator*, is a sizeable volume containing three books that are focused on the sequential steps of spiritual formation leading to salvation. It is a Christian *paideia* rooted in the Christ-event and guided by the divine *Logos* toward the complete salvation of a human being. Clement wrote the *Paidagogos* to introduce believers to Christ Jesus (*Paid.* I.7) as the Instructor, and in doing so, composed a divine course of spiritual formation that leads to deification predicated upon the Incarnation and plan of God.

Generally, scholars interpret the *Paidagogos* as Clement's intermediate stage in *paideia* focused on Christian morals.⁷⁰ Read sequentially, however, the literary and thematic movement of introductions and conclusions in each of the three books unfolds a different reading. The internal structure demonstrates a seamless progression from elemental exhortations in Christian *paideia*, toward median instructions in Christian morals and virtue, to advanced teachings in godliness and deification. Accordingly, there is another way to read the *Paidagogos*. It is directed toward the complete

⁷⁰ For examples: Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, 63; J.L. Kovacs, 'Divine Pedagogy and the Gnostic Teacher According to Clement of Alexandria,' *J ECS* 9:1 (2001): 23; Eric Osborn, 'Clement of Alexandria,' in *The First Christian Theologians: An Introduction to Theology in the Early Church*, G.R. Evans, ed., (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 127; Simon Wood, *Clement of Alexandria: CTE*, The Fathers of the Church, 23. (CUAP, 1954), xiv.

salvation of a human being.⁷¹ Clement's focus is to show 'the greatest and most regal work of God,' which is 'to save humanity.'⁷² To this end, the *Paidagogos* was written about the divine *Logos*, whose mission as Saviour and Teacher is to lead believers to real human existence, becoming like God. He shows this purpose through three stages of spiritual formation. At the outset, his aim is three-fold: (1) to heal believers of their base habits, (2) to train them in godly deeds, and (3) to teach them how to overcome the passions.⁷³ Each stage of spiritual formation corresponds to the intent and content of each of the three books.

Book I is an introduction to the divine *Logos* as the *Paidagogos* to humankind. Here the *Paidagogos* is primarily concerned with elementary instructions, such as forgiveness of sins, and the multifaceted ways God acts to guide believers toward the path of sinlessness. In chapters 2-6, Clement sets out his theological agenda for the entire volume; this section is replete with Clement's mystical theology from John 6 about the incarnate *Logos* who became flesh: 'He is the bread of God that descends from heaven and gives life to the world.'⁷⁴ Chapter six contains Clement's explicit teachings on the mystery rite of baptism, which sets the course to immortality and deification. Thus, baptism includes initiation into the mysteries of illumination, adoption, and perfection. Drawing from the Old Testament prophets and Wisdom Literature, Clement demonstrates how the *Paidagogos* exhorts, instructs, and corrects in order to heal people, imparting divine wisdom for guidance in the spiritual course

⁷¹ See Quatember, *Die christliche Lebenshaltung des Klemens von Alexandrien nach seinem Pädagogus: Mit einer kritischen Voruntersuchung über die Person des Klemens und sein Werk, den Pädagogus*, (Wien: Verlag Herder, 1946).

⁷² *Paid.* I.12.100.1, τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ μέγιστον καὶ βασιλικώτατον ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ σώζειν τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.

⁷³ *Paid.* I.1.1.1.

⁷⁴ Jn. 6:33; *Paid.* I.6.46.2, ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ.

toward life.⁷⁵ Instruction and correction are requisite, Clement's thinks, for the reception of advanced *gnosis*.

Book II is about intermediate instructions, directing believers toward emotional healing and mental well-being. Clement shows the psychological lift from the regions of physical sensibility and pleasure upward to spiritual comprehension of divine reality. Chapter two contains Clement's explicit teachings on the mystery of the Eucharist—the visible, tangible, and perpetual presence of the Incarnation—which releases participants from corruption and makes them sharers of an incorruptible life through union with Christ. This spiritual relationship produces a transformation in human existence, which reflects godly virtue. Conversion to godly ethics is not the goal for Clement, but demonstrates that one is on the proper path toward godliness.

In Book III, Clement advances believers toward deification. He begins chapter one with a Christian interpretation of the Delphic Oracle: 'It seems the greatest of all lessons is "to know self." For if one knows one's self, one will know God; and knowing God, one will be made like God.'⁷⁶ The path to deification is the will of God because 'that man with whom the *Logos* dwells is made like to God; [and] that person becomes god, because God wills it.'⁷⁷ Deification is the aim and focus of Book III, which ends with a prayer of praise to the *Logos*-Son, who is both the *Paidagogos* and *Didaskalos* and has led the catechumens on a successful journey.⁷⁸ As a complete volume, the *Paidagogos* represents Clement's Christian *paideia* in three successive stages: (1) healing the soul of sins, (2) learning to see spiritual reality, reflected through

⁷⁵ *Paid.* I.8-9.

⁷⁶ *Paid.* III.1.1.1, ὡς ἔοικεν, πάντων μέγιστον μαθημάτων τὸ γινῶναι αὐτόν· ἑαυτὸν γὰρ τις εἰδὼν, θεὸν εἴσεται, θεὸν δὲ εἰδὼς ἐξομοιωθήσεται θεῷ.

⁷⁷ *Paid.* III.1.1.5.

⁷⁸ *Paid.* III.12.101.2. While the *Paidagogos* highlights the presence of the Instructor, there are at least 14 references to διδάσκαλος: six in Book I, two in Book II, and six mentions in Book III.

godly virtues, and (3) becoming god. In this light, if Clement wrote a trilogy, perhaps the *Paidagogos* is it.

3. *Stromateis*

Clement's larger work, referred to as the *Miscellanies*, *Stromata*, or *Stromateis*, was known by Eusebius as: Τίτου Φλαύιου Κλήμεντος τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀληθῆ φιλοσοφίαν γνωστικῶν ὑπομνημάτων Στρωματεῖς.⁷⁹ Commenting on the title, Stuart Thompson points out that 'Clement presents himself first and foremost as a philosophical teacher. The full title of the *Stromateis* makes this point rather bluntly: The Patchworks of the Gnostic Notes according to the "True" Philosophy. Not Christianity, but the "true philosophy."⁸⁰ Thompson makes a point, but what Clement means by the 'true philosophy' is Christianity.⁸¹ The point of philosophy for Clement, as in the ancient world, means a way of life. Accordingly, in the *Stromateis*, Clement portrays Christianity as the true path for human existence, advancing the *telos* of likeness to God. It is probable that he compiled these notes during his journey to Alexandria and while in the metropolis.⁸²

He made the true philosophy no easy pursuit. Scholars recognize that Clement concealed *gnosis* in the *Stromateis* the way a nutshell conceals the edible meat (*Str.* I.1.18.1), or that bushes hide game birds (*Str.* I.2.21.1), and the earth covers gold (*Str.* IV.2.4.1-5.3).⁸³ Clement made the discovery of divine knowledge a personal, but demanding task, requiring the sincerity of the seeker. Part of this intention was to hide *gnosis* from those who scoff at the truth, such as the Sophists. As one searches through

⁷⁹ *H.E.* 6:13.1.

⁸⁰ Thompson, 'Apostolic Authority: Reading and Writing Legitimacy in Clement of Alexandria,' *Studia Patristica*, LXVI (2013): 21.

⁸¹ *Str.* I.18.90.2; *Str.* II.11.48.1; *Str.* VI.11.89.3; *Str.* VII.16.98.2.

⁸² *Str.* I.1.11.1. Clement remarked that the *Stromateis* are an 'image and outline of those manifest and animated discourses [he] was privileged to hear' as he traveled to Alexandria.

⁸³ For Clement's method of concealment, see Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, 134-152; J.L. Kovacs, 'Concealment and Gnostic Exegesis: Clement of Alexandria's Interpretation of the Tabernacle,' *Studia Patristica* XXXI (1997): 414-437.

the *Stromateis*, the chief doctrine that emerges is soteriology: ‘And I think the Saviour exerts energy, since it is his work to save.’⁸⁴

From the time of Eugene De Faye (1898), who doubted the *Stromateis* contains Clement’s advanced theology and argues it could not be the alleged ‘Didaskalos,’ it is well known that there are disagreements concerning the intent and content of the *Stromateis*.⁸⁵ While it is not the aim here to engage in this discussion, one useful way to approach the *Stromateis* is to determine the direction they teach and guide people. Since the *Stromateis* do not introduce a more advanced *telos* (deification) than already taught in the other works, they cannot advance believers forward thematically. Instead, they provide the detailed information of subjects already discussed in Clement’s other writings, such as the identity and work of the divine *Logos*, true *gnosis*, the economy of salvation, forgiveness of sins, ethics, the attainment of *apatheia*, godliness, and perfection. In this way, it seems more likely that these miscellanies function as a comprehensive reference manual for the journey to salvation, supplementing Clement’s other writings.⁸⁶

For the reason that the *Stromateis* cover so many subjects, and the material is so wide-ranging, it is necessary here to limit the discussion to at least three central aims relevant to my project. Firstly, Clement wants to demonstrate that all Hellenistic philosophies have divine origins and fulfillment in the one ‘true’ philosophy, Christianity.⁸⁷ He aims to sum up all relevant cultural knowledge by showing that the Incarnation and *parousia* of the Lord fulfills all truth. He therefore presses the Greeks

⁸⁴ *Str.* VI.6.46.1, ἐνεργεῖ δὲ, οἶμαι, καὶ ὁ σωτήρ, ἐπεὶ τὸ σῶζειν ἔργον αὐτοῦ.

⁸⁵ De Faye, *Clément d’Alexandrie, étude sur les rapports du christianisme et de la philosophie grecque a IIe siècle*, (Paris, 1898), 104.

⁸⁶ See *Str.* VI.1.1.1, εἰς γραφὴν ὑπομνηστικὴν. Wilson translates this as ‘a book of reference’ (*ANF2*: 480). Literally, this construction means ‘unto writing that awakens recollection.’ See L&S, ‘ὑπομνηστικός,’ 1890. The term means: ‘awakening the recollection,’ or ‘suggestive.’

⁸⁷ Clement’s discussion about Hellenistic philosophy in the *Stromateis* re-appropriates classical literature by showing its value. After reading the *Protreptikos*, one might consider Clement anti-Hellenistic; so, the way he treats philosophical literature in the *Stromateis* demonstrates how Hellenic knowledge can serve humanity.

and Jews, especially in books I and VI, to move beyond philosophy and the law to the knowledge of salvation disclosed by Christ at his *parousia*. Due to the Incarnation and Christ's disclosure of true knowledge, Clement demarcates these preparatory structures of knowledge and subordinates them to the writings of the prophets and apostles.

Secondly, Clement preserves the apostolic teachings, which are Christ's renderings of the Old Testament and an accurate interpretation of the Christ-event. From the apostles forward, humankind began to pursue and attain a radical existence of godliness through the economy of salvation. The witness, experience, and realization of likeness to God through Christ credibly demonstrates for Clement that the Gospel is the true philosophy. Whereas both Hellenistic philosophy and Jewish law proved weak, the Gospel provides both wisdom and power to guide believers to the *telos* of human existence. Clement preserves this path of knowledge in his *Stromateis*.

Thirdly, based upon the apostolic teachings, Clement aims to teach and preserve the true 'gnostic' tradition for spiritual progeny. As will be shown, this tradition is concerned with the content and function of disclosed knowledge. Contending with the various Gnostic sects, Clement tells us that the real gnostic tradition is to be 'learned from the prophets and the apostles,' especially given through the '*energeia* of Christ.'⁸⁸ In this way, Clement was intent on preserving a mode of epistemic agency: Believers learn true *gnosis* through the revelatory and didactic functions of the *Logos*. Because this knowledge is divine, Clement emphasizes that only the true Gnostic or the Christian is in fact godly, because the *gnosis* that comes from Christ is beneficial unto salvation. The *Stromateis* are to be studied as Clement's intentional writing in which he preserves his 'gnostic notes' and advances his understanding of the true philosophy as a way to attain salvation.

⁸⁸ *Str.* VI.7.61.1.

4. *Quis Dives Salvetur?*

Clement's concise treatise, *Who is the Rich Man being Saved* (Τὶς Σωζόμενος Πλούσιος), commonly referred to as *Quis Dives Salvetur*, is an allegorical exposition on Mark 10:17-31. It is an exemplar of Clement's mystical insights, his exegetical skills, and his contextual application of the New Testament. Scholars think *Quis Dives Salvetur* is Clement's later work, because in *Stromateis* III, Clement promises to treat certain subjects when he writes *On First Principles*, but had not yet written it.⁸⁹ In *Quis Dives Salvetur*, Clement mentions this work was already composed: 'the exegesis *On First Principles and Theology* [ἐν τῇ περὶ ἀρχῶν καὶ θεολογίας ἐξηγήσει].'⁹⁰ Moreover, since Clement mentions both the *Protreptikos* (VII.4.22.3) and *Paidagogos* (VI.1.1.3) in the *Stromateis*, *Quis Dives Salvetur* is later than all three surviving works. Being a later work and noting the thematic content, this homily summarizes many of Clement's Christian doctrines essential to salvation.

Clement's overall purpose for *Quis Dives Salvetur* is to aid the rich in working out their salvation every possible way, leading them to attain the truth in order to gain eternal life through the salvific work and teachings of Christ.⁹¹ Clement emphasizes Christ's roles as Saviour (Σωτήρ) and Teacher (Διδάσκαλος).⁹² His literary aim is twofold. Firstly, Clement *explains* the hope of the Gospel tailored for those trapped in wealth (4), which requires grace and a proper exegesis of Scripture to broach knowledge of God (7-8) and pursue eternal life. Clement explains that the 'immovable and unshakable beginning and foundation of life is the knowledge of God.'⁹³ Clement's epistemology in *Quis Dives Salvetur* is mystical. He argues that 'the Saviour teaches

⁸⁹ *Str.* III.3.13.1, τὸν περὶ ἀρχῶν λόγος; *Str.* III.3.21.2, περὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν; in *ANF2*: 383, 384, *de principiis*.

⁹⁰ *Q.d.s.* 26.8.

⁹¹ *Q.d.s.* 1.4.

⁹² *Q.d.s.* 6.1.

⁹³ *Q.d.s.* 7.2, αὕτη γὰρ ἄτρεπτος καὶ ἀσάλευτος ἀρχὴ καὶ κρηπὶς ζωῆς, ἐπιστήμη θεοῦ.

with divine and mystic wisdom.’⁹⁴ Christ, the divine Messenger, says: ‘I am the teacher of super-celestial instructions [ἐγὼ διδάσκαλος ὑπερουρανίων παιδευμάτων].’⁹⁵ Accordingly, Clement advises believers to hear Christ’s teachings in the Gospels ‘not in a fleshly manner [μὴ σαρκίνως]’ but to seek his heavenly teachings with a ‘super-celestial depth of mind [ὑπερουρανίῳ διανοίᾳς βάθει].’⁹⁶ These lessons are about the hope of overcoming the passions and progressing toward perfection. To reach this aim, Clement explains the inherent weakness of Hebrew *propaideia* by using the story of the rich young ruler, which affirms the limits of the law and stresses the need for Christ as Saviour. The hope is perfection (21), which is realized by Christ, who helps people sell the possessions of the passions and attain *apatheia*.

Secondly, Clement *accesses* the hope of the Gospel so that the wealthy in Alexandria (and abroad) might participate in the journey to perfection. For Clement, participation means entering the salvific contest (3). Humanity is not idle in the work of Christ; rather, believers play a substantial role in living out their salvation just as an athlete contests against an opponent. For believers, the opponent is the passions, which are internal persecutions and burning fires in the soul often inflicting psychological wounds that cause emotional trauma (25, 29). He stresses that *apatheia* is possible (21) through the addition of divine power (21), but one must be willing and determined to choose salvation, because ‘God conspires with willing souls’ (21). To illustrate the solution, Clement depicts Jesus as Saviour through the parable of the Good Samaritan (28-29). This story signifies the doctrine of exchange as mission: The Good Samaritan is Christ, who has the resources to enter into human brokenness so that the wounded might experience his love and power through his healing agency: oil and wine (37).

⁹⁴ *Q.d.s.* 5.2, ὁ σωτήρ, ἀλλὰ πάντα θεία σοφία καὶ μυστικῇ διδάσκει.

⁹⁵ *Q.d.s.* 23.4.

⁹⁶ *Q.d.s.* 5.4.

A subtle feature in this treatise is Clement's rebuke to the Alexandrian Christian ministry for allowing rich believers to fall away from Christ. The story at the conclusion about the apostle John, the young convert who fell away from Christ, and the bishop, who neglected advanced training for the convert (42), seems a correction to the official episcopate that ignored pastoral care. In fact, prior to this story, Clement suggests that the rich should set over themselves, not a bishop, but a 'certain man of God as a trainer and guide [τινα ἄνθρωπον θεοῦ καθάπερ ἀλείπτην καὶ κυβερνήτην].'⁹⁷ Such words are un-ecclesial and draw attention to those who train in a gymnasium, reflecting more of a Gnostic view of Christian leadership. Clement's ultimate choice for the trainer is the *Logos*: 'When bearing [the contest] let each [one] submit himself to [the] trainer of athletes, the *Logos* [γυμναστῆ τῶ λόγῳ].'⁹⁸

As the title implies, the contents of *Quis Dives Salvetur*—as with Clement's other extant works—accentuate the topic of salvation. He concludes his overall argument assuring believers in Alexandria that 'the one who looks attentively at this salvation, both desiring and asking [for it] with shamelessness and force of mind, the good Father, who is in the heavens will provide the true cleansing and unchangeable life.'⁹⁹ *Quis Dives Salvetur* contains many subjects scholars may study throughout Clement's works.

D. Literature Review

Clement's compositions contain a multifarious range of topics. They include quotations from Homeric poetry, pre-Socratic and classical philosophy, insights from Jewish-Alexandrine literature, and significant interaction with second century Gnostic beliefs. In addition, there are thousands of references from the Scriptures, which for Clement include the Old and New Testaments, the Apocrypha, and the Apostolic

⁹⁷ *Q.d.s.* 41.1.

⁹⁸ *Q.d.s.* 3.6.

⁹⁹ *Q.d.s.* 42.19.

Fathers. With this assortment of secular and sacred writings and the array of subjects, scholars may approach Clement's works from a variety of perspectives. This section catalogues examples of these topics, followed by a more extensive review of additional works on Clement.

In his book, *Études sur les 'Stromates' chez Clément d'Alexandrie* (1966), André Méhat focuses on the literary structure and the manifold themes of the *Stromateis*. He claims the structure is based upon the concept of concealment, not orderly arrangement. Subjects, such as poetry, philosophy, theology, biblical interpretation, the *Logos*, *gnosis*, and the Gnostic are set within the religious and philosophical contexts. Approaching Clement's work and his association with the Philonic heritage, Annewies van den Hoek (1988) demonstrates Clement's usage of Philo's writings, comparing references to Moses, Hagar and Sarah, and the allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament.¹⁰⁰ John Behr (2000) published his research on the asceticism and anthropology of Irenaeus and Clement, showing the similarities and differences between the bishop (Irenaeus) and the teacher (Clement).¹⁰¹ Narrowing his research to a single word, Jon Ewing (2008) demonstrates how Clement 'Christianized' the stoic conception of *πρόνοια*.¹⁰² Approaching Clement's work from a non-Patristic point of view, the Spanish scholar, Miguel Herrero (2008), wrote a commentary on Clement's *Protreptikos* from a classicist's perspective.¹⁰³ He identifies ancient references Clement cited, linking them to Greek sources. Intrigued by the notion of the 'other Clement,' Bogdan Bucur (2009) compares Clement's usage of angelic imagery with the Holy

¹⁰⁰ Van den Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromateis: An Early Reshaping of a Jewish Model*, (Leiden: Brill, 1988).

¹⁰¹ Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement*, (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

¹⁰² Ewing, *Clement of Alexandria's Reinterpretation of Divine Providence: The Christianization of the Hellenistic Idea of Pronoia*, (Edwin Mellen Press, 2008).

¹⁰³ Herrero, 'The Protrepticus of Clement of Alexandria: A Commentary,' 48.

Spirit in early Christian documents.¹⁰⁴ Adding a new perspective to reading Clement's works, Andrew Itter (2009) examines some of Clement's esoteric teachings in the *Stromateis*, especially the symbolism of the tabernacle as a model of the human ascent in Christ.¹⁰⁵ Finally, the French scholar, Alain Le Boulluec, recently published his latest work: *Alexandrie Antique et Chrétienne: Clément et Origène* (2012).¹⁰⁶ In this book, Le Boulluec sums up French scholarship concerning early Christianity in Alexandria, beginning with the origin of the *didaskaleion* and the roles of Pantaenus and Clement. Boulluec delineates the modes of exegesis Clement and Origen developed, highlighting their allegorical methods and the theological foundations they set for Alexandrian Christianity, especially their emphasis on true *gnosis*.

The above monographs are useful thematic works that scholars have added to our Clementine library, as they showcase Clement's treasury of knowledge. However, due to each specific focus, none of these writings deals with Clement's doctrine of the Incarnation. What follows, therefore, is a review of other contributions scholars have added to our knowledge of Clement, including concise analysis about what they state or do not state vis-à-vis Clement's doctrine of the Incarnation and Christ-event.

Scholarly interest in Clement's writings arose in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and continues into the twenty-first century. For example, preparing for the Bampton lectures in 1886, Charles Bigg wrote about what he styles, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*.¹⁰⁷ Bigg portrays Clement as a Christian Platonist and provides a general assessment of Clement's affinity to Platonism (46-52). He further shows Clement's disdain for Gnosticism (77-88), and surveys many Christian

¹⁰⁴ Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses*, VChr. Suppl. 95, (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

¹⁰⁵ Itter, *Esoteric Teaching in the Stromateis of Clement of Alexandria*, (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

¹⁰⁶ Le Boulluec, *Alexandrie Antique et Chrétienne: Clément et Origène*, (Paris: Institut d' Études Augustiniennes, 2012).

¹⁰⁷ Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1913, 2001).

subjects in Clement's works, such as theology, the doctrine of the Son, creation, the lower and higher life of a Christian, grace, and the Eucharist. An advantage of Bigg's work is his use of meticulous footnotes, where he provides copious lists of Clement's references to specific topics, making his monograph a helpful reference tool.

Concerning Clement's view of the Incarnation, Bigg observes: 'The Word, the whole Word, took flesh of the Virgin Mary, and became man' (71). However, he follows this by saying: 'But His flesh was not wholly like ours, inasmuch as it was exempt from all carnal desires and emotions, even the most necessary and innocent' (71). Bigg suggests that the 'Platonic dislike of the body has led Clement here, though no Docetist, perilously near to the confines of Docetism' (71-72).

Perhaps as a reaction to Bigg's work, John Patrick wrote his Croall Lectures (1899-1900) on Clement.¹⁰⁸ Due to illness, the lectures were not revised for publication until 1914.¹⁰⁹ Patrick discusses Clement's usage of philosophical categories (34-64), but he takes a different view than Bigg, and proposes:

Clement was himself unconscious of any disloyalty to the teaching of the Church; and while he faced the situation of the time with intellectual courage, he did not dream of making any concession to the Hellenistic culture around him that either transformed or deformed the Christian Faith.¹¹⁰

Patrick shows Clement assigned philosophy to a similar category as Jewish law; it was 'preliminary discipline for Christianity.'¹¹¹

Patrick systematizes Clement's theology under the modern rubrics of the Nature and Attributes of God (65-96) and the Person and Work of Christ (97-140). He emphasizes that God created from his own will, and in Clement's view, God is the cause of creation and the absolute first principle (74-78). He further stresses the

¹⁰⁸ Patrick, *Clement of Alexandria* (1914).

¹⁰⁹ For a treatment of Clement similar to Patrick, see R.B. Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria VI & V2: A Study in Christian Liberalism*, (London: Williams and Norgate, 1914).

¹¹⁰ Patrick, *Clement of Alexandria*, 63.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 35.

absolute goodness of God (84-85); consequentially, God cannot originate evil (87-90). Patrick uses Clement's pithy text in *Stromateis* V.1.1.2 to outline Clement's Christology: 'It escapes their notice that it is necessary to believe truly in the Son, that he is the Son and he came and how and why and concerning his sufferings. And it is necessary to know who is the Son of God.'¹¹² Following this framework, Patrick depicts Clement's view of the Son of God by answering the questions: Who is the Son? He is the eternal *Logos* and Son of the Father (99-108). Why did he come? He came for the salvation of humankind teaching people how to live well. How did he come? He came through the Virgin Mary, and thus, his body was real flesh. In what ways did he suffer? He suffered in death as a ransom for humanity. Patrick is careful to cite texts in Clement's works about the Incarnation and work of Christ, but does not elucidate them.

Patrick addresses the docetic problem (111-115), noting that 'in Clement we must always be prepared for apparent contradictions' (112). He cites passages where Clement affirms the humanity of Christ and the isolated texts that appear docetic. Patrick's rationalizes a solution, suggesting that the 'wavering language is rather due to the fact that Clement approached the question of the person of Christ from the divine side...and was thinking not so much of the influence of the human on the divine as of the influence of the divine on the human' (115). Clement, therefore, 'does not ask what limitations the human embodiment put on the divine, but what prerogatives the divine imparted to the human' (115). Thus, Patrick concedes that for Clement, 'a tendency in the direction of docetism was inevitable' (115).

On Clement's subject of *gnosis* and the true Gnostic, Walther Völker (1952) produced a monograph, *Der wahre Gnostiker*, which depicts the 'true' Gnostic as a

¹¹² *Str.* V.1.1.2.

Christian mystic striving for perfection.¹¹³ Völker interprets the *Logos* as a world Educator, who instructs the true Gnostic by mysteries. This instruction leads to salvation which is motivated by ‘the sacred love’ of God (98-99). Völker asserts that Clement ‘looks primarily at the effective Incarnation [*in der Inkarnation wirksam*] and the passion,’ as the expression of love (99). The recurring theme in Clement’s work, as Völker sees it, is ‘παίδευσις-Motiv’ and God the *Logos* as ‘the Great Educator’ (*Gott der große Pädagoge*, 99). In another way, he shows that Clement gives equal weight to the *Logos*, who is the *Paidagogos*, is ‘at the same time the Redeemer who died for our sins on the cross’ (107).¹¹⁴ Völker presents the Christian journey as a fight against the passions (183-188) in which the true Gnostic overcomes through faith (*Glaube*, 221-254) and divine *gnosis*; he devotes all of Chapter IV (301-445) to *gnosis*. After one has received *gnosis*, one becomes a true Gnostic with a new character and an ‘active life’ (*tätiges Leben*). The character traits of a true Gnostic are love, dispassion, and the pursuit of perfection; Völker sees perfection as θεοποίησις (597-609). The value of his work for this present study is that Völker roots the work of the *Logos* in redemptive and pedagogical roles, and the former follows the latter. However, though Völker mentions the Incarnation, he does not develop it, and as Lilla observes, Völker does not root his discussion in Clement’s intellectual context in Alexandria.

Dissatisfied with the sparse attention paid by previous scholars (such as Völker) to Clement’s intellectual background, Salvatore Lilla (1971), devotes his book to display Clement’s thought with Jewish-Alexandrine philosophy (Philo), Middle Platonism (Alcinous), Neoplatonism, and second century Gnosticism.¹¹⁵ Lilla emphasizes Clement’s view that Greek philosophy was a divine deposit and God apportioned it to

¹¹³ Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur LVII, (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1952).

¹¹⁴ *Der Logos als der Erzieher, was eine pädagogische Wertung der Strafe in sich begreift, und zugleich als der Versöhner, der für unsere Sünden am Kreuze stirbt.*

¹¹⁵ Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*.

prepare the Greeks to receive the Gospel (9-57). He focuses on the works of Philo and Alcinous, citing copiously from the Philonic corpus and Alcinous's *Didaskalikos*. Lilla demonstrates numerous doxographical parallels of theological phraseology between these thinkers and Clement; he highlights Clement's doctrines of *pistis* and *gnosis*, and draws textual similarities in ethics, theology, and cosmogony. Lilla makes clear Clement's familiarity with Philo and Middle Platonic concepts.¹¹⁶

Lilla points out two reasons for which Clement taught the Incarnation of the *Logos*. Firstly, the *Logos* became a human being in order to teach people to fight against the passions (113-117). Secondly, 'after becoming a historical person,' the *Logos* became 'the source of *gnosis*' (159). Here, Lilla is perhaps the first scholar to associate Clement directly with Gnosticism of the second century, observing that Christ has come down as the 'Gnostic' teacher to impart secret knowledge to those with ears to hear (158-163). Thus, Lilla argues that the *Logos*

is not simply the impersonal law of φύσις and of ethics, nor does he represent only human reason; being one and the same thing with Christ, his intervention in the human sphere is far more concrete and personal: He teaches, educates, he guides, he is the παιδαγωγός, both when he is a metaphysical principle and after his descent on earth, when he acts as a historical person.¹¹⁷

Lilla develops neither the exchange aspect of the Incarnation nor the Christ event (as the redeeming work of the *Logos*), because 'for Clement, it is Christ, the *Logos*, who has the task of healing the passions of man, and of guiding him gradually toward perfection by educating him' (113). As Lilla sees it, the primary purpose for the Incarnation in Clement's Christology was to teach *gnosis*.

Lilla advances a three-stage theory of the *logoi* in Clement. Firstly, the *Logos* is the mind of God and is in God, and thus, identical to God (201-203). Secondly, the *Logos* "comes out" of the mind of God and becomes a distinct being, which is the author of

¹¹⁶ Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, B-8; here, his introduction states that the primary focus of his work is Clement's intellectual background.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 114.

creation and the sensible world' (204-209). Thirdly, the *Logos* is immanent in the universe and is its supreme law and helmsman, sustaining and guiding its course (209-212). The value of Lilla's work is the copious evidence he has collated portraying Clement's multidimensional background, which serves as a useful reference work. The weakness is that it steeps Clement so deeply in the four backgrounds that Lilla does not bring Clement's Christian milieu forward, but this was not his intention.

Immediately following Lilla, Alfredo Brontesi (1972) published a massive monograph: *la Soteria in Clemente Alessandrino*. He divides it into two parts. In Part One, Brontesi focuses on philological and linguistic concerns (13-233), providing a comprehensive treatment of four primary terms in all of their 'case' functions within the Clementine corpus: σωτηρία, σωτήρ, σώζω, and σωτήριος.¹¹⁸ Part Two presents the theological aspects of *soteria*, which is the ultimate goal of the pedagogical process and human effort. Although his focus is *la soteria è tutto* ('salvation is everything,' 237)—since salvation is 'at the beginning and end of creation' (597)—he provides no elucidation of either the Incarnation or the Christ-event. In fact, this omission was intentional. Up front, he states that his study is 'delimited and incomplete' and his research is a foundation upon which others 'will have their launch' (*che pure nella presente ricerca hanno un loro avvio*, xxvii). Accordingly, he admits that he purposely omits 'the systematic soteriology of the mysteries of Christ from the Incarnation to the ascension' (*la soteriologia sistematica dei misteri di Cristo dalla incarnazione alla ascensione*), 'the humble *parousia*' (*la parousia umile*), and 'the salvific efficacy of the flesh assumed by the *Logos*' (*la efficacia salvifica della carne assunta dal Logos*).¹¹⁹

¹¹⁸ Brontesi also reviewed other words with the common root, σω-, which have minimal occurrences, such as: σωτηρίως, σωτική, διασώζω, ἀνασώζω, περισώ, ἀποσώζω; for the list, see Brontesi, *La Soteria in Clemente Alessandrino*, (1972), 3.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, xxvii.

However, Brontesi recognizes that for Clement, the Logos was incarnated twice: Once by ‘operating through the prophets’ and a second time when ‘he became man in the *parousia*’ (621). He claims that Clement affirms that the eternal Son and ‘the historical Christ [*Cristo storico*] are always manifestations of the very same Logos [*medesimo Logos*] in which he becomes flesh’ and ‘becomes, so to speak, the revelation of the Father’ (*rivelazione del Padre*, 621). Beyond this, Brontesi has nothing more to say about the Incarnation or the Christ-event. The strength of his work is the detailed lexical and philological analysis on σωτηρία and related terms.

By-passing Brontesi and appearing to respond to Lilla’s emphasis on contemporary Middle Platonism as part of Clement’s intellectual dependence, Dietmar Wywra (1983) argues against Clement’s association with the Middle Platonists and links Clement directly to Plato.¹²⁰ Wywra contends that the extensive doxographical lists comparing Clement’s passages with those of Alcinous and Philo (such as found in Lilla’s work) can obscure Clement’s use of the texts, blurring Clement’s ‘new’ Christian theology (173-176). Wywra recognizes the similarities with Clement and Middle Platonists concerning apophatic theology, but claims that Clement’s view of Plato is completely incompatible with the contemporary ‘Schulplatonismus’ (318). He also concludes that Clement denied matter as an ‘independent principle’ (*eigenständiges Prinzip*, 318), and rejected the tenet of the ‘three first principles’ (*Drei-Prinzipien-Lehre*) of Middle Platonism (13, 307, 318). Wywra contends that Clement does not hold to the ‘eternality of the world’ (*Ewigkeit der Welt*), and interprets the *Timaeus* literally (318). He concludes that Clement cannot be classified among the Middle Platonists of the second century, but must be associated with the philosophical teachings of Plato.

¹²⁰ Wywra, *Die Christliche Platonaneignung in den Stromateis des Clemens von Alexandrien* (1983).

Concerning the Incarnation and Christ-event, Wywra has little to say. He does report that Clement believed it was the ‘transcendent God in the Incarnation of the Son of God [*der transzendentente Gott in der Inkarnation des Gottessohnes*, 320].’ He affirms that Clement envisaged the goal of the Incarnation, which is ‘formulated on the basis of John 1:14’ was to ‘manifest God’ to humankind (261); thus he quotes Clement: ‘The Word became flesh in order that he might be seen.’¹²¹ As far as detected, he mentions the cross (*Kreuz*) only twice (164, 192), and states Christ is the best possible sacrifice because he is ‘the Son of God’ (*der Sohn Gottes*, 290). However, because his agenda is to join Clement to Plato and not Middle Platonists, Wywra develops neither the theology of the Incarnation nor Christ-event.

Challenging the two-*logoi* theory against scholarly opinion, Mark Edwards wrote what could be read as the decisive article, ‘Clement of Alexandria and His Doctrine of the Logos.’¹²² Edwards contends against Photius’s assertion (and Lilla’s), based on the Patriarch’s reading of Clement’s *Hypotyposesis*, of a two *logoi* system that makes Clement say the *Logos* was first in the mind of God and then proceeded forth to become a second divine *hypostasis*; therefore, ‘only the nature and not the person of the Logos is eternal’ (159). Alternatively, Edwards argues for the ‘eternal generation’ of the *Logos* in Clement, advancing his case with four arguments: Firstly, the two-stage theory of the *Logos* was not a ubiquitous datum in the second century, and therefore cannot be applied to all of the apologists or ecclesial leaders and teachers of that time, especially Clement. Secondly the philosophical and philological arguments cannot sustain—from Clement’s usage of the term λόγος—a procession of two different *logoi*. Thirdly, he challenges the charge from Photius based upon his misquotation of Clement’s Greek

¹²¹ Wywra, *Die Christliche Platonaneignung in den Stromateis des Clemens von Alexandrien*, 261; Str. V.3.16.6, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ γένηται, ἵνα καὶ θεαθῆ.

¹²² M.J. Edwards, ‘Clement of Alexandria and His Doctrine of the Logos,’ *Brill: Vigiliae Christianae* 54:2 (2000): 159-177.

text. Fourthly, Edwards points to a passage in Cassiodorus's *Adumbrationes* (1John 1:1-2) which he claims is authentic: 'When it says, "From the beginning," it alludes to the generation without beginning of the Son who exists coevally with the Father.' From this and other texts, Edwards argues for the eternal generation of one *Logos* in Clement.

Focusing on the three themes in Clement's works: *Gnosis*, *Theophany*, and *Theosis*, Arkadi Choufrine situates Clement in the Gnostic thought of Valentinus and Basilides (for *gnosis*), an exegetical dependence on Philo (for theophany), and the backdrop of Platonic and Aristotelian ethics (for *theosis*).¹²³ Dissimilar to Lilla, Choufrine's thesis is that at 'the center of Clement's synthesis [of these backgrounds] is the Christ-event in its two aspects of divine revelation and human deification' (199). Choufrine argues that Clement does not merely borrow from these intellectual backgrounds, but refines the concepts and shapes them to his own viewpoints.

Choufrine interprets Clement's teaching on the Incarnation from more uncertain passages: *Eclogae Propheticae* 23.1 and *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 4.1; 5.2; 18.1-2; and 19.1, and explains Clement's concept of illumination as the 'Incarnation' of divine light (100-111). He reads Clement to think that when a believer receives illumination of Christ, divine light has been incarnated in the 'flesh' of that person. Based upon *Eclogae Propheticae* 23.1, Choufrine argues that 'Clement construes the deification integral to the Gnostic condition in terms of God's Incarnation. This makes Clement's idea of deification "distinctively Christian," because it is 'rooted in the event of Christ as Light'" (101). This Light was first embodied in Jesus; thus the Incarnation was the 'παρουσία of the Light' (113), and what people were meant to see in the historical Jesus was this Light. After the Christ-event, 'the *Logos* for Clement "becomes" any "flesh" It illuminates by Its presence' (122). Choufrine provides scant discussion about

¹²³ Choufrine, *Gnosis, Theophany, Theosis: Studies in Clement of Alexandria's Appropriation of His Background* (2002).

the *Logos* assuming flesh as a historical person and the significance Clement places on this event for salvation.

After publishing his first book, *The Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria* (1957), forty years later Eric Osborn wrote his *magnum opus*, *Clement of Alexandria* (2005). This monograph addresses three primary questions that Osborn deems problematic to Clement. Firstly, how can ‘one move from the kerygma and Scripture to propositions about God?’ Secondly, how is it possible that God the Father and God the Son comprise one God? Thirdly, how do human beings respond in faith to the economy of salvation and to this one God?¹²⁴ Osborn centers the answers to each of these questions in the theology of divine movement and reciprocity. The God who exists is also the God who acts; his actions are accomplished by the Son, who is God and in reciprocal relations with the Father. Osborn stresses that ‘Clement was concerned to maintain a distinction between Father and Son, to emphasize the transcendence of the former and the immanence and condescension of the latter. But he was also concerned to maintain the unity of the Godhead’ (40). The saving God moves toward humankind; in reciprocal motion, people move toward God (44, 107). In one instance, God has moved to humanity by dispensing philosophy and the sacred writings of the prophets. In another instance, God has moved to humankind through the Incarnation. The relation of faith and knowledge is also answered by an interchange: ‘Faith and knowledge are joined by a “divine sequence of reciprocity.”’¹²⁵ Thus, people move to God through faith, and in doing so, they receive insight into the knowledge of God. Concerning the Incarnation, Osborn states that ‘The Word became flesh not merely when he came to earth as a man...,’ but ‘he also became flesh when he worked in the prophets.’¹²⁶ Clement ‘retains an abiding concern for the words and deeds of Jesus on earth. The

¹²⁴ Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria*, (Cambridge: CUP, 2005), xiii.

¹²⁵ Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria*, 161; *Str.* II.4.16.2.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 210.

whole point of the Incarnation was that the word might be seen' (77).¹²⁷ The strength of Osborn's monograph is that it is a reference work on many of Clement's subjects of interest, such as dialectics, philosophy, virtue, epistemology, theology, ethics, faith, and *gnosis*. However, the breadth of this work restricts sufficient treatment of the Incarnation to brief discussion.

Examining Clement's theology *via negativa*, Henny Hägg (2006) asserts that Clement initiated, along with Middle Platonists, some Gnostic literature, and the Hermetic corpus, the beginnings of Christian Apophaticism.¹²⁸ 'Clement is,' in Hägg's view, 'the first Christian writer who systematically employs the method of abstraction in relation to God' (158). Like Lilla, she situates Clement in the philosophical tradition of Alcinous, but also includes Atticus and Numenius. Hägg outlines the theology of these three Middle Platonists, providing extensive doxography, demonstrating Clement's familiarity with their philosophical systems (72-133). However, possibly influenced by Wywra, she observes that 'the similarities that we may detect [between Clement and Platonists] are likely to be due to their common cultural milieu, which may be characterized as Middle Platonic' (78). In other words, similar terms and phrases were common currency in the schools between Athens and Alexandria. Thus, the use of comparable terminology does not mean dependence. Hägg extracts from Clement's works a list of alpha privatives, which Clement utilized to talk about God: ἄγνωστος (unknown), ἀκατάληπτος (incomprehensible), ἀναρχος (without beginning), ἄωνόμαστος (without name), ἄρρητος (inexpressible), and ἀπαθής (dispassionate), to give a few.¹²⁹ Although she set Clement firmly within the Platonic background, she shows that he partly moved beyond Platonism to the Christian knowledge of God. In light of Clement's movement toward Christianity, and especially

¹²⁷ Here, Osborn quotes *Str.* V.3.16.5.

¹²⁸ Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, (2006).

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 159.

his usage of alpha privative terms, Hägg portrays Clement as the leading figure in the Christian *apophatic* tradition.

Hägg offers a light discussion on the Incarnation of the *Logos* affirming Clement's position that the 'Logos is both God and man' (194-195). However, she moves to address the two issues concerning Clement's doctrine of the Incarnation, the 'two logoi' theory and Docetism. Following Edwards, Hägg rejects the idea of a 'two stage' theory in which the *Logos* is said to be 'identical with the mind of God,' but then issues forth from God and 'becomes a distinct being, a second hypostasis, which is also the author of the creation of the world' (188). She maintains a 'single stage theory' that of 'eternal generation' (189): 'The Logos generation from the Father is a process without beginning and the Logos is united with God from eternity' (193). Although there are stages in the generation of the *Logos*—both at creation and Incarnation—there are not two *logoi*, but the same divine *Logos* is generated (188-189). Regarding Docetism, Hägg softened the christological contradiction by drawing attention to the 'Platonic milieu to which he [Clement] belonged and the influence it had on his thought' (196). She rationalizes that, although Clement insisted that the *Logos* became flesh, 'the idea of attributing to the creator and sustainer of the universe a lack or a need for anything external to sustain his own body, would seem ludicrous' to Platonic thinking (196).

Blending philosophical categories and Christian theology, Rüdiger Feulner (2006), highlights Clement's philosophical and theological thought as the foundation to the Christian way of life, a 'Christian philosophy' (16-19).¹³⁰ The Christian gospel and Greek philosophy are not irreconcilable, because they lead to the same destination: God, who is the ground of all existence. Courses of study, such as *Logik*, *Erkenntnistheorie*, *Ontologie*, *Philosophische Gotteslehre*, *Kosmologie*, and

¹³⁰ Feulner, *Clemens von Alexandrien: Sein Leben, Werk und philosophisch-theologisches Denken* (2006).

Anthropologie (82-130) comprise this Christian philosophy. Christianity as a philosophy is centered on a salvific pedagogical program that leads to the likeness of Christ. Feulner constructs a model of ‘subject-object-process’: Christ is the divine Instructor; the believer is the learner; the philosophical and theological subjects are the salvific instructions that bring about salvation (157). Although Feulner develops neither Clement’s doctrine of the Incarnation nor the Christ-event, he includes the fact of the Incarnation and the effect of the cross in a brief section subtitled: ‘The Salvific education of Jesus Christ’ (*die Heilserziehung Jesu Christi*, 185-189; and ‘the salvific pedagogy,’ *die Heilspädagogik*, 189-191). Referring to the Incarnation, he quotes Clement: ‘the eternal Logos became man in Christ, “in order that he might be seen.”’¹³¹ He mentions the cross as the atoning death of Christ: *durch seinen Sühnetod am Kreuz* (209), and notes that Clement instructs about the cross because by it Christ overcame ‘sin, death and the power of evil’ (*Als Sieger auch über Sünde, Tod und die Macht des Bösen verwandelt*, 186). Feulner suggests that Clement included the doctrine of the cross in the pedagogical program, because by it, ‘[Christ] really transforms the heart’ (*verwandelt er die Herzen wirklich*, 186). Feulner briefly states these themes, but develops none of them, because his concentration is on philosophical theology.

Oleh Kindiy, a Ukrainian scholar, published his dissertation entitled *Christos Didaskalos* (2008).¹³² He focuses on Clement’s christology, ‘not in the terms of dogmatic theology of the fourth century and afterwards,’ but rather ‘as the key subject of Christian tradition about the Incarnation of the logos and his role in the divine economy of salvation’ (4). Kindiy argues: ‘It is not an overstatement that the hermeneutic principle that determined orthodoxy and normativeness of early Christian doctrines was early christology, i.e., the way the early Christian communities and their

¹³¹ Feulner, *Clemens von Alexandrien*, 185: ‘Der ewige Logos ist in Christus Mensch geworden, “damit er auch geschaut werden könne.”’

¹³² Kindiy, *Christos Didaskalos: The Christology of Clement of Alexandria*, (2008).

heralds portrayed and confessionally articulated the identity of Jesus Christ' (19). The author observes in secondary literature a 'strong emphasis on the pre-existent nature of the logos, his absolute transcendence and divinity.' He suggests that: '[I]f we look more closely, we find that for [Clement] the *logos* is not a purely intellectual category, metaphysical principle, or simply a logical formula, but rather a personalized reality that permeates, represents, and unites the human and the divine' (47). Since he emphasizes the 'personal character' of the *Logos*, Kindiy examines the argument about the 'two-stage' theory of the *Logos* (52-122). In the end, he agrees with Mark Edwards and draws the conclusion that 'for Clement the logos was single, unique, and yet multifaceted agent – the Son of God, the Creator of the cosmos, and the Teacher of humanity' (123). In his interpretation of Clement, Kindiy sees that 'education, [or] Christian *paideia*, is the innermost component and vehicle, through which Clement's theological program operates' (125).

Similar to Feulner, Kindiy envisaged the three-fold pedagogical model: 'Subject-object-process' with the *Logos* as subject, the Gnostic as object, and transformation as process (127-137). Clement's *Logos* is 'the living Word of God, the New Song, who on many occasions has been interacting with the world but most stunningly at one point of time and history descended into earth as God-man, Jesus Christ and united the heavenly and human by means of his education' (41). Concerning the role of *Christos* as *Didaskalos*, he emphasizes, 'Christ was the perfect teaching, the exemplary student, and the sole *didaskalos*' (198). Kindiy denotes Clement's view of the inter-personal—human-loving—character of the divine *Logos*, and connects the *Logos* to the person of Christ, and not as a metaphysical-cosmic principle. He addresses the topic of Christ as Saviour in his discussion of Christ as High Priest (192-196), but leaves opportunity for future research. What is missing in his christology is elucidation on Clement's doctrine

of the Incarnation. Kindiy mentions the Incarnation, but does not focus on it, because his interest is the function of the *Logos* in Christian *paideia*.

Piotr Ashwin-Siejkowski (2008) wrote a thematic work depicting Clement's program of Christian perfection.¹³³ His project advances Clement's dependence on the Jewish traditions of Moses (43-55), the role of the sapiential sage, and thus, Clement relies heavily upon Philo (55-68). He also provides discussion on Plato's influence, but reinforces Clement's point that Plato was ultimately dependent on Moses, so even through Platonism, we have Jewish dependence for Clement's program. According to Ashwin-Siejkowski, Clement's pedagogical movement toward perfection is a long gradual process aided by grace and knowledge. The true Gnostic enters the regions of perfection and rest. In the entire monograph, there is no discussion about the Incarnation or the Christ-event as part of the provision for perfection.

In his subsequent work, *Clement of Alexandria on Trial*, Ashwin-Siejkowski aims to address the charge of Docetism leveled by Photius.¹³⁴ The *locus classicus* for Clement's docetic text is *Stromateis* VI.9.71.1-2 and the parts in question are: "The Saviour...ate, not for the sake of the body, which was kept together by a holy energy...as certainly some afterwards supposed that he appeared in phantasmal shape (δοκήσει). He was entirely impassible; inaccessible to any movement of feeling—either pleasure or pain."¹³⁵ Ashwin-Siejkowski indicates that Clement was aware of the docetic heresy and comments: 'As we can see, Clement opposed this opinion' (98). However, Ashwin-Siejkowski's solution to this passage is that Clement's point about Jesus not needing to eat or drink, and that he was 'inaccessible to any movement of feeling,' is an "'over spiritualization" of the historical Jesus of Nazareth' (98). Ashwin-

¹³³ Ashwin-Siejkowski, *Clement of Alexandria: A Project in Christian Perfection*, (2008).

¹³⁴ Ashwin-Siejkowski, 'Chapter Five: The Docetic View of Christ,' in *Clement of Alexandria on Trial: The Evidence of 'Heresy' from Photius' Bibliotheca*, (2010), 95-111.

¹³⁵ *Str.* VI.9.71.1-2; most scholars refer to Wilson's translation (*ANF2*: 496).

Siejkowski rationalizes that it ‘is rather a rhetorical construction which aims by its radicalism to draw the attention of those who were searching for a model of spiritual excellence’ (98).

On one side, Ashwin-Siejkowski states: ‘Christ’s Incarnation offered the necessary, recognizable and irreplaceable bridge between the place where human beings are and reality, where God is’ (101). On the other side, he claims: ‘Clement’s personal interests in philosophical theology elaborate less on the historical appearance in the flesh of the Logos. Consequently, in Clement’s oeuvre a “word-became-flesh” Christology is subordinated to a “Logos-begotten” theogony.’¹³⁶ Ashwin-Siejkowski concludes that ‘the whole concept of Incarnation is treated by Clement as the secondary event in relation to the principal generation of the Son by his divine Father’ (102). Unlike Kindiy, Ashwin-Siejkowski pays more attention to the metaphysics of the *Logos* than the personal relations of the *Logos* with humanity through the Incarnation.

Before concluding the literature review, there is one more work to mention. Published about the same time as Lilla’s influential work (1971) and Brontesi’s monograph (1972), W.E.G. Floyd composed a book entitled, *Clement of Alexandria’s Treatment of the Problem of Evil*.¹³⁷ The overall book broaches the subject of Clement’s theodicy, addressing the human struggle with the problem of evil—especially emphasizing the Gnostic solutions. Accordingly, he points to the work of Christ as preliminary for Clement’s pedagogical program. Assuming readers have a working knowledge of Platonism and the Gnostic Myth, Floyd addresses the problems of philosophical dualism (B-23) and the anthropological determinism of Valentinus and Basilides (24-40). Floyd depicts Clement’s view on the origins of evil (41-60) and, although not describing them in detail, he mentions the malevolent powers that

¹³⁶ Ashwin-Siejkowski *Clement of Alexandria on Trial*, 102.

¹³⁷ Floyd, *Clement of Alexandria’s Treatment of the Problem of Evil*, (London: OUP, 1971).

subjugate humanity to evil (61-73). His final chapter discusses Christ as the victor over evil (74-90). Floyd emphasizes the Incarnation and Christ-event, but does not provide a systematic treatment of either one. He portrays Clement's view of the descent of the *Logos*, but perhaps, due to his focus on Clement's polemic against Gnosticism, he omits the human 'ascent' unto deification through the disclosure of *gnosis*.

Assessment and Methodology

Regarding the literature review, there is one critical observation to set forth crucial to this project. Most scholars highlight Clement's pedagogical path as the way to salvation, referring briefly to Clement's doctrine of the Incarnation. Where scholars do discuss Clement's logology they address one of two subjects, or both: the metaphysics of the multiple *logoi* theory (Lilla, Edwards, Hägg, Kindiy) and the docetic issue (Bigg, Patrick, Hägg, Ashwin-Siejkowski). These two theological issues, especially Docetism, tend to sidetrack a sufficient treatment on Clement's doctrine of the Incarnation.

For the reason that Edwards, Hägg, and Kindiy have adequately treated the multiple *logoi* theory, it is unnecessary to address it here. However, since the secondary literature generally affirms that for Clement the divine *Logos* assumed human flesh, and since the discussion commonly shifts to the issue of Docetism, there remains a gap in the literature. The topic that needs further exploration is the Incarnation of the divine *Logos*, interlaced with Clement's version of the 'exchange' doctrine as a divine mission. The reason for this is that the Incarnation makes clear and explains how Clement's salvific program works. Without the Incarnation, Clement has no soteriology, because the Incarnation as the physical coming of the *Logos* as the suffering Saviour and Teacher undergirds Clement's pedagogical plan of salvation.

The objective of this thesis is twofold. Firstly, it locates Clement in the intellectual climates of Platonism and Gnosticism. Trained in Platonism and familiar with

Gnosticism, Clement interacts with both schools of thought, but claims to possess the ‘true philosophy’ and the ‘true *gnosis*.’ Secondly, this thesis claims that the Incarnation is central to Clement’s version of Christianity and is rooted in John 1:14. The methodology collates and classifies Clement’s textual evidence showing that the *Logos* became both *anthropos* and *sarx*. Simultaneously, this thesis yokes the exchange doctrine to the salvific and didactic missions of the *Logos*. This approach focuses on the descent of the *Logos* to become *anthropos* and the ascent of human beings to become god. (Some significant passages that are thematically dense are used in multiple sections to portray the appropriate theology.)

To this end, chapter one provides a sketch of the intellectual climate of Middle Platonism and second century Alexandrian Gnostic belief, utilizing a sketch of the Gnostic myth from the *Apocryphon of John* and other Gnostic tractates. The discussion includes a four-part outline for both contexts: (1) theology, (2) the demiurge, (3) anthropogony, and (4) teleology for Platonism, but soteriology for Gnosticism. Chapter two explains Clement’s intellectual background in terms of an apostolic tradition and succession, and highlights his version of a ‘gnostic tradition.’ The second chapter also includes a parallel outline of Clement’s theology, including the demiurge, anthropogony, and soteriology. Clement’s context shows ‘which’ God became incarnate, ‘what’ kind of human being the *Logos* became, and ‘what’ kind of salvific mission God accomplished through the Incarnation.

The third chapter depicts Clement’s view of the Incarnation and salvific mission of the *Logos*-Son as Saviour. It presents the evidence that for Clement the *Logos*-Son became a real flesh and blood human being, who suffered and died to vanquish death and rescue humankind from corruption. The investigation examines Clement’s usage of John 1:14 and the term γίνομαι linked with λόγος, ἄνθρωπος, and σάρξ. It

examines Clement's discussion in *Stromateis* VII.2, where he claims the *Logos* assumed flesh that is παθητός, ἔμπαθής, εὐπαθεία, and αἰσθητός. The findings show that in Clement's teachings, the *Logos* became both *anthropos* and *sarx* so that *anthropos* might become *theos*. Important to Clement's soteriology is the event of the crucifixion of Christ, because it is the means to *apatheia*.

The final chapter is about Clement's version of the didactic mission of the *Logos*-Son as Teacher. It explains Clement's usage of the terms παρουσία (*coming*) and ἐπιφάνεια (*appearing*) in relation to the *Logos*, made possible because of the Incarnation. It identifies him as the revelatory Agent of divine *gnosis*, who exegetes Scripture and its hidden *gnosis*, which unifies the Old and New Testaments and demarcates Greek philosophy as preparatory knowledge. This mission awakens believers from ignorance, yokes them to Christ through *gnosis*, and assists them to assimilate the likeness of God.

The intention for this present work is that it adds to the discussion and begins to fill the gap in present scholarship regarding Clement's doctrine of the Incarnation of the divine *Logos*.

PART I: INTELLECTUAL CONTEXTS

Chapter One: Platonic and Gnostic Contexts

A. Introduction

When we survey the second century intellectual context in Alexandria, it becomes apparent that the speculative philosophy of Platonism, the secret writings of Gnosticism, and the Christian teachings of Clement, share at least four primary concerns. Each structure of knowledge is interested in (1) the transcendent God, (2) the intermediary deity (the demiurge) who created the cosmos, (3) the origins of humankind and the problem of evil, and (4) the way to human happiness, or a pathway to salvation. This chapter addresses these four subjects in both Platonism and Gnosticism. The *modus operandi* is not to give an exhaustive treatment of these topics, but to sketch a thematic outline that shows how Clement's theological discourse is distinct among philosophical and religious intellectual influences of his time.

B. The Platonic Context

During his delivery of the Gifford Lectures (1927-1928), Alfred N. Whitehead made the now oft-quoted remark: 'The safest characterization of the European philosophical tradition is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato.'¹³⁸ While this might be a slight exaggeration, there is no doubt that Socrates (469-399 BC) and Plato (427-327 BC) opened the door of knowledge called *philosophia*: the 'love of wisdom' to western civilization. In Clement's generation, there was an intellectual rise of Platonic thinking, which some modern scholars, such as John Dillon, entitled Middle Platonism.¹³⁹ It is named 'Middle' Platonism because it was the transitional period—

¹³⁸ Whitehead, *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*, (NY: The Free Press, 1979), 39.

¹³⁹ John Dillon, *The Middle Platonists 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*, (NY: Cornell University Press, 1996); and R.M. Berchman, *From Philo to Origen: Middle Platonism in Transition*, (1984). Some scholars interpret Plato's Dialogues as myths. See for examples: P.P. Murray, 'What Is a Mythos for Plato?', in: R. Buxton, ed., *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought*, (Oxford: OUP, 1999), 251-262; G.R.F. Ferrari, 'The Freedom of Platonic Myth,' in: C. Collobert, et al. eds., *Plato and Myth: Studies on the Use and Status of Platonic Myths*, (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 67-86.

from *ca.* 80 BC to *ca.* AD 220—of Platonic thought, roughly between Antiochus of Ascalon (125-68 BC), who rejected the speculative philosophy of the New Academy, and Plotinus (AD 204-270), the alleged founder of Neoplatonism. Middle Platonism was not pure Platonic philosophy; it included Aristotelian logic and Stoic ethics. For the reason that Middle Platonism permeated Alexandria in the second century and that Platonic philosophy is woven throughout *Protreptikos* and *Stromateis*, some scholars have situated Clement's Christian theological discourse within this intellectual context.

Although scholars identify Middle Platonism as the main stream philosophy in Alexandria during the second century, another being Stoicism, Dietmar Wywra argues that Clement's Platonic ties were with Plato himself, not his epigones.¹⁴⁰ While not pursuing this matter in detail, there are at least two points worth noting briefly as they relate to Clement. Firstly, Clement commonly cites Plato's primary compositions: *Laws*, *Meno*, *Phaedo*, *Phaedrus*, *Politicus*, *Republic*, *Sophist*, *Symposium*, *Theaetetus*, and *Timaeus*.¹⁴¹ It seems Clement did not acquire Platonic philosophy through the secondary sources, although he was familiar with their language and concepts, as Lilla and Hägg have demonstrated. Rather, Clement displays broad knowledge of Plato's primary texts, and thus, following Wywra, Osborn states, Clement 'goes direct to Plato and also knows Middle Platonism.'¹⁴²

Secondly, in his surviving works, Clement does not mention the Middle Platonists Alcinous, Celsus, or Plutarch by name. He mentions Numenius once, calling him a 'Pythagorean philosopher.'¹⁴³ In fact, Clement expresses antipathy for contemporary

¹⁴⁰ Wywra, *Die Christliche Platonaneignung in den Stromateis des Clemens von Alexandrien*, 5. He supports his argument, noting: 'nur ein Fünftel der clementineschen Platonzitate in der Sammlung des Johannes von Stoboi, dem «florilegium florilegium», wiederkehrt' (5). He means Clement did not cite from handbooks on Plato.

¹⁴¹ For a complete list of the references to Plato in Clement's works, see Otto Stählin, 'Platon der Philosoph,' in *Clemens Alexandrinus Vierter Band die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, 50-53.

¹⁴² Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria*, 104.

¹⁴³ *Str.* I.22.150.4, Νουμήνιος δὲ ὁ Πυθαγόρειος φιλόσοφος.

philosophers, because in his opinion, they were not genuine in their search for truth.¹⁴⁴ Conversely, in his known works, Clement mentions Plato by name 150 times, and more than once calls him ‘truth-loving’ (ὁ φιλαλήθης Πλάτων).¹⁴⁵ Since Clement interacts with Plato what follows is a pithy sketch of Platonic theology, including the demiurge of *Timaeus*, Plato’s anthropogony, and his *telos* for humankind. This section also interacts with Alcinous’s *Didaskalikos: The Handbook of Platonism*.¹⁴⁶

1. Platonic Theology

Plato’s universe is swarming with divine beings. John Dillon comments that ‘the Platonist cosmos was filled with subordinate, intermediate beings, the race of daemons.’¹⁴⁷ Alcinous calls the daemons “‘created gods,” [that are] present in each of the elements [γενητούς θεούς, καθ’ ἕκαστον τῶν στοιχείων], some of them visible, others invisible, in ether, fire, air, and water.’¹⁴⁸ Plato deems the celestial spheres as gods and even includes the traditional Homeric gods (like Zeus and Poseidon) in his theology.¹⁴⁹ In *Critias*, for example, Plato calls Zeus ‘the god of gods’ (θεὸς δὲ ὁ θεῶν Ζεὺς).¹⁵⁰ Beyond this *plethora* of subordinate deities, there are two Platonic gods of importance for this study in Clement: the transcendent god and the demiurge.

Plato’s transcendent god is known in the *Republic* as ‘the idea of the Good [τὴν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἰδέαν].’¹⁵¹ The Good is the transcendent first principle, which some Middle Platonists claim Plato calls the ‘One.’¹⁵² Plato postulated that the Good exists ‘in the intelligible region’ (ὅ τι περ αὐτὸ [τὰγαθόν] ἐν τῷ νοητῷ τόπῳ) and that

¹⁴⁴ *Str.* VIII.1.1.1-2.

¹⁴⁵ *Str.* I.8.42.1; *Str.* V.12.78.1.

¹⁴⁶ Virtually nothing is known about Alcinous’s life.

¹⁴⁷ Dillon, trans., *Alcinous: The Handbook of Platonism*, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1993), xxxiii (hereafter: *Alcinous*). All Greek texts by Alcinous are from John Whittaker, transl., *Alcinoos: Enseignement des Doctrines de Plato*, (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1990), (hereafter, Whittaker).

¹⁴⁸ *Alcinous*, 15.1 and Whittaker, XV.15-16.

¹⁴⁹ Gerd van Riel, *Plato’s Gods*, (England: Ashgate, 2013), 53-59.

¹⁵⁰ *Crit.* 121b

¹⁵¹ *Rep.* VI.508e.

¹⁵² *Alcinous*, xxxiii. Dillon points out that the supreme Good in the *Republic* is also the ‘One of the first hypothesis of the *Parmenides*.’

‘the “idea of the Good” gives truth to the objects of knowledge and the power of knowing to those who know.’¹⁵³ As the sun provides vision for the objects of sight, so the Good provides knowledge and truth for the objects of knowing.¹⁵⁴ Commenting on this theology, Gerd van Riel states:

Plato unveiled metaphysical principles, knowable only by reason, which constitute true reality and are participated in by sensible things. When it comes to explaining how those metaphysical principles can posit themselves as intelligent beings, Plato intimates that they owe this to an even higher principle, the Idea of the Good, which provides being and intelligibility to the Forms.¹⁵⁵

For Plato, the Good is the transcendent and primal god, who exists in the divine realm. Concerning the nature of the Good, Alcinous reports that ‘the primary god is eternal [ὁ πρῶτος θεὸς αἰδιδίος ἔστιν], ineffable, self-perfect [that is, deficient in no respect], and all-perfect (that is, perfect in all respects);’ the primary god is ‘divinity [θειότης], essentiality [ουσιότης], truth [ἀληθεία], commensurability [συμμετρία], <beauty>, good [ἀγαθόν].’¹⁵⁶ For a Middle Platonist, Plato’s ‘[g]od is ineffable, graspable only by the intellect.’¹⁵⁷

Clement assesses Plato’s theology, explaining that Plato ‘confessed god to be one, indestructible, and unbegotten [ἓνα γε εἶναι θεόν, ἀνώλεθρον καὶ ἀγένητον τοῦτον],’ but also that ‘somewhere above, around the back side of heaven, in his own and private place, he surveys all things, truly existing forever.’¹⁵⁸ This god is unknowable. Clement commends Plato regarding his search for God, but then points out that Plato did not know exactly what he was searching for, and so encourages him to keep seeking for the Good. Clement preceded the passage above with the following well-known quote from the *Timaeus*: ‘How then is God to be searched out, O Plato?

¹⁵³ *Rep.* VI.508c, e.

¹⁵⁴ *Rep.* VI.508a-509c

¹⁵⁵ G. van Riel, *Plato’s Gods*, 105.

¹⁵⁶ *Alcinous*, 10.3 and Whittaker, X.164.31-34.

¹⁵⁷ *Alcinous*, 10.4.

¹⁵⁸ *Prot.* VI.68.3; *Phaedr.* 247c.

“For to find the Father and Maker of this universe [πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν τοῦδε τοῦ πάντος εὐρεῖν] is a hard task, and having found him, to declare him to everyone is impossible.”¹⁵⁹

Clement agrees that the search for God is difficult. However, he follows his agreement with encouragement and direction: ‘Well done, Plato! You have touched on the truth. Do not give up! Take up with me the research concerning the Good [ξύν μοι λαβοῦ τῆς ζητήσεως τἀγαθοῦ πέρι].’¹⁶⁰ Clement implies that Plato did not complete his search and perhaps did not clearly understand what he stated about God. Consequently, he encourages Plato (or the Middle Platonists in Alexandria) to join him in the search for τἀγαθόν.

2. Platonic Demiurge

The second god we need to know about is Plato’s demiurge.¹⁶¹ None of Plato’s gods attracts more attention and controversy than the demiurge of *Timaeus*.¹⁶² Classicists are at variance concerning the identity and function in the cosmos that Plato assigned to the demiurge. Is it a mythical divine being, or an active principle of creation in the mind of the Good?

Some scholars locate the demiurge below the transcendent god as an intermediary between the intelligible and sensible regions; the demiurge is seen as a mythical deity who generates the cosmos and orders it. Gabriela Carone remarks: ‘The *Timaeus* presents the demiurge as the cause of the universe (29a6), according to the demand that

¹⁵⁹ *Prot.* VI.68.1; *Tim.* 28c.

¹⁶⁰ *Prot.* VI.68.2; *Tim.* 28c; for more on *Tim.* 28c, see *Str.* II.18.78.3; *Str.* V.12.78.1; *Str.* V.14.92.3.

¹⁶¹ *Tim.* 28a, 29a, 41a, 68e, and 69c; also *Gorg.* 455a.

¹⁶² For a survey of the interpretation of the demiurge from Plato to the third century CE, see Carl Séan O’Brien, *The Demiurge in Ancient Thought: Secondary Gods and Divine Mediators*, (Cambridge, CUP, 2015), 18-168. See also, David Keyt, ‘The Mad Craftsman of the *Timaeus*,’ *The Philosophical Review*, 80:2 (April 1971): 230-235; Keyt interprets Plato’s demiurge as a ‘mad craftsman who attempts to copy even the irrelevant features of his model’ (232). See also R.D. Mohr, ‘Plato’s Theology Reconsidered: What the Demiurge Does,’ *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, 2:2 (April 1985): 131-134. Mohr concludes that the task of the demiurge was epistemic: ‘The Demiurge’s project then, I suggest, is to introduce into the world conditions which make possible the formation of true opinions’ (132).

everything that undergoes becoming, or generation (*genesis*), does so necessarily by virtue of a cause (cf. 28a4-5, c2-3).¹⁶³ The demiurge did not create ‘*ex nihilo*, but from a pre-existing state of disorder, trying to make his product resemble the eternal model of the Forms (29a, 30a).’¹⁶⁴ According to Alcinous, the demiurge created the cosmos ‘out of the totality of matter [ἐκ τῆς πάσης οὐν ὕλης αὐτὸν ἐδημιούργει]. This, as it moved without order and randomly, prior to the generation of the heavens [πρὸ τῆς οὐρανοῦ γενέσεως], he took in hand and brought from disorder into the best order.’¹⁶⁵ For this reason, ‘the demiurge is usually regarded as ordering [the cosmos] rather than creating [it].’¹⁶⁶ The demiurge is thought to be the ‘mediator between the immutable Forms (those stable paradigms that serve to direct his purposive activity) and our sensible changing realm.’¹⁶⁷ This mythical deity shapes eternal matter, generating and maintaining all cosmic, stellar, planetary, and sensible realities. The task of the platonic craftsman is to shape the material world according to the Forms of the Good.

Other scholars demythologize the demiurge and view it as an active principle of creation. In his commentary on the *Didaskalikos*, Dillon comments that a ‘constructive meditation on such a passage as the Sun Simile of *Republic* 6 should lead one to conclude that the Forms, dependent as they are on the Good for their existence as well as their knowability, are only fully actualized when cognized by a mind.’¹⁶⁸ He concurs with Xenocrates that ‘a mind must think, and its contents can only be the Forms.’¹⁶⁹ As a result, Dillon takes the view with Speusippus and Xenocrates and demythologizes the *Timaeus*, so that the demiurge is not a divine being. Dillon argues that, if the Good is

¹⁶³ Carone, *Plato's Cosmology and Its Ethical Dimensions*, (Cambridge, NY: CUP, 2005), 29.

¹⁶⁴ Carone, *Plato's Cosmology and Its Ethical Dimensions*, 29.

¹⁶⁵ Alcinous, 12.2 and Whittaker, XII.167.15-16, 17.

¹⁶⁶ O'Brien, *The Demiurge in Ancient Thought: Secondary Gods and Divine Mediators*, 24.

¹⁶⁷ Carone, *Plato's Cosmology and Its Ethical Dimensions*, 29; Richard D. Mohr, *God & Forms in Plato*, (Parmenides Publishing, 2005).

¹⁶⁸ Alcinous: Commentary, 67.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 67; Xen. Frs. 15-16.

identified as ‘the supreme god...’, then inevitably the demiurge becomes merged with the Essential Living Being, the sum-total of the Forms, as simply an active principle of the intelligible world.¹⁷⁰ The demiurge in this argument is the creative principle of the Forms, which are in the mind of the Good.

Alcinous’s rendering of Plato sets down the Forms as one of three first principles; he claims matter, Forms (or ideas), and the primal god to be first principles.¹⁷¹ He explains that a ‘form is defined as an eternal model of things that are in accordance with nature...for the forms are eternal and perfect thoughts of God.’¹⁷² It is believed that Plato set forth the metaphysical theory of Forms in order to ‘explain the permanent, universal, stable, and intelligible nature of things over against the ever-changing and unstable nature of things.’¹⁷³

Providing his own view on the issue, Clement reports that ‘Plato the philosopher says that the *telos* is twofold: It is that which is communicable and exists in the Forms themselves [ἐν αὐτοῖς ὑπάρχον τοῖς εἶδεσιν], which in fact, [Plato] names the Good [ὁ δὲ καὶ τὰγαθὸν προσονομάζει].’¹⁷⁴ Clement’s interpretation of Plato is that the Forms are in ‘the Good,’ and are not a first principle. The second aspect of Plato’s *telos* is that whatever participates in the Good receives likeness (ὁμοιοτητα) to the Forms.¹⁷⁵ This happens with ‘people, who lay claim to virtue and the true philosophy,’ which for Clement is Christianity.¹⁷⁶ Here Clement would agree with Dillon and deny the existence of a mythical intermediary deity; Clement seems interested, not in Plato’s

¹⁷⁰ Alcinous, Commentary, 67.

¹⁷¹ Alcinous, 8.1-12.3.

¹⁷² Alcinous, 9.2.

¹⁷³ G. van Riel, *Plato’s Gods*, 105.

¹⁷⁴ *Str.* II.22.131.2.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, ὁ περὶ ἀνθρώπου γίνεται τοὺς μεταποιουμένους ἀρετῆς τε καὶ τῆς ἀληθοῦς φιλοσοφίας.

demiurge, but in Plato's supreme god. As will be shown, Clement's demiurge is both the transcendent God and the divine *Logos*.

Plato's cosmos is dualistic. There is the intellectual region of the Forms or ideas of the Good and there is the sensible region, the copy of the Forms. The intellectual realm of the Good is eternal and unchanging; it is the region of being and existence. The sensible realm is in a state of flux, ever subject to becoming; it is the region of things coming into existence.¹⁷⁷ In this way, *Timaeus* presents the demiurge as moving within a dualistic cosmos, acting as the 'principle of becoming and order...that organizes the sensible world by imposing on it regularity and structure.'¹⁷⁸ On this point, Carl O'Brien notes that 'the sensible cosmos can never achieve a state of perfection. It does not even exist, but is always in a state of "coming-to-be."¹⁷⁹ In line with this thinking, 'When [Plato] says that the world is 'generated', one must not understand him to assert that there ever was a time when the world did not exist; but rather that the world is perpetually in a state of becoming and reveals a more primordial cause of its own existence.'¹⁸⁰

Taking into account Plato's multiplicity of gods, including the Good and the demiurge, Mark Edwards points out that 'Plato traces the origin of the cosmos to a demiurge, whom he frequently styles as *ho theos*. This locution functions in the Greek Bible as a proper name and definite description, and could not be rendered otherwise than as "God."¹⁸¹ Although Plato and Clement use the term θεός, the θεός of the *Timaeus* is neither the same divine being as the θεός of the Septuagint nor of Clement's writings. In view of this, Edwards sets out two reasons to be cautious of the term θεός in Plato's writings:

¹⁷⁷ *Tim.* 29c.

¹⁷⁸ Carone, 29, γενέσεως καὶ κόσμου ἀρχή (*Tim.* 29e).

¹⁷⁹ O'Brien, *The Demiurge in Ancient Thought*, 23.

¹⁸⁰ *Alcinous*, 14.3.

¹⁸¹ Mark J. Edwards, *Origen Against Plato*, (England: Ashgate, 2002), 49.

First the demiurge delegates many tasks to acolytes who, though inferior in rank, belong to the category of gods; secondly, while he is free to create he is not free to determine the character of his creation. That is determined rather by the everlasting paradigm, which is logically if not temporally prior to all material existence and contains the archetypes of natural kinds.¹⁸²

Edwards continues his argument and issues the following *caveat*: ‘It is dangerous to count Plato as a monotheist, or a theist of any kind, when he did not, in any sense that the Bible knows, believe in God.’¹⁸³ Since Clement’s God is the God of the Greek Bible, his theological discourse differs radically from Plato.

3. Platonic Anthropogony

Following the *Timaeus*, Alcinous recounts that the creation of humankind took place after ‘[g]od had imposed order upon the universe as a whole.’¹⁸⁴ As Plato’s cosmos is dualistic—intelligent and sensible, or invisible and visible—so also, the gods created humankind with ‘two Forms of existences [δύο εἶδη τῶν ὄντων], that which is visible and that which is invisible [τὸ δὲ ὄρατὸν, τὸ δὲ ἀειδέες].’¹⁸⁵ For Plato, humankind is made up of body (σῶμα) and soul (ψυχή); ‘the soul is more like the invisible than the body is, and the body more like the visible.’¹⁸⁶ For Alcinous, the gods fashioned the somatic structure of humankind from the *stoicheia*: ‘earth, fire, air, and water.’¹⁸⁷

The human soul, however, comes from the cosmic bowl wherein the demiurge ‘blended and mixed the Soul of the Universe [τὴν τοῦ παντὸς ψυχήν].’¹⁸⁸ The Soul of the Universe animates the physical structure of the cosmos. The demiurge ‘poured the residue of the previous material, mixing it in somewhat the same manner...and when

¹⁸² Edwards, *Origen Against Plato*, 49.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 48.

¹⁸⁴ *Alcinous*, 16.1; for Plato’s account, see *Tim.* 41b-43a, 72e-75c.

¹⁸⁵ *Phaed.* 79a.

¹⁸⁶ *Phaed.* 79b.

¹⁸⁷ *Alcinous*, 17.1; Whittaker, XVII.172.20.1-3, οἱ δὲ θεοὶ ἔπλασαν μὲν προηγουμένως τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ γῆς καὶ πυρὸς καὶ ἀέρος καὶ ὕδατος.

¹⁸⁸ *Tim.* 41d.

He had compounded the whole He divided it into souls equal in number to the stars, and each several soul He assigned to one star.’¹⁸⁹ The demiurge also ‘showed them [the souls] the nature of the universe and declared to them the laws of destiny.’¹⁹⁰ He further informed the souls that there comes a time for them to be

planted in bodies, and their bodies are subject to influx and efflux, these results would necessarily follow,—firstly, sensation [αἴσθησις] that is innate and common to all proceeding from violent affections; secondly, desire [ἔρως] mingled with pleasure and pain [ἡδονῆ καὶ λύπη]; and besides these, fear and anger and all such emotions.¹⁹¹

The passions are inherent in the body and part of the sensible nature, making it an evil region, and therefore, a cause for human struggle and suffering. In one passage, he elucidates his view of the body this way:

For the body [τὸ σῶμα] keeps us constantly busy by reason of its sustenance; moreover, the body fills us with passions and desire and fears [ἐρώτων δὲ καὶ ἐπιθυμιῶν καὶ φόβων], so that it really and truly, as they say, makes it impossible for us to think at all. The body and its desire [τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἱ τοῦτου ἐπιθυμίαι] are the only cause of wars and factions and battles; for all wars arise for the sake of gaining money for the body, since we are enslaved to its service [δουλεύοντες τῇ τοῦτου θεραπείᾳ].¹⁹²

Plato thought that the divine plan for the soul is to enter the body and then master the emotions and purify the mind through reason and contemplation, and in so doing, the soul will return to its ‘native star’ (οἴκησιν ἄστρου).¹⁹³ ‘The soul is naturally divine and seeks to return to the divine realm. And it does this in the act of contemplation – *theoria* — of Being, Truth, Beauty, Goodness.’¹⁹⁴ Alcinous points out that ‘when the gods had thus constructed man, and had bound into his body the soul which was to be its master, with good reason they established the ruling part of it in the head.’¹⁹⁵ The

¹⁸⁹ *Tim.* 41d-e.

¹⁹⁰ *Tim.* 41e.

¹⁹¹ *Tim.* 42a.

¹⁹² *Phaed.* 66b-d.

¹⁹³ *Tim.* 42b.

¹⁹⁴ Andrew Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition: From Plato to Denys*, (NY: OUP, 2007), 3.

¹⁹⁵ *Alcinous*, 17.4.

ruling organs are reason and judgement.¹⁹⁶ These guides are designed to assert authority over the sensible region. Thus, for Plato, humankind is in one sense earthly, sensible, and subject to emotions, but in another, humans are celestial, intellectual, and able to contemplate the Good.

4. Platonic Teleology

Since the gods have embodied the soul within the visible, material region, the assignment for humans is to master the sensible realm through contemplation of the Good and the practice of philosophy. Alcinous suggests that ‘if one examines his [Plato’s] works with care, one will see that he placed the good for us in the knowledge and contemplation of the primal good, which one may term [g]od and the primal intellect.’¹⁹⁷ The qualities found in the Good are ‘noble, divine, lovely, [and] well proportioned.’¹⁹⁸ None of the qualities people call good, such as ‘health, beauty, strength, wealth’ are deemed good, unless their purpose is for virtue.’¹⁹⁹ Thus, happiness is ‘not to be found in human goods, but in divine and blessed ones.’²⁰⁰ Plato directs people to follow the contemplation of the Good with disciplined practice of proper thoughts and virtue in order to reach the *telos*. He tells us:

But he who has seriously devoted himself to learning and to true thoughts, and has exercised these qualities above all others, must necessarily and inevitably think thoughts that are immortal and divine [φρονεῖν ἀθάνατα καὶ θεῖα], if so be that he lays hold of the truth, and in so far as it is possible for human nature to partake of immortality [καθ’ ὅσον δ’ αὐ̄ μετασχεῖν ἀνθρωπίνη φύσις ἀθανασίας], he must fall short thereof in no degree. Having achieved this likeness, [one will] attain finally to that goal of life [τέλος βίου] which is set before men by the gods [προτεθέντος ἀνθρώποις ὑπὸ θεῶν] as the most good both for the present and for the time to come.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁶ Alcinous, 17.4.

¹⁹⁷ Alcinous, 27.1 and Whittaker, XXVII.179.27.40-42, ἐτίθετο ἐν τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ θεωρίᾳ τοῦ πρῶτου ἀγαθοῦ, ὅπερ θεόν τε καὶ νοῦν τὸν πρῶτον προσαγορεύσαι ἂν τις.

¹⁹⁸ Alcinous, 27.2.

¹⁹⁹ Alcinous, 27.2.

²⁰⁰ Alcinous, 27.3.

²⁰¹ Tim. 90c-d.

Just as the cosmos is intellectual and sensible, and humankind is visible and invisible, Plato also postulates that the realm of human existence is two-fold: ‘Two patterns, my friend, are set up in the world, the divine which is most blessed, and the godless, which is most wretched.’²⁰² These two regions co-exist for humankind, and accordingly, Plato thought malice would not be eliminated, because evil must always oppose the good and haunt human existence.²⁰³

As a way to navigate one’s way through this haunted existence, Plato urges people to like god:

‘Every man ought to follow god.’ What life then is pleasing to god? There is an old saying that, ‘like agrees with like, measure with measure’, and god ought to be our measure in all things. The temperate man is the friend of god because he is like Him, and the intemperate man is not His friend, because he is not like Him.²⁰⁴

Plato’s *telos* is to be like god; yet, what does he mean to be like God? He answers: ‘We ought to try to escape from earth to the dwelling of the gods [the intellectual realm] as quickly as we can. And to escape is to become like God, so far as this is possible, and to become like god is to become righteous [δικαίον] and holy [ὅσιον] with wisdom [φρονήσεως].’²⁰⁵ Platonic ‘[p]hilosophy is thus an attempt to live now a life we can only really live beyond death; it is preparation for death.’²⁰⁶

Recently, and concluding a different interpretation, John Armstrong observes that a Middle Platonic reading of Plato assumes likeness to god means one had to take ‘flight from the sensible world.’²⁰⁷ So, Alcinous thinks ‘one should escape from here to there as quickly as possible.’²⁰⁸ By ‘here’ he means the sensible region; by ‘there’ he means the intellectual region and thus likeness to god, which is possible after death, is flight

²⁰² *Theaet.* 176e.

²⁰³ *Theaet.* 176a.

²⁰⁴ *Laws*, IV.716d.

²⁰⁵ *Theaet.* 176b.

²⁰⁶ Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition: From Plato to Denys*, 7.

²⁰⁷ Armstrong, ‘After the Ascent: Plato on Becoming Like God,’ *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, 26 (2004): 171-172; for Philo, *Fug.* 62-63; *Opif.* 69-71; *Alcinous*, 28.

²⁰⁸ *Alcinous*, 28.1.

from the body. However, drawing from his study of Plato's works, especially *Timaeus*, *Philebus*, and *Laws*, Armstrong postulates that what Plato means by likeness to god is putting forth the 'effort to unify the city under the intelligent law and to educate the citizens in virtue.'²⁰⁹ Armstrong concludes that Plato thought likeness to god—*viz.* the attainment and expression of virtue—was an engagement in society, not a departure from it. Thus, to become 'righteous and holy with wisdom' is to be like god in the *polis* where people assimilate these Forms of virtue.

Unlike Clement, Plato's *telos* is linked neither to a salvific figure nor a revelatory agent, but to intellectual and moral virtue.²¹⁰ Thus, likeness to god is not based on the descent of god to humankind, as it is for Clement, but upon the disciplined philosophical ascent toward the Forms of the Good.

C. The Gnostic Context

Scholars have long recognized the theological similarities between Platonism and Gnosticism, especially the theology of a transcendent god, the myth of a demiurge and the metaphysical dualism of intelligible and sensible regions. Based upon the writings of early heresiologists, there has been reason to suppose various groups of Platonists spawned the Gnostic religion.²¹¹ Irenaeus reports that the Valentinians derived their doctrines from Democritus and Plato.²¹² Tertullian surmises that all heresies came from Hellenistic philosophy.²¹³ Hippolytus maintains that Valentinian Gnosticism originated from the philosophy of Pythagoras and Plato.²¹⁴

²⁰⁹ Armstrong, 'After the Ascent: Plato on Becoming Like God,' 171-183.

²¹⁰ See Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition*, 8-9.

²¹¹ See Birger Pearson, 'Gnosticism as Platonism,' in Pearson, *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*, 148-164; Kevin Corrigan and Tuomas Rasimus, eds., *Gnosticism, Platonism and the Late Ancient World: Essays in Honour of John D. Turner*, (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

²¹² Carl B. Smith II, *No Longer Jews: The Search for Gnostic Origins*, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 20.

²¹³ *A.H.* 2.14.

²¹⁴ *Praes.* 7.

²¹⁴ *Ref.* 6.16.

Yet for some biblical specialists, there is reason to think ‘Gnosticism was an aberration of early Christianity.’²¹⁵ Simone Pétrement argues that Christianity, specifically the theological background of John and Paul, has given rise to doctrines such as redemption and a salvific figure; issues of salvation are central to gnostic thought.²¹⁶ Concurring, Arthur Nock and Alastair Logan connect the Nag Hammadi codices to the New Testament and deduce Christian origins for Gnosticism.²¹⁷ Some scholars believe that intellectual Christians with philosophical backgrounds blended Platonic ideas with biblical stories and theology, and in this way, developed Gnostic myths. If so, the question arises: What form of Christianity gave rise to Gnosticism, specifically in Alexandria?

Currently, there is scholarly claim that both Judaism and Jewish Christianity are the provenance for most Gnostic sects in Alexandria.²¹⁸ This school of thought depends on two essential arguments.²¹⁹ Firstly, the gnostic literature of the Nag Hammadi codices demonstrates close knowledge of the Old Testament, especially Genesis 1-9, and the prominent characters, such as a creator-God, Adam, Eve, the Serpent, Cain, Seth, Noah, and the Sons of God. Some gnostic sects were called by Old Testament names such as the Ophites, Sethians, and Cainites.²²⁰ In addition, gnostic documents show a particularly Jewish set of self-designations such as the ‘elect,’ the ‘seed,’ and the ‘sons

²¹⁵ Smith, *No Longer Jews: The Search for Gnostic Origins*, 20.

²¹⁶ Simone Pétrement, *Le Dieu Séparé: les Origines du Gnosticisme*, (Paris: Cerf., 1984), 14-25.

²¹⁷ See Allistair H.B. Logan, *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy: A Study in the History of Gnosticism*, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996); Arthur D. Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, 2 vols, ed. Zeph Stewart, (Cambridge, MA: HUP, 1972), 2:956; Craig A. Evans ed. et al, *Nag Hammadi Texts and the Bible: A Synopsis and Index*, (Leiden: Brill, 1993); PHEME PERKINS, *Gnosticism and the New Testament*, (St. Paul, MN: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1993); and Barbara Aland, *Was Ist Gnosis? Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).

²¹⁸ See also Henry A. Green, *The Economic and Social Origins of Gnosticism*, SBLDS 77, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).

²¹⁹ For the arguments, see Smith, *No Longer Jews*, 37-112; and Michael A. Williams, *Rethinking Gnosticism: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*, (Princeton, NJ: PUP, 1999), 220-229.

²²⁰ For Ophites and Sethians, *A.H.* I.30.1-15 and *Epiph.Pan.* I.39, *Against Sethians*; for Cainites: *A.H.* I.31.1-4. Clement mentions, ὡς Καϊανιστᾶί τε καὶ Ὀφίανοί προσαγορευόμενοι: ‘as those called Cainists and Ophites’ (*Str.* VII.17.108.2). Also, Tuomas Rasimus, ‘Ophite Gnosticism, Sethianism and the Nag Hammadi Library,’ *Vigiliae Christianae* 59:3 (January 2005): 235-263.

of light,' which show connections with the Essenes, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Jewish theology in general.²²¹ The personification of Sophia as a divine *hypostasis* is prominent in Gnostic speculation. Addressing this topic, George MacRae argues for a Jewish wisdom tradition as the antecedent for the Gnostic myth of Sophia. He shows many parallels between Proverbs and ben Sirach with myths.²²² It is recognized that particular knowledge of the Old Testament points towards a Jewish influence, and perhaps, a Jewish Christian origin for the development of Gnostic belief in Alexandria.

Secondly, this school argues that the social suppression, heavy economic loss, and personal defeat the Jews experienced after Vespasian and Titus (AD 66-70), Trajan (AD 115-117), and Hadrian (AD 132-135) demoralized, dislocated, and eventually disenfranchised the Jewish population in Alexandria. Assessing the roots of this theodicy, Smith argues: 'The most radical feature of Gnosticism, that which gives it its distinctiveness as a religious movement, could not have arisen apart from some crisis that caused profound disappointment on a religious plane.'²²³ History shows that after Trajan suppressed the Jews, Basilides arose as an influential Christian teacher and flourished in Alexandria (AD 117-138). Directly after the Bar Kokhba revolt, Valentinus (AD 100-160) emerged as an effective Christian teacher in Alexandria. Attesting to these events, Clement reports that 'it was later, around the times of Hadrian the King that those who contrived the heresies came to be.'²²⁴ Clement lists in order the inventors of heresies: Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion.²²⁵ He further informs us that '[i]t is evident from the high antiquity and perfect truth of the Church, that these later

²²¹ Pearson, 'Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature,' in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. Michael Stone; CRINT 2/2, (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984), 443-481; Smith, *No Longer Jews*, 39.

²²² MacRae, 'The Jewish Background of the Gnostic Sophia Myth,' *Novum Testamentum* 12:2 (April 1970): 86-101. See also the *Apocryphon of John, Hypostasis of the Archons*, and the *Origin of the World*. Each treatise portrays the fall of Sophia from the pleroma.

²²³ Smith, *No Longer Jews*, 48.

²²⁴ *Str.* VII.17.106.4, περὶ τοὺς Ἀδριανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως χρόνους.

²²⁵ *Str.* VII.17.106.4-107.1. This list is not chronological; Clement made mention that Marcion was an 'elder living among the younger' (*Str.* VII.17.107.1).

heresies, and those subsequent to them in time, were new inventions.’²²⁶ One new invention was the recasting of the identity of the God of the Old Testament.

Considering the devastating results of the revolts, some scholars argue that intellectual Jews, disillusioned from a heightened sense of theodicy—the problem of evil and suffering without deliverance from the God of their Scriptures—radically reshaped their theology.²²⁷ What was at stake was the character of the God of their Fathers. Charles Hedrick states the issue:

By definition, a righteous and benevolent God could not be the source of evil and disorder in the universe. And since the creator God of the Old Testament can be understood to have acted in capricious and questionable ways (as for example Job), it would naturally follow that he is not the righteous and benevolent father; rather he proves to be a merely blind and ignorant fashioner of worlds.²²⁸

The notable theological change, which is consistent in the gnostic literature having Jewish antecedents, is the emergence of a lesser god, who is responsible for creating the chaotic cosmos and allowing, even causing, the sufferings of humanity. About this point, Smith further asserts that ‘Judaism itself provided the religious and intellectual soil in which Gnosticism took root, especially its most distinctive feature: a negatively valued biblical demiurgy.’²²⁹ This feature of a demiurge reflects a Platonic antecedent from *Timaeus*. The argument is that the origins of Gnosticism in Alexandria are rooted in Judaism and Jewish Christianity, and as Luttikhuisen suggests, ‘with a background in Hellenistic schools of thought who evaluated biblical and other no-Gnostic traditions in the light of their own religio-philosophical world view’²³⁰

²²⁶ *Str.* VII.17.107.2.

²²⁷ For the different theories of origins of Gnosticism, see Smith, *No Longer Jews*, 44-71.

²²⁸ Hedrick, ‘Introduction: Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity—a Beginner’s Guide,’ in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*, ed., Charles W. Hedrick et al, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1986), 4.

²²⁹ Smith, *No Longer Jews*, 44.

²³⁰ See Gerard P. Luttikhuisen, *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions*, (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 10-11.

The intention here is not to advocate one view over another, but to provide a setting that recognizes that Gnosticism arose from a combination of Judaism, Platonism, and Christianity—the three foremost intellectual environments Clement encountered in Alexandria. At this point, it is worth noting along with Mark Edwards that ‘the tumult of conjectures that is now called Gnosticism may be seen as an evil leaven in Egyptian Christianity, but a scholar who omits them from a study of Origen’s Alexandrian background will be making bread without yeast.’²³¹ The same point is true for Clement. Thus, what follows is a basic sketch of the gnostic myth circulating in Clement’s time, including its theology, the demiurge, anthropogony, and soteriology.

1. Gnostic Theology

Scholars propose that ‘the starting point of Gnostic thought is not Christ, but an explanation of the ambivalence of the world and especially mankind (being divine in mind or spirit, but mortal and bad in flesh and moral behavior).’²³² This polarity in the human struggle points to the culpability of a certain god responsible for creation. Concerning this deity, Pearson asserts that Jewish Gnostics ‘split the transcendent God of the Bible into a supreme ineffable being...and a lower creator responsible for the material world. It is precisely this radical dualism which marks the decisive step out of (normative) Judaism taken by the Gnostic thinkers.’²³³ For the Gnostics, the highest ‘deity is absolutely transmundane, its nature alien to that of the universe, which it neither created nor governs and to which it is the complete antithesis: to the divine realm of light, self-contained and remote, the cosmos is opposed as the realm of

²³¹ Edwards, *Origen Against Plato*, 26.

²³² Volker H. Drecoll, ‘Martin Hengel and the Origins of Gnosticism,’ in *Gnosticism, Platonism and the Late Ancient World*, ed. by Kevin Corrigan et al, (2013), 161.

²³³ Pearson, ‘The Problem of “Jewish Gnostic” Literature,’ in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*, (1986), 22.

darkness.²³⁴ The divine realm of this God is in the spiritual perfection of the pleroma (the region exterior to the cosmos), whereas the lower region, the stellar and planetary cosmos, is governed by the demiurge and his archons.

Within this theological shift there are Middle Platonic designations of God in some Gnostic theology. In the *Gospel of Truth*—attributed to Valentinus—God is ‘the incomprehensible, inconceivable one.’²³⁵ Another Gnostic writing, perhaps written at the close of the second century that describes the transcendent God is *The Tripartite Tractate*. As its title infers, it is a three-part document that ‘narrates the origin and history of the universe from the beginning to the anticipated “restoration” of all things.’²³⁶ The first section is dense with apophatic theology:

He [God] is without beginning and without end; for not only is he without end—he is immortal for this reason, that he is unbegotten—but he is also invariable in his eternal existence, in his identity. Likewise, he is himself unchanged, and no one else can remove from him his existence and his identity. Thus, he cannot be grasped, nor is it possible for anyone else to change him into a different form or to reduce him, or diminish him, because this, in the fullest sense, is the truth: he is the unalterable, unchangeable, one, with immutability clothing him.²³⁷

An important second century Jewish-Christian ‘gnostic’ document with platonic theology is the *Apocryphon of John*.²³⁸ Since the gnostic myth described in this tractate corresponds to Irenaeus’s depiction of the gnostic heresy, scholars have assigned to it a *terminus ante quem* of AD 180, the dating of *Against Heresies*.²³⁹ Karen King reports:

²³⁴ Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion: The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity*, (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1958), 42.

²³⁵ *Gos.Truth* I.3.17-18. Perhaps the more cogent argument for Valentinian authorship for *Gos.Truth* is by B. Standaert, ‘L’Évangile de Vérité: Critique et Lecture,’ *NTS* 22 (1976): 243-275. He compares the text with fragments of Valentinus (259-265), and thus, assigns the authorship to Valentinus.

²³⁶ See Harold W. Attridge and Dieter Mueller, translators, ‘The Tripartite Tractate,’ in *NHL*, James M. Robinson, dir., Marvin W. Meyer ed., (San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row Publishers 1977), 54.

²³⁷ *Tri.Trac.* I.52.9-11, 20-32.

²³⁸ However, Pearson argues that by stripping the document of its Christian components, it can be seen as an originally Jewish writing that later underwent a Christian change. See Pearson, ‘The Problem of “Jewish Gnostic” Literature,’ 15-25. Arguing against Pearson, Luttikhuisen notes the structure of *Ap.John*, even if certain ‘Christian’ sections were deleted, shows Christian influence using OT motifs. See Luttikhuisen, *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions*, 17-19.

²³⁹ But, see G. Quispel, ‘The Original Doctrine of Valentinus the Gnostic,’ *Vigiliae Christianae* 50:4 (1996): 332. Quispel situates *Ap.John* in Alexandria ca. AD 120. This dating suggests that *Ap.John* may have been a theological reaction following Trajan’s persecutions (AD 115-117).

‘The importance of the *Secret Revelation of John* can hardly be overestimated. It was the first Christian writing to formulate a comprehensive narrative of the nature of God, the origin of the world, and human salvation.’²⁴⁰ Since the provenance of this document is situated in early to mid-second century—representing a Valentinian version of the Gnostic myth—and it covers (as King points out) the theological topics essential to this present thesis, I use it as a framework for the fundamental Gnostic doctrines circulating in Clement’s time.

The *Apocryphon of John* is theologically diverse and shows clear evidence of Platonic thought. The following passage is quoted exactly, including interpolations, as the editors, Michael Waldstein and Frederick Wisse, translated it (with the lacunae) in their edition.²⁴¹ It is as follows:

- 2 [He is eternal]
 since he does [not] need (χρεία) [anything].
 4 For (γὰρ) [he] is total perfection.
 [He] did not [lack anything] that he might be perfected by [it];
 6 Rather (ἀλλά) he is always completely perfect
 in [light].
 8 He is [illimitable]
 since there is no one [prior to him] to set limits to him.
 10 He is unsearchable
 [since there] exists no one prior to him to [examine him].
 12 He is] immeasurable since there [was] no one [prior to him
 to measure] him.
 14 [He is invisible since no] one saw [him
 He is eternal] since he [exists] eternally.
 16 He is [ineffable since] no one was able to comprehend him
 to speak [about him].
 18 He is unnamable
 since [there is no one prior to him] to give a name to [him].²⁴²

Here, the *Apocryphon of John* contains terminology similar to Alcinous’s *Didaskalikos* and *Stromateis* V.12.81.4-82.1.

²⁴⁰ King, *The Secret Revelation of John*, (Cambridge, MA: HUP, 2006), vii.

²⁴¹ Waldstein and Wisse, eds., *The Apocryphon of John: Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II,1; III,1 and IV,1 with BG 8502,2*, (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23. In translations of Nag Hammadi codices, square brackets indicate a lacuna in the MS where text was probably written, but is now entirely missing. The random Greek words show the treatise was originally written in Greek and later copied in Coptic.

²⁴² *Ap. John*, II.3.3-18; Fredrick Wisse, ‘The Apocryphon of John,’ in *NHL*, 98-116.

In other places, the *Apocryphon of John* shows a Christian context, which points to the ‘teaching [of the Saviour] and [the revelation] of the mysteries [and the] things hidden in silence, [all these things which] he taught John, [his] disciple.’²⁴³ The author also shows a Christian theology of benevolence. The boundless God shares his cornucopia of goodness with humankind:

For the [perfect one] is majestic; he is pure and immeasurable [greatness]. He is an aeon-giving Aeon, [life]-giving Life, a blessed-ness-giving Blessed One, knowledge-giving Knowledge, goodness-giving Goodness, mercy and redemption-giving Mercy, grace-giving Grace, not because he possess it, but because he gives immeasurable and incomprehensible [light].²⁴⁴

This style of discourse is analogous to a passage in *Quis Dives Salvetur*:

For our Lord and Saviour is pleased to be asked a question most appropriate to Him. The Life concerning life, the Saviour about salvation, the Teacher about the chief doctrines he was teaching, the Truth concerning the true immortality, the *Logos*, about the paternal *Logos*, the perfect One about perfect rest, [and] the incorruptible One concerning sure incorruption.²⁴⁵

This passage shows that Clement was possibly aware of the *Apocryphon of John*, but he applies these attributes to Christ the Saviour.

As the *Apocryphon of John* and other tractates unfold, the portrait of the transcendent God, including the generation of other gods, morphs into myth. The supreme God is portrayed as the ‘invisible’ and ‘virginal Spirit,’ the ‘Father’ who possesses ‘the five-aeon: Ennoia, Pronoia, Aphtharsia, Zoe Aionios, and Aletheia.’²⁴⁶ In the protological setting, the Father brought forth from his interior thought (Ennoia), a female being exterior to himself; Pronoia is ‘[The first power], Barbelo, the perfect glory in the aeons, the glory of the revelation.’²⁴⁷ Barbelo is the ‘first thought, his image; she became the womb of everything for she is prior to them all, the Mother-

²⁴³ *Ap. John* II.1.1-5.

²⁴⁴ *Ap. John* II.4.1-10.

²⁴⁵ *Q.d.s.* 6.1.

²⁴⁶ *Ap. John* II.4.25-6.10.

²⁴⁷ *Ap. John* II.4.35-5.1; 6.5, ‘It is Pronoia which is Barbelo.’

Father, the first Man, the holy Spirit.’²⁴⁸ Barbelo asks the invisible Spirit to give her Pronoia, Aphtharsia, Zoe Aionios, and Aletheia, and ‘the invisible Spirit consented.’²⁴⁹ Consequently, similar to the invisible Spirit, Barbelo became a five-aeon being, possessing thought, foreknowledge, incorruption, eternal life, and truth; moreover, Barbelo is androgynous: the divine Mother-Father.²⁵⁰

Subsequently, the invisible Spirit looked inside Barbelo ‘with the pure light which surrounds the invisible Spirit and (with) his spark, she conceived from him.’²⁵¹ Barbelo brought forth ‘the only-begotten one of the Father, the pure Light,’ the Son.²⁵² The Father anointed the Son with the goodness of the invisible Spirit. This Son became ‘the great Logos, the divine Autogenes, and the incorruptible man,’ the Christ.²⁵³ Subsequently, Autogenes asked for Nous to be his assistant, and the invisible Spirit granted it.²⁵⁴ The *Apocryphon of John* continues:

The [H]oly Spirit completed the divine Autogenes, his son, together with Barbel[o], that he may stand before the mighty and invisible, virginal Spirit as the divine Autogenes, the Christ, whom he had honored with a mighty voice. He came forth through the Pronoia. And the invisible, virginal Spirit placed the divine Autogenes of truth over everything.²⁵⁵

In the *Apocryphon of John* and other Gnostic tractates, this account shows the perfection of the Godhead in the pleroma. God is the transcendent, invisible, and the virginal Spirit; God is Barbelo, the five-aeon of pure light and the androgynous Mother-Father; and God is the one conceived by the spark of the invisible Spirit, the Autogenes of the truth, the Logos, the Son of God, the Christ. From this perfection in the pleroma, the attempt by the Gnostics to answer the questions about the origins of evil, human

²⁴⁸ *Ap. John* II.5.5-6.

²⁴⁹ *Ap. John* II.5.12-35.

²⁵⁰ *A.H.* I.29.1.

²⁵¹ *Ap. John* II.6.12-13.

²⁵² *Ap. John* II.6.15-19.

²⁵³ *Ap. John* II.7.20; *Gos. Eg.* III.50.20-21.

²⁵⁴ *Ap. John* II.6.34-35.

²⁵⁵ *Ap. John* II.7.16-24.

deficiency, suffering, and imperfection was a complicated task. Their solution is the creation of the lower-God, the demiurge.

2. Gnostic Demiurge

While the transcendent God of Gnosticism is similar to the highest God in Platonism—discounting Barbelo and Autogenes—the gnostic lower-God is altogether a different figure than the demiurge of *Timaeus*. As we saw, Plato’s demiurge takes the eternal Forms of the Good and creates order out of primal disorder. It is the aim of this demiurge to generate and shape matter to emulate the likeness of the highest Good. The *Timaeus* tells us:

For God desired that, so far as possible, all things should be good and nothing evil; wherefore, when He took over all that was visible, seeing that it was not in a state of rest but in a state of discordant and disorderly motion, He brought it into order out of disorder.²⁵⁶

The Gnostic demiurge is quite different: He is an arrogant, ignorant, and a jealous deity. Part of the reason for this portrayal is that ‘the [Gnostic] myth of origins aims to answer the question of how the imperfect and perishable world in which the Gnostic lived was related to the eternal spiritual perfection of the Invisible Spirit.’²⁵⁷ For the Gnostic, the dualism of two worlds—the pleroma and the cosmos—requires a theological dualism: a transcendent God with good attributes and a lesser God, a marplot.

The lesser God in Gnostic myth is Yaldabaoth. Some of the tractates that depict accounts of the generation of Yaldabaoth are the *Apocryphon of John*, the *Hypostasis of the Archons*, *On the Origin of the World*, and in a concise narrative, the *Trimorphic Protennoia*.²⁵⁸ According to the theogony in these tractates, Sophia was tempted by her own inner thought to produce an image of herself. Upon acting without the consent or the power of the Autogenes (her consort), she brought forth Yaldabaoth. On account of

²⁵⁶ *Tim.* 29e.

²⁵⁷ Luttikhuisen, *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions*, 45.

²⁵⁸ *Ap.John* II.10.1-20; *Hyp.Arch* II.86-87; *Orig.World* II.100.1-30; *Trim.Prot* XIII.39.14-31; for Irenaeus’s description of Yaldabaoth, see *A.H.* I.5.1-6; I.30.4; Hippolytus, *Ref.* VI.32.

this theogony, it will be helpful straightaway to discuss the saga of Sophia before describing her offspring, the malevolent demiurge.

Sophia is the twelfth aeon brought forth by the invisible Spirit to stand by his Son, Autogenes. In the myth, God brought forth twelve aeons that emanate from four luminous-aeons. The first luminous-aeon is Armozel; ‘grace, truth, and form’ emanate from this light. The second aeon is Oriel; ‘conception, perception, and memory’ proceed from this luminary. The third luminous-aeon is Daveithai; ‘understanding, love, and idea’ emanate from this light. The fourth aeon is Eleleth; ‘perfection, peace, and Sophia’ proceed from this luminary.²⁵⁹ The Godhead and these emanations constitute the fullness of the divine realm—the pleroma.²⁶⁰ The pleroma is the unity of these luminous powers functioning in harmony, providing fullness of existence.²⁶¹ The Gnostics believed that attaining the knowledge of the pleroma displaces the deficiency of human ignorance concerning human nature. In this light, Violet MacDermot reports that ‘Knowledge of pleroma enables man himself to become a pleroma.’²⁶²

Sophia is part of this divine realm and emanates from Eleleth. The tractate, *Sophia of Jesus Christ*, says that Christ’s consort was the great Sophia, ‘who was from the first destined in him for a yoke through the self-begotten Father.’²⁶³ In the pleroma, Sophia and Autogenes (Christ) were yoked. Analogous to the story of Adam and Eve, Sophia stepped away from her partner and conceived independently an inner thought and ‘a thing came out of her which was imperfect and different from her appearance, because she had created it without her partner [Autogenes].’²⁶⁴ She conceived and brought forth

²⁵⁹ For the narrative of all four light-aeons, see *Ap.John* II.8.1-25 and *A.H.* I.29.2.

²⁶⁰ *Ap.John* II.7.31-9.25.

²⁶¹ For discussion on the pleroma, see MacDermot, ‘The Concept of Pleroma in Gnosticism,’ in *Gnosis and Gnosticism*, NHS XVII, ed. Martin Krause, et al, (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 76-81.

²⁶² MacDermot, ‘The Concept of Pleroma in Gnosticism,’ 79; see also, *Gos.Truth* I.3.35 and *Tri.Trac.* I.5.90.

²⁶³ *Soph.Jes.Chr.* III.101.16-19; III.102.11-20; III.104.10-19; III.114.13-118.

²⁶⁴ *Ap.John* II.10.1-7.

from her female seed (principle), not a good demiurge, but an ignorant and arrogant monster: Yaldabaoth. Concerning his appearance, Yaldabaoth was a *theriomorphic* demiurge: He had the ‘form of a lion-faced serpent.’²⁶⁵ Its eyes were like ‘lightening fires which flash.’²⁶⁶ Some literature calls this event the ‘Fall of Sophia.’²⁶⁷

Pearson suggests that the name Yaldabaoth ‘is often interpreted according to an Aramaic etymology as “child of chaos.”’²⁶⁸ The treatise, *Trimorphic Protennoia*, calls Yaldabaoth ‘the great Demon who rules over the lowest part of the underworld and Chaos. He has neither form nor perfection, but on the contrary possesses the form of the glory of those begotten in darkness.’²⁶⁹ Yaldabaoth has two other names: Saklas and Samael.²⁷⁰ Saklas means ‘fool,’ and according to the *Hypostasis of the Archons*, Samael means ‘god of the blind,’ or perhaps ‘blind god,’ a god in darkness.²⁷¹ When Sophia saw his image, she was horrified and regretted the existent consequence of her independent thought; so, she anxiously cast Yaldabaoth outside of the pleroma so that no one within the divine region would see him, because ‘she created him in ignorance.’²⁷² She then surrounded Yaldabaoth with a cloud to conceal him, and placed a throne in the midst of the cloud.²⁷³ As the offspring of Sophia, Yaldabaoth ‘took great power from his mother.’²⁷⁴ The divine power was the light, which emanated from Eleleth, but was the gift of ‘Christ and the indestructibility.’²⁷⁵

²⁶⁵ For discussion on Yaldabaoth’s theriomorphic appearance, see E. Aydeet Fischer-Mueller, ‘Yaldabaoth: The Gnostic Female Principle in Its Fallenness,’ *Novum Testamentum* 32:1 (1990): 83-85.

²⁶⁶ *Ap. John* II. 10.9-11.

²⁶⁷ Luttikhuisen, *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions*, 46. Also see Gilles Quispel, ‘The Demiurge in the Apocryphon of John,’ in *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis*, ed. by R. McL. Wilson (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 1-33.

²⁶⁸ See Pearson, *Ancient Gnosticism: Traditions and Literature*, 57; O’Brien, *The Demiurge in Ancient Thought*, 227.

²⁶⁹ *Trim.Prot.* XIII.39.22-26.

²⁷⁰ *Ap. John* II.11.16-18.

²⁷¹ *Hyp.Arch.* II.4.87.2-3.

²⁷² *Ap. John* II.10.10-14.

²⁷³ *Ap. John* II.10.13-14.

²⁷⁴ *Ap. John* II.10.20.

²⁷⁵ *Ap. John* II.7.31.

As the chief archon, Yaldabaoth created twelve lesser archons, and ‘placed seven kings—corresponding to the firmaments of heaven—over the seven heavens and five over the depth of the abyss, that they might reign.’²⁷⁶ Codex Berlin, which includes another tractate of the *Apocryphon of John*, states that, when Yaldabaoth made the archons, ‘he shared with them of his fire which belongs to him and of his power. But he did not give them of the pure light power which he had taken away from his mother.’²⁷⁷ It is important to note that the Gnostic myth is ultimately focused on the invisible Spirit recovering this ‘pure light power’ that Yaldabaoth took from Sophia.

The important aspect about the makeup of Yaldabaoth is that, because he was conceived by only Sophia (a female), he was a mixture of (1) her psychic thought, (2) the light emanation (from Eleleth), and (3) darkness. The darkness was derived from Sophia’s insubordination and desire to conceive a thought without her partner.²⁷⁸ Consequently, Yaldabaoth is a psychic being (not *pneumatic*), a mixture of light and darkness, and thus he was ‘ignorant darkness.’²⁷⁹ The *Apocryphon of John* goes on to say that ‘when the light had mixed with the darkness, it caused the darkness to shine. And when the darkness had mixed with the light, it darkened the light and it became neither light nor dark, but it became weak.’²⁸⁰ The deficiency in Yaldabaoth is that his weakness was unknown to him because he was ignorant, unable to know the pleroma, and especially blind to his actual identity; he was not really a god.

Yaldabaoth had confused the light power he took from his mother with his own being. When he conceived a thought, and then spoke it, his words created the cosmos,

²⁷⁶ *Ap. John* II.10.20-11.8.

²⁷⁷ BG 42.13-18; *Ap. John* II.11.7-10.

²⁷⁸ For discussion on the weakness of female seed without the male seed, see Fischer-Mueller, ‘Yaldabaoth: The Gnostic Female Principle in Its Fallenness,’ (1990): 85-89.

²⁷⁹ *Ap. John* II.11.10.

²⁸⁰ *Ap. John* II.11.11-15.

along with the luminary and planetary systems within it. The *Apocryphon of John* explains that

everything he organized according to the model of the first aeons which had come into being so that he might create them like the indestructible ones. Not because he had seen the indestructible ones, but the power which is in him which he took from his mother produced in him the likeness of the cosmos. And when he saw the creation which surrounds him and the multitude of angels around him which had come forth from him, he said to them, 'I am a jealous God and there is no other God besides me.'²⁸¹

The Gnostics claim that Yaldabaoth misunderstood this creative activity. Yaldabaoth thought he created the cosmos from his own sovereign power; however, the light of the invisible Spirit that Sophia passed on to him created the cosmos. The luminous power within Yaldabaoth knew the realm of the pleroma, and it easily created a copy of that region through Yaldabaoth's will. Accordingly, the Gnostic system depicts Yaldabaoth as a weak demiurge, manifested in ignorance and arrogance, which were consummated in madness; his madness is shown when he blasphemed, calling himself 'God.'²⁸² To the Gnostic, this self-proclamation reveals that he was ignorant of Autogenes, Barbelo, the invisible Spirit, and the pleroma above him. Accordingly, the Gnostic system associates Yaldabaoth with the Creator-God of the Old Testament. Thus, in this myth, the Old Testament God is not the God of the pleroma, the invisible Spirit and perfect Goodness. Instead, the God of the Old Testament is Yaldabaoth, the God of this cosmos, and is malevolent.

This form of Gnosticism claims that by reason of the light power within him, the God of the Old Testament (Yaldabaoth) made two foolish claims. Firstly, Yaldabaoth said to the angels: 'I am a jealous God.'²⁸³ Secondly, he ignorantly boasted: 'Besides me there is no other God beside me.'²⁸⁴ In the *Hypostasis of the Archons*, it adds the

²⁸¹ *Ap. John* II.12.34-13.10.

²⁸² *Ap. John* II.11.16-22.

²⁸³ Ex. 20:5; 34:14; Deut. 4:24; 5:9; *Ap. John* II.13.9.

²⁸⁴ Isa. 43:11; 44:6-8; 45:5; *Ap. John* II.13.10.

characterization that ‘their chief is blind; [because of his] Power and his ignorance [and his] arrogance he said, with his [Power], “It is I who am God; there is none [apart from me].”’²⁸⁵ This event is also recorded in the *Origin of the World*: After creating the world, “all the ⟨gods⟩ and their angels gave him praise and glory. And he rejoiced in his heart, and boasted continually, saying to them “I do not need anything.” He said, “I am God and no other one exists.”’²⁸⁶ In the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, the writer adds: ‘After the founding [of the world] Sakla said to his [angels], “I, I am a [jealous] god, and apart from me nothing has [come into being]” since he] trusted in his nature.’²⁸⁷ When Irenaeus recounted this part of the myth, he recorded: ‘Ialdabaoth, becoming uplifted in spirit boasted himself over all those things that were below him, and exclaimed, “I am father, and God, and above me there is no other.”’²⁸⁸ Pearson refers to this event as the ‘Blasphemy of the demiurge.’²⁸⁹

The Gnostic myth writers did not interpret the Old Testament texts of God’s self-characterizations as declarations of divine sovereignty and love. Rather, they interpreted the jealousy of God as a base passion, and the boast as a serious blasphemy. For the reason that the demiurge was ignorant and did not know that the invisible Spirit, Barbelo, Autogenes, and the pleroma were ‘above’ him, ‘when he [Yaldabaoth] said this [blasphemy], he sinned against [the Entirety]. And this speech got up to Incorruptibility, saying, “You are mistaken, Samael”—which is “god” of the blind.’²⁹⁰ Ultimately, Yaldabaoth did not realize he was in a contest with the invisible Spirit, who sought to retrieve the eternal light Yaldabaoth took from Sophia. The divine strategy,

²⁸⁵ *Hyp.Arch.* II.86.27-32; *Orig.World* II.103.1-30.

²⁸⁶ *Orig.World* II.103.6-11.

²⁸⁷ *Gos.Eg.* III.58.25-59.1. This echoes John’s claim about the eternal *Logos* in Jn. 1:3.

²⁸⁸ *A.H.* I.30.6; and see *A.H.* I.29.4.

²⁸⁹ Pearson, *Ancient Gnosticism: Traditions and Literature*, 107.

²⁹⁰ *Hyp.Arch.* II.87.2-4.

according to the Gnostic system, was that the light would return through the formation, enslavement, and subsequent salvation of humankind.

3. Gnostic Anthropogony

The *Apocryphon of John* provides a detailed and complex account of the formation of humankind. After the invisible Spirit rebuked Yaldabaoth for his blasphemous mistake, ‘a voice came forth from the exalted aeon in heaven: “The Man exists and the son of Man.”’²⁹¹ Infuriated at the impiety of Yaldabaoth, Pistis declared: ““You err, Samael,” i.e. “the blind god.” An enlightened immortal man exists before you. This will appear within your molded bodies. He will trample upon you like potter’s clay.”’²⁹² Subsequently, the First Anthropos (Autogenes), caused his image to appear in the waters ‘in human form.’²⁹³ When Yaldabaoth and his archons ‘saw the form of the image in the water,’ Yaldabaoth ‘said to the authorities which attend to him, “Come let us create a man according to the image of God and according to our likeness, that his image may become a light for us.”’²⁹⁴

There are two aspects to the formation of the image of God, that show the gnostic dualism in humankind: (1) the creation of the psychic body and (2) the formation of the material body. To bring his creation under the control of the archons, Yaldabaoth commissioned seven cosmic powers to create the structure of Adam’s psychic body. The first power, Goodness, created a bone-soul; Foreknowledge fashioned a sinew-soul; Divinity shaped a flesh-soul; Lordship created a marrow-soul; Kingdom fashioned a blood-soul; Envy shaped a skin-soul; finally, Understanding created an eye-lid soul.²⁹⁵

²⁹¹ *Ap.John* II.14.14-15; *Gos.Eg.* III.59.2-3.

²⁹² *Orig.World* II.103.15-23.

²⁹³ *Ap.John* II.14.23-24.

²⁹⁴ *Ap.John* II.14.32-15.5. In *Hyp.Arch.* II.87.24-25, ‘The Rulers (Archons) laid plans and said, “Come let us create man that will be soil from the earth.”’ The Gnostic interpretation of Genesis 1:26 answered the question of the plurality among the Gods. The statement, ‘Let us make man,’ was asked either by Yaldabaoth (*Ap.John* II.15.2) or the archons (*Hyp.Arch.* II.87.24-25).

²⁹⁵ *Ap.John* II.15.15-22.

Then the multitude of angels ‘received from the powers the seven substances of the psychic (form) in order to create the composition’ of man.²⁹⁶ The psychological anatomy, which replicates identically the physical body, is the exact structure of the psychic body—also called the material soul.²⁹⁷ From the brain to the toes, Yaldabaoth created Adam, a psychic body, a material soul.²⁹⁸

Four demons are contained in this soulish body, which produce grief, pleasure, desire, and fear.²⁹⁹ It is from these demons that passions arise:

From grief (came) envy, jealousy, distress, trouble, pain, callousness, anxiety, mourning, etc. And from pleasure much wickedness arises, and empty pride. And from desire (comes) anger, wrath and bitterness and bitter passion and unsatedness. And from fear (comes) dread, fawning, agony, and shame.³⁰⁰

Since the psychic body was formed with aspects of the cosmic powers—as well as the four demons—most Gnostics thought that the archons had authority over souls and brought human beings into emotive struggles. Based on the introduction to the *Hypostasis of the Archons*, Elaine Pagels argues that Gnostics drew this connection from the Pauline tradition: ‘Our contest is not with blood and flesh, but with the archons [ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰ ἀρχάς]’ (Ephesians 6:12).³⁰¹ In contrast to the Genesis account, which shows Adam and Eve responsible for the entrance of evil, the Gnostic account blames Yaldabaoth and the archons for designing *anthropos* with innate passions. Clement does not concur that the archons created humankind, but he thinks that the passions are ‘cosmic rulers of darkness,’ opposing human existence.³⁰²

²⁹⁶ *Ap. John* II.15.24-26.

²⁹⁷ *Ap. John* II.18.33.

²⁹⁸ *Ap. John* II.15.30-17.28.

²⁹⁹ *Ap. John* II.18.15-18

³⁰⁰ *Ap. John* II.18.20-32.

³⁰¹ *Hyp. Arch.* II.86.20-28; see Pagels, ‘Exegesis and Exposition of the Genesis Creation Accounts in Selected Texts from Nag Hammadi,’ in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*, 257-285. She proposes a Pauline backdrop to the treatise *Hypostasis of the Archons*.

³⁰² *Str.* II.20.110.1-2; *Str.* VII.3.20.4-5; *Q.d.s.* 29.2-3, τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν κοσμοκρατόρων τοῦ σκάτους ὀλίγου τεθνατωμένους τοῖς πολλοῖς τραύμασι, φόβοις, ἐπιθυμίαις, ὀργαῖς, λύπαις, ἀπάταις, ἡδοναῖς.

Yaldabaoth's creation was problematic, because *anthropos* could neither arise nor move about: 'And their product was completely inactive and motionless for a long time.'³⁰³ Observing the immobile *anthropos*, Sophia moved to retrieve the light Yaldabaoth had taken from her. She brought her request to Barbelo and to the invisible Spirit. Barbelo sent five aeons, disguised as angels, to Yaldabaoth and the archons. The aeons advised Yaldabaoth to utilize the power of his mother to animate *anthropos*:

And they said to Yaldabaoth, 'Blow into his face something of your spirit and his body will arise.' And he blew into his face the spirit which is the power of his mother; he did not know (this), for he exists in ignorance. And the power of the mother went out of Yaldabaoth into the psychic soul which they had fashioned after the image of the One who exists from the beginning. The [psychic] body moved and gained strength, and it was luminous.³⁰⁴

This event calls to mind Genesis 2:7, which is Clement's account of anthropogony, where God blew the breath of life into Adam and he 'became a living soul.' Receiving the third element, the 'light' from the invisible Spirit, *anthropos* became greater than Yaldabaoth, the archons, and their angels. In the *Apocalypse of Adam*, Adam recounts this story to Seth: 'And we [Adam and Eve] resembled the great eternal angels, for we were higher than the God who had created us.'³⁰⁵ Because Yaldabaoth was ignorant, he did not realize that, when he blew Sophia's power of light into Adam, Yaldabaoth would lose it forever. Upon losing the light, Yaldabaoth and the archons became jealous of Adam, 'because he had come into being through all of them and they had given their power to the man, and his intelligence was greater than that of those who had made him, and greater than that of the chief archon,' Yaldabaoth.³⁰⁶

This jealousy sets up the second phase of gnostic anthropogony. In a jealous frenzy, Yaldabaoth and the archons seized Adam and 'threw him into the lowest region

³⁰³ *Ap. John* II.19.15.

³⁰⁴ *Ap. John* II.19.21-33.

³⁰⁵ *Apoc. Adam* V.64.15-16.

³⁰⁶ *Ap. John* II.19.35-20.6.

of all matter,' a material oubliette.³⁰⁷ In order to assist him in this prison, Barbelo sent 'a helper to Adam, luminous Epinoia which comes out of him, who was called Life.'³⁰⁸

Epinoia is the *pneumatic* Eve given to assist Adam

by toiling with him and by restoring him to his fullness and by teaching him about the descent of his seed (and) by teaching him about the way of ascent, (which is) the way he came down. And the luminous Epinoia was hidden in Adam, in order that the archons might not know her, but that the Epinoia might be a correction of the deficiency of the mother.³⁰⁹

With the help of Epinoia, Adam 'came forth because of the shadow of the light which is in him. And [as a result], his thinking was superior to all those who made him. When they looked up they saw that his thinking was superior.'³¹⁰ Consequently, the rulers and the angels created a great disturbance:

They brought [Adam] into the shadow of death in order that they might form (him) again from the earth and water and fire and the spirit which originates in matter, which is the ignorance of darkness and desire, and their opposing spirit which is the tomb of the newly formed body with which the robbers had clothed the man, the bond of forgetfulness; and he became a mortal man.³¹¹

Yaldabaoth enslaved the image he created within the prison of matter and left him to struggle with the opposing material body. Being in 'the bond of forgetfulness,' Adam lost the knowledge of his true existence. However, 'the gift of Epinoia that was in him' is the light 'to awaken his thinking' of his true origins and identity.³¹²

Gnostic anthropogony is complex. The *Apocryphon of John* explains that the archons formed the material soul before forming the material body. The psychic body has an anatomical structure similar to the material body, and houses both good and evil energies. It is able to receive and contain the light of Sophia, the *pneumatic* element of psychic existence. Yaldabaoth and his retinue formed the material body from the four

³⁰⁷ *Ap. John* II.20.7-8.

³⁰⁸ *Ap. John* II.20.17-18.

³⁰⁹ *Ap. John* II.20.20-27.

³¹⁰ *Ap. John* II.20.30-35.

³¹¹ *Ap. John* II.21.3-14.

³¹² *Ap. John* II.21.15-16.

elements to be a material prison based on their jealousy over Adam's superiority. The imprisonment was not so much punishment, but analogous to the way Joseph's brothers, who through jealousy, sold him into Egypt: 'the house of bondage' (Exodus 3:14).

4. Gnostic Soteriology

The gnostic demiurge is not a Saviour. Yaldabaoth is a malicious evildoer, who enslaves human beings into oblivion and forgetfulness. Consequently, salvation must come from another realm, and for the Gnostic, salvation comes from the pleroma. The primary means for salvation is *gnosis*; true *gnosis* of God connects the Gnostic to the root of the Father. At this point, what appears as Gnostic myth, concerning the plight of human existence, becomes a serious quest for salvation. Salvation is to 'awaken' from ignorance and gain knowledge of the Father, the Son, and of one's true existence. *Gnosis* is insight, as the *Testimony of Truth* describes: 'This, therefore, is the true testimony. When a man comes to know himself and God who is over the truth, he will be saved.'³¹³ Commenting on this point, Pearson states: 'In typically Gnostic fashion our tractate equates knowledge of God with knowledge of self.'³¹⁴ As will be shown in chapter four, Clement shares this salvific quest and insight with the Gnostics, but Clement takes *gnosis* farther than they.

For this reason, the Gnostics were ardent about their pursuit of *gnosis*. They believed that a divine illuminator from the pleroma disclosed salvific knowledge. The *Apocalypse of Adam* speaks about 'the illuminator of knowledge.'³¹⁵ To those who are illuminated (awakened) and 'reflect upon the knowledge of the eternal God in their hearts will not perish.'³¹⁶ In some Gnostic texts, Sophia, or the biblical figures Adam or

³¹³ *Test.Truth* IX.44.30-45.5.

³¹⁴ Pearson, *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*, 175.

³¹⁵ *Apoc.Adam* V.76.10, 29.

³¹⁶ *Apoc.Adam* V.76.23-24.

Seth were the agents of enlightenment. Generally, for Christian Gnostics, the agent of revelation is Christ.³¹⁷ The *Apocryphon of John* concludes with the Saviour telling John: ‘I, therefore, the perfect Pronoia of the all, changed myself into my seed, for I existed first, going on every road. For I am the richness of the light; I am the remembrance of the pleroma.’³¹⁸ The seed of Pronoia enters ‘the realm of darkness’ and ‘into the middle of the darkness and inside Hades.’ Pronoia ‘entered into the middle of their prison which is the prison of the body. And [Pronoia] said, “He who hears, let him get up from a deep sleep.”’³¹⁹ Because there is a vast difference between ignorance and knowledge and sleeping and consciousness, the one who awoke, ‘wept and shed tears.’³²⁰ The Saviour describes the awakening:

Bitter tears he wiped from himself and he said, ‘Who is it that calls my name, and from where has this hope come to me, while I am in the chains of prison?’ And I said, ‘I am the Pronoia of the pure light; I am the thinking of the virginal Spirit, he who raised you up to the honored place. Arise and remember that it is you who hearkened, and follow your root, which is I, the merciful one, and guard yourself against the angels of poverty and demons of chaos and all those who ensnare you, and be aware of the deep sleep and the enclosure of the inside of Hades.’³²¹

For the Gnostic, the source of salvation is exterior to this cosmos, and salvation is envisaged as an awakening. In the *Gospel of Truth*, the Spirit gives those who awaken from the sleep of ignorance ‘the means of knowing the knowledge of the Father and the revelation of his Son.’³²² *Gnosis* rouses the mind and shows people they belong to the pleroma. Thus, the knowledge is visionary; it provides insight into the fullness of God, enabling Gnostics to experience, according to their belief, true human existence.

The Gnostics despised spiritual error, seeing it as the cause of spiritual insensibility in humankind. In the *Gospel of Truth*, the demiurge appears, not as an ignorant God,

³¹⁷ For examples, *Ap.James* II.1.9-2.26; *Ap.John* II.2.9-25; *Apoc.Peter* VII.70.14-72.4; *Gos.Mary* BG 7.3-17.10.

³¹⁸ *Ap.John* II.30.13-16.

³¹⁹ *Ap.John* II.30.18-31.6.

³²⁰ *Ap.John* II.31.7.

³²¹ *Ap.John* II.31.8-22.

³²² *Gos.Truth* I.30.17-27.

but personified as ‘error’ (πλάνη). Error brings humanity into unconsciousness and forgetfulness.³²³ ‘Error became powerful; it fashioned its own matter foolishly, not having known the truth.’³²⁴ Like Yaldabaoth, error ‘set about making a creature, with (all its) might preparing, in beauty, the substitute for the truth.’³²⁵ The substitute for true human existence is the material body. Shaped from matter, the somatic structure has neither root nor connection to the pleroma, and therefore, ‘ignorance of the Father’ leads people into ‘anguish and terror.’³²⁶ Bound to oblivion, humans think they exist for the body; it is *gnosis* that exposes this mistake and discloses the true root. Thus, according to the *Gospel of Truth*, the human problem is not sin or guilt, but rather, it is ignorance and forgetfulness brought about by error. In this light, the Saviour admonished John to ‘despise error.’³²⁷

Gnostic soteriology, therefore, asserts that salvation is a certain *gnosis*, not forgiveness. Most Gnostics ‘insisted that ignorance, not sin, is what involves a person in suffering.’³²⁸ In this way, ‘conversion does not involve repentance from sin to grace, or repugnance and guilt for one’s past, but a reorientation from ignorance to Gnosis, and from anxiety and rootlessness to repose.’³²⁹ To begin the salvific economy, the Father brought knowledge into existence, ‘which appeared in order that oblivion might vanish and the Father might be known, then if the Father comes to be known, oblivion will not exist from that moment on.’³³⁰ In the *Gospel of Truth*, knowledge of the Father is the true gospel, which is the ‘hidden mystery, Jesus, the Christ.’ Through this gospel,

³²³ MacRae, ‘The Jewish Background of the Gnostic Sophia Myth,’ (April 1970): 96.

³²⁴ *Gos.Truth* I.17.15-17.

³²⁵ *Gos.Truth* I.17.17-20.

³²⁶ *Gos.Truth* I.17.10-11.

³²⁷ *Gos.Truth* I.17.29.

³²⁸ Elaine Pagels, *The Gnostic Gospels*, (London: Phoenix, 2006), 133.

³²⁹ Anne McGuire, ‘Conversion and Gnosis in the ‘Gospel of Truth,’’ *Novum Testamentum* 28:4 (October 1986): 354.

³³⁰ *Gos.Truth* I.18.5-12.

Christ ‘enlightened those who were in darkness. Out of oblivion, he enlightened them, he showed them the way. And the way is the truth which he taught them.’³³¹

This chapter outlines the fundamental theological themes of Platonism and Gnosticism, sketching especially the theology of the supreme God, the demiurge, anthropogony, and teleology for Platonism but soteriology for Gnosticism. Into this background, Clement entered Alexandria and worked there as a Christian teacher, propagating his theology of the Incarnation and mission of the divine *Logos*. The following chapter looks at Clement’s preferred intellectual climate: the teachings of the apostles, his idea of a gnostic tradition, and his own theology—including the demiurge, anthropogony, and soteriology.

³³¹ *Gos.Truth* I.18.13-21.

Chapter Two: Clement's Theological Context

A. Introduction

The affinity Clement shows to philosophy in general and Platonism in particular, as seen in the previous chapter, is a leading reason for which, in the past, scholars have cast Clement as a 'Platonized' Christian. Understandably, some have envisaged Clement as too 'Hellenistic' to convey a pure Christian theology.³³² Charles Bigg, for example, praises Clement for his erudition, but then accuses him for passing 'many a sharp remark on the rhetoricians, but at bottom he is himself a member of their guild, cloudy, turgid and verbose. But theology had not yet driven out the Muses.'³³³ More directly, John Ferguson (1976) concludes: 'I see Clement very much a Platonist in a correlative branch with Numenius (who blended Plato with Pythagoras), and standing in the line of succession, though not in direct line, between Albinus and Plotinus.'³³⁴ While acknowledging Clement's ties to Platonic thought is true, it is nevertheless requisite to bring the 'Christian' and even the 'apostolic' Clement to the fore, because the latter two are his preferred theological context.

This chapter partially responds to the above propositions by addressing Clement's reception of the apostolic tradition, his participation in apostolic succession, and the major points of what he calls the 'gnostic tradition.' It situates Clement in his select intellectual environment: the spiritual lineage of Christ and the apostles: Peter, James, John, and Paul, as well as Barnabas, and Clement of Rome. It compares and contrasts Clement's views with those of Irenaeus on the succession of the apostolic tradition, and shows how Clement moves away from the bishop of Lyons concerning who may stand in line with the apostles. It is not without difficulty to delineate Clement's beliefs of an

³³² John Kenney, 'Divinity and World in Clement,' *Studia Patristica XXI*, (1989): 313-314.

³³³ Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, 74-75. Though this book is dated, it has been influential in patristic studies concerning Alexandrian Christianity.

³³⁴ Ferguson, 'The Achievement of Clement of Alexandria,' *Religious Studies*, 12:1 (March 1976): 62.

apostolic succession or tradition, because he shows affinities to the proto-orthodox episcopate and to the disclosure of concealed *gnosis*.

There are three ways to portray Clement's theological context in Alexandria. Firstly, like Irenaeus, Clement grounds his theological discourse in the Scriptures, which includes the prophets, the Gospels, and ecclesiastical letters, which he believes have apostolic authorship. Secondly, unlike Irenaeus but similar to the Gnostics, Clement maintains a gnostic tradition disclosed by Christ and handed down by the apostles. Thirdly, the latter part of this chapter delineates the same four theological topics as sketched in chapter one for the Platonists and Gnostics: (1) Clement's theology, (2) the Demiurge, (3) Clement's anthropogony, and (4) his soteriology. This four-part outline demonstrates where Clement agrees or disagrees with Platonism and Gnosticism, and it sets up the study of his doctrine of the Incarnation and mission in Part II.

B. Apostolic Tradition and Succession

That Clement had a philosophical nature and a zeal for wisdom is no secret. Platonic philosophy in Clement's time, as Alcinous tells us, was 'striving for wisdom, or freeing [λύσις] and turning around [τρεπομένων] the soul from the body, when we turn towards the intelligible things [τὰ νοητά] and what truly is; and wisdom is the knowledge [ἐπιστήμη] of things divine and human.'³³⁵ Clement echoes Alcinous's Platonism: 'Philosophy is pure devotion to wisdom, and wisdom is the knowledge [ἐπιστήμη] of divine and human things.'³³⁶ However, Clement searches deeper into a different stream of knowledge than a Middle Platonist. He discovered that 'wisdom is well-tested knowledge [ἔμπεδον γνῶσιν] of both divine and human affairs..., which

³³⁵ *Alcinous*, 1.1 and Whittaker, I.2-5.

³³⁶ *Str.* I.5.30.1, ἔστι γὰρ ἡ μὲν φιλοσοφία ἐπιτήδευσις <σοφίας>, ἡ σοφία δὲ ἐπιστήμη θείων καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων.

the Lord taught us through his *parousia* and by the prophets.³³⁷ Thus, earlier in his philosophical vocation, Clement spent his intellectual quest ‘striving’ for the wisdom of divine and human matters, but reached theological limits; later in his pursuit, he found ‘well-tested knowledge’ by pursuing what truly exists through the teachings of Christ. This path means that sometime before his arrival in Alexandria, Clement found another strain of knowledge—beyond his academic background—that explained, to his satisfaction, the knowledge of divine and human realities. Christ had revealed this *gnosis* to a group of disciples, who later became notable apostles.

The apostles, in Clement’s depiction, were a circle of select people appointed by Christ to be his followers, and specifically chosen to learn the mysteries of divine knowledge leading to salvation. Clement recounts that Christ said to his disciples: “To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven.” Again, the Gospel states that the saviour spoke to the apostles the *Logos* in a mystery [ὁ σωτὴρ ἔλεγεν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις τὸν λόγον ἐν μυστηρίῳ].³³⁸ Some disciples, such as Peter and John, grasped the language and theology, as attested by their epistles.³³⁹ In this way, the apostles were not only learning about God, they became ‘God-taught’ (θεοδίδακτος): the *Logos* was their Teacher.³⁴⁰ In Clement’s teachings, this mode of learning is an essential aspect of the apostolic tradition and a vital experience for attaining true *gnosis*. Markedly, those who received this knowledge and became ecclesial leaders, such as bishops or teachers, were participants in a unique spiritual lineage that passed down the apostolic teachings.

³³⁷ *Str.* VI.7.54.1, τὴν δὲ σοφίαν ἔμπεδον γινώσιν θείων τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων..., ἦν ἐδιδάξατο ἡμᾶς διὰ τε τῆς παρουσίας διὰ τε τῶν προφητῶν ὁ κύριος.

³³⁸ *Str.* V.12.80.6-7; Matt. 13:11; Mk. 4:11; Lk. 8:10.

³³⁹ *Str.* VI.8.68.3.

³⁴⁰ See 1Thess. 4:9; EB 21.6; *Paid.* I.6.37.2; *Str.* I.20.98.4; *Str.* VI.18.166.4.

Clement refers to this lineage of Christian leaders as a ‘succession’ (διαδοχή). He identifies the teaching content passed on as a ‘tradition’ (παράδοσις).³⁴¹ The idea of succession reflects the alignment in which Christian leaders walk ‘the straight path’ (ἡ ὀρθὴ ὁδός): viz., living faithfully to the interpretation of the knowledge given by Christ to the apostles, and the apostles to their followers. Clement of Rome, who Irenaeus claims spoke with the apostles (*A.H.* III.3.3), professes: ‘The apostles received the gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus the Christ was sent forth from God. So then Christ is from God, and the apostles are from Christ. Both, therefore, came of the will of God in good order [εὐτάκτως]’ to us.³⁴² Clement of Alexandria reports that ‘the *gnosis* itself was handed over [ἡ γνῶσις δὲ αὕτη [ἡ] παραδοθεῖσα] unwritten from the apostles according to successions [κατὰ διαδοχάς].’³⁴³ For Clement, therefore, succession is the lineage of Christian leaders and the tradition is the body of knowledge they passed down. However, Christian frontrunners of the second century disagreed about who qualified to stand in apostolic succession and pass down the apostolic tradition. One way to see this difference is to bring a contemporary bishop into the discussion, Irenaeus of Lyons (AD 130-202).

Early in the fourth century, Eusebius ‘purposed to record in writing the successions of the holy apostles [τὰς τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχάς].’³⁴⁴ One form of succession he delineates is the proto-orthodox episcopate. Eusebius tells us that the apostolic teachings had been passed on by bishops such as Dionysius, Pinytus, Philip, Apolinarius, Melito, Musanus, Modestus and ‘above all, Irenaeus; and [that] the

³⁴¹ For a treatment on tradition, see Yves Congar, *la Tradition et la Vie de l’Eglise*, (Paris: les Éditions de Cerf, 1984).

³⁴² 1Clem. 42.1-2.

³⁴³ *Str.* VI.7.61.3. Here the term διαδοχή is plural (διαδοχάς) because Clement recognizes at least two forms of apostolic succession: the teacher and the bishop.

³⁴⁴ *H.E.* I.1. See the full context: *H.E.* I.1-6.

orthodoxy on the sound faith of the apostolic tradition came down to us in writing.³⁴⁵

In the mid to late second-century, amid the varying intellectual challenges of Gnosticism, this line of transmission emphasized true knowledge of God, not necessarily liturgy or pastoral care.³⁴⁶ In his work, *Against Heresies*, Irenaeus argues forcefully that the apostolic tradition proclaims (against the Gnostics) that there is

One God, the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven, and earth, and sea...and one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who became incarnate for our salvation; and in the Holy Spirit, who proclaimed through the prophets the dispensations of God, and the advents, and the birth from a virgin, and the passion, and the resurrection from the dead, and the ascension into heaven in the flesh of the beloved Christ Jesus, our Lord, and his [future] manifestation from heaven.³⁴⁷

This one true God, not a lesser demiurge, fashioned humankind.³⁴⁸ In the quote, Irenaeus specifies the purpose of the Incarnation: ‘The Son of God...became incarnate for our salvation.’ Elsewhere he adds that ‘the Son of God, who because of His surpassing love towards His creation, condescended to be born of a virgin, He Himself uniting man through Himself to God.’³⁴⁹ For Irenaeus, these dogmas were handed down through the Church ubiquitously as if by ‘one mouth’ through successions of bishops.³⁵⁰ The doctrine of the Incarnation is part of the apostolic tradition, a teaching Clement adopts. Hence, whereas the Gnostics were divided into multiple sects, Irenaeus confesses the apostolic tradition to be one; it is the same in content throughout the world, one *regula fidei*.

Adherence to an episcopal succession was natural for Irenaeus, because of his early association with Polycarp (d. AD 157), who was a disciple of the apostles and later

³⁴⁵ H.E. IV.21, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν Εἰρηναῖος, ὧν καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς τῆς ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως ἡ τῆς ὑγιούς πίστεως ἐγγραφὸς κατῆλθεν ὀρθοδοξία.

³⁴⁶ For commentary on the Apostolic Tradition attributed to Hippolytus of Rome, see Dix and Chadwick, *Αποστολική Παραδοσις: The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St Hippolytus of Rome*, (London: The Alban Press, 1992); P.E. Bradshaw, M.E. Johnson, and L.E. Phillips, *The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary*, ed. by Harold W. Attridge (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2002).

³⁴⁷ A.H. I.10.1; III.1.2. All translations of Irenaeus are from ANFI.

³⁴⁸ A.H. III.3.3.

³⁴⁹ A.H. III.4.2.

³⁵⁰ A.H. I.10.2; III.2.1-3.2.

appointed by John to the bishopric in Smyrna.³⁵¹ Conceivably, because of his familiarity with Polycarp and the provenance of the episcopate for the Church in Rome, Irenaeus insists that only appointed bishops stand as legitimate successors to the apostles. This precept stems from his opinion that the

tradition derived from the apostles, of the very great, the very ancient and universally known Church, [was] founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also [by pointing out] the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the succession of bishops.³⁵²

Moreover, concerned about the bizarre revelations of theogony, cosmogony, and anthropogony propagated by heretical Gnostic teachers—some associated with the Valentinian school—and persuaded that the apostles had received full knowledge of God, Irenaeus believes any novel revelation exceeding the teachings of the apostles is heretical. His contention is this: ‘If the apostles had known hidden mysteries, which they were in a habit of imparting to “the perfect” apart and privily from the rest, they would have delivered them especially to those to whom they were also committing the Churches.’³⁵³ Irenaeus grounds his argument against additional secret *gnosis* upon his belief that the apostles received full revelation from Christ and passed it on to appointed bishops, so that there is nothing lacking in the content of the apostolic tradition. It was, therefore, a complete and public form of knowledge.

Eusebius describes another form of apostolic succession. He draws attention to Clement’s list of anonymous teachers in *Stromateis* I.1 as a ‘reference to the more distinguished members of the apostolic succession [ἀποστολικῆς διαδοχῆς] which he [Clement] had received.’³⁵⁴ Unlike Irenaeus, Clement was linked to Christian teachers, who had passed on the prophetic and apostolic knowledge. Association with teachers was natural for Clement because, having experienced a philosophical background, he

³⁵¹ A.H. III.3.4; *Praes.* 32.

³⁵² A.H. III.3.2.

³⁵³ A.H. III.3.1.

³⁵⁴ H.E. V.11.2; *Str.* I.1.11.2.

knew the guild of philosophers and teachers, not bishops. He understood that classical schools maintained a succession of philosophers and that there were occasions when thinkers either continued the chain of teaching or broke the link of a theoretical tradition by founding another school of thought (αἵρεσις).

Clement explains that Speusippus succeeded Plato and Xenocrates was in line with Speusippus.³⁵⁵ The succession was based upon each philosopher remaining faithful to the tradition of Platonic philosophy. In this way, Xenocrates and Speusippus upheld a Platonic succession. However, although Aristotle studied under Plato, Clement points out that Aristotle ‘withdrew to the Lyceum and founded the Peripatetic sect.’³⁵⁶ Accordingly, Aristotle broke succession, having moved away from the Academy to a new school of thought (heresy). Aristotle ‘was succeeded [διαδέχεται] by Theophrastus, who was succeeded by Strato, and he by Lycon, then Critolus, and then Diodorus,’ who maintained Aristotelian succession.³⁵⁷ Clement carries this sense of a philosophical lineage to the utility of an apostolic succession, which naturally adopts the position that the Christian teacher is similar to the philosopher. Just as a philosopher could maintain the succession of a school of thought, so a Christian teacher could sustain apostolic succession and preserve the ‘tradition of the blessed teaching derived directly from the holy apostles.’³⁵⁸

With Irenaeus, Clement believes the apostolic tradition includes the unbroken unity of knowledge given ‘through the Prophets, the Gospel, and the blessed apostles,’ because these sources provide ‘the beginning unto the end of knowledge.’³⁵⁹ The

³⁵⁵ *Str.* I.14.63.6.

³⁵⁶ *Str.* I.14.63.5, Περιπατητικὴν αἵρεσιν.

³⁵⁷ *Str.* I.14.63.5.

³⁵⁸ *Str.* I.1.11.1-2.

³⁵⁹ *Str.* VII.16.95.3, ἔχομεν γὰρ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς διδασκαλίας, τὸν κύριον διὰ τε τῶν προφητῶν διὰ τε τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ διὰ τῶν μακαρίων ἀποστόλων «πολυτρόπως καὶ πολυμερῶς» ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰς τέλος ἡγούμενον τῆς γνώσεως.

teachings of the Lord and the apostles represent a standardized interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. Together, they comprise the ‘ecclesiastical canon’:

‘But all things are right,’ says the writing. That is, those who receive and observe, according to the ecclesiastical canon, the exposition of the writings [τὴν τῶν γραφῶν ἐξήγησιν] explained by him; the ecclesiastical canon is the concord and harmony of the law and the prophets with the covenant delivered at the coming of the Lord [τῆ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίαν παραδιδόμενη διαθήκη].³⁶⁰

Clement understands the harmony of the two Testaments as an exegetical principle. He thinks it mandatory to demonstrate Scripture with Scripture, because ‘the truth is not found by changing the meanings (for so people subvert all true teaching), but in consideration of what perfectly belongs to and becomes the sovereign God,’ so that ‘each one of the points verified in the Scripture’ is supported ‘from similar Scriptures.’³⁶¹ When, therefore, the apostles studied the Old Testament, they uncovered the prophecies of Christ’s ‘coming [παρουσία], his death [τὸν θάνατον], his cross [τὸν σταυρόν], and his resurrection [τὴν ἔγερσιν] even his ascent into heaven [τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν].’³⁶² For Irenaeus and Clement, these subjects disclosed by Christ and explained by the apostles are essential teachings of the apostolic tradition.

At this point, it will be helpful to observe the well-known passage—which Eusebius mentions concerning an apostolic succession of teachers (*Ecclesiastical History* V.11.2-5)—in which Clement recounts his search for true *gnosis* around the districts of the Mediterranean:

I was counted worthy to hear brilliant and animated discourses of blessed and truly remarkable men. Of these, one was in Greece, an Ionic, and others in Magna Græcia (one was a Syrian from Coele, the other was from Egypt), and others were from the East: one from Assyria and the other was by origin a Hebrew in Palestine. When I came upon the last one (he was first in power), having tracked him down, since he was hidden in Egypt, I found rest. He was the Sicilian, the real bee

³⁶⁰ *Str.* VI.15.125.2-4, πλὴν «ἅπαντα ὀρθὰ ἐνώπιον τῶν συνιέντων» φησὶν ἡ γραφή, τουτέστι τῶν ὅσοι ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ σαφηνισθεῖσαν τὴν τῶν γραφῶν ἐξήγησιν κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα ἐκδεχόμενοι διασώζουσι· κανὼν δὲ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἢ συνωδία καὶ ἡ συμγώνια νόμου τε καὶ προφητῶν τῆ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίαν παραδιδόμενη διαθήκη.

³⁶¹ *Str.* VII.16.96.4.

³⁶² *Str.* VI.15.128.1.

[Σικελικὴ τῶ ὄντι ἦν μέλιττα], who upon gathering the spoil of the flowers of the prophetic and apostolic meadow, engendered [ἐνεγέννησε] in the souls of his hearers a deathless element of knowledge [ἀκήρατον γνώσεως].³⁶³

Clement adds that these teachers ‘preserved the true tradition of the blessed teaching directly from the holy apostles: Peter, James, John, and Paul, receiving as a child from a father.’³⁶⁴ These are the primary apostles highlighted in the book of *Acts*, who spread the knowledge through preaching and teaching. Moreover, these apostles contributed the majority of epistles that make the canonical New Testament. Clement then adds that the blessed teachings ‘had indeed come even to us with the help of God [σὺν θεῶ], having deposited those ancestral and apostolic seeds [τὰ προγονικὰ ἐκεῖνα ἀποστολικὰ σπέρματα].’³⁶⁵ Clement positioned himself as a member of this lineage and stored up the apostolic seeds. Agreeing with Irenaeus, even though there are differing lines of succession, Clement also claims that ‘the teaching of all the apostles is one, and so the tradition is also [one].’³⁶⁶

Along these lines, Ecclesiastical historians give testimony to Clement’s place as a teacher in apostolic succession. Reflecting on Clement’s passage in respect to his teachers, Eusebius concludes: ‘It is clear that [Clement] came very near to the succession of the apostles.’³⁶⁷ Eusebius notes further that Alexander, Clement’s student, who came to know Origen through Clement, identified his teacher as one of

³⁶³ *Str.* I.1.11.1-2; *ANF2*: 301. Here, Clement attributes the metaphor ‘Sicilian bee’ to Pantaenus. Chadwick popularizes the interpretation that the adjective Σικελικὴ refers not to Sicily, but to the quality of honey gleaned there. He states: ‘the best honey came from Sicily, so that this is Clement’s way of complimenting Pantaenus for the brilliance of his lectures.’ H. Chadwick, *Alexandrian Christianity: Selected Translations of Clement and Origen*, (SCM Press, 1954), 16; the possible antecedent to Chadwick is W. Telfer, ‘Bees’ in Clement of Alexandria,’ *JTS*, 28 (1926/27): 167-178 (esp. 170). Others follow Chadwick, such as Ashwin-Siejkowski, *Clement of Alexandria: A Project of Christian Perfection*, 24.

³⁶⁴ *Str.* I.1.11.3, τὴν ἀληθῆ τῆς μακαρίας σῶζοντες διδασκαλίας παράδοσιν.

³⁶⁵ *Str.* I.1.11.3. σὺν θεῶ could mean ‘with God.’

³⁶⁶ *Str.* VII.17.108.1, μὴ γὰρ ἡ πάντων γέγονε τῶν ἀποστόλων ὡσπερ διδασκαλία, οὕτως δὲ καὶ ἡ παράδοσις. See also *A.H.* I.10.2.

³⁶⁷ *H.E.* VI.13.8, περὶ ἑαυτοῦ δηλοῖ ὡς ἔγγιστα τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων γενομένου διαδοχῆς; see *Str.* I.1.11.3; *H.E.* V.11.5.

‘those blessed Fathers.’³⁶⁸ Furthermore, a surviving fragment shows that, within this succession, Clement was known as a ‘holy and apostolic teacher.’³⁶⁹ As follows, Roelof van den Broek adduces: ‘What is really astonishing here is that Clement claims a *successio apostolica*, which is also a *successio veritatis*, not for the bishop but for the διδάσκαλος.’³⁷⁰ At this point, we can see that Clement, unlike Irenaeus, allows Christian teachers, not appointed by a bishop, to participate in apostolic succession and transmit divine knowledge. In this light, Van den Broek adds that the outstanding Christian teachers of the second century believed that ‘they not only participated in the apostolic tradition but also in the same Spirit which had inspired the apostles. They were in fact charismatic διδάσκαλοι.’³⁷¹ This description applies to Clement.

However, while Clement includes the Christian teacher *in successione apostolica*, he does not exclude the bishop, as is evident by his use of the writings by Clement of Rome.³⁷² Nevertheless, like some Gnostic perspectives—such as found in the *Apocalypse of Peter*, an anti-episcopal tractate—Clement does not recognize the official episcopate without the operation of divine *gnosis* shaping the ecclesial leaders.³⁷³ He knows that bishops, like philosophers, could break succession through a variant teaching and alter the tradition, as later centuries would prove. In Clement’s case, one is ‘enrolled in the presbyterate because one is a righteous person.’³⁷⁴ While Irenaeus regarded the official bishop to be the transmitter of the true teaching, Clement’s experience was finding the true teaching as the way to recognize the orthodox leader.

³⁶⁸ *H.E.* VI.14.9, πατέρα τοὺς μακαρίου ἐκείνου.

³⁶⁹ *Frag.* 42, ὁ δὲ ἱερός καὶ ἀποστολικὸς διδάσκαλος Κλήμης ἐν τῷ Περὶ Προνοίας καὶ δικαιοκρισίας θεοῦ.

³⁷⁰ R. van den Broek, *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity*, (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 200.

³⁷¹ R. van den Broek, *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity*, 201.

³⁷² *Str.* IV.17.

³⁷³ See *Apoc. Peter* VII:79.23-26: ‘There shall be others of those who are outside our number who name themselves bishop and also deacons, as if they have received their authority from God.’

³⁷⁴ *Str.* VI.13.106.2.

Thus, Clement does not hold to ecclesial positions—episcopal or didactic—as qualifying factors for apostolic succession; rather, he thinks about succession this way:

According to my opinion, the grades here in the Church of bishops, presbyters, and deacons are imitators of the angelic glory, and of that economy, which the writings say, awaits those who follow the footsteps of the apostles having lived in perfection of righteousness according to the Gospel.³⁷⁵

Clement adopts his position for theological reasons: God is not only the Teacher of humanity, he is also a Bishop, who manages the Gnostic’s life ‘with closer oversight [προσεχερτέρα ἐπισκοπή].’³⁷⁶ The divine *Logos* is the ‘all-surveying *Logos* [πανεπισκόπῳ λόγῳ].’³⁷⁷ For Clement, therefore, apostolic succession is not primarily about the human bishop or teacher, but is about the divine Bishop and Teacher who watches over and transmits *gnosis* to and through faithful adherents of divine knowledge. Clement further informs us:

Those who live perfectly and gnostically [τελείως βιώσαντας γνωστικῶς] according to the Gospel, are to be enrolled in the chosen body of the apostles. This one is the real presbyter of the Church and a true deacon of the will of God, if he does and teaches the will of the Lord.³⁷⁸

Although Clement acknowledges the ecclesial office, he goes beyond it and fixes his attention on the faithful administration of divine knowledge. Those who bear truly the knowledge of God—*viz.*, the true Gnostic—stand in succession with the apostles.

C. Clement’s Gnostic Tradition

Amidst the doctrinal diversity of the Christian movements of the second century, Irenaeus was concerned that ‘a multitude of Gnostics ha[s] sprung up, and ha[s] been manifested like mushrooms growing up out of the ground.’³⁷⁹ While Clement acknowledges with Irenaeus that there was a *gnosis* ‘falsely so called,’ Christoph

³⁷⁵ *Str.* VI.13.106.1-2.

³⁷⁶ *Str.* VII.7.48.1; *Ign.Mag.* 3.1-2, ἀλλὰ τῷ πατρὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῷ πάντων ἐπισκόπῳ.

³⁷⁷ *Paid.* III.12.101.3.

³⁷⁸ *Str.* VI.13.106.1-2, οὗτος πρεσβύτερος ἐστὶ τῷ ὄντι τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ διάκονος ἀληθῆς τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ βουλήσεως, εἰάν ποιῇ καὶ διδάσκη τὰ τοῦ κυρίου.

³⁷⁹ *A.H.* I.29.1.

Markschies observes that ‘Clement is concerned with right “knowledge” as opposed to a “knowledge wrongly so-called.”’³⁸⁰ Volker Drecoll adds this: ‘Clement’s use of the term shows that “Gnostic” in itself was considered to be a positive appellation, not a heresiological category.’³⁸¹ Accordingly, Clement was unwilling to concede the terms Gnostic, *gnosis*, or the idea of a gnostic tradition to the so-called Gnostics.³⁸² He was convinced that, just as

philosophy has been brought into evil repute by pride and self-conceit, so also there is a false *gnosis* being called by the same name as *gnosis* [οὕτως καὶ τὴν γνῶσιν ἢ ψευδῆς γνῶσις ἢ ὁμωνύμως καλουμένη]. Concerning which, the apostle writes: ‘O Timothy, keep that which is committed to your trust, avoiding the profane and vain babblings and oppositions of *gnosis* falsely so called, which while proclaiming, some have missed the mark concerning the faith.’³⁸³

In his major works, therefore, Clement avoids the ‘babbling’ myths of second-century Gnosticism. He engages in the theology of Basilides and Valentinus, but says their ‘fantastic’ myths are ‘chatterings and chirpings.’³⁸⁴ Impressed that his own teachers preserved the knowledge tradition handed down by the apostles Peter, James, John, and Paul, Clement himself was resolved to guard (φυλάττειν) this same *gnosis* from opinionated dissolution.³⁸⁵

Commenting on Clement’s view of a gnostic tradition, Jean Daniélou argues that ‘Clement himself makes no claim to be introducing anything new. He is above all the man of tradition and traditions. And *gnosis* too is, for him, supremely a tradition.’³⁸⁶ Daniélou’s statement is justified by reason of the many ways Clement uses the term παράδοσις in relation to the teachings handed down by Christ to the apostles. For

³⁸⁰ Markschies, *Gnosis: An Introduction*, transl. John Bowden, (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 31.

³⁸¹ Drecoll, ‘Martin Hengel and the Origins of Gnosticism,’ in *Gnosticism, Platonism and the Late Ancient World*, ed. by Kevin Corrigan et al., (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 144.

³⁸² In chapter four, I delineate Clement’s use of the knowledge terms ἐπιστήμη, γνῶσις, and ἐπίγνωσις.

³⁸³ *Str.* II.11.52.5; 1Tim. 6.20-21.

³⁸⁴ *Str.* II.8.37.1.

³⁸⁵ *Str.* I.1.12.1.

³⁸⁶ Daniélou, *A History of Early Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea Volume Two: Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*, (London: D.L. and T, 1973), 453.

example, he mentions the ‘divine tradition’ as a philosophy that ‘establishes and confirms providence.’³⁸⁷ The divine tradition is sacred knowledge that providentially passes through time, visiting the generations of Moses, David, Solomon, and the Prophets. Remarking on the nature of tradition, Georges Florovsky comments: ‘Tradition was not just a transmission of inherited doctrines, but the continuous life of the truth.’³⁸⁸ For Clement, the ‘continuous life of the truth’ is the *essence* of the teachings that comprise the tradition passed down by Christ to the apostles.

When this knowledge was disclosed by Christ, it was called ‘the tradition through the Son’ (τὴν δι’ υἱοῦ παράδοσιν, *Stromateis* VI.5.39.4), because the Son of God is the Teacher of the divine tradition (*Stromateis* VI.7.61.1-3). As this knowledge was transmitted, Clement knew it as ‘the tradition of the Lord’ (διὰ τῆς τοῦ κυρίου παραδόσεως, *Stromateis* VII.16.104.2; VII.17.106.2) and ‘the traditions of Christ’ (τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παραδόσεων, *Stromateis* VII.16.99.5). Moreover, Christ’s teachings became known as ‘the tradition of the truth’ (τὴν παράδοσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, *Stromateis* I.20.99.4.), ‘the sacred traditions’ (τῶν ἁγίων παραδόσεων, *Stromateis* VII.18.110.4.); and even as ‘the secret traditions of the true *gnosis*’ (τὰς ἀποκρύφους τῆς ἀληθοῦς γνώσεως παραδόσεις, *Stromateis* I.12.56.2). The apostolic teachings were spoken of as ‘the understanding and practice of the godly tradition (τῆς θεοσεβοῦς παραδόσεως, *Stromateis* VI.15.124.4). The godly tradition is the belief that God renovates humanity for godliness through the truth. As noted, Clement classifies a known corpus of authoritative writings, which comprises his account of the Old and New Testaments, as the ‘ecclesiastical tradition’ (τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν, *Stromateis* VII.16.95.1.). Although he knows the apostolic teachings by

³⁸⁷ *Str.* I.11.52.2, ἡ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν θεῖαν παράδοσιν φιλοσοφίαν ἴστησι τὴν πρόνοιαν καὶ βεβαιοῖ; *Str.* VII.16.103.5.

³⁸⁸ Florovsky, *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View*, Volume One, (Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishing Company, 1972), 80.

these various titles, the overarching appellation Clement uses for the apostolic tradition in the *Stromateis* is ‘the gnostic tradition’ (ἡ γνωστικὴ παράδοσις).³⁸⁹

One can trace the origins of Clement’s gnostic tradition back to Moses. Clement ascribes to Moses the title of the Gnostic, explicitly calling him, ‘the Gnostic Moses [ὁ γνωστικὸς Μωυσῆς].’³⁹⁰ In the context, Clement compares and contrasts Basilides with Moses. Both men taught that the world was ‘only-begotten [μονογενῆ τε κόσμον].’ However, that ‘God is one [τὸν ἕνα θεόν] did not yet appear to Basilides,’ for he was a polytheist, teaching a variant of the Gnostic myth: the existence of a chief *archon* and lesser deities who were in command of 365 heavens.³⁹¹ In contrast, Clement notes that Moses believed God is One: ἄκουε Ἰσραὴλ κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου, κύριος εἷς ἐστίν.³⁹² This insight about the one God classifies Moses, in Clement’s judgment, as a Gnostic: the one who truly knows. More significantly, Moses’s encounters with God on the holy mountain within the cloud-veil are authentic gnostic experiences that epitomize the gnostic tradition.³⁹³ Clement recounts: ‘Whence Moses, persuaded that God is not to be known by human wisdom, said: “Show me your glory,” and so he pressed into the thick darkness where God’s voice was, that is, into the inaccessible and invisible thoughts regarding [true] existence.’³⁹⁴ During this and other experiences, Moses heard the voice of God, which disclosed the *Decalogue* and other forms of knowledge, such as the construction of the tabernacle (Exodus 25-31).

This experience of ‘hearing God’s voice’ is, in Clement’s thinking, a sign of the true Gnostic. He argues that since the Lord taught the apostles directly, it is suitable to

³⁸⁹ Clement mentions explicitly the gnostic tradition in five passages: *Str.* I.1.15.2; IV.1.3.2; V.10.63.2; V.10.64.5; and VI.7.61.1.

³⁹⁰ *Str.* V.11.74.4.

³⁹¹ *Str.* V.11.74.3; see *A.H.* I.24.3-7; *A.H.* II.35.1-3; *Ref.* 7.14.

³⁹² Deut. 6:4; *Prot.* VIII.80.4; *Str.* V.14.115.5.

³⁹³ See *Str.* II.2.5.5-6.1; *Str.* V.11.71.5; *Str.* V.12.78.2-3.

³⁹⁴ *Str.* II.2.5.5-6.1; Ex. 33:18.

claim that the teaching of the apostles is ‘the voice of the Lord.’³⁹⁵ Through the proper demonstration of the sacred writings, ‘we are trained up by the voice of the Lord to the knowledge of the truth.’³⁹⁶ Accordingly, those who hear the voice of the Lord and ‘advance further, and become correct expounders of the truth are Gnostics.’³⁹⁷ The primary reason, therefore, Clement calls Moses a Gnostic is that he received *gnosis* directly from God. Moses concealed knowledge within his plain writings about the *Decalogue*. Where Clement sets out to write an explanation of the Ten Commandments, he called it a ‘pattern unto Gnostic exposition.’³⁹⁸ In this discussion, Clement uncovers the spiritual meanings behind the plain texts. For instance, concerning the seventh commandment, which prohibits adultery, Clement states that adultery is ‘abandoning the ecclesiastical and true knowledge’ for a false opinion.³⁹⁹ According to Clement’s standards of a true Gnostic, this designation—ὁ γνωστικὸς Μωυσηῆς—places Moses at the forefront of a gnostic practice, which engenders an authentic gnostic tradition.⁴⁰⁰

Clement does not recognize Basilides or Valentinus as Gnostics, and he contrasts his version of the true Gnostic with Marcion and Prodicus.⁴⁰¹ He, in fact, maintains that ‘James, Peter, John, and Paul and the rest of the apostles,’ were each one a ‘true Gnostic [τὸν τῷ ὄντι γνωστικόν].’⁴⁰² These apostles were ‘real Gnostics’ because they heard true knowledge and walked the salvific path unto *apatheia* and were perfected through

³⁹⁵ *Paid.* I.6.49.2, τῆ τοῦ κυρίου φωνῆ.

³⁹⁶ *Str.* VII.16.95.6, φωνῆ κυρίου παιδευόμεθα πρὸς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας.

³⁹⁷ *Str.* VII.16.95.9.

³⁹⁸ *Str.* VI.16.133.1, ὑπόδειγμα δ’ ἡμῖν κατὰ παραδρομὴν ἐκκείσθω εἰς σαφήνειαν γνωστικὴν ἢ δεκάλογος.

³⁹⁹ Ex. 20:14; *Str.* VI.16.146.3, καταλιπὼν τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν καὶ ἀληθῆ γνῶσιν.

⁴⁰⁰ *Str.* V.11.74.4. Moses’s encounters with God on the mountain became paradigmatic of Christian *theoria*; see Gregory of Nyssa, *The Life of Moses*.

⁴⁰¹ *Str.* VII.16.103.6-7.

⁴⁰² *Str.* VI.8.68.3, τὸν τῷ ὄντι γνωστικόν, ὁποῖος ἦν Ἰάκωβος, Πέτρος, Ἰωάννης, καὶ Παῦλος καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι. A fragment from Eusebius shows that ‘after the resurrection, the Lord handed down *gnosis* to James the Just, John, and Peter; these apostles handed down [*gnosis*] to the other apostles’ (*Frag.* 13.5; *H.E.* II.1.4. Eusebius derives his quote, not from the *Stromateis*, but from *Hypotyposeis* VI).

their sufferings ‘on behalf of the Churches which they established.’⁴⁰³ Clement adds that ‘the apostles had more gnostically mastered [γνωστικώτερον κρατήσαντες] anger, fear, and desire through the teaching of the Lord.’⁴⁰⁴ In this way, ‘the writings say that those who, [follow] the footsteps of the apostles in the perfection of righteousness have lived their lives according to the Gospel.’⁴⁰⁵ Thus, in Clement’s view, these apostles were true Gnostics because they followed the Gospel.⁴⁰⁶

Referring to his anonymous associates, Clement advances what he styles, ‘our Gnostic’ (ὁ γνωστικός δ’ ἡμῖν).⁴⁰⁷ ‘Our Gnostic is the faithful one.’⁴⁰⁸ ‘Our Gnostic shall be much learned,’ especially in the Scriptures.⁴⁰⁹ The following passage describes Clement’s view of an ‘orthodox’ Gnostic:

‘Our Gnostic alone, having grown old in the Scriptures themselves [ὁ γνωστικός ἄρα ἡμῖν μόνος ἐν αὐταῖς καταγηράσας ταῖς γραφαῖς], and preserving the apostolic and ecclesiastical orthodoxy of the dogmas [τὴν ἀποστολικὴν καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικὴν σωζῶν ὀρθοτομίαν τῶν δογμάτων], according to the Gospel, lives most orthodoxly [ὀρθότατα βιοῖ].’⁴¹⁰

The result of living ‘most orthodoxly’ is that ‘our Gnostic alone is shown to be godly.’⁴¹¹ The notion of ‘our Gnostic’ (ἡμῖν ὁ γνωστικός) in Clement’s writings demonstrates that he had a clear sense of what he thought an orthodox Gnostic was, which was distinct from the Basilidian and Valentinian Gnostics.

In his *Stromateis*, Clement associates the apostles Paul, Barnabas, and Clement of Rome with the gnostic tradition, and recognizes Christ as the revelatory Agent of

⁴⁰³ *Str.* IV.9.75.1.

⁴⁰⁴ *Str.* VI.9.71.3, οἱ δὲ ἀπόστολοι ὀργῆς καὶ φόβου καὶ ἐπιθυμίας διὰ τῆς κυριακῆς διδασκαλίας γνωστικώτερον κρατήσαντες.

⁴⁰⁵ *Str.* VI.13.107.2.

⁴⁰⁶ For a discussion on the ‘circle’ of apostles from the *Nag Hammadi Library* concerning which apostles may have been proto-orthodox, and others, who were heterodox Gnostics, see D.M. Parrott, ‘Gnostic and Orthodox Disciples in the Second and Third Centuries,’ in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*, ed. Charles W. Hedrick et al., (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1986), 193-219.

⁴⁰⁷ *Str.* VI.18.162.1.

⁴⁰⁸ *Str.* VII.7.45.4, οὗτος ἡμῖν ὁ γνωστικός ὁ πιστός.

⁴⁰⁹ *Str.* VI.10.82.1, ἡμῖν ὁ γνωστικός πολυμαθὴς ἔσται.

⁴¹⁰ *Str.* VII.16.104.1.

⁴¹¹ *Str.* VII.7.47.3, μόνος ἄρα ὁ γνωστικός εὐσεβῆς ἡμῖν εἶναι δέδεικται.

gnosis. Clement maintains that the knowledge of the gnostic tradition is a higher form of *gnosis* and is insight into greater mysteries after one has grasped minor mysteries.⁴¹² In his spiritual pedagogical curriculum, therefore, Hebrew and Greek preparatory instructions open the way for catechumens to be ‘prepared for the reception of the gnostic tradition.’⁴¹³ The subjects that Clement links to this tradition are (1) the revelatory agency of Christ, (2) Paul and the fullness of Christ, (3) Barnabas and an allegorical exegesis of the Old Testament, (4) Clement of Rome and his character sketch of the Gnostic’s life.⁴¹⁴

1. Revelatory Agency of Christ

The essential feature to Clement’s gnostic tradition is the revelatory agency of Christ, who enables believers to perceive and learn *gnosis*. Clement trusts the faithful operation of Christ to reveal true knowledge of God, thus he reasons:

If we say that Christ himself is *sophia* and that it was his *energeia* that worked through the prophets [εἰ τοίνυν αὐτόν τε τὸν Χριστὸν σοφίαν φαμέν καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν], through which [operation] one is to learn the Gnostic Tradition [δι’ ἧς ἐστὶ τὴν γνωστικὴν παράδοσιν ἐκμανθάνειν], just as he himself taught the holy apostles during his coming, then *gnosis* is *sophia* [ὡς αὐτὸς κατὰ τὴν παρουσίαν τοὺς ἁγίους ἐδίδαξεν ἀποστόλους, σοφία εἶη ἢ γνῶσις]. It is sure and reliable, having been handed down and revealed by the Son of God [βεβαία καὶ ἀσφαλής, ὡς ἂν παρὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ παραδοθεῖσα καὶ ἀποκαλυφθεῖσα].⁴¹⁵

There are two points to emphasize here. Firstly, the same epistemic *energeia* (activity) of Christ that worked through the prophets and taught the apostles true knowledge continues to aid believers in apprehending the knowledge of God. In this way, people are not limited to themselves in learning the knowledge of God. Secondly, Clement uses the two terms—παραδοθεῖσα and ἀποκαλυφθεῖσα—to point out that the content

⁴¹² *Str.* I.1.15.3; *Str.* IV.1.3.1, τὰ μικρὰ πρὸ τῶν μεγάλων μυθέντες μυστηρίων.

⁴¹³ *Str.* I.1.15.2, ὡς ἐτοίμους ἔχειν τὰς ἀκοὰς πρὸς τὴν παραδοχὴν τῆς γνωστικῆς παραδόσεως. In *Str.* IV.1.3.2-3, Clement mentions a cosmogony that is ‘according to the canon of truth of the gnostic tradition [κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας κανόνα γνωστικῆς παραδόσεως].’

⁴¹⁴ Clement also mentions an understanding of *physiologia* from the gnostic tradition, but does not elaborate (*Str.* IV.1.3.1-3).

⁴¹⁵ *Str.* VI.7.61.1.

of the gnostic tradition is not only ‘handed down,’ but also ‘revealed.’ Similar to Paul and some gnostic tractates, such as the *Apocryphon of John*, Clement was connected to a tradition of knowledge that looked to Christ as the Agent of revelation. Even though the apostles, and later their spiritual progeny, searched the sacred writings, the Son of God enabled them to understand the *gnosis* concealed in the texts. Clement is ready to say, ‘we are taught by God, instructed by the son of God in the truly sacred letters which are the scriptures.’⁴¹⁶ Whereas Clement claims Christ to be the Teacher of the gnostic tradition, as some Gnostic tractates do, the *gnosis* derived from the Scriptures is void of the Gnostic myth. The above passage shows—against the Gnostic fable concerning the fall of Sophia and the evil demiurge—that Clement’s version depicts *sophia* to be equivalent to *gnosis* and Christ. This *sophia* did not fall from the pleroma and generate a lesser deity, but in Clement’s view *sophia* is true *gnosis*.⁴¹⁷

2. Paul and the Fullness of Christ

Clement recognizes Paul’s unique calling as ‘the’ apostle and attributes notable qualities to him. He designates Paul as the ‘noble apostle’ because of his boldness in declaring the mysteries of God.⁴¹⁸ He names him the ‘blessed apostle’ or the ‘blessed Paul,’ because of his clarity in disclosing the mysteries.⁴¹⁹ Clement speaks of Paul as ‘the holy apostle,’ because he thought Paul exemplified his goal for spiritual formation: Paul had attained godliness.⁴²⁰ Clement also attributes to Paul the adjectives θεῖος (the ‘divine’ apostle), and θεσπέσιος (the ‘divinely sounding’ apostle).⁴²¹

⁴¹⁶ *Str.* I.20.98.4,

⁴¹⁷ This section about Revelatory Agent is brief, because it is the subject matter of chapter four.

⁴¹⁸ For ὁ γενναῖος ἀπόστολος, see *Str.* I.8.40.1; *Str.* III.8.61.2; *Str.* V.3.18.8; V.4.25.2; V.12.80.3; *Str.* VI.16.147.1; *Str.* VII.9.53.3. For ‘the noble Paul,’ see *Str.* III.6.53.4.

⁴¹⁹ For ὁ μακάριος ἀπόστολος, see *Prot.* IX.83.3; *Str.* I.10.49.3. For ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος, see *Paid.* I.5.19.2; I.6.33.1; *Str.* III.6.51.2.

⁴²⁰ For ὁ ἅγιος ἀπόστολος τοῦ κυρίου, see *Prot.* VIII.81.2; for ὁ ἅγιος ἀπόστολος Παῦλος see *Str.* V.10.65.4; and for ὁ δὲ ἅγιος Παῦλος, see *Frag.* 70.11.

⁴²¹ For ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολος, see *Paid.* III.11.56.2; *Str.* II.20.109.3; *Str.* IV.12.87.3; IV.16.101.1; IV.21.132.2; *Str.* VII.14.84.3. For ὁ θεσπέσιος ἀπόστολος, a more poetic designation of a divine characteristic, see *Str.* I.19.94.4; *Str.* V.10.60.1; and for ὁ θεσπέσιος Παῦλος, *Str.* V.1.5.1.

It follows that Clement views Paul as an ‘interpreter of the divine voice.’⁴²² He therefore reads Paul’s letters as expositions of the voice of the *Logos*. For instance, Clement recounts—from a non-biblical source—that ‘one must see to be sure that, even though Paul was young during those times, he flourished after the ascension of the Lord. His writings were derived from the Old Testament, from whence they take breath and then they speak.’⁴²³ In Clement’s thinking, Paul inhaled the Old Testament, and from that inspiration, exhaled the proper interpretation of the mysteries of God into his teachings and writings. Clement drew from Paul’s epistles in order to apply apostolic authority to his own teachings.⁴²⁴ He demonstrates this emphasis with his literary style: ὡς φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος and κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον.⁴²⁵ Judith Kovacs notes that Clement ‘quotes Paul very frequently as the greatest of human authorities.’⁴²⁶

In *Stromateis* V.10, Clement utilizes Ephesians and Colossians to demonstrate Paul’s insight into the mystery of the knowledge of God. He also quotes from Paul’s letter to the Romans, and provides commentary to the ‘content’ of the gnostic tradition.⁴²⁷ He acknowledges that Paul received knowledge [ἐπίγνωσις] of the divine mystery (Ephesians 3:3-4; Colossians 1:25-27) and that ‘God wished to make known what are the riches of the glory of this mystery among the nations.’⁴²⁸ In his letter to

⁴²² *Prot.* IX.87.4, ὁ ἀπόστολος τοῦ κυρίου...ἐρμηνεὺς γίνεται τῆς θείας φωνῆς.

⁴²³ *Str.* IV.21.134.2, ἰστέον μέντοι ὅτι, εἰ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος τοῖς χρόνοις νεάζει, εὐθέως μετὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἀνάληψιν ἀκμάσας, ἀλλ’ οὖν ἡ γραφὴ αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἡρτηται διαθήκης ἐκεῖθεν πνέουσα καὶ λαλοῦσα.

⁴²⁴ For discussion on Paul’s status in the early Church by the end of the second Century, see Maurice F. Wiles, *The Divine Apostle: The Interpretation of St Paul’s Epistles in the Early Church*, (Cambridge, NY: CUP, 1967), 3-25; For a sketch of Clement’s view of Paul, see M.W. Elliott, ‘The Triumph of Paulinism by the Mid-Third Century,’ in *Paul and the Second Century*, ed. by M.F. Bird and J.R. Dodson, (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 248-250.

⁴²⁵ For ὡς φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος, see *Paid.* II.10.86.3; *Paid.* III.11.83.3; *Str.* I.17.87.4; *Str.* IV.3.10.2; IV.21.131.1; *Str.* V.6.40.3; *Str.* VI.15.127.2; for κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον, see *Str.* I.1.15.4.

⁴²⁶ Kovacs, ‘Saint Paul as Apostle of *Apatheia*: *Stromateis* VII, Chapter 14,’ in Havrda Matyáš, et al., *The Seventh Book of the Stromateis*, 201.

⁴²⁷ In the broader context of *Str.* V.10.60.1-62.1, Clement quotes Eph. 3:3-5, Col. 1:9-10, 1:25-27, Col. 2:2-3, and Col. 4:2-4. For Rom. 15:29 and 16:25-26 as reference to the gnostic tradition, see *Str.* V.10.64.5-6. On how the Gnostics interpreted the Pauline corpus, see Elaine Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters*, (New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 1992).

⁴²⁸ *Str.* V.10.60.3; Col. 1:27.

the Romans, Paul shared his desire to travel to Italy to speak with believers in Rome. Clement mentions that Paul's intention was to arrive there, bearing 'the fullness of the blessing of Christ' [ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ ἐλεύσομαι] in order to impart the 'spiritual gift and the gnostic tradition [τὸ πνευματικὸν χάρισμα καὶ τὴν γνωστικὴν παράδοσιν].'⁴²⁹ The gnostic tradition is the fullness of Christ, and the spiritual gift is the *pneumatic* ability to declare the mysteries of God.⁴³⁰ Clement's point is that passing on the Gnostic tradition requires the epistemic agency of a 'Christ-bearer'—an apostle, or a true Gnostic—who participates in the fullness of Christ.⁴³¹ What the Gnostics speculate as light emanations illuminating the pleroma, Paul and Clement view the radiance as the part of the 'fullness' of deity in Christ.

The fullness of Christ in the Pauline corpus, as Clement explains it, is two-fold. Firstly, Clement maintains with Paul that 'Christ is the fullness [πλήρωμα] of the Law.'⁴³² Clement interprets this to mean that the coming of Christ delimits both the Law and philosophy, because neither could perfect a person. Perfection comes through the knowledge of the 'pleroma' of Christ. Secondly, Clement adapts into his spiritual *paideia* the apostle's mission 'to present every man perfect in Christ.'⁴³³ He explains the perfection of 'every man [πάντα ἄνθρωπον]' as 'the whole person [ὅλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον], the one being purified in body and soul.'⁴³⁴ Like Paul, Clement believes that 'the knowledge of God' can transform a person 'into a perfect man [εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον] unto the mature measure of the fullness of Christ [πληρώματος τοῦ

⁴²⁹ *Str.* V.10.64.5.

⁴³⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴³¹ *Ibid.* Although it is not found in Wilson's translation (*ANF2*: 459-460), Clement includes a parenthetical statement stating that Paul will impart the gnostic tradition in person, not through a letter. He adds: οὐ γὰρ δι' ἐπιστολῆς οἷά τε ἦν ταῦτα μηνύεσθαι: 'For through a letter he was not able to disclose such things.' *Sources Chrétiennes* does preserve it: car par lettre ceci ne pouvait être signifié: 'because by a letter this [tradition] could not be delivered' (*Stromate* V.10.64.5, p. 133). The parenthetical statement demonstrates that the gnostic tradition is by nature an oral tradition.

⁴³² *Str.* IV.21.130.3-4; *Q.d.s.* 9.2.

⁴³³ *Str.* V.10.61.2; *Col.* 1:28; and *Str.* I.1.15.5.

⁴³⁴ *Str.* V.10.61.3, ἀλλὰ «πάντα ἄνθρωπον» λέγει, ὡς εἰπεῖν ὅλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον, οἶον σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ ἡγνισμένον.

Χριστοῦ].⁴³⁵ John tells us that Christ gave his fullness to his disciples: ‘From his pleroma [ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος], we have all received’ (John 1:16).⁴³⁶ In John’s teachings, this fullness includes ‘grace and truth’ (John 1:17), divine ‘life’ and ‘light’ (John 1:4-5), and ‘love’ (John 15:9-10; 1John 4:7-18). The disclosure of the knowledge of the fullness of Christ is crucial to Clement’s gnostic tradition. As noted in the former chapter, Violet MacDermot reports that ‘knowledge of pleroma enables man himself to become a pleroma,’ which Clement interprets as the mature Gnostic.⁴³⁷

3. Barnabas and Allegorical Interpretation

Throughout the *Stromateis*, where Clement introduces certain quotes from the Epistle of Barnabas (EB), he includes personal information about Barnabas, his exegetical approach to the Old Testament, and important aspects of his teachings. According to Clement, Barnabas was one of the 70 disciples of Jesus and calls him ‘the apostle Barnabas,’ and ‘co-labourer’ with Paul in ‘preaching the *Logos*.’⁴³⁸ Eusebius links Barnabas to Paul, and like Clement, locates Barnabas as one of the seventy disciples.⁴³⁹ Although Eusebius mentions EB—including it with other disputed writings, such as *The Acts of Paul* and *The Revelation of Peter*—he does not explicitly connect Barnabas to EB.⁴⁴⁰ Scholars generally consider EB to be anonymous and the earliest extant Christian document with an Alexandrian provenance, written *ca.* AD 70-132.⁴⁴¹ According to L.W. Barnard, EB demonstrates a similarity to the preaching of

⁴³⁵ *Paid.* I.5.18.3; Eph. 4:13; and *Str.* IV.21.132.1.

⁴³⁶ *Str.* I.17.87.4-7; *Paid.* I.7.60.2.

⁴³⁷ Macdermot, ‘The Concept of Pleroma in Gnosticism,’ 79.

⁴³⁸ *Str.* II.20.116.3, Βαρνάβαν (ὁ δὲ τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα) κατὰ λέξιν; *Str.* II.6.31.2, εἰκότως οὖν ὁ ἀπόστολος Βαρνάβας; *Str.* II.7.35.5, καὶ Βαρνάβας ὁ ἀπόστολος; *Str.* II.20.116.3, τὸν ἀποστολικὸν Βαρνάβαν ἦν καὶ συνεργὸς τοῦ Παύλου; *Str.* V.10.63.1, ἀλλὰ καὶ Βαρνάβας ὁ καὶ αὐτὸς συγκηρύξας τῷ ἀποστόλῳ κατὰ τὴν διακονίαν τῶν ἔθνῶν τὸν λόγον.

⁴³⁹ *H.E.* I.12.1; II.1.5.

⁴⁴⁰ For his mentions of EB, *H.E.* III.25.4; VI.13.6; VI.14.1.

⁴⁴¹ For instance, see Michael W. Holmes (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 372-373. The reason for the long span is that Barnabas mentions the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem (AD 70), and does not refer to the rebuilding of the city under Hadrian after the revolt (132-135).

Stephen.⁴⁴² It appears that Barnabas was Jewish, but had rejected the temple ministry with the Judaism of his day.⁴⁴³ In view of Barnabas's background in the Scriptures and proficient knowledge of Christian doctrine, Clement tells us that Barnabas 'explained explicitly the prophets.'⁴⁴⁴ Overall, EB presents an allegorical reading of the Old Testament, which Clement identifies as a gnostic interpretation. Allegorical interpretation 'assumes the existence of and seeks to uncover the hidden spiritual meaning of a text.'⁴⁴⁵ Since there are eight explicit references to Barnabas in the *Stromateis*, with substantive interactions with EB, we can be certain that Clement was conversant with EB and Barnabas's allegorical mode of interpretation.⁴⁴⁶

Where Clement describes the ways Barnabas interprets the Old Testament, he selects such terms as: μυστικῶς (*Stromateis* II.18.84.3.), γνωστικῶς (*Stromateis* II.18.84.3.), μηνύων (*Stromateis* V.8.51.4.), ὑποβάς (*Stromateis* V.10.63.1.), and ἐξηγούμενος (*Stromateis* VI.8.64.3.). With the exception of ἐξηγούμενος (and debatably ὑποβάς) these terms signify the stewardship of hidden knowledge.⁴⁴⁷ Clement notes that, where Barnabas interprets the writings of Moses, he shows the 'tracks of the gnostic tradition.'⁴⁴⁸ For example:

Barnabas, who himself preached the *Logos* with the apostle as a minister of the Gentiles said, 'I am writing to you openly, in order that you might understand.' Then, already, after going down under [ὑποβάς], places before us a more manifest trace of the gnostic tradition [σαφέστερον γνωστικῆς παραδόσεως ἴχνος παρατιθέμενος], he says: 'What does the other prophet Moses say to them?' Behold the Lord God says: 'enter into the good land, which the Lord God swore,

⁴⁴² Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background* (Oxford, 1966), 62-72. He argues that Stephen had close ties with Alexandria, though he admits that it 'cannot be proved' (71).

⁴⁴³ *Ibid.*, 54-55. Compare this with EB 16.1-10 and Barnabas's critique against Judaism and the Temple. For the anti-Jewish problem in EB, see J.N. Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden-Calf Incident*, (DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

⁴⁴⁴ *Str.* VI.8.64.3, ἐξηγούμενος δὲ τὸ ῥητὸν τοῦ προφήτου Βαρνάβας ἐπιφέρει.

⁴⁴⁵ Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 271.

⁴⁴⁶ There are three additional references: *Frag.* 4.4; *Frag.* 13.7; *Frag.* 70.6.

⁴⁴⁷ While the term ὑποβάς as a literary device is commonly translated: 'while going further,' it actually means 'while going down under,' conveying the sense that the author is going beyond the literal meaning of the text to disclose the allegory.

⁴⁴⁸ *Str.* V.10.63.2.

the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and you received it as an inheritance, a land flowing with milk and honey.’⁴⁴⁹ ‘What does *gnosis* say? Learn [μύθετε], hope in Jesus who is about to be manifested in the flesh, for *anthropos* is the suffering ground [γῆ πάσχουσα], since from the face of the earth the formation of Adam came into being.’⁴⁵⁰

Like Barnabas, Clement sees the suffering land pointing to the sufferings of Christ, who was ‘manifested in the flesh’ (as the ‘suffering ground’), which indirectly refers to the Incarnation. Hidden in a mystery, the sufferings of Christ—his journey and death in the flesh—are ‘the power and wisdom of God.’⁴⁵¹ Barnabas and Clement agree that believers are able to perceive the knowledge of God by the sufferings of Christ, because Christ ‘places wisdom and perception of his secrets within us.’⁴⁵² To enter the land of ‘milk and honey’ is to enter into Christ, who is rich with wisdom and knowledge.⁴⁵³

EB is important to Clementine studies, because at the outset, Barnabas states his purpose for his letter: ‘I have hastened to send you a brief note, so that along with your faith [μετὰ τῆς πίστεως], you might have perfect knowledge [τελείαν ἔχητε τὴν γνῶσιν].’⁴⁵⁴ It is this *gnosis* that Clement preserves and propagates as a gnostic tradition. For Clement, *gnosis* is a deeper understanding of the Scriptures. Those who possess *gnosis* read the Scriptures allegorically and find meanings that promote salvation. Unlike some Gnostics, who revised stories of the Old Testament or deleted sections altogether, Clement’s *gnosis* does not violate the Scriptures by recasting it into a fantastic myth; rather, his *gnosis* is harmonious with the ecclesiastical canon and maintains a proto-orthodox sense of the knowledge of God. What is essential here is

⁴⁴⁹ *Str.* V.10.63.1; EB 6.5; 6.8-19, ἀλλὰ καὶ Βαρνάβας ὁ καὶ αὐτὸς συγκληρῦξας τῷ ἀποστόλῳ κατὰ τὴν διακονίαν τῶν ἔθνων τὸν λόγον· «ἀπλούστερον» φασίν, «ὑμῖν γράφω, ἵνα συνητε.» εἶθ’ ὑποβὰς ἤδη σαφέστερον γνωστικῆς παραδόσεως ἵχνος παρατιθέμενος, λέγει.

⁴⁵⁰ *Str.* V.10.63.4.

⁴⁵¹ *Str.* VI.15.127.2.

⁴⁵² *Str.* V.10.63.5; EB 6.10. Clement’s text matches EB: εὐλογητὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ὁ σοφίαν καὶ νοῦν θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τῶν κρυφίων αὐτοῦ.

⁴⁵³ Barnabas interprets gnostically Ex. 33:1 and Lev. 20:24.

⁴⁵⁴ EB 1.5; *Str.* II.6.31.2, ὁ ἀπόστολος Βαρνάβας «ἀφ’ οὗ» φασίν «ἔλαβον, μέρος ἐσπούδασα κατὰ μικρὸν ὑμῖν πέμψαι, ἵνα μετὰ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν τελείαν ἔχητε καὶ τὴν γνῶσιν.»

that Clement sets Barnabas in succession with the gnostic tradition, an allegorical interpretation of Christ set within the writings of Moses.⁴⁵⁵

Because Clement utilizes Barnabas frequently to support his own spiritual teachings, it is important to mention here some of the germane topics. Barnabas thought that before people believed in God, their hearts were ‘full of idolatry, a house of demons,’ the result of thoughts and actions ‘contrary to God.’⁴⁵⁶ Following suit, Clement maintains that sin is analogous to a demon and remission of sin is a type of exorcism.⁴⁵⁷ Once released from the sinful demon, one is free to enter the way to perfect knowledge, which comes directly from God. Barnabas professes that ‘God, who rules the universe [ὁ δὲ θεός, ὁ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου κυριεύων], gives to us wisdom, knowledge [ἐπιστήμην], *gnosis* of his statues, and patience; therefore, become God-taught [γίνεσθε οὖν θεοδίδακτοι]!’⁴⁵⁸ Clement adopts this teaching and encourages his group of Gnostics to be ‘God-taught.’⁴⁵⁹ In his polemic against the fall of the Jewish temple in AD 70, Barnabas asserts that renewed humanity is the true spiritual temple of God. In the same way, Clement exhorts his students: ‘Let us become spiritual; let us become a perfect temple for God.’⁴⁶⁰ One becomes a ‘perfect temple’ by housing ‘the *Logos* of faith, [by] the calling of his promise, the wisdom of his statues, and [by] the commandments of his teaching.’⁴⁶¹ From EB, Clement gleaned an allegorical interpretation of Scripture and Christian principles for spiritual formation.

4. Clement of Rome and Gnostic Character

Clement of Rome was an heir of the gnostic tradition, handed down by Paul. Irenaeus tells us that the apostles, Peter and Paul, ‘committed into the hands of Linus

⁴⁵⁵ For allegorical interpretation of aspects of the *Torah*, compare *Str.* V.8.51.4 with EB 10.11.

⁴⁵⁶ *Str.* II.20.116.3-117.4; EB 16.7-8.

⁴⁵⁷ *Str.* II.20.116.3-117.3.

⁴⁵⁸ *Str.* II.18.84.3; EB 21.5-6, 9.

⁴⁵⁹ 1Thess. 4:9; *Paid.* I.6.27.2-3, φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος, «θεοδίδακτοι ἐστε»; *Paid.* I 6.37.2-3.

⁴⁶⁰ *Str.* II.7.35.5; EB 4.11.

⁴⁶¹ *Str.* II.20.117.4; EB 16.9.

the episcopate. Of this Linus, Paul makes mention in the Epistles to Timothy. To him succeeded Anacletus; and after him in third place Clement [of Rome] was allotted the bishopric.⁴⁶² Irenaeus continues to inform us that Clement, ‘as he had seen the blessed apostles, and had been conversant with them, might be said to have the preaching of the apostles still echoing [in his ears], and their traditions before his eyes.’⁴⁶³ Along with Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria considers Clement of Rome (CR) to be in succession with the apostles, calling him ὁ ἀπόστολος Κλήμης.⁴⁶⁴ Because of CR’s apostolic status, Clement considers 1Clement an authoritative writing and Scripture.⁴⁶⁵ Scholars consider 1Clement an anonymous work and date it *ca.* AD 80-98.⁴⁶⁶ Clement mentions CR in at least three explicit passages in the *Stromateis*.⁴⁶⁷ One reference is a block of text that covers nearly the entirety of 1Clement, suggesting that 1Clement was on Clement’s desk when he composed *Stromateis* IV.17.⁴⁶⁸

Clement uses 1Clement to outline the virtues of a true Gnostic. At the end of *Stromateis* I.7, Clement quotes 1Clement, confirming that real Gnostics ‘direct their steps in gnostic sanctity [ἐν ὁσιότητι γνωστικῆ].’⁴⁶⁹ He states further that ‘Clement, in his epistle to the Corinthians, expounds the differences of those who are approved by the Church. Let one be faithful; let another be powerful to explain *gnosis*; let one be wise in discerning discourses [λόγων]; let another be energetic in deeds.’⁴⁷⁰ Clement’s view that 1Clement is a portrait of a Gnostic becomes evident at the outset of

⁴⁶² *A.H.* III.3.3.

⁴⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶⁴ *Str.* IV.17.105.1, ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῇ ὁ ἀπόστολος Κλήμης.

⁴⁶⁵ *Str.* IV.17.105.1. For the literary style and reception of 1Clement in the early Church, see Michael Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 36-38; D.A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*, (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 1-17.

⁴⁶⁶ Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 35-36.

⁴⁶⁷ The three passages are: *Str.* I.7.38.8; *Str.* IV.17.105.1; *Str.* VI.8.65.4.

⁴⁶⁸ See *Str.* IV.17.105.2-IV.18.112.4 and 1Clem. 1.2; 9.2-50.3.

⁴⁶⁹ *Str.* I.7.38.7; 1Clem. 48.4.

⁴⁷⁰ *Str.* I.7.38.8; 1Clem. 48.5-6.

Stromateis IV.17: ‘Yes, indeed, the apostle Clement, in the epistle to the Corinthians, sketches out for us a certain model of the Gnostic [τύπον τοῦ γνωστικῶν].’⁴⁷¹

Using 1Clement as a guidebook conjointly with the Old Testament, Clement imports the character traits of a Gnostic into *Stromateis* IV.17. He lists successively the individuals and their virtues: Enoch (obedience), Noah (faith), Abraham (faith and hospitality), Isaac (hospitality and piety), and Rahab (faith and hospitality). Then he adds, from 1Clement, a more detailed position about Abraham, who was the friend of God; Job, who overcame the tempter; Moses, who heard God speak divine oracles from the burning bush; and David, who was a man after God’s heart, because he could hear God’s voice ‘gnostically’ (γνωστικῶς), when God reasoned with David about his iniquities.⁴⁷² Clement applies 1Clement to explain the character traits of the Gnostic, showing that, similar to Moses, these Old Testament figures behaved as Gnostics.

To this point, the evidence shows that Clement worked as a Christian teacher in apostolic succession and propagated a gnostic tradition inherited from Moses, (indeed with many other Old Testament characters who acted *gnostically*), Christ, Paul, Barnabas, and Clement of Rome. From these leading figures and others, Clement developed his theological context, which he wraps up in philosophical and biblical language, but is clearly a Christian theology.

D. Clement’s Theological Context

As explained at the outset in the previous chapter, the philosophical inquiry of Platonism, the esoteric teachings of Gnosticism, and the Christian theology of Clement share common interests in at least four subjects. Each is concerned with (1) the ultimate deity, (2) the demiurge responsible for creating the cosmos, (3) the origins of

⁴⁷¹ *Str.* IV.17.105.1, καὶ μὲν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῇ ὁ ἀπόστολος Κλήμης καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμῖν τύπον τινὰ τοῦ γνωστικῶν ὑπογράφω λέγει.

⁴⁷² 1Clem. 18-21. All of *Str.* IV.17 reflects 1Clem. 2-40. Clement draws from other OT characters (Daniel, Job, and Jonah) to describe the endurance of the Gnostic. See *Str.* II.20.103.1-104.1.

humankind, including the enigma of human suffering, and (4) the goal of human existence, or the way of salvation. This section discusses these subjects as found in Clement's writings. They are important to Clement's doctrine of the Incarnation because they tell us about Clement's God—the One who descended into the cosmos, became a human being, and initiated the economy of salvation.

1. Clement's Theology

One of the intellectual links between platonic philosophy and Christianity is Philo Judaeus (25 BC-AD 50), a Hellenistic Jew from Alexandria. David Runia traces some of Philo's doctrine of God back to various strands of Greek philosophy, demonstrating Philo's synthesis of Hellenic influence (mainly terminology) on his biblical tradition, viz., his interpretation of the Pentateuch. Although Dillon asserts that Philo turns Moses into a 'fully-fledged Middle Platonist,' Runia is clear that Philo adapts only that which was true for Philo's theo-centric thinking and commitment to *Torah*.⁴⁷³ Similarly, Jaroslav Pelikan argues that Philo read the *Timaeus* not as Plato wrote it, but as Philo interprets it through his own doctrine of God rooted in the Septuagint. Pelikan's conclusion is that with Philo, Genesis prevails over *Timaeus*.⁴⁷⁴ Along these lines, one could say the same about Clement and the *Timaeus*, and more broadly: All Scripture prevails over philosophy. This observation led Mark Edwards to assert that Clement himself 'does not...take up a theological position from any Greek source which fails to confirm or elucidate the truths communicated in the Scriptures.'⁴⁷⁵

With the above in mind, Clement admits that 'discourse about God is exceedingly difficult to handle [δυσμεταχειριστότατος].'⁴⁷⁶ Talking about God is complicated

⁴⁷³ Dillon, *The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*, 143; Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 433-475.

⁴⁷⁴ Pelikan, *What Has Athens to Do with Jerusalem?: Timaeus and Genesis in Counterpoint* (MI: The University of Michigan Press, 1997), 67-87.

⁴⁷⁵ Edwards, *Catholicity and Heresy in the Early Church*, (Surrey, England: Ashgate, 2009), 57.

⁴⁷⁶ *Str.* V.12.81.4, ναὶ μὴν ὁ δυσμεταχειριστότατος περὶ θεοῦ λόγος οὗτός ἐστιν.

because ‘the source for everything is difficult to find out,’ and ‘the first and elder principle, which is the cause for all other existing things, is hard to prove.’⁴⁷⁷ Nevertheless, in view of his claim about the function of the gnostic tradition, Clement points out that ‘Moses, persuaded that God is not to be known by human wisdom, said: “Show me your glory.”’⁴⁷⁸ In response, God disclosed divine knowledge to Moses. Finding Moses in the book of Hebrews, Clement remarks that Moses was steadfast in his pursuit of God because he saw ‘the invisible one [τὸν ἀόρατον].’⁴⁷⁹ As a result, Clement recognizes that Moses’s theology is based on God’s self-disclosures through grace and the *Logos*, not human speculation: ‘Since the inquiry [about God] is incorporeal and invisible,’ Clement concludes that ‘one perceives the Unknown [τὸ ἄγνωστον] by divine grace [θεία χάριτι], and by the only *Logos* with him.’⁴⁸⁰ In this way, the Incarnation is essential to Clement’s theology because ‘the grace of the knowledge regarding him [God] is through the Son.’⁴⁸¹ In brief, Clement insists that viable theological discourse is contingent upon inquiry into the Scriptures—a genuine search for God—accompanied with divine grace and the epistemic agency of the *Logos*.

Clement knew that the philosophical search for the First Principle (ἡ ἀρχή) of the universe was a matter of speculation and difference among the pre-Socratics and subsequent streams of Greek thought. After his research in the Scriptures, Clement concluded that the views of the ancient philosophers fell short of identifying the First Principle of the universe. They conjectured that either matter (ύλη) or the elements (στοιχεῖα) were among the first principles.⁴⁸² Thales believed water to be the first

⁴⁷⁷ *Str.* V.12.81.4.

⁴⁷⁸ Ex. 33:18; *Str.* II.2.6.1; *Str.* V.11.71.5.

⁴⁷⁹ Heb. 11:26-27; *Str.* IV.16.103.2, τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὄρων ἐκαρτέρησεν.

⁴⁸⁰ *Str.* V.12.82.4, λείπεται δὴ θεία χάριτι καὶ μόνω τῷ παρ’ αὐτοῦ λόγῳ τὸ ἄγνωστον νοεῖν; see also, *Str.* V.11.71.5.

⁴⁸¹ *Str.* V.11.71.5, ἡ μὲν γὰρ ζήτησις ἀευδῆς καὶ ἀόρατος, ἡ χάρις δὲ τῆς γνώσεως παρ’ αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ.

⁴⁸² *Prot.* V.64.1-6; V.65.4-66.5.

principle.⁴⁸³ Parmenides thought fire and earth to be gods.⁴⁸⁴ Heraclitus worshipped fire as the ‘first origin’ (ἀρχέγονον).⁴⁸⁵ Since the Greeks did not know the Creator of their deified elements, Clement draws the conclusion that ‘the First Principle of the universe [ἡ τῶν ὅλων ἀρχή], was not previously made known to the Greeks.’⁴⁸⁶

Nevertheless, Clement turns to Timaeus the Locrian—the character featured in Plato’s *Timaeus*—and quotes from his composition, *On Nature*, to explain the meaning of the First Principle: ‘There is one first principle of all things, unoriginated [μία ἀρχὰ πάντων ἐστὶν ἀγέννητος]. For, if it was originated, it would no longer be a first principle, but the first principle would be that from which it was originated.’⁴⁸⁷ However, Clement does not credit Timaeus as the originator of this explanation. Rather he clarifies that ‘this true opinion flows from here: “Listen,” he says, “Israel, the Lord your God, the Lord is one [κύριος εἷς ἐστι], and you shall serve only him.”’⁴⁸⁸ In Clement’s opinion, Timaeus obtained this understanding about the First Principle (‘The Lord is One’) from Moses. In this way, Clement conjoins philosophical language and biblical theology, professing that the transcendent ‘God is without beginning [ὁ θεὸς δὲ ἀναρχος], the absolute beginning of the universe [ἀρχὴ τῶν ὅλων παντελής].’⁴⁸⁹ In addition, he describes the eternal Son as ‘God, the Saviour, [and] the First Principle of the universe [ἡ τῶν ὅλων ἀρχή].’⁴⁹⁰

⁴⁸³ *Str.* II.4.14.1-2; *Prot.* V.64.2.

⁴⁸⁴ *Prot.* V.64.2.

⁴⁸⁵ *Prot.* V.64.6.

⁴⁸⁶ *Str.* II.4.14.1, οὐ προεγινώσκετο δὲ ἡ τῶν ὅλων ἀρχὴ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. For discussion on Plato’s understanding of the First Principle, see E. Osborn, *The Emergence of Christian Theology*, (Cambridge: CUP, 1993), 39-63.

⁴⁸⁷ *Str.* V.14.115.4, μία ἀρχὰ πάντων ἐστὶν ἀγέννητος· εἰ γὰρ ἐγένετο, οὐκ ἂν ἦν ἔτι ἀρχά, ἀλλ’ ἐκεῖνα, ἐξ ἧς ἡ ἀρχὰ ἐγένετο.

⁴⁸⁸ Deut. 6:4, 13; *Str.* V.14.115.5, ἐρρῦν γὰρ ἐκείθεν δόξα ἡ ἀληθῆς· «ἄκουε» φησίν, «Ἰσραὴλ, κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου, κύριος εἷς ἐστι, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατεύσεις.

⁴⁸⁹ *Str.* IV.25.162.5, ὁ θεὸς δὲ ἀναρχος, ἀρχὴ τῶν ὅλων παντελής, ἀρχῆς ποιητικός.

⁴⁹⁰ *Str.* V.6.38.7, ὡς βλέπει τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν ἀγαθότητα, ὁ υἱὸς ἐνεργεῖ, θεὸς σωτὴρ κεκλημένος, ἡ τῶν ὅλων ἀρχή: ‘As he sees the goodness of the Father, the Son works, being called God, Saviour, the ἀρχή of the universe.’

As seen in the previous chapter, Alcinous, in his *Didaskalikos*, set down three first principles: matter, forms (or ideas), and the primal God.⁴⁹¹ Hägg maintains that ‘the doctrine of how the genesis and existence of the universe can be explained by the three basic principles (ἀρχαί)—God, Ideas, Matter (θεός, ἰδέαι, ὕλη)—is the cornerstone of this renewed Platonism.’⁴⁹² Regarding this position, Wywra has sufficiently argued that Clement believed in only one first principle, and rejected a *Drei-Prinzipien-Lehre*.⁴⁹³ As seen above, Clement holds to only one First Principle: both Father and Son are the First Principle. This theology moves Clement away from the Middle Platonists.

As the First Principle, God is the only existent God, and he alone possesses true existence for all reality. Many Greeks in Clement’s time were superstitious: they were idolaters and daemon worshippers. The veneration of ‘dead matter’ (ὕλη νεκρά), taken from the earth and shaped into objects of adulation, demonstrated that the Greeks had no knowledge of the true God, because superstition is consequential to ignorance of divine existence.⁴⁹⁴ Commenting on Clement’s view of superstition, George Karamanolis states: ‘superstitious people believe in something that is not. And by doing so, they practically deny what really is, God as rightly conceived. It is in this sense that such people, namely the Greeks, are atheists.’⁴⁹⁵ Idolatry is atheism, because it is worship of non-existences (τοὺς οὐκ ὄντας), and therefore, ignorant of true reality.⁴⁹⁶ In contrast, Clement explains that materiality only exists because ‘God alone created [it], since God alone truly exists.’⁴⁹⁷

⁴⁹¹ Alcinous, 8.1-12.3.

⁴⁹² Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria*, 85.

⁴⁹³ Wywra, *Die Christliche Platonaneignung in den Stromateis des Clemens von Alexandrien*, 13, 307, 318.

⁴⁹⁴ *Prot.* II.25.1.

⁴⁹⁵ Karamanolis, ‘Clement on Superstition and Religious Belief,’ in *The Seventh Book of the Stromateis*, ed. Matyáš Havrda et al. (2012), 116.

⁴⁹⁶ *Prot.* II.23.1. Here, Clement calls idolatry a two-fold atheism because idolaters are ignorant of God and ‘think nonexistence is existence [τοὺς οὐκ ὄντας ὡς ὄντας νομίζοντες].’

⁴⁹⁷ *Prot.* IV.63.3, μόνος γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν, ἐπεὶ καὶ μόνος ὄντως ἐστὶ θεός.

Clement argues in the *Protreptikos* that God cannot be analogous to stone statues fashioned by human hands from lifeless matter, because ‘matter is always in need of skill [someone to shape it], but God needs nothing.’⁴⁹⁸ The polemic is about real existence and nonexistence, as Clement relentlessly points out the nonexistence (τοὺς οὐκ ὄντας) of so-called deities and professes the true existence of the only existing God. He therefore urges the Greeks to ‘believe in the only God of all humanity.’⁴⁹⁹ He exhorts them to become ‘joint-heirs,’ to remove the ‘ignorance and the darkness,’ and to once again ‘behold the truly existing God.’⁵⁰⁰ For this God is ‘the only true one, the almighty good God, who is being manifested from eternity to eternity, [and] saving through his Son.’⁵⁰¹ When Clement addresses the idolatries of Hellenistic customs, the notable biblical dogma that comes into view is God portrayed as ‘the only truly existing God [ὁ μόνος ὄντως ὑπάρχων θεός].’⁵⁰²

Clement advances a case for the existence of God from the Prophets.⁵⁰³ He emphasizes that God revealed himself to Moses: “‘Look, behold that I exist and there is no other God except me.’”⁵⁰⁴ Isaiah declares: “‘I exist,” he says, “I am the Lord who speaks righteousness and announces the truth. I am God and there is not a just God besides me...I am God [ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεός] and there is no other.””⁵⁰⁵ As seen, the Gnostics identify this God as Yaldabaoth—the ignorant demiurge—but for Clement, this one is the only existent and transcendent God, not an inferior deity.

⁴⁹⁸ *Prot.* IV.56.5.

⁴⁹⁹ *Prot.* X.106.5, πάντες ἄνθρωποι πιστεύατε μόνῳ τῷ πάντων ἀνθρώπων θεῷ.

⁵⁰⁰ Rom. 8:17; *Prot.* XI.114.1.

⁵⁰¹ *Str.* VII.2.12.1, ὁ τῷ ὄντι μόνος εἷς παντοκράτωρ ἀγαθὸς ἀναφαίνηται θεός, ἐξ αἰῶνος εἰς αἰῶνα σωζῶν διὰ υἱοῦ.

⁵⁰² *Prot.* X.103.1.

⁵⁰³ See *Prot.* VIII. Nearly the entire chapter quotes passages from the Prophets.

⁵⁰⁴ Deut. 32:39; *Prot.* VIII.79.1, ἴδετε, ἴδετε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι.

⁵⁰⁵ Isa. 14:21-23; *Prot.* VIII.79.3-4, ἐγὼ εἰμι, ἐγὼ εἰμι, φησιν ὁ κύριος ὁ λαλῶν δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀναγγέλλων ἀληθεία.

Although Clement envisages God as the one true God, there is enough evidence to show that he believes God to be three divine beings. He exclaims: ‘Oh mystic wonder! The Father of the universe is one [εἷς], the *Logos* of the universe is one [εἷς], and the Holy Spirit is one [έν] even the same everywhere.’⁵⁰⁶ These three beings are a *triad* comprising one God. Interpreting a Platonic text with Christian theology, Clement explains: ‘Indeed, I hear nothing differently than the holy *triad* to be made known; for the third is the Holy Spirit, and the second is the Son through whom all things came into existence according to the will of the Father.’⁵⁰⁷ Moreover, Clement composed texts that contain salvific content and triadic language. For example, he teaches that: ‘Hidden inside [us] dwells the Father and his Son, who after dying for us, was raised up with us.’⁵⁰⁸ Those who truly believe bear the divine treasure mysteriously contained within earthen vessels, ‘which have been fortified by the power of God the Father [δυνάμει θεοῦ πατρὸς], by the blood of God the Son [αἵματι θεοῦ παιδὸς], and by the dew of the Holy Spirit [δρόσῳ πνεύματος ἁγίου].’⁵⁰⁹ It is the *triad* God alone who gives existence to humanity by providing the food of eternal life: ‘The one who eats the true bread of the Spirit shall not die. The living bread, the one given by the Father to those wishing to eat, is the Son.’⁵¹⁰ Finally, in a passage with salvific and doxological content—probably drawn from 1 Clement 64-65—Clement ascribes to the Father eternal glory through Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit: ‘To whom, through his Son Jesus

⁵⁰⁶ *Paid.* I.6.42.1, Ὁ θαύματος μυστικοῦ· εἷς μὲν ὁ τῶν ὅλων πατήρ, εἷς δὲ καὶ ὁ τῶν ὅλων λόγος, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πανταχοῦ.

⁵⁰⁷ *Epis.* II.312e; compare with *Str.* V.14.103.1, οὐκ ἄλλως ἔγωγε ἔξακούω ἢ τὴν ἁγίαν τριάδα μνησθαι· τρίτον μὲν γὰρ εἶναι τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τὸν υἱὸν δὲ δεύτερον, δι’ οὗ πάντα ἐγένετο κατὰ τὴν βούλησιν τοῦ πατρὸς. For an antecedent usage of τριάς, see *Theoph.Autol.* II.15.

⁵⁰⁸ *Q.d.s.* 33.6, ἔνδον κρυπτὸς ἐνοικεῖ ὁ πατήρ καὶ ὁ τούτου παῖς ὁ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανῶν καὶ μεθ’ ἡμῶν ἀναστᾶς.

⁵⁰⁹ *Q.d.s.* 34.1, θησαυρὸς ἐν ὀστρακίνῳ σκεύει βαστάζομεν, δυνάμει θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ αἵματι θεοῦ παιδὸς καὶ δρόσῳ πνεύματος ἁγίου περιτετειχισμένον. Clement believes the Holy Spirit to be God; following Luke and the apostles (Acts 20:23, 28; 2 Cor. 13:13), he modifies πνεῦμα with ἅγιον (*Paid.* I.6.28.1).

⁵¹⁰ Jn. 6:32; *Exc.Thdot.* 1.13.3, ὁ δὲ τὸν ἀληθινὸν ἄρτον τοῦ πνεύματος ἐσθίων οὐ τεθνήσκει. ὁ ζῶν ἄρτος ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς δοθεὶς ὁ υἱὸς ἐστὶ τοῖς ἐσθίειν βουλομένοις.

Christ, the Lord of the living and the dead, and through the Holy Spirit, be glory, honour, might, and eternal majesty now and unto all generations, even forever and ever. Amen.⁵¹¹ Clement does not systematize his doctrine of the holy *triad*, but it is discernible in his works and reflects a Christian theology.

However, like the Platonists and the Gnostic myth, Clement believes in the transcendence of God.⁵¹² He employs philosophical language to explain that ‘the Father of the universe [του̅ των̅ ὄλων̅ πατρός],’ that is, ‘the First Cause [τὸ πρῶτον̅ ἄτιον̅] is not in space, but above space, time, name, and intelligence.’⁵¹³ ‘For the one is indivisible; [the one] is infinite...without dimensions and not having a limit, and therefore, without form and name.’⁵¹⁴ While Clement is fluid with philosophical language, he prefers an existing Christian tradition that uses alpha privative terms to speak of God. Clement demonstrates apophatic theology from the lost text: the *Preaching of Peter* (KP). Some scholars consider KP to be an Alexandrian document dated *ca.* AD 80-140.⁵¹⁵ With the exception of one reference to KP in Origen (his comment on John 13:17), all surviving passages come from Clement, and most from *Stromateis* VI.⁵¹⁶ While Origen rejects KP as spurious (but does not dismiss it), Clement accepts it as a document with apostolic authority.⁵¹⁷ Birger Pearson points out that KP ‘Clearly represents a variety of Christianity that lies on a trajectory leading to

⁵¹¹ *Q.d.s.* 42.19-20. Compare the latter part of the doxology with 1Clem. 64-65. For additional texts on the three names together, see *Paid.* I.6.42.1; *Paid.* III.12.101.2; *Q.d.s.* 34.1.6; *Exc.Thdot.* 4.76.3-4, πατρός καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος; *Exc.Thdot.* 4.80.3, διὰ γὰρ πατρός καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος σφραγισθεῖς; and *Ecl.Proph.* 13.1.

⁵¹² A. van den Hoek, ‘God Beyond Knowing: Clement of Alexandria and Discourse on God,’ *Brill Essay* (2009): 37-60.

⁵¹³ *Str.* V.11.71.4-5. For doxographical texts comparing Clement with Philo, Middle Platonism, and Gnosticism see Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*, 212-222.

⁵¹⁴ *Str.* V.12.81.6-82.1.

⁵¹⁵ Wilhelm Schneemelcher, ed., ‘The Kerygma Petri,’ in *New Testament Apocrypha*, Volume Two: Writings Relating to the Apostles; Apocalypses and Related Subjects, (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 2003), 34; for complete discussion, see 34-41.

⁵¹⁶ For Clement’s references to KP, see *Str.* I.29.182.3; *Str.* II.15.68.2; *Str.* VI.5.39.2; VI.5.42.3; VI.6.48.1; VI.15.128.1; and *Ecl.Proph.* 58.1.

⁵¹⁷ Schneemelcher, ‘The Kerygma Petri,’ 41, fn. 14.

the mainline Christianity of Clement.⁵¹⁸ The following is an excerpt of *apophatic* theology from KP, as Clement preserved it:

Peter says in the *Preaching*: ‘Know therefore that there is one God, who made the beginning of all things, [γινώσκετε οὖν εἷς θεός ἐστιν, ὃς ἀρχὴν πάντων ἐποίησεν], and holds the authority of the end [τέλους]. And he is invisible [ἀόρατος], who sees everything; he is uncontained [ἀχώρητος], who contains everything; he needs nothing [ἀνεπιδεής], but everything is in need of him, and through him they do exist; he is incomprehensible [ἀκατάληπτος], everlasting [ἀέναιος], immortal [ἀφθαρτος], uncreated [ἀποίητος], who made everything by the word of his power’ [λόγῳ δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ] of the Gnostic Scripture, that is, the Son [τῆς γνωστικῆς γραφῆς τουτέστι τοῦ υἱοῦ].⁵¹⁹

By using the present imperative, γινώσκετε KP and Clement mean that believers can know—and continue to know—God even through *apophasis*. In the middle section of the passage, there are positive affirmations following *apophatic* designations: God ‘is invisible, who sees everything; he needs nothing, but everything is in need of him and through him they do exist; he is uncontained, who contains everything.’⁵²⁰ Clement’s approach to *apophasis* extends beyond concepts it negates and recognizes something more: The one who needs nothing possesses all the resources for those in need.

In view of the above, in what way does Clement explain divine transcendence? His doctrine of the immeasurability of God has two distinctions: God is transcendent according to divine essence and spatial location. Firstly, the οὐσία of God is an ontological uniqueness, because ‘the divine essence [οὐσία θεία] is eternal and without beginning, incorporeal and uncircumscribed, and the cause of [all] existing things [τῶν ὄντων αἴτιον].’⁵²¹ By reason of his nature, ‘[God] is far away from humankind according to essence [κατ’ οὐσίαν]’ because he is ‘unoriginated [ἀγέννητος]’ and

⁵¹⁸ Pearson, *Gnosticism and Christianity in Roman and Coptic Egypt*, 16.

⁵¹⁹ *Str.* VI.5.39.2-3. For Clement’s *apophasis*, see Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, 153-179, 238-251. For her list of Clement’s *apophatic* terms, see 159.

⁵²⁰ *Str.* VI.5.39.2-3.

⁵²¹ *Str.* IV.25.162.5; *Frag.* 37, περὶ πρόνοια, οὐσία θεία ἐστὶν αἰδίον τι καὶ ἀναρχον ἀσώματον τε καὶ ἀπερίγραφτον καὶ τῶν ὄντων αἴτιον. For discussion on Clement’s use of the term οὐσία, see Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, 164-173.

humankind is ‘originated [γεννητός].’⁵²² Furthermore, human beings do not participate in the essence of God, because they are adopted into the divine likeness, and therefore, are not the same in essence, because God is divine essence by nature.⁵²³ Although God is ontologically distinct from humankind, there is the human capacity—through the image of God—to participate in God’s likeness. As a way to relate to God’s essence, Clement exhorts believers to ‘become imitators and servants of the best essence of those that exist’—namely God.⁵²⁴ Secondly, Clement recognizes God’s immeasurable ‘location’ (χώρα) vis-à-vis creation and vis-à-vis human beings. He acknowledges the intellectual restrictions that make it difficult for humans to locate God in the universe, because the region of God is beyond human reach.⁵²⁵ Since God cannot be circumscribed, Clement depicts God as ‘above both place and time, and [beyond] the property of those things that have come into being.’⁵²⁶

In other passages, however, Clement marvels because, unlike the Gnostic and Platonic supreme deity, Clement’s God approaches human beings.⁵²⁷ The Scriptures informed Clement concerning the nearness of God. He recalls from the words of Jeremiah that ‘the all-wise prophet, or rather the Holy Spirit in Jeremiah, shows God: “I am a God who draws near [θεὸς ἐγγίζων ἐγὼ εἰμι]” he says, “and not a God far away [καὶ οὐχὶ θεὸς πόρρωθεν].”’⁵²⁸ Clement credits such knowledge to the Holy Spirit. In another passage, Clement exults because ‘[God] being far away has drawn very close—an ineffable wonder [θαῦμα ἄρρητον]: “I am a God who draws near,” says the

⁵²² *Str.* II.2.5.4, πόρρω μὲν κατ’ οὐσίαν (πῶς γὰρ ἂν συνεγγίσα ποτὲ τὸ γεννητὸν ἀγεννήτω;).

⁵²³ *Str.* II.17.77.4.

⁵²⁴ *Prot.* XI.117.1, τῆς ἀρίστης τῶν ὄντων οὐσίας. This passage has been rendered: ‘of the best of all beings’ (*ANF2*: 204) and ‘of the highest of all beings’ (*BW*: 248-249).

⁵²⁵ *Str.* V.11.73.3, δυσάλωτος γὰρ ἡ χώρα τοῦ θεοῦ.

⁵²⁶ *Str.* II.2.6.1, οὐ γὰρ ἐν γνώφῳ ἢ τόπῳ ὁ θεός, ἀλλ’ ὑπεράνω καὶ τόπου καὶ χρόνου καὶ τῆς τῶν γεγονότων ιδιότητος.

⁵²⁷ *Prot.* XI.111.2-3; XII.120.1-5; *Str.* II.2.5.4-5.

⁵²⁸ *Jer.* 23:23; *Prot.* VIII.78.1.

Lord.⁵²⁹ Then he adds, ‘but those who possess the Holy Spirit examine “the deep things of God,” that is, they become holders of the hidden things in respect to the prophecies.’⁵³⁰ The nearness of God surprised Clement with an indescribable wonder; consequently, the knowledge and experience of divine immanence distanced him from the theologies of Platonism and Gnosticism.

How did Clement think of God as near and present? ‘He draws close with his power that embraces all things.’⁵³¹ While his divine essence transcends spatial reality, the ‘power of God is always present, affecting us with insight, with beneficent ends, and with [his] instruction.’⁵³² For Clement, the transcendent God, who cannot be limited to space, has nevertheless decided to occupy the space he transcends and make himself known to human beings.

2. Clement’s Demiurge

Similar to the Gnostics, ‘Clement conceded a “gap” between the Supreme being and the visible world, but unlike them he saw it bridged by God himself instead of by intermediary beings.’⁵³³ *Contra* the Platonists and Gnostics, Clement assigns the term δημιουργός—meaning Artisan, Author, Craftsman, Creator, Maker, or Worker—to the transcendent God himself, who is above space and time.⁵³⁴ As previously seen, Plato uses the term δημιουργός to describe a lesser deity who mediated the invisible forms of reality to their corresponding copies in the sensible world. Familiar with Plato’s *Timaeus*, Clement imports the term δημιουργός to describe God’s relationship to

⁵²⁹ Jer. 23:23; *Str.* II.2.5.4, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς μακρὰν ὦν ἐγγυτάτῳ βέβηκεν, θαῦμα ἄρρητον· «θεὸς ἐγγίζων ἐγώ,» φησὶ κύριος.

⁵³⁰ 1Cor. 2:9-10; *Str.* II.2.7.3, ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα κεκτημένοι ἐρευνῶσι «τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ» τουτέστι τῆς περὶ τὰς προγητείας ἐπικρύψεως ἐπήβολοι γίνονται.

⁵³¹ *Str.* II.2.5.4.

⁵³² *Str.* II.2.5.5, δὴ πάρεστιν αἰεὶ τῇ τε ἐποπρικῇ τῇ τε εὐεργετικῇ τῇ τε παιδευτικῇ ἀπτομένη ἡμῶν δυνάμει δυνάμις τοῦ θεοῦ.

⁵³³ Floyd, *Clement of Alexandria’s Treatment of the Problem of Evil*, 74.

⁵³⁴ I translate δημιουργός as ‘Artisan.’ Wilson translated δημιουργός as ‘Creator.’ See *Str.* I.11.51.1-52.3 (*ANF2*: 311); I.19.91.5; I.19.94.2 (*ANF2*: 322); and *Str.* VI.7.55.2 (*ANF2*: 493). He also translated δημιουργός as ‘originator’ (*Str.* I.2.20.1; *ANF2*: 303), ‘workers’ (*Str.* V.14.98.2; *ANF2*: 467), ‘author’ (*Str.* VI.8.69.2; *ANF2*: 496), and ‘maker’ (*Str.* VIII.6.19.1; *ANF2*: 563).

creation.⁵³⁵ The transcendent God is the Artisan, who created the universe by his own will and design; and then, out of wisdom and love, he fashioned humankind from previously created matter.

Clement ascribes the title δημιουργός to both God the Father and the *Logos*. Concerning the Father, he claims: ‘This one—the Artisan of all things together, the all-powerful Lord—is the Father of the Son.’⁵³⁶ The Father is ‘the holy Artisan [τὸν ἅγιον δημιουργόν], the only almighty God [τὸν παντοκράτορα μόνον].’⁵³⁷ ‘Before God became Creator [κτίστην], he was God and he was good; and so, he wished to be both an Artisan [δημιουργός] and a Father [πατήρ].’⁵³⁸ Since, all things came into existence through the *Logos*, it follows that Clement also applies the term δημιουργός to him. The *Logos* is ‘God and Artisan [θεὸς καὶ δημιουργός],’ because “all things came through him and without him not one thing came into existence.”⁵³⁹ Here Clement imports John 1:3 into the term δημιουργός, attributing all the works of creation to the *Logos*, without attaching any philosophical or gnostic notions of a lesser deity to its meaning. Although he does not assign the term δημιουργός to the Holy Spirit, Clement’s account is that the *Logos* arranges the cosmos and humanity in harmonious order ‘by the Holy Spirit [ἀγίῳ πνεύματι].’⁵⁴⁰ The two things the demiurge brought into being are the ‘cosmos and humankind.’⁵⁴¹ God lovingly cares for people and the contingent cosmos in which they live.

⁵³⁵ Karl Barth claims that the translators of the LXX intentionally avoided the verb δημιουργεῖν, so as not to equate God ‘with the demiurge of Greek philosophy’ (*CD*: III.1, 40-42: 017). The term δημιουργός does show up in *WoS*. 15:13; 2*Mc*. 4:1; 10:2; and 4*Mc*. 7:8; once in the NT: Heb. 11:10, and it is found in 1*Clem*. 20:11; 26:1; 33:2; 35:3; 59:2.

⁵³⁶ *Str.* IV.13.92.1, ὅτι δὲ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ υἱοῦ πατήρ, ὁ δημιουργὸς τῶν συμπάντων, ὁ παντοκράτωρ κύριος.

⁵³⁷ *Str.* III.6.45.1, τὸν ἅγιον δημιουργὸν τὸν παντοκράτορα μόνον θεόν.

⁵³⁸ *Paid.* I.9.88.2, πρὶν γὰρ κτίστην γενέσθαι θεὸς ἦν, ἀγαθὸς ἦν· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ δημιουργός εἶναι καὶ πατήρ ἠθέλησεν.

⁵³⁹ *Paid.* I.11.97.3, παρρησία δὲ ὅτι θεὸς καὶ δημιουργός, «πάντα γὰρ δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν.»

⁵⁴⁰ *Prot.* I.5.3.

⁵⁴¹ *Paid.* III.12.100.2.

The ancient philosophers postulated various theories about cosmogony based on scientific observables. Some concluded that the cosmological bodies (sun, moon, and stars) were the first causes of all things.⁵⁴² Clement points out the inconsistencies of the philosophers' logic concerning the rational investigation of astronomy: 'The host of philosophers turns aside, when they admit that man was beautifully made for the contemplation of heaven, and yet they worship the things that appear in heaven and apprehended by sight.'⁵⁴³ Clement presses them to search beyond observables to the God of creation: 'Let no one worship the sun; rather let him yearn for the maker [ποιητήν] of the sun. Do not deify the cosmos; instead, seek after the Artisan [δημιουργόν].'⁵⁴⁴ Völker notices this kind of language and points out that Clement's aim was 'to win the philosophers to Christianity.'⁵⁴⁵

Clement highlights the doctrine of creation because it accentuates the greatness of God's will and power. He muses this way:

How should I speak of such great things God creates? Look at the whole cosmos! That is his work: heaven, the sun, angels, and people are 'the works of his fingers.'⁵⁴⁶ How great is the power of God [ὄση γε ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ]! His will alone is creation [μόνον αὐτοῦ τὸ βούλημα κοσμοποιία]; for God alone created, since God alone truly exists [μόνος γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν ἐπεὶ καὶ μόνος ὄντως ἐστὶ θεός]. By a simple wish he creates, and he wishes only to attend to that which has come into existence [ψιλῶ τῶ βούλεσθαι δημιουργεῖ καὶ τῶ μόνον ἐθελῆσαι αὐτὸν ἔπεται τὸ γεγενῆσθαι].⁵⁴⁷

The point is that the cosmic objects do not point to themselves, but to the power of God, the will of God, and the knowledge that all things exist because God wishes them to be there. Clement illustrates the way creation points to God with a story of Abraham. When God instructed Abraham to look at the heavens and count the stars (Genesis

⁵⁴² See *Prot.* V.64.1-6; V.65.4-66.5; *Str.* II.4.13.3-15.3; *Str.*V.14.89.1-94.3. Clement lists the philosophers and their chosen elements as a first principle (*Prot.* V.64.1-3.). Thales (water); Anaximenes of Miletus (air); Parmenides introduced fire and earth as gods. Also see *Str.* II.4.13.4-14.2.

⁵⁴³ *Prot.* IV.63.4.

⁵⁴⁴ *Prot.* IV.63.5.

⁵⁴⁵ Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus*, 8.

⁵⁴⁶ Ps. 8:3.

⁵⁴⁷ *Prot.* IV.63.2-3.

15:5), his gaze went beyond the physical objects to the Creator. Through stargazing, ‘Abraham ascended to the knowledge of the creator [Ἀβραάμ εἰς τὴν τοῦ κτίσαντος ὑπεξάνεβη γνώσιν].’⁵⁴⁸ Abraham subjected astronomical inquiry to the counsel of God, moving the human search beyond the astral bodies to the knowledge of the only existent God. Moreover, Clement appeals to David’s theology: “God made the heavens and the things in the heavens.”⁵⁴⁹ For it was “by his *Logos* [τῷ λόγῳ] they were established and all their power [exists] by the breath of his mouth.”⁵⁵⁰ The stars, therefore, are a stellar tale of the supremacy and artistry of the true Creator.

Drawing from the philonic interpretation of creation, Clement maintains that by God’s will and power, he created the intellectual and sensible regions of creation: the ‘world of thought [κόσμος νοητός] and the world of sense [κόσμος αἰσθητός].’⁵⁵¹ As with Plato, the latter is a copy of the former and is visible; unlike Plato, the former is not an eternal form or idea, but a created, invisible archetype (ἀρχέτυπος). In Clement’s thinking, God chose to create an invisible pattern before creating its observable copy. Thus, neither pattern nor copy was coeval with God. The idea of the pattern-copy is in the Bible. Moses built the tabernacle according to an existing pattern.⁵⁵² Accordingly, arguing from Scripture, Clement holds a clear distinction between the Demiurge and creation, and sought to lead the host of philosophers to behold this God of creation.

3. Clement’s Anthropogony

Following Moses’s account of the creation of Adam, God created *anthropos* in his image with capability of assimilating to the divine likeness. Clement argues that each

⁵⁴⁸ *Str.* VI.10.80.3.

⁵⁴⁹ Ps. 96:5, ὁ δὲ κύριος τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἐποίησεν; *Prot.* IV.62.4, ὁ δὲ θεὸς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἐποίησεν καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.

⁵⁵⁰ Ps. 33:6; *Prot.* IV.63.1-2.

⁵⁵¹ *Str.* V.14.93.4-94.1; Gen. 1:2 (LXX); and see Philo, *Opif.* VII.26-XI.38.

⁵⁵² Ex. 25:9; Heb. 8:5; also see WoS. 9.8, μίμημα σκηνῆς ἁγίας: ‘a copy of the holy tent.’

human being is formed in God's image, but must choose to become his likeness.⁵⁵³ Clement's anthropogony is important to the Incarnation, because God expected to assume this image and likeness when the *Logos* becomes *anthropos*, and Clement makes special mention that only Christ through the Incarnation was the image and likeness of God completely.⁵⁵⁴ Thus, for Clement, the *Logos* does not take on the constitution of a platonic or a Gnostic human being, but assumes the biblical model of human existence. Accordingly, Clement's Demiurge formed and animated humankind with a divine design: assimilation to the likeness of God.

Noting this purpose prompts admonitions against idolatry, especially the 'god-makers,' who formed non-existent images for the naïve and superstitious to worship. With probing rhetoric, Clement poses questions concerning the 'workers of the earth' (γῆς ἔργαται):

How could any one of these [workers of the earth] make seeing eyes? Who breathed [ἐνεφύσησε] the soul [into a human being]? Who bestowed the sense of righteousness? Who promises deathlessness [ἀθανασίαν]? Only the Artisan of the universe, the Father, who is the Supreme Artisan [μόνος ὁ τῶν ὅλων δημιουργός ὁ ἀριστοτέχνας πατήρ], fashioned us a human being, that is, a living statue [τοιούτον ἄγαλμα ἔμψυχον ἡμᾶς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἔπλασεν].⁵⁵⁵

Clement draws distinction between the 'workers of the earth' and the 'Artisan of the universe.' The term he selects for image (ἄγαλμα) refers to a 'statue' created in honour of a god. Clement emphasizes the 'otherness' of God's handy-work: His workmanship is a living statue for his own honour. Since the only existent God formed and animated a breathing, seeing, and existent human being, it is irrational for these beings to fashion statues of non-existent gods. This is a distortion of the created order; humans do not make gods; instead, God made humans to be an existent image of himself. For Clement, the divine design is a mystery, but when disclosed, it illumines

⁵⁵³ For discussion on Clement's doctrine of image and likeness, see Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement*, 135-151; Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria*, 233-236.

⁵⁵⁴ *Paid.* I.12.98.3.

⁵⁵⁵ *Prot.* X.98.2-3.

the knowledge that ‘God created *anthropos* for immortality, and made mankind an image of his own character.’⁵⁵⁶

God breathed into Adam two parts that constitute the divine image, which are the gift of reason (and intellect) and the seat of love (and affection). Firstly, from the Genesis account, Clement maintains that God breathed into Adam a rational soul:

Moses says that the body was completely formed from the earth, which Plato says is an earthly tent; but the rational soul [ψυχὴν τὴν λογικὴν] is from above [and] was breathed by God into the [human] face [εἰς πρόσωπον]. Wherefore, also humankind came into existence as an image and likeness [of God] [κατ’ εἰκόντα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν τὸν ἄνθρωπον γεγονέναι]. For on the one hand, the image of God is the divine and royal *Logos*, an impassible man; but on the other hand, the image of the image is the human intellect [θεοῦ λόγος θεῖος καὶ βασιλικός, ἄνθρωπος ἀπαθής, εἰκὼν δ’ εἰκόνος ἀνθρώπινος νοῦς].⁵⁵⁷

On the one hand, unlike the Platonists and Gnostics, Clement believes that the body is good and not to be disparaged; it is God’s creation. On the other hand, Behr points out that ‘the scope of the image does not extend to the body.’⁵⁵⁸ As Clement explains: ‘For conformity with the image and likeness is not meant for the body (for it were wrong for what is mortal to be made like what is immortal).’⁵⁵⁹ The image of God, therefore, does not include ‘the form of that which was prepared [τῆς κατασκευῆς τὸ σχῆμα]’—meaning the body.⁵⁶⁰

Instead, *anthropos* is an ‘image of the image.’ The image is neither derivative of the Platonic ‘World Soul’ that animates the cosmos, nor is it the creation of archons. Rather the transcendent God bestowed upon his human creation rational (λογικὴν) and intellectual (νοῦς) capabilities derived from the divine *Logos*:

On the one hand, the ‘image of God’ is his *Logos* (the genuine Son of the mind, the divine *Logos*, the archetypal light of light). On the other hand, the image of the *Logos* is the true human being [ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἀληθινός], meaning the intellect that is in the person, the one being said to have come into existence ‘according to

⁵⁵⁶ *Str.* VI.12.97.1.

⁵⁵⁷ *Str.* V.14.94.3-5; Gen. 1:26-27.

⁵⁵⁸ Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement*, 141.

⁵⁵⁹ *Str.* II.19.102.6 (Wilson, *ANF2*: 370).

⁵⁶⁰ *Str.* VI.16.136.3.

the image' of God and 'according to [his] likeness.' And with this purpose in heart, [the] *logikos* is likened to the divine *Logos*.⁵⁶¹

Just as the *Logos* is the image and mind of God, correspondingly, so the 'true human being,' who possesses reason (λογικός) and the intellect (νοῦς) derived from the *Logos* is the image of the *Logos*.⁵⁶² Human beings, in Clement's anthropology, possess the cognitive capability to receive and understand the mysteries of divine *gnosis*, because *logikos* is the suitable receptor of *Logos*.

Why does Clement think this correlation between *Logos* and *logikos* is important? His doctrine of creation—noting the connection between *Logos* and *logikos*—is one reason he asserts humankind can acquire divine *gnosis*, increase in respect to salvation, and behold the vision of God. Clement links the relationship of *logikos* to the *Logos* in two ways. Firstly, drawing from the apostle Peter, Clement exhorts believers to 'yearn for the rational milk [τὸ λογικὸν γάλα] in order that [they] might increase in respect to salvation.'⁵⁶³ This milk, which is the nourishing food from the Father, is 'the Lord Jesus, that is, the *Logos* of God [ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς, τουτέστιν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ].'⁵⁶⁴ In Clement's view, it is desirable for an intellectual creature to drink rational milk because spiritual milk (λογικὸν γάλα) nourishes and purifies the intellectual part of creaturely existence. Secondly, since the human being is 'a rational creature [τὸ ζῶον τὸ λογικόν, τὸν ἄνθρωπον],' Clement wants people to use their intellect to behold the divine being [θεάσασθαι τὸ θεῖον δεῖν].⁵⁶⁵ However, in order to look upon God,

⁵⁶¹ *Prot.* X.98.4, «εἰκὼν» μὲν γὰρ «τοῦ θεοῦ» ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ (καὶ υἱὸς τοῦ νοῦ γνήσιος ὁ θεῖος λόγος φωτὸς ἀρχέτυπον φῶς), εἰκὼν δὲ τοῦ λόγου ὁ ἄνθρωπος «ὁ ἀληθινός, ὁ νοῦς ὁ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ, ὁ «κατ' εἰκόνα» τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ «κατ' ὁμοιώσιν,» διὰ τοῦτο γεγενῆσθαι λεγόμενος, τῇ κατὰ καρδίαν φρονήσει τῷ θεῷ παρεικαζόμενος λόγῳ καὶ ταύτῃ λογικός. For Philo's claim that the λόγος is the image of God, see *Spec.Leg.* 1.81, λόγος δ' ἐστὶν εἰκὼν θεοῦ; *Conf.* 147, θεοῦ γὰρ εἰκὼν λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτερος.

⁵⁶² Since Clement uses λογικός in passages on creation (and others), it is interpreted as 'rational,' and as 'reason,' because it stands for λογισμός (reason); λογικός then is the guiding faculty of the soul.

⁵⁶³ 1Pet. 2:1-3; *Paid.* I.6.44.1, ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ ἀυξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν.

⁵⁶⁴ *Paid.* I.6.43.3.

⁵⁶⁵ *Paid.* I.12.100.3.

one must become pure in heart. For this path, Clement looks to Christ’s teaching: ‘He called the “pure in heart” blessed, because “they shall see God.”’⁵⁶⁶ In Clement’s thinking, the reception of *Logos* re-orientates human intellect to perceive God.

The second aspect to the image is love and affection. Clement often mentions that ‘the Lord is human-loving [φιλόανθρωπος] and good.’⁵⁶⁷ ‘The human-loving God is the Instructor’ to his creatures.⁵⁶⁸ In one passage, Clement argues that the event of the Incarnation was motivated by love, because ‘God himself is love, and on account of love, he became visible to us.’⁵⁶⁹ Since God is *philanthropic*, Clement deduces that ‘the human being is precious to God [φίλος ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῷ θεῷ], because *anthropos* is the creation of God.’⁵⁷⁰ Central to Clement’s theology—especially his soteriology—is that God loves human beings.

How did God make it possible to share his love with humanity? How could an earthen formation, even a rational creature, receive love and reciprocate love to God? Clement observes from the Genesis narrative that God created everything in the cosmos with commands alone, but he carefully formed humankind with his hands.⁵⁷¹ While fashioning Adam, the Artisan breathed into him what Clement calls the *philtron* (φίλτρον), the capacity for humans to experience affections. The *philtron* was exclusive to God, but because he loves humanity, he chose to breathe (ἐνεφύσησεν) the capacity to love into his human creation. The *philtron* ‘is said to be the very inspiration [ἐμφύσημα] of God.’⁵⁷² This inspiration is the swelling of the chest with air, thus an

⁵⁶⁶ Matt. 5:8; *Str.* IV.6.39.1; see also *Str.* II.20.114.6.

⁵⁶⁷ *Paid.* I.8.64.3, φιλόανθρωπος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀγαθὸς ὁ κύριος; *Prot.* IX.85.3.

⁵⁶⁸ *Paid.* I.7.55.2, αὐτὸς ὁ φιλόανθρωπος θεὸς ἐστὶ παιδαγωγός; *Paid.* I.3.t.1; I.9.75.3; *Paid.* III.8.43.2.

⁵⁶⁹ *Q.d.s.* 37.2, ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη καὶ δι’ ἀγάπην ἡμῖν ἐθεάθη.

⁵⁷⁰ *Paid.* I.3.7.1.

⁵⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷² *Paid.* I.3.7.2, καὶ τὸ φίλτρον ἔνδον ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, τοῦθ’ ὅπερ ἐμφύσημα εἶρηται θεοῦ.

increase of interior breath, spirit, or inspiration. Similarly, the *philtron* is the interior swelling of the human soul with the feelings of love and tender affections.⁵⁷³

Clement points out that the *philtron* increases in human parents, but for different reasons. A mother's *philtron* swells after the birth of her child, and she affectionately provides milk—produced from her own blood—to nourish her new-born. The father's *philtron* swells while training his children, leading his offspring towards true knowledge.⁵⁷⁴ Mystically speaking, Clement likens the mother's milk and the father's training to the teachings (milk), sufferings (blood), and guidance of Christ. Like the mother, the human-loving God gives his milk—produced from the blood of Christ—to those newly generated by the Spirit.⁵⁷⁵ Like the father, God lovingly discloses his salvific teachings and instructs humanity in the knowledge of Christ, guiding them to the divine likeness.⁵⁷⁶ Just as the inspired *logikos* is the receiver of the divine *Logos*, so the inspired *philtron* is the receptor of divine *philos* (φίλος). Thus, no divine command alone fashioned humankind; rather, the intelligence, artistry, and philanthropy of the Artisan formed Adam, and animated him with both *logikos* and the *philtron*: reason and love. The possibility of possessing tender affections and love does not contradict Clement's teachings on *apatheia*, the idea of living without passions. Rather, in Clement's thinking, *apatheia* applies to the eradication of lustful and corrupt passions, not to feelings of love, mercy, and compassion.⁵⁷⁷

There are two conclusions to be drawn from Clement's teaching on the creation of humankind. Firstly, central to his theological discourse is that 'God is human-loving;

⁵⁷³Wilson translated τὸ φίλτρον as 'the love charm' (*ANF2*: 211); Wood translated it as 'a certain lovableness in man' (*CTE*, 9). The φίλτρον is the human capability to share in the love and affections of God.

⁵⁷⁴For mother and father and φίλτρον, see *Paid.* I.6.49.1-4.

⁵⁷⁵*Paid.* I.6.49.2.

⁵⁷⁶*Paid.* I.6.49.4.

⁵⁷⁷For Clement's balance in *apatheia*, see Andrew Louth, 'Apathetic Love in Clement of Alexandria,' *Studia Patristica* XVIII: 3 (1989): 413-418.

therefore, the *Logos* is human-loving.⁵⁷⁸ Clement's logology shows that the *Logos* is reason, and also love and tender affection. Secondly, Clement explains that the human being is 'the best of all things fashioned' by God and was created to be 'a God-loving creature [φιλοθεὸν ζῶον].'⁵⁷⁹ Reason alone does not separate God's creatures from animals, love does this. The possibility for humans to love God and other human beings exalts God's image above all creation. However, as will be shown in the following chapter, humankind fell to a sub-human existence and in need of salvation.

4. Clement's Soteriology

Two features define Clement's soteriology: a destination and the means to arrive there. Firstly, concerning his course to salvation, Clement sets up front the *telos* for which believers are to aim: to become like God. The speculation about the goal of life or the way to happiness was a topic of interest in philosophical inquiry. Clement notes that philosophers speculated about the *telos* for humankind, but they did not discern accurately the divine aim. He points out their misunderstanding by outlining—in *Stromateis* II.21.127.1-II.22.134.7—their dissimilar and limited proposals concerning the purpose for human existence. For example, he reports that the Epicureans proposed pleasure to be the *telos* for human beings.⁵⁸⁰ Aristotle advanced virtue as the aim for human happiness, but concluded that, even most people who attain virtue are not happy.⁵⁸¹ The Stoics, especially Cleanthes, thought living agreeably to nature—'the right exercise of reason'—is the *telos*.⁵⁸² Closer to the mark for Clement is Plato, who claimed the *telos* to be 'likeness to God as far as possible. And likeness is to become

⁵⁷⁸ *Paid.* I.8.63.1, φιλόανθρωπος ἄρα ὁ θεός, φιλόανθρωπος ἄρα ὁ λόγος; see also *Paid.* I.1.3.3.

⁵⁷⁹ *Paid.* I.8.63.1, πολὺ δὴ πλεον τῶν ἄλλων ἀγαπήσει τὸν ἄνθρωπον, εἰκότως, τὸ κάλλιστον τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δημιουργηθέντων καὶ φιλοθεὸν ζῶον.

⁵⁸⁰ *Str.* II.21.127.1-2.

⁵⁸¹ *Str.* II.21.128.3.

⁵⁸² *Str.* II.21.129.1-5.

just and holy with wisdom.’⁵⁸³ Clement suggests that Plato was ‘concurring with the precept of the Law’ in which Moses ‘calls assimilation a following, and such a following assimilates as far as possible’ to the likeness of God.⁵⁸⁴

After delineating the history of philosophical thought regarding the *telos*, Clement moves far beyond the philosophers, and exhorts his readers ‘to reach the endless *telos* [τέλος ἀτελεύτητον] by obeying the commandments—that is God—[and] by living according to them irreproachably and knowingly through the knowledge of the divine will. Assimilation to the true *Logos*, as far as possible, is the *telos*.’⁵⁸⁵ Clement qualifies this passage with his ‘trump’ card, Paul’s *telos*:

The Apostle, in his letter to the Romans, while concisely describing the *telos* [συντόμως τὸ τέλος διαγράμψων], says: ‘and now, having been freed from sin and having become servants to God, you possess the fruit unto holiness; and the *telos* is eternal life [τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον].’⁵⁸⁶

Clement sets people on a quest to be released from corruption, experience the fruit of holiness, assimilate to the divine *Logos*, reach the unending end, and possess eternal life. Plainly, Clement retains the Platonic terminology of ‘likeness to God’ in order to convey his salvific aim, but he makes it clear that the primacy of the apostolic *telos* defines likeness to God. For example, farther on in the passage, Clement joins Paul (1Corinthians 11:1) and Plato (*Theaetetus* 176b) to Christianize the concept of assimilation to God:

Openly and explicitly, the Apostle, in the first epistle to the Corinthians, says: ‘Be imitators [μιμηταί μου γίνεσθαι] of me, just as I am also of Christ,’ in order that this might happen: If you are of me, and I am of Christ, then you have become imitators of Christ, and Christ of God. Assimilation to God, therefore, as far as possible is to become ‘just and holy with wisdom.’ [This] [Paul] sets down as the

⁵⁸³ *Str.* II.22.131.2-133.3.

⁵⁸⁴ *Str.* II.19.100.3-4, ἡ δὲ τοιαύτη ἀκολουθία κατὰ δύναμιν ἐξομοιοῖ.

⁵⁸⁵ *Str.* II.22.134.1-2, ἡμῖν δὲ αὐτοῖς εἰς τέλος ἀτελεύτητον ἀφικέσθαι πρόκειται πειθομένοις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς, τουτέστιν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ κατ’ αὐτὰς βιώσασιν ἀνεπιλήπτως καὶ ἐπιστημόνως διὰ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ θελήματος γνώσεως· ἢ τε πρὸς τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον ὡς οἶόν τε ἐξομοίωσις τέλος ἐστί.

⁵⁸⁶ Rom. 6:22; *Str.* II.22.134.3; in *Str.* IV.3.11.3, he again uses Rom. 6:22 for the *telos*.

aim of faith [σκόπον, τῆς πίστεως ὑποτίθεται], and the end [τέλος] [he presents] as the restoration of this promise by faith.⁵⁸⁷

Here, Clement maintains Platonic language, but uses it to explain the Pauline goal. In this light, one can easily subscribe to Völker's observation: 'As you can see, our author [Clement] is profoundly different from the philosophy of his time.'⁵⁸⁸

Secondly, to attain likeness to God, Clement takes the spiritual path of the Incarnation of the *Logos* and ensuing Christ-event. In his coming, the *Logos* assumed the roles of Saviour and Teacher. Since humankind was fraught with psychological impediments due to the misuse of freedom and the deception of pleasure, Clement argues that people become deaf to divine instructions and blind to the vision of God.⁵⁸⁹ Consequently, people need a Saviour-Healer and a Teacher-Guide. In response to the dysfunctional human condition, 'the Saviour was sent as a Teacher for the acquisition of the good.'⁵⁹⁰ The Incarnation, therefore, has a two-fold mission:

The *Logos* himself is a manifest mystery [μυστήριον ἐμφανές]: God is within a man and the man is God [θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος θεός]. In this way, the mediator achieves the will of the Father, for the mediator is the *Logos*, who is common for both. On the one hand, [the *Logos*] is the Son of God, but on the other hand, [the *Logos*] is the Saviour of humanity, and he is [God's] servant, but our instructor.⁵⁹¹

Having witnessed the corruption and brokenness in human beings, Clement assures the Greek believers that the Saviour is the 'cleansing one, the saving one, the gentle one, the divine *Logos*.'⁵⁹² 'He was destined to stand beside [us], as our Saviour' and Teacher.⁵⁹³

⁵⁸⁷ *Str.* II.22.136.5-6; 1Cor. 11:1; *Theaet.* 176b.

⁵⁸⁸ Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus*, 93. «Wie man sieht, unterscheidet sich unser Autor [Clement] hier tiefgehend von der Philosophie seiner Zeit.»

⁵⁸⁹ *Prot.* X.104.4.

⁵⁹⁰ *Str.* V.1.7.8, καταπέμπεται ὁ σωτὴρ, τῆς ἀγαθοῦ κτήσεως διδάσκαλός τε καὶ χορηγός.

⁵⁹¹ *Paid.* III.1.2.1.

⁵⁹² *Prot.* X.110.1.

⁵⁹³ *Prot.* X.110.3.

Clement portrays the Saviour's role by depicting him as a divine Champion, who entered the amphitheatre of human tragedy in order to conquer death. He accomplished a decisive victory through his obedience in life—subjecting the passions to the will of God—and by his obedience in death on the cross by conquering the power of death, *viz.*, the devil. Consequently, he was crowned the Champion. Following the Apostle Paul, Clement declares the cross to be the ‘wisdom and power’ of God because by it, the Saviour forgives sins and provides the sure means of attaining *apatheia*; and through it, people receive the gift of eternal life. In this way, the Incarnation was the ‘greatest appearance of the Saviour [τὴν μεγίστην τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐπιφάνειαν],’ because of the magnitude of the work accomplished for humankind.⁵⁹⁴ In Clement’s mind, as expressed through his writings, ‘the greatest and most royal work of God is to save humanity.’⁵⁹⁵

The Saviour initiates salvation in at least three ways. Firstly, he awakens the spiritual senses of seeing and hearing, so that one may begin to hear divine instructions and see reality beyond the sensible region.⁵⁹⁶ Secondly, the Saviour applies rational medicine to human reason, aiding the *logikos* by grace to receive *gnosis*.⁵⁹⁷ Thirdly, he heals the traumatized soul by cutting out the root of evil. Clement exhorts believers to follow in the steps of the Saviour, because he is healing and his path leads to ‘sinlessness and perfection.’⁵⁹⁸ According to Clement, this work of salvation effectively frees a human being to assimilate the likeness of God by imbibing the knowledge of God.⁵⁹⁹

⁵⁹⁴ *Str.* V.6.37.4.

⁵⁹⁵ *Paid.* I.12.100.1, τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ μέγιστον καὶ βασιλικώτατον ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ σῶζειν τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.

⁵⁹⁶ *Prot.* I.6.1.

⁵⁹⁷ *Paid.* I.6.29.5.

⁵⁹⁸ *Q.d.s.* 21.7, οὕτως γὰρ ἀκολουθεῖν ὄντως τῷ σωτῆρι, ἀναμαρτησίαν καὶ τελειότητα τὴν ἐκείνου μετερχόμενον.

⁵⁹⁹ *Q.d.s.* 29.2-4.

The *Logos* also came as the Teacher, who guides believers to the knowledge of God: The ‘Son is the power of God, the most ancient *Logos* of the Father, and is called the Teacher of those who were formed by him.’⁶⁰⁰ The Incarnation is essential to Clement’s soteriology, because the *Logos* became a human being in order to teach humankind how to become god. Observing this prominence in Clement’s works, Oleh Kindiy remarks: ‘Clement deems the status of teacher as the highest stage of Christian initiation’ into divine knowledge.⁶⁰¹ Through faith, which has ‘drinkable properties,’ believers imbibe divine *gnosis*, by which they increase in godliness. In view of the work of the *Logos* as a Saviour and Teacher, Clement did not approach theological discourse as a theoretical or impersonal theology. Rather, his knowledge of God generates Christian praxis and shows God’s lovingkindness, compassion, and attentive care for wounded humanity.

E. Conclusion and Summary Table

This chapter places Clement in his preferred intellectual background: the apostolic tradition. It is important to locate Clement here because it helps us to read him a certain way that brings his knowledge of God forward as he engages in the challenges of Platonism and Gnosticism of his day. Although Clement emphasizes *gnosis* and the Gnostic, he follows a gnostic tradition that remains faithful to the ecclesiastical canon (a harmony of the two covenants), beginning with Moses, and in line with Christ, Paul, Barnabas, and Clement of Rome. Concerning his theological discourse, the following table summarizes concisely the similarities and differences between Platonism, Gnosticism, and Clement concerning the four subjects: theology, demiurge, anthropogony, and soteriology (teleology).

⁶⁰⁰ *Str.* VII.2.7.4, καὶ διδάσκαλος λεχθείη τῶν δι’ αὐτοῦ πλασθέντων. See also, *Str.* VI.7.58.1, οὗτος [ὁ θεός] ἐστὶν ὁ τῶν γενητῶν ἀπάντων διδάσκαλος.

⁶⁰¹ Kindiy, *Christos Didaskalos*, 42.

Subjects	Platonism	Gnosticism	Clement of Alexandria
Theology	The unknowable transcendent God, the Good, the One, but not the Creator of the sensible cosmos.	The unknowable transcendent God, the Creator of the Pleroma, but not the Creator of humans or the cosmos live in.	The unknowable, but knowable transcendent God and Creator of the heavens, this cosmos, and humankind. He is the God of the OT and is good.
Demiurge	A good, but lesser deity (or creative principle) that generated the sensible cosmos to represent the intellectual and eternal Forms.	An evil, ignorant, and created deity responsible for the creation of the cosmos, the evil in it, and the sufferings of humankind; he is identified with the God of the OT.	The divine <i>Logos</i> , who is the eternal Son and equal to the transcendent God, who is his Father. The divine <i>Logos</i> became incarnate in the person of Jesus.
Anthropogony	Humanity is made of the four elements: earth, fire, air, and water; the soul is immortal and comes from the cosmic soul. The body is created with evil energy and is a source of suffering.	Anthropos has a material and a psychic body, both created by the evil demiurge and his archons. The body is a prison in which the psychic body is imprisoned to ignorance, pain and suffering.	God created <i>anthropos</i> in his image to assimilate to his likeness. God breathed into anthropos reason and affection and made <i>anthropos</i> for the knowledge of God.
Teleology	Platonic <i>telos</i> is likeness to God by becoming just and holy with wisdom, which is attained by escaping the world (passions) through devotion to philosophy.	Gain knowledge of the Father and ultimately return to the pleroma.	Eternal life and likeness to God through the salvific and didactic missions of the <i>Logos</i> .
Soteriology	Platonism has no soteriology based on Christ.	Salvation is attained through reception of <i>gnosis</i> . A divine illuminator gives the Gnostic knowledge of self and of God, resulting in salvation, which is an awakening.	The <i>Logos</i> came as both Saviour and Teacher. As Saviour, he frees humanity from corruption; as Teacher, he guides humanity to the likeness of God through divine <i>gnosis</i> .

The attention now turns to Part II, which is about Clement's doctrine of the Incarnation and mission of the *Logos*-Son. The following two chapters depict which God or Demiurge became incarnate, what kind of *anthropos* the *Logos* became, and explains the salvific and didactic missions he accomplished through his work subsequent to the Incarnation.

PART II: INCARNATION AND MISSION

Chapter Three: Incarnation and Salvific Mission

A. Introduction

The Christian doctrine claiming the Creator of the universe descended into the cosmos and became a human being through an Incarnation was absurd to a Middle Platonist. As seen in chapter one, the Platonists of Clement's generation thought the human body was an evil prison of suffering (pain) and darkness (ignorance), a torturous dungeon from which to escape. Origen preserves many of the opinions of the Alexandrian Middle Platonist, Celsus, who was contemporary with Clement. Celsus, in his important work, *The True Logos* (composed ca. AD 177), contests Christian teachings, especially the Incarnation. According to Origen's record, Celsus contends:

God is good and beautiful and happy, and exists in the most beautiful state. If then He comes down to men, He must undergo a change, a change from good to bad, from beautiful to shameful, from happiness to misfortune, and from what is best to what is most wicked. Who would choose a change like this? It is the nature only of a mortal being to undergo change and remoulding, whereas it is the nature of an immortal being to remain the same without alteration. Accordingly, God could not be capable of undergoing this change.⁶⁰²

Reacting further against the doctrine of the Incarnation, Celsus is said to retort: 'If God came in contact with human flesh, he himself would be defiled.'⁶⁰³

In contrast, Clement's teaching on the Incarnation is the descent of the divine *Logos*—who is God in God, the Creator-demiurge, the First Cause, and equal to the transcendent God—became a real human being and suffered in the flesh for the salvation of humankind. Clement depicts his doctrine of the Incarnation with the exchange formula: 'The *Logos* of God became *anthropos* in order that one might learn from a man, how *anthropos* might become *theos*.'⁶⁰⁴ Irenaeus posits this exchange

⁶⁰² Henry Chadwick (trans.) *Origen: Contra Celsum*, (Cambridge: CUP, 1965), IV: 14, 192.

⁶⁰³ R. Joseph Hoffmann (trans.), *Celsus, On the True Doctrine: A Discourse against the Christians*, (Oxford: OUP, 1987), 104-105.

⁶⁰⁴ *Prot.* I.8.4.

similarly: ‘But following the only true and steadfast Teacher, the Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who did, through His transcendent love, become what we are, that He might bring us to be even what he is Himself.’⁶⁰⁵ This chapter treats the first step of the exchange: The *Logos*-Son became *anthropos* and *sarx*.

In the first stage of the exchange, the *Logos*-Son, ‘while assuming the role of *anthropos* and after being fashioned with flesh [σὰρκὶ ἀναπλασάμενος], shouldered the mission of the salvific drama for humankind.’⁶⁰⁶ This mission means that the *Logos*-Son descended into the human region and ‘put on humanity [ἄνθρωπον ἐνέδυ],’ because ‘he willingly suffered the experiences of men [τὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐκὼν ἔπαθεν].’⁶⁰⁷ Clement indicates that Christ experienced bad emotions and physical pain long before, directly prior to, and during his death. Being clothed with flesh, Jesus was susceptible to passions and griefs throughout his life on earth:

ὁ σωτὴρ αὐτὸς παραγίνεται καὶ πάσχει δι’ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ γενέσεως μέχρι τοῦ σημείου τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα διατρέχων.

‘The Saviour himself came and suffered for us from birth even to the cross, running straight through his human course.’⁶⁰⁸

Moreover, Clement points out that ‘God is incapable of weariness [ἀκητός], suffering [ἀπαθής], and want [ἀπροσδεής], but we who are flesh-bearing [σαρκοφοροῦντες] need rest.’⁶⁰⁹ Turning attention back to God, Clement emphasizes that during Jesus’s journey to the cross, and because he too was ‘flesh-bearing,’ Jesus grew weary; he nevertheless toiled and endured his sufferings because of his love for humankind. In view of this, consider what Clement says:

⁶⁰⁵ *A.H.* V.Preface; and *A.H.* III.20.2.

⁶⁰⁶ *Prot.* X.110.2, οὐθ’ ὅτε τὸ ἀνθρώπου προσωπεῖον ἀναλαβὼν καὶ σαρκὶ ἀναπλασάμενος τὸ σωτήριον δράμα τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος ὑπεκρίνετο ἀγνοηθεῖς.

⁶⁰⁷ *Q.d.s.* 37.3.

⁶⁰⁸ *Q.d.s.* 8.2.

⁶⁰⁹ *Str.* VI.16.137.4.

‘I came not,’ [Jesus] says, ‘to be ministered unto, but to minister.’⁶¹⁰ Wherefore he is introduced in the Gospel [as] ‘wearied,’ because while toiling for us, he promised ‘to give his life as a ransom [λύτρον] for many.’⁶¹¹ He is generous, therefore, who gives us the greatest of all gifts, his life [τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ]. He is exceedingly kind and human-loving, in that, when he might have been Lord, he wished to be the brother of humanity and he was so good that he even died for us [ὥστε ἡμῶν καὶ ὑπεραποθανεῖν].⁶¹²

Clement reports that the Scriptures ‘declare the flesh that suffered, which the Lord had assumed, is the “power and wisdom of God.”’⁶¹³ He deduces that in obedience to the prophecies, the *Logos*-Son ‘chose to suffer in order that by his suffering we might live [τῷ πάθει ζήσωμεν αὐτοῦ].’⁶¹⁴ Therefore, Christ was destined to suffer and his suffering flesh is efficacious for salvation. In response to Celsus’s demand whether people can be saved by God, Origen himself replies: ‘Who but the divine Logos can save and lead the soul of man to the supreme God?’⁶¹⁵

The first stage of the exchange formula was a life-giving mission accomplished by the sufferings of the *Logos*-Son. *Contra* the Middle Platonic and most Gnostic views of God, Clement’s God, the First Principle and demiurge of the universe, became a real human being who willingly subjected himself to personal sufferings and even a bloodstained death for the salvation of his creatures. Clement argues that an accurate belief about the Son of God that emphasizes the Incarnation—which in his thinking was lacking among the heretics—is necessary to Christian faith. Addressing some anonymous false Gnostics, he argues that ‘in order to believe truly in the Son, we must believe that he is the Son, and that he came, and how, and why, and [believe the things]

⁶¹⁰ Matt. 20:28; Mk. 10:45.

⁶¹¹ Matt. 20:28; Jn. 4:6.

⁶¹² *Paid.* I.9.85.1-2.

⁶¹³ 1Cor. 1:24; *Str.* VI.15.127.2, ὁ πέπονθεν ἡ σὰρξ, ἣν ἀνείληφεν ὁ κύριος, «δύναμις θεοῦ καὶ σοφία» καταγγέλλουσιν.

⁶¹⁴ *Str.* IV.7.43.2, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ζῶν ὢν δι’ οὓς ἔπαθεν παθεῖν ἠθέλησεν, ἵνα τῷ πάθει ζήσωμεν αὐτοῦ.

⁶¹⁵ Chadwick (trans.) *Origen: Contra Celsum*, VI:68, 382.

concerning his suffering [περὶ τοῦ πάθους].⁶¹⁶ Clement argues that the Son came to humanity through the Incarnation.

If we fail to notice Clement's testimony on the salvation of humankind through the Incarnation and the sufferings of the *Logos*-Son, we may draw the conclusion that Bigg tendered: 'If we ask, why the Birth, why the Passion, the Cross? Why Jesus redeemed us in this way, and no other? Clement has no answer.'⁶¹⁷ Likewise, one might settle with Athanasius Wintersig, who deduces that a 'positive understanding of the redemptive meaning of the Incarnation in Jesus is completely lacking in Clement.'⁶¹⁸ Moreover, without discerning the difference between Clement and the Gnostics, we could conclude with Lilla: 'The idea of Christ as a redeemer of the whole of mankind by means of a sacrifice is replaced, in Clement's philosophical system, by the esoteric idea of *gnosis*.'⁶¹⁹ Although *gnosis* plays an indispensable role in Clement's ascending path to deification, the reception of *gnosis* is predicated upon and conjoined with the work of Christ as Saviour: Christ heals the soul from corruption and ignorance, preparing it to receive disclosures of *gnosis*.⁶²⁰

Addressing the above assertions about Clement's soteriology, Mark Edwards delivers the following assessment:

[Clement is] sometimes thought to have been, if not a Platonist, an adherent of that sect which he himself on one occasion styles 'eclectic', and whose teaching was an amalgam of serviceable doctrines from the leading pagan schools. And since, it is alleged, he failed to discover in these sources any plausible cognates of the Incarnation, the Passion, the Atonement, the resurrection of the body or the second coming, the president of the Catechetical School pays only superficial homage to these fundamental tenets of the Church.⁶²¹

⁶¹⁶ *Str.* V.1.1.2.

⁶¹⁷ Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, 103.

⁶¹⁸ Wintersig, *Die Heilsbedeutung der Menschheit Jesu in der vorincarnischen griechischen Theologie*, (München: Bremer Press, 1932), 72.

⁶¹⁹ Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 59.

⁶²⁰ *Paid.* I.1.3.1-3; *Str.* I.1.15.2; *Q.d.s.* 29.2-4.

⁶²¹ Edwards, *Origen Against Plato*, 19.

In the sentence that follows, Edwards makes the counter-claim, ‘Few of these charges will survive inspection.’⁶²²

Hence, with a closer view of the evidence, this chapter offers a discussion on the Incarnation and salvific mission of the *Logos*-Son. It locates passages that highlight Clement’s attribution of the *Logos* and the Son as Saviour, and denotes salvation as the foreground in Clement’s works. This chapter also identifies Clement’s interpretation of the malevolent powers that deceive human beings and tempt them toward sub-human existence. Importantly, it classifies Clement’s use of John 1:14 and the term γίνομαι with λόγος, ἄνθρωπος, and σάρξ to depict the Incarnation. Consequently, it examines the allegation of Docetism by observing the three passages in question: Cassiodorus’s *Adumbrationes* (1John 1:1-2), *Stromateis* III.7.59.3, and *Stromateis* VI.9.71.1-2. Subsequently, it provides an exegesis of a key passage in *Stromateis* VII.2, where Clement depicts explicitly the kind of flesh the *Logos*-Son assumed. Finally, this chapter explains Clement’s doctrine of the cross as the power of God that vanquished death and eradicates the passions, and the chapter closes with a section on Clement’s explanation of the blood of Christ.

B. *Logos*-Son as Saviour

It will be helpful now to explain the appellation: the *Logos*-Son. According to Henny Hägg, ‘[t]he favourite term for the Son of God in Clement’s writings is *Logos*.’⁶²³ Suitably, the divine *Logos* and the eternal Son of God are designated in this present work as the *Logos*-Son, because this combination of relations—the *Logos* of God as the Son of God—is an essential theme in Clement’s *Logos* theology.⁶²⁴ Clement tells us that the Lord is ‘the divine *Logos*, the truly most manifest God, the one

⁶²² Ibid., 19.

⁶²³ Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, 181.

⁶²⁴ For examples of υἱός and λόγος used in combination, see *Prot.* X.98.4; X.110.2; *Paid.* I.8.71.3; I.11.97.2; *Str.* IV.25.162.5; *Str.* V.6.34.2; *Str.* VII.2.7.4; *Frag.* 23.14, ὁ υἱὸς λόγος.

who is equal to the Master of the universe, because he is his Son and “the *Logos* was in God.”⁶²⁵ This text and its last clause show that Clement’s theology blends λόγος and υἱός with θεός, and derives from John’s Gospel.⁶²⁶ In addition, we read that the ‘Son is the power of God, even before the generation of all things; he is the most ancient *Logos* of the Father.’⁶²⁷ Another text shows that ‘this is the Son; this is Christ; this is the *Logos* of God.’⁶²⁸ Since Clement portrays the *Logos* and the Son as one divine being equal with the Father, the divine *Logos* and eternal Son of God are designated here as the *Logos-Son*.⁶²⁹

Clement speaks of the *Logos* and the Son as Saviour.⁶³⁰ Firstly, ‘the *Logos* is called Saviour [σωτήρ ὁ λόγος κέκηται]’ because ‘he has procured for humankind the rational medicines [τὰ λογικὰ φάρμακα] unto quick sensibility and salvation.’⁶³¹ Secondly, ‘the one who saves is the Saviour, that is, the Son of God [σωτήρ δὲ ὁ σώζων υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ].’⁶³² The Son of God is the ‘great God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ.’⁶³³ The *Logos-Son* teaches people the ‘eternal salvation of the eternal Saviour.’⁶³⁴ Clement leads the wealthy in Alexandria to ‘seize before all things the Saviour, Advocate, and Comforter of the soul, the Ruler of the boundless life.’⁶³⁵ He celebrates the ‘greatness of the Saviour [τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ σωτήρος].’⁶³⁶ The reason

⁶²⁵ *Prot.* X.110.1-2, ὁ θεῖος λόγος, ὁ φανερώτατος ὄντως θεός, ὁ τῷ δεσπότη τῶν ὅλων ἐξισωθεὶς, ὅτι ἦν υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ «ὁ λόγος ἦν ἐν τῷ θεῷ.»

⁶²⁶ *Jn.* 1:1-51; 3:16. Clement also portrays the *Logos-Son* as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, see *Paid.* II.2.32.4; *Str.* I.3.23.2; *Str.* III.6.49.5; III.6.52.4; *Str.* IV.6.35.3; IV.9.70.2.

⁶²⁷ *Str.* VII.2.7.4.

⁶²⁸ *Prot.* XII.120.4, τοῦτο υἱός, τοῦτο Χριστός, τοῦτο ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.

⁶²⁹ To reduce repetition, the *Logos-Son* will be referred to, where appropriate, as Jesus and as Christ, particularly in reference to his time in earth.

⁶³⁰ For a comprehensive list of all the case functions of σωτήρ including prepositional phrases in Clement’s writings, see Brontesi, *La Soteria in Clemente Alessandrino*, 56-139.

⁶³¹ *Paid.* I.12.100.1.

⁶³² *Ecl.Proph.* 4.2.

⁶³³ *Tit.* 2:13; *Prot.* I.7.3, τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

⁶³⁴ *Paid.* I.6.27.3, τὸ δὲ μάθημα αἰδίου σωτηρία αἰδίου σωτήρος.

⁶³⁵ *Q.d.s.* 25.7, ἐλοῦ τὸν σωτήρα πρὸ πάντων.

⁶³⁶ *Q.d.s.* 8.1.

for his jubilation is that ‘the Saviour destroyed death.’⁶³⁷ Thus, Clement exults in the ‘power of the Saviour and the manifestation of salvation.’⁶³⁸

In each of his major extant writings, Clement draws attention to God’s will to save humanity. For examples, he writes in the *Protreptikos*: ‘Nothing but this is the only work for [God], to save people.’⁶³⁹ Again, in the same work: ‘It is always set before God to save the flock of humanity. For this [purpose] the good God sent the good Shepherd.’⁶⁴⁰ In the *Paidagogos*, we read that ‘the greatest and most royal work of God [is] to save humanity.’⁶⁴¹ Clement continues this emphasis in the *Stromateis*: ‘I think the Saviour exerts energy, since it is his work to save.’⁶⁴² Again, in the *Stromateis*: ‘God takes pleasure in our salvation alone.’⁶⁴³ Clement concludes his overall argument in *Quis Dives Salvetur* encouraging the Alexandrian believers to press towards salvation, knowing that God would provide lavishly for the one asking with determination:

For the one who looks attentively at this salvation, both desiring and asking [for it] with shamelessness and force of mind, the good Father who is in the heavens will provide the true cleansing and the unchangeable life [παρέξει τὴν ἀληθινὴν κάθαρσιν καὶ τὴν ἄτρεπτον ζωὴν].⁶⁴⁴

Observing the evidence in Clement’s works, John Patrick admits that ‘no name is more frequently given to Jesus than that of the Saviour; no word is employed so frequently to denote the goal and work of Christ as salvation.’⁶⁴⁵ The very notion that the *Logos*-Son is a Saviour begs the question: What does Clement think is the problem with humanity?

⁶³⁷ *Exc.Thdot.* 3.61.7, ὁ σωτὴρ ἀπώλεσε μὲν τὸν θάνατον.

⁶³⁸ *Q.d.s.* 2.4, λέγω τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ σωτῆρος καὶ τῆς ἐπιφανοῦς σωτηρίας.

⁶³⁹ *Prot.* IX.86.3, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλ’ ἢ τοῦτο ἔργον μόνον ἐστὶν αὐτῷ σώζεσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

⁶⁴⁰ *Prot.* XI.116.1, πρόκειται δὲ αἰεὶ τῷ θεῷ τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἀγέλην σώζειν. ταύτη καὶ τὸν ἀγαθὸν ποιμένα ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἀπέστειλεν θεός.

⁶⁴¹ *Paid.* I.12.100.1, τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ μέγιστον καὶ βασιλικώτατον ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ σώζειν τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.

⁶⁴² *Str.* VI.6.46.1, ἐνεργεῖ δὲ, οἶμαι, καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ, ἐπεὶ τὸ σώζειν ἔργον αὐτοῦ.

⁶⁴³ *Str.* VII.3.14.6, μόνη γὰρ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ σωτηρίᾳ ὁ θεὸς ἥδεται.

⁶⁴⁴ *Q.d.s.* 42.19.

⁶⁴⁵ Patrick, *Clement of Alexandria*, 121.

C. Problem: Corruption in Human Existence

The knowledge of salvation requires an assessment of the human condition. We must ask why Clement thinks people need a Saviour figure and from what are they to be saved? According to Clement, humankind has been corrupted by disobedience through the misuse of freedom; choices contrary to divine truth breed corruption and disorder in the human constitution. Others have claimed that humanity was created with innate corruption. Basilides thinks the base passions, such as anger, envy, and lust are ‘appendages’ and says, ‘these are in essence certain spirits attached to the rational soul through a certain primal disorder and confusion.’⁶⁴⁶ Isadore, the son of Basilides, wrote a book entitled: *About the Soul Attached to Us*. Clement preserves a fragment of it, in which Isadore wrote: “‘We must become more excellent by the use of reason to show mastery over the inferior creation in us [τῆς ἐλάττονος ἐν ἡμῖν κτίσεως φανῆναι κρατούντας].” Like Basilides, [Isadore] too lays down the hypothesis of two souls in us.’⁶⁴⁷ Because of their opinion of the inferior creation (the second soul), Basilides and Isadore infer that people are born with inherent evil.

Rejecting this theory, Clement argues that people become corrupt through thoughts and deeds conflicting with the knowledge of God. Similar to Adam in Paradise, humans are born innocent and free, but become defiled through irrational choices that release demonic passions. On this point, Clement follows Barnabas:

How we say that the activities of the devil [τοῦ διαβόλου τὰς ἐνεργείας] and the unclean spirits sow into the soul of the sinner needs no more words from me; [I] place as a witness the apostolic Barnabas, who was one of the seventy and Paul’s co-worker. He makes the point, according to a saying: ‘Before we believed in God, the dwelling place of our heart was corrupt and weak [φθαρτὸν καὶ ἀσθενές], truly a temple built by hands, because it was full of idolatry and was a house of demons through doing whatever things were contrary to God [ἦν οἶκος δαιμόνων διὰ τὸ ποιεῖν ὅσα ἦν ἐναντία τῷ θεῷ].’⁶⁴⁸

⁶⁴⁶ *Str.* II.20.112.1.

⁶⁴⁷ *Str.* II.20.114.1-2.

⁶⁴⁸ EB 16.7; *Str.* II.20.116.3-4.

The person (temple) becomes a house of demons through human construction (a temple built by hands = irrational choices and actions contrary to God). Sinful energy is a type of demon and forgiveness of sins is an exorcism.⁶⁴⁹ Regarding the actuality of sin (the energy of the devil), the question is how does Clement view the origin of sin and its activity in God's creatures?

1. Adam and Eve

Clement sees the beginning of corruption in the Genesis account of Adam and Eve, which he interprets literally.⁶⁵⁰ In the beginning, Adam possessed remarkable nobility, because 'no mortal was his father.'⁶⁵¹ God fashioned Adam and then generated him by the breath of the Almighty, and for a season, he enjoyed a royal existence. Clement comments that, through the same divine influence by which the prophets spoke—'the power and inspiration of God'—Adam foretold the names of all the animals and of Eve.⁶⁵² Along with Irenaeus, Clement represents Adam and Eve as youthful (νέοι) in Paradise.⁶⁵³ In Paradise, Adam played freely [ἐν παραδείσῳ ἔπαιζε λελύμενος].⁶⁵⁴ Because of his simplicity (ἀπλότητα), he was free from passions and their pleasures.⁶⁵⁵ John Behr notes that while in Paradise, 'Adam enjoyed an immortal life.'⁶⁵⁶ However, the nobility of Adam's origin was not enough to secure his destiny, because God created Adam with freedom.⁶⁵⁷ By the misuse of freedom, he 'readily seized the shameful things [τὰ μὲν αἰσχρὰ οὗτος προθυμῶς εἴλετο].' Knowingly, Adam followed Eve and willingly 'forfeited the true and beautiful things God gave to

⁶⁴⁹ *Str.* II.20.17.3.

⁶⁵⁰ For a view of Clement's departure from Philo, who interprets Adam (mind) and Eve (sensible flesh) allegorically, see Ashwin-Siejkowski, 'Clement of Alexandria on the Creation of Eve: Exegesis in the Service of a Pedagogical Project,' *Studia Patristica* LXVI (2013): 53-59.

⁶⁵¹ *Str.* II.19.98.3, πατήρ δὲ αὐτοῦ θνητὸς οὐδεὶς.

⁶⁵² *Str.* I.21.135.3, δυνάμει θεοῦ καὶ ἐπιπνοίᾳ.

⁶⁵³ *Prot.* XI.111.1; *Str.* III.17.103.1; *A.H.* III.22.4; IV.38.1.

⁶⁵⁴ *Prot.* XI.111.1.

⁶⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵⁶ *Str.* II.19.98.4; Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement*, 135.

⁶⁵⁷ For Clement's view of freedom of human will (αὐτεξούσιον), see Karavites, *Evil, Freedom, and the Road to Perfection in Clement of Alexandria*, 109-138.

him.’ Consequently, ‘he relinquished [ἀνθυπηλλάξατο] the life of immortality for those things that are mortal.’⁶⁵⁸

God formed Eve from the side of Adam and made her physically receptive to be his partner in all domestic affairs.⁶⁵⁹ She was fashioned to be the ‘mother of all who live.’⁶⁶⁰ However, she is the one through whom ‘error came into the world.’⁶⁶¹ Beginning with Eve, the serpent cunningly assaults God’s creatures.⁶⁶² Clement explains that the serpent, ‘the deceiver [ὁ ἀπατεών]’ that is, the ‘wicked and reptilian beast [τὸ πονηρὸς καὶ ἐρπηστικὸν θηρίον]’ that ‘from the beginning carried Eve down into death [ἀνωθεν τὴν Εὐάν εἰς θάνατον ὑποφέρω] continues to enslave all of humanity, binding their souls like corpses to death.’⁶⁶³ Thus, ‘this wicked tyrant and dragon [ὁ πονηρὸς οὐτοσὶ τύραννος καὶ δράκων] buries human beings alive, until they suffer corruption.’⁶⁶⁴ Their ‘living-death’ is portrayed as being ‘riveted to stocks, stones, statues and various idols, bound with the miserable chain of demon worship.’⁶⁶⁵ Clement’s interpretation is that the serpent maliciously misled Eve’s thoughts in order to enslave her—and the rest of humanity—to endless regret and emotional tyranny.⁶⁶⁶

How does Clement interpret the results of the first couple’s plight in Paradise? In his reading of the fall, Clement follows Paul: ‘Death by sin passed through [διῆλθεν] into all humanity [δι’ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους διῆλθεν].’⁶⁶⁷ Concerning this event, Justin claims ‘Eve, who was a virgin and undefiled, having conceived the word of the serpent, brought forth disobedience and

⁶⁵⁸ *Str.* II.19.98.3-99.1; ἀνθυπηλλάξατο means to substitute, to choose one thing over another.

⁶⁵⁹ *Paid.* III.3.19.1.

⁶⁶⁰ *Str.* III.16.100.7.

⁶⁶¹ *Prot.* II.12.2.

⁶⁶² *Prot.* I.7.6; *Str.* III.11.74.3; III.12.80.2; III.14.94.1.

⁶⁶³ *Prot.* I.7.4-6.

⁶⁶⁴ *Prot.* I.7.5.

⁶⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶⁶ For a compilation of patristic texts on Eve, especially her confession of disobedience, see Johanna Manley, *The Lament of Eve*, (Menlo Park, CA: Monastery Books, 1993).

⁶⁶⁷ *Str.* III.9.64.2; Rom. 5:12.

death.’⁶⁶⁸ By Adam and Eve’s disobedience, the power of death gained ingress and opened up the ‘passible’ region in human existence. Disobedience permits the power of death to unleash the passions that fasten people to existential corruption. The result is that Adam was ‘found fettered to sins’ and ‘bound fast to ruin.’⁶⁶⁹ In this way, Behr can say: ‘Alongside death, the fall effected the disordering of man’s existential constitution.’⁶⁷⁰ In Clement’s view, therefore, one is not born a sinner, but conceived with the energetic principle that tempts one to sin. People become enslaved to evil and irrational pleasures—like the first couple—because they open the door to the energetic principle of death through choices against the precepts of God.⁶⁷¹

2. Malevolent Powers

Apart from the cessation of the body, Clement identifies death (θάνατος) in two ways. Firstly, like the Gnostics, death is figurative. It is likened to the soul that is asleep: ‘The oppression of sleep is like death, which forces us into insensibility, cutting off the light by closing the eyelids.’⁶⁷² Both sleep and death are states of spiritual dysfunction: ‘There is no use for a sleeping man as there is for a dead man,’ because both are oblivious to divine and human realities.⁶⁷³ Secondly, Clement views death as an existential evil activity possessing no existence of its own; it is non-existing existence. Death’s energetic existence depends on the human soul; it needs a soul to exist in and wreak intellectual and emotional ruin. Drawing a parallel point, but concerning sin, Pavel Florensky argues that ‘sinfulness, even though it is, is something

⁶⁶⁸ See *Dial.* 100.5 (*ANFI*: 249). παρθένος γὰρ οὔσα Εὐὰ καὶ ἄφθορος, τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄψεως συλλαβοῦσα, παρακοὴν καὶ θάνατον ἔτεκε.

⁶⁶⁹ *Prot.* XI.111.2-3.

⁶⁷⁰ Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement*, 146.

⁶⁷¹ For the arguments that claim Eve acted as temptress to Adam, see Jean M. Higgins, ‘The Myth of Eve: The Temptress,’ *JAAR* 44:4, (1976): 639-647; Nicole Zeegers-Vander Vorst, ‘Satan, Ève et le serpent chez Theophile d’Antioche,’ *VChr* 35:2 (June 1981): 152-169.

⁶⁷² *Paid.* II.9.80.3.

⁶⁷³ *Paid.* II.9.79.1, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀνδρὸς ὄφελος καθεύδοντος ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τεθνεῶτος.

that does not have being.⁶⁷⁴ Sin and death find being through human consent. Peter Karavites comments on Clement's ontology of sin and evil, stating:

Judging from Clement's description of it, hamartia is not a thing; it has no hypostasis. Everything sensible and intelligible is good but owing to its having been created it runs the risk of becoming nothing. It can be changed, altered, corrupted. This change, in its turn corruptive, is hamartia, evil. Evil has no hypostasis because it is not an object nor a being, the μὴ ὄν, but it can corrupt the essence of good.⁶⁷⁵

The existence of evil power is realized, from Clement's point of view, when it is permitted—through disobedience—to mingle with human thought and experience: 'Sin lies in activity, not existence.'⁶⁷⁶ People become psychologically weakened because 'wickedness feeds upon the ruin of human beings.'⁶⁷⁷ When maleficent powers graze upon human souls, people become a 'house of demons' (plagued with passions).⁶⁷⁸

Clement likens the power of death to a tyrant, the serpent, the dragon, satan, and the devil.⁶⁷⁹ These five titles point out the different activities of death itself. Prior to Clement, Justin uses three of these titles to describe one person:

When Herod succeeded Archelaus, having received the authority which had been allotted to him, Pilate sent to him, by way of compliment Jesus bound; and God, foreknowing that this would happen, had thus spoken: 'And they brought him to an Assyrian, a present to the king.' Or, he meant the devil by the lion roaring against him: whom Moses calls the serpent, but in Job and Zachariah he is called the devil, and by Jesus is addressed as Satan, showing that a compounded name was acquired by him from the deeds which he performed.⁶⁸⁰

Justin explains that there are multiple names to illustrate the different activities of one thing, death. In addition, Justin likens Herod to the devil, the serpent, and satan,

⁶⁷⁴ Pavel Florensky, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth: An Essay in Orthodox Theodicy in Twelve Letters*, trans. Boris Jakim, (Princeton NJ: PUP, 1977), 125.

⁶⁷⁵ Karavites, *Evil, Freedom, and the Road to Perfection in Clement of Alexandria*, 34.

⁶⁷⁶ *Str.* IV.13.93.3, τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν ἐν ἐνεργείᾳ κεῖται, οὐκ οὐσία.

⁶⁷⁷ *Prot.* I.6.2, κακία μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβόσκειται φθοράν.

⁶⁷⁸ For demonology, Clement drew from EB. See *Str.* II.20.16.3-17.4 and compare EB 16.6-9. Calvin later remarked that humankind has become 'a perpetual factory of idols.' See John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. J.T. McNeill, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), 1.9.8.

⁶⁷⁹ Clement uses the term ἀντίδικος (adversary) once, *Str.* IV.14.95.2. The term 'satan' is not capitalized to be consistent with the other names describing death.

⁶⁸⁰ *Dial.* 103.4-5 (*ANFI*: 251); Hos. 10:6. See also, Zeegers-Vander Vorst, 'Satan, Ève et le serpent chez Theophile d'Antioche,' 159. Here, she mentions the Johannine literature and a Jewish list of 123 names for demons.

suggesting that a human being can take on the likeness of the malevolent powers. Clement builds on this idea and explains that human beings can assimilate to the devil's likeness. Against the Gnostics and Platonists, who think the body is evil, Clement says:

The adversary is not the body, as some wish it to be, but it is the devil—and those who are being assimilated to him [οἱ τούτῳ ἕξομοιούμενοι]—who travels along with us through people [ὁ συνοδεύων ἡμῖν δι' ἀνθρώπων], who zealously strive after his deeds in this earthly life.⁶⁸¹

There is distinction between the devil and a human being. Neither the person nor the body is the adversary; the adversary is the evil energy (the devil) operating through people who have assimilated to its likeness. How does this happen? This is a difficult question to answer; so to this end, it will be helpful to examine Clement's usage of the names of the evil powers and their corresponding activities, because they pinpoint the energies behind human corruption and point to the nature of salvation required.

2.1. Death as Tyrant

In a passage describing the Incarnation as a mystery and a mission, which we will encounter again, Clement sets the term 'death' (τὸν θάνατον) in apposition to 'the tyrant' (τὸν τύραννον). He reports that The *Logos*-Son, 'having been bound to flesh [καὶ σαρκὶ ἐνδεθείς], this is a divine mystery [μυστήριον θεῖον τοῦτο], he trounced the serpent [τὸν ὄφιν ἐχειρώσατο καὶ] and he enslaved the tyrant, that is, death [καὶ τὸν τύραννον ἐδουλώσατο, τὸν θάνατον].'⁶⁸² Clement calls death a tyrant and equates the serpent with the tyrant. Thus, he thinks the energy of death functions like serpentine tyranny.

A tyrant's administration is to govern people by the laws of war and chaos, not peace. Clement recounts the warning that Samuel gave to the Israelites, who had

⁶⁸¹ *Str.* IV.14.95.2, ἀντίδικος δὲ οὐ τὸ σῶμα, ὡς τινες βούλεται, ἀλλ' ὁ διάβολος (καὶ οἱ τούτῳ ἕξομοιούμενοι), ὁ συνοδεύων ἡμῖν δι' ἀνθρώπων τῶν ζηλούντων τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐπιγείῳ τῷδε βίῳ.

⁶⁸² *Prot.* XI.111.2.

pleaded for a human king rather than the administration of God.⁶⁸³ Samuel stated that God would give them not a loving lord, but a self-willed and remorseless tyrant, who would draft their children into his services and govern people by the laws of war, not safety.

Clement tells brief tales of certain disciples of philosophers, who at the demands of tyrants to divulge knowledge, kept the teachings concealed. For example, Zeno of Elea, when being tortured to the point of death, bit off his tongue and spit it at the tyrant.⁶⁸⁴ When a tyrant ordered Anaxarchus be pounded with iron clubs, Anaxarchus retorted: ‘Pound away at the sack which holds Anaxarchus, for it is not Anaxarchus you are pounding.’⁶⁸⁵ The disciples of philosophers, as well as Christians such as Ignatius of Antioch, were tortured and thrown to wild beasts, the diabolical works of a tyrant.⁶⁸⁶

Like a tyrant, death seeks to dominate the soul with cognitive chaos and emotional tyranny. In his intermediate teachings on spiritual formation, Clement depicts wantonness (ὕβρις) as a tyrant, oppressing people with other desires under the command of lust. When wantonness morphs into sexual lust (ἀφροδίτη), then ‘lust plays the tyrant [τυραννεύει ἐπιθυμία],’ commanding a militia of maladies such as ‘love of wine [φιλοινία], the desire for women [φιλογυνία], dissipation of existence [ἀσωτία], and a propensity for pleasure [φιληδονία]’ to trouble the soul. Consequently, ‘countless related passions increase [μυρία δὲ τούτοις αὐξεται ἀδελφὰ παθήματα] molding a dissolute character.’⁶⁸⁷ Clement’s point is that as political tyrants condemned people to be tortured by beasts, so too, lustful energies tyrannize people. As mentioned above, the names Clement applies to the energy of death are the serpent, the dragon, satan and the devil.

⁶⁸³ 1Sam. 8:13; *Paid.* III.4.27.1, νόμῳ πολέμου κρατήσας.

⁶⁸⁴ *Str.* IV.8.56.1.

⁶⁸⁵ *Str.* IV.8.56.4 (Wilson’s translation, *ANF2*: 419).

⁶⁸⁶ *Str.* IV.8.56.4-58.2 and *Str.* IV.8.67.2.

⁶⁸⁷ *Paid.* II.10.93.2-3.

2.2. Serpent and Dragon

Lampe identifies three uses in Patristic literature for the serpent (ὄφις).⁶⁸⁸ Firstly, the serpent is an instrument of the devil in the dialogical narrative between Eve and the serpent.⁶⁸⁹ Secondly, in the same narrative, the serpent is the devil, not an agent.⁶⁹⁰ Thirdly, the likeness of a serpent is applied allegorically to the evil principle concealed within the human soul.⁶⁹¹ The third construal is Clement's primary reading of ὄφις.

This malevolent principle is the source of intellectual deception. According to Clement, the serpent is 'the one who deceives' (ὁ ἀπατεῶν), who tricks people.⁶⁹² It sets cunning traps to mislead human reason, leading to disobedience and then corruption.⁶⁹³ The serpent's intention is to ruin intellectual acuity to prevent the reception of divine *gnosis*.⁶⁹⁴ To this end, the serpent deceived Eve.⁶⁹⁵

The serpent uses two methods to mislead people. The first is through false doctrine. Matthew's Gospel portrays certain groups of teachers as serpents, and Clement cites John the Baptist, who called the Pharisees 'serpents, a brood of vipers.'⁶⁹⁶ Clement also draws from 2Corinthians 11:3 to show that Paul was concerned about the spiritual condition of the Corinthian believers. False teachers had propagated deficient knowledge, tempting Christians in Corinth to deny true *gnosis*. Clement explains Paul's concern accordingly: 'Just as the serpent deceived Eve [ὁ ὄφις ἐξηπάτησεν Εὐάν], so your thoughts might be wounded by the evil event [ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ φθαρῆ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν].'⁶⁹⁷ The evil event (τῇ πανουργίᾳ) is forfeiting truth for deficient

⁶⁸⁸ See 'ὄφις,' LMP, 989.

⁶⁸⁹ Gen. 3:1-6; EB 12.5.

⁶⁹⁰ *Exc.Thdot.* 3.53.1.

⁶⁹¹ *Paid.* III.2.5.2-4.

⁶⁹² *Prot.* I.7.6; in *Str.* IV.3.12.4.

⁶⁹³ Clement knew about Hellenistic and Egyptian veneration of serpents in mystery cults. In the *Protreptikos*, he denounces the veneration of serpents: *Prot.* I.1.2; II.34.1; X.104.1.

⁶⁹⁴ *Str.* III.11.74.3; III.14.94.1.

⁶⁹⁵ *Paid.* II.12.123.3; *Str.* III.11.74.3; III.12.80.2; III.14.94.1.

⁶⁹⁶ Matt. 3:7; *Paid.* I.9.80.1.

⁶⁹⁷ 2Cor. 11:3; *Str.* III.11.74.3; III.14.94.1.

knowledge, thus setting up a fall. Like Paul, Clement applies the serpent's operation to the heretical Christian sects that spread false *gnosis*.⁶⁹⁸

The second mode of deception happens through the serpent projecting false images of what it means to be human, especially images conjoined with deceitful pleasures. Clement allegorically renders pleasure as the serpent, and suggests that Adam had 'fallen down by pleasure.'⁶⁹⁹ Clement does not tell us what this pleasure is, but he does express that the serpent is associated with the ground, and thus, evil is of an earthly nature. The correlation is that serpents are belly-bound, crawling upon the earth. Analogously, people who are bound by the pleasures of the body are not rationally joined to the knowledge of God, but are thought to be crawling on the ground like serpents. Hence, Clement taught neophytes that, as children of God, 'we no longer roll on the ground, or creep on the earth like serpents, crawling with the whole body and engaging in senseless lusts, but we stretch upward in soul.'⁷⁰⁰

To illustrate deception through pleasure, Clement sketches a scenario in which the serpent, which is also the dragon, plans the ruin of a woman, who conforms her existence to the image of a courtesan.⁷⁰¹ Clement explains that, although she adorns herself with beautiful, but earthly treasures, the image of God is not in her soul. Instead, behind her cosmetic veil is the impress of 'a fornicator; an adulteress occupies the shrine of her soul, and the true beast [τό ἀληθινὸν θηρίον] is exposed: a cosmetic baboon!'⁷⁰² The following passage is Clement's account of how deception occurs:

And that deceitful [παλίμβολος, reversing] serpent, upon devouring the intellect of the woman through vanity [διαβιβρώσων τὸ νοερόν τῆς ἀνθρώπου διὰ τῆς

⁶⁹⁸ *Str.* III.12.80.2. In Antiquity, it was thought that some snakes could turn off their hearing at will to avoid being charmed. Clement categorizes heretics as serpents, because they refused to hear the truth (*Str.* VII.16.102.3.).

⁶⁹⁹ *Prot.* XI.111.1, ὄφης ἀλληγορεῖται ἡδονή; ὁ πρῶτος ὑποπίπτων ἡδονῆ.

⁷⁰⁰ *Paid.* I.5.16.3.

⁷⁰¹ Clement uses the term δρακόν to describe the mythical gods, Zeus and his son, Tauros, who were abusive deities. Zeus courted his own daughter Core in the form of a dragon (*Prot.* II.16.1-3).

⁷⁰² *Paid.* III.2.5.2-3.

φιλοδοξία], possessed the soul as a hole, having filled all [of her thoughts] with deadly poisons. And after injecting his own venom of deception [τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τῆς πλάνης ἐνερευξάμενος ἰόν], this pimping dragon changes the fashion of women (γυναικας) into harlots (πόρνας).⁷⁰³

Being tricked by the serpent and deceived by vainglory, the once virtuous girl is convinced she is a courtesan and wears the cosmetics of her fallen identity. In this passage, Clement describes the serpent as ὁ παλίμβολος ὄφης: ‘the reversing, deceiving serpent.’⁷⁰⁴ The reptile deceives in order to reverse the condition and direction of human beings—away from the image and likeness of God—making them sub-human. Elsewhere, Clement remarks that lust arises and fabricates everything; it wishes to play the trickster to cover up the [real] person.⁷⁰⁵

2.3. Satan and Devil

Clement uses the term σατανᾶς nine times in order to depict two functions of satanic activity. Firstly, satan works through the *pathos* of sexual temptation. In his discussion on sexual infidelity in marriage, Clement draws from Paul’s correspondence to the Corinthians. Paul advises a married couple that, if the husband or wife separate from sexual activity for a season of prayer, then they should soon re-join for conjugal relations, so that ‘satan will not tempt them because of their lack of self-control.’⁷⁰⁶ Clement supports fidelity in marriage and the connubial relationship, and thus, endorses Paul’s counsel that couples should avoid sexual temptation, traps set by satan.

Secondly, satan exercises adversarial authority over people, blinding them to the knowledge of God. Clement interprets Paul’s calling to the Gentiles as a mission ‘to open the eyes’ of the Greeks ‘to turn them from darkness to light, from the authority of

⁷⁰³ *Paid.* III.2.5.3-4.

⁷⁰⁴ *Paid.* III.2.5.3; παλίμβολος is a *hapax legomenon* in Clement’s extant works.

⁷⁰⁵ *Paid.* III.1.1.4, πάντα γὰρ ἡ ἐπιθυμία γίνεταί τε καὶ πλάττεται καὶ φενακίζειν βούλεται, ἵνα κατακρύψῃ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

⁷⁰⁶ *Str.* III.12.82.1; 1Cor. 7:5.

satan to God.⁷⁰⁷ The ‘opening of the eyes of the blind’ occurs when the Greeks perceive the bits of truth found in their philosophy, which leads them to ‘the knowledge of the Father by the Son, [and] to turns [them] away from the authority of satan.’⁷⁰⁸ Although Clement believes philosophy came from God, it is incapable of perfecting people, and thus he thinks satan chains the Greeks to philosophy to hinder them from progressing to the knowledge of God.

The idea and the operations of the devil are significant in Clement’s writings. The Scriptures show, according to Clement, that the devil has personal characteristics that are interior to human beings; people can take on the image and function of *diabolos*.⁷⁰⁹ In two passages, Clement quotes the Pauline injunction to the Ephesians: ‘Give no place to the devil.’⁷¹⁰ For Clement, such an imperative implies a perception of diabolical presence, or knowledge of the devil. If one is not to give place to the devil, then one must know what *diabolos* is and when this activity seeks to occupy a ‘place’ in human experience. The primary function of the devil is lying. Both references follow directly Paul’s admonitions to ‘put away lying’ and to ‘speak the truth,’ which implies lying is giving rational place to the devil.⁷¹¹

Clement recalls the teachings of Jesus where he said the devil ‘did not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him. Whenever he speaks the lie [ὅταν λαλή τὸ ψεῦδος], he speaks from his own natures [ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λαλεῖ], because he is a liar

⁷⁰⁷ *Str.* I.19.92.1; Acts 26:17-18.

⁷⁰⁸ *Str.* I.19.92.2.

⁷⁰⁹ Concerning the doctrine of the devil, there is a close relationship between the writings of the Shepherd and Clement. Compare Mand. 31.4.4 with *Str.* II.13.56.2; Mand. 37.2.1-2 with *Str.* II.12.55.5; Mand. 43.3.4 with *Str.* I.17.85.4; and Sim. 69.6.3 with *Str.* VII.3.20.3-6.

⁷¹⁰ *Paid.* III.12.94.3; *Str.* I.18.90.2; Eph. 4:27. The term διάβολος, -ον is an adjective and it means slanderous; as a substantive, it means a slanderous person, one prone to abusive speech. This idea is found in the LXX: Job 2:1; 1Chron. 21:1 and Zech. 3:1ff; and in the NT, see 1Tim. 3:11.

⁷¹¹ In *Paid.* III.12.94.3, Clement includes the clause: ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω ἐπὶ τῷ παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν; retaining anger overnight is giving cognitive room to the devil. See Mand. 5.1.3: ‘The Lord lives [κατοικεῖ] in patience [μακροθυμία], but the devil lives [κατοικεῖ] in an angry temper [ἐν τῇ ὄξυχολίᾳ].’

and the father of it [ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ].⁷¹² Clement imagines *diabolos* as a liar generating offspring; the broods are not lies, but liars. Hence, the cause for the notable accusation against some Pharisees: ‘You are of your father the devil.’⁷¹³ Those who are active liars (unfaithful to the truth) are the offspring of the devil; according to Clement, liars are part of ‘the devil’s army [τὴν τοῦ διαβόλου στρατείαν].’⁷¹⁴ Liars are heretics, who do not propagate true knowledge of God, but spread human teachings. As liars and slanderers, they are given over to ‘the rule of the devil [τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ διαβόλου],’ that is, they persecute truth.⁷¹⁵

In actuality, Clement portrays some of the results of the activity of death, through these tyrannical energies—the serpent, the dragon, satan and the devil—as people becoming beasts, as the following section demonstrates.

3. Human Beings as Beasts

The activities of death through malevolent powers focus on intellectual and emotive struggles: deception, lying, sexual *pathos*, lust, and chaos. When people irrationally give themselves over to these powers, then Clement likens human beings to beasts. He derives this idea from Moses, David, and Paul. Moses reports that humanity was created on the same day as the cattle and from the same earthen matter; hence, humankind and animals share a similar psychosomatic materiality.⁷¹⁶ We find in his notes that the Creator ‘framed a soul earthly and material, irrational and consubstantial with the beasts.’⁷¹⁷ In the Psalms, David tells us that after the ingress of sin and death into the human race, people became irrational. Clement reiterates David’s conclusion: ‘Since the first man sinned and disobeyed God, it is said that “humanity became like the

⁷¹² *Str.* I.17.85.1-2; *Jn.* 8:44.

⁷¹³ *Str.* I.17.85.2; *Jn.* 8:44.

⁷¹⁴ *Str.* IV.7.42.1.

⁷¹⁵ *Str.* IV.14.95.2-3.

⁷¹⁶ *Gen.* 1:24-31; 2:7.

⁷¹⁷ *Exc.Thdot.* 3.50.1, ψυχὴν γεώδη καὶ ὑλικὴν ἐτεκμήνατο ἄλογον καὶ τῇ τῶν θηρίων ὁμοούσιον.

beasts.” Being rightly regarded as irrational, human beings are beasts.’⁷¹⁸ Moreover, Clement draws attention to Paul’s reference to the Hellenic prophet, Epimenides’s statement: ‘Cretans are always liars and evil beasts [κακὰ θηρία].’⁷¹⁹ Paul also testifies that he ‘fought with wild beasts in Ephesus,’ which probably alludes to his struggles with irrational people, who at that time opposed his teachings.⁷²⁰

Drawing further from Paul’s teachings, Clement remarks that ‘the writing knows that those who are sold over to sin are slaves [δούλους δὲ τοὺς ὑπὸ ἀμαρτίαν καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις πεπραμένους], that is, [they are] lovers of pleasures [φιληδόνους] and lovers of the body [φιλοσωμάτων]. They are beasts rather than men [θηρία μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώπους].’⁷²¹ He explains that the ‘dissolute person [ὑβριστῆς] is the lustful donkey-ass, the covetous one [ὁ πλεονεκτικὸς] is the savage wolf [λύκος ἄγριος], and the trickster [ὁ ἀπατεῶν] is the serpent.’⁷²² Men are like stallions craving mares, whinnying for their neighbors’ wives.⁷²³ In another passage, Clement identifies corrupted humans as the most vexatious beasts of all. The ‘flighty ones [τοὺς κούφους] are birds; those who deceive [τοὺς ἀπατεῶνας] are reptiles; the petulant [τοὺς θυμικούς] are lions; those who roll around in pleasure [τοὺς ἡδονικούς] are swine; and the rapacious [τοὺς ἀρπακτικούς] are wolves.’⁷²⁴ Due to the activity of death—through the evil powers—and misuse of freedom, Clement sees human beings marked by the likeness of beasts, corrupted by the passions, and in need of salvation, which came (in his theology) through the Incarnation of the *Logos*-Son.

⁷¹⁸ Ps. 49:12, 20 (LXX); *Paid.* I.13.101.3-102.1.

⁷¹⁹ Tit. 1:12; *Str.* I.14.59.2, Κρηῖτες αἰεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία. See also Ign.Eph. 7.1-2; Ign.Smyrn. 4.1, προφυλλάσσω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν θηρίων τῶν ἀνθρωπομόρφων.

⁷²⁰ 1Cor. 15:32, εἰ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ἐθηριομάχησα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. For concise discussion delineating the arguments whether Paul was speaking literally or figuratively, see R.E. Osborne, ‘Paul and the Wild Beasts,’ *JBL* 85:2 (June 1966): 225-230.

⁷²¹ *Str.* IV.3.12.4; Rom. 6:17.

⁷²² *Str.* IV.3.12.4.

⁷²³ *Str.* III.17.102.3; *Str.* III.18.105.2; Jer. 5:8.

⁷²⁴ *Prot.* I.3.2-4.1.

D. Incarnation and John 1

This section gives attention to the ‘pre-existence’ of the *Logos*-Son, Clement’s references to the *Logos*-Son as θεός and ἄνθρωπος, and it collates Clement’s passages—drawing from John 1:14—using γίνομαι with λόγος, ἄνθρωπος, and σάρξ. There are pagan and Jewish influences on Clement’s doctrine of the *Logos*—such as Middle Platonism, Stoic philosophy (*spermatikos logos*), and Philo. Concerning Philo, Grillmeier observes: ‘In connection with the Apologists it is important to note that Philo’s Logos speculation is the most far-reaching attempt at the hypostatization of Wisdom (or the Logos) within the Hebrew tradition.’⁷²⁵ Clement adopts this connection and makes *Logos* and *sophia* synonymous. Grillmeier further argues that since Justin Martyr moved the discussion beyond Philo and the philosophers by ‘the proclamation that the Word had become flesh,’ there was ‘only a limited possibility for the influence of Philo to make itself felt on the Apologists. Nor should the philosophical influence be over-estimated.’⁷²⁶ This observation applies to Clement, who thought that the *Logos*-Son cannot remain ‘on the level of a pure metaphysical principle; he must have a relationship with history.’⁷²⁷

1. Pre-existence

Clement draws his logology from the Old Testament (including the works of Philo) and the Gospel of John. Firstly, Clement observes from the Old Testament that it was the eternal *Logos*, who spoke through Moses, David, Solomon, and the prophets.⁷²⁸ For example, ‘He was God, the *Logos*, the *Paidagogos*; he teaches Moses to instruct the

⁷²⁵ Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition Volume One: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975), 108.

⁷²⁶ Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition Volume One*, 108.

⁷²⁷ *Ibid.*, 134.

⁷²⁸ Clement develops his logology from the phrase: ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου that came to the prophets of the OT. For examples, see *Paid.* 1.8-9. In these two chapters, Clement cites Moses (Deut. 2:5); David (Ps. 140:5; 18:43-45); Solomon (Prov. 1:7; 3:11); Isaiah 1:1-4; 29:13; 30:1, 9; Jeremiah 1:16; 2:12-13, 19; 3:3-4, 8; 5:8, 11-12; 6:10; 9:26; Lamentations 1:8; Ezekiel 2.6; Hosea 4:14; Nahum 3:4; and Ecclesiasticus 32:21. The words *Logos* worked through the voices of the prophets.

people.’⁷²⁹ Working through the prophets, ‘[t]he *Logos* has spoken most clearly concerning himself through Hosea: “I, I am your Instructor; and godliness is instruction.”’⁷³⁰ Clement’s point—concerning the Incarnation—is that this very *Logos*, the *Paidagogos*, who operated through the prophets, and is the Author of the Old Testament, is the same *Logos* that became a flesh and blood human being. Thus, ‘our Instructor is the holy God Jesus, the *Logos*.’⁷³¹

Secondly, Clement frequently mentions the *Logos* theology from the prologue in John’s Gospel. Three times in *Protreptikos* I, Clement quotes John 1:1 to demonstrate to the Greeks that he is referring to the apostle’s teaching of the divine *Logos*.⁷³² In one case, using John 1:1-3, Clement highlights the pre-existence of the *Logos*-Son:

This is the New Song, the manifestation, which is now shining amongst us, the one who exists in the beginning [του̅ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντος], even the pre-existing *Logos* [καὶ προόντος λόγου]. Recently, the pre-existing Saviour appeared [ἐναγχος ὁ προὼν σωτήρ]; the one who really exists appeared [ἐπεφάνη ὁ ἐν τῷ ὄντι ὢν], because ‘the *Logos* was with God’ and as a teacher, the *Logos* was manifested by whom all things have been created.⁷³³

Elsewhere, using John 1:1-3, Clement asserts that the *Logos*-Son is God and ‘equal with the Ruler of the universe, because “the *Logos* was in God [ὁ λόγος ἦν ἐν τῷ θεῷ].”’⁷³⁴ He argues that ‘nothing is hated by God and certainly nothing [is hated] by the *Logos*—for both are one God, because he [John] says: “In the beginning the *Logos* was in God, and the *Logos* was God.”’⁷³⁵ In relation to the Godhead, ‘the *Logos* is God in God [λόγον θεὸν ἐν θεῷ], who also is said to be ‘in the bosom of the Father,’

⁷²⁹ *Paid.* I.7.57.3-4.

⁷³⁰ Hos. 5:2; *Paid.* I.7.53.3, ἀναργέστατα γούν ὁ λόγος περὶ ἑαυτοῦ διὰ Ὡσηε εἶρηκεν, «ἐγὼ δὲ παιδευτῆς ὑμῶν εἶμι» παιδαγωγία δὲ ἡ θεοσέβεια.

⁷³¹ *Paid.* I.7.55.2, ὁ δὲ ἡμέτερος παιδαγωγὸς ἅγιος θεὸς Ἰησοῦς.

⁷³² For Jn. 1:1, see *Prot.* I.6.3, 4, 5; a variant, *Prot.* I.7.3; *Prot.* X.110.1, ὁ λόγος ἦν τῷ θεῷ.

⁷³³ *Prot.* I.7.3.

⁷³⁴ *Prot.* X.98.4; X.110.1-2, ὁ θεῖος λόγος, ὁ φανερώτατος ὄντως θεός, ὁ τῷ δεσπότῃ τῶν ὄλων ἐξισωθεὶς, ὅτι ἦν υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ «ὁ λόγος ἦν ἐν τῷ θεῷ.»

⁷³⁵ *Paid.* I.8.62.3-4, οὐδὲν ἄρα μισεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου· ἐν γὰρ ἄμφω, ὁ θεός, ὅτι εἶπεν «ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ λόγος ἦν ἐν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.» *Paid.* III.7.39.4, ὁ τὸν παντοκράτορα θεὸν λόγον ἔχων: ‘the one who has the Almighty God [i.e.], the *Logos*.’

continuous, indivisible, one God [εἶναι λέγεται, ἀδιάστατος, ἀμέριστος εἰς θεός].⁷³⁶ Since he exists ‘before the generation of all things,’ he therefore pre-exists creation. Commenting on Clement’s logology, Hägg notes that ‘[i]n the prologue to John, the Logos is declared to be eternally pre-existent in God, to be his self-revelation, and to be himself God.’⁷³⁷ In Clement’s view the pre-existing *Logos*-Son, who is ‘God in God,’ and spoke through the prophets, became *anthropos* and *sarx*.

2. *Logos*-Son as *Theos* and *Anthropos*

Upon becoming a human being, the *Logos*-Son embodied the mysteries of the true God and of the real human being. Clement claims: ‘The *Logos* himself is a manifest mystery [λόγος ωὐτός μυστήριον ἐμφανές]: God is within a man and the man is God [θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος θεός].’⁷³⁸ The mystery is that the *Logos* is fully God and truly human: ‘This same *Logos* has recently appeared, who is both God and man, the cause of all good things for us.’⁷³⁹ This well-being is the effect of two causes: ‘The Lord, as God and as man, profits everything and helps in every way. On the one hand, as God, he forgives our transgressions; on the other hand, as man, he teaches [us] not to sin [commit faults].’⁷⁴⁰ The *Logos*-Son releases people from sin and then teaches

⁷³⁶ *Exc.Thdot.* 1.8.1; *Str.* VII.3.16.5, καὶ λόγος αἰώνιος. For discussion on eternal generation: M.F. Wiles, ‘Eternal Generation,’ *JTS*, 12:2 (January 1961): 284-291. For the one and two-stage theories concerning the generation of the *Logos* in Clement’s works, see H.A. Wolfson, ‘Clement of Alexandria on the Generation of the Logos,’ *Church History* 20:2 (June 1951): 72-81. This two-stage theory became an issue in Clementine studies primarily because Photius charged Clement with teaching the doctrine of the two *logoi* of the Father, ‘of which the lesser was revealed to men.’ See N.G. Wilson (Transl.), *Photius: The Bibliotheca*, 89a. (London: Duckworth, 1994), 124. For a defense of Clement’s *Logos* theology against Photius, see Ashwin-Siejkowski, *Clement of Alexandria on Trial*, 80-93. For a review of the scholarly discussion on the two *Logoi* theory and Clement’s doctrine of the *Logos* in general, see M.J. Edwards, ‘Clement of Alexandria and His Doctrine of the Logos,’ *Brill: Vigiliae Christianae* 54:2 (2000): 159-177; Oleh Kindiy, *Christos Didaskalos*, 52-149; Henny F. Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, 185-206.

⁷³⁷ Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, 182.

⁷³⁸ *Paid.* III.1.2.1.

⁷³⁹ *Prot.* I.7.1, νῦν δὴ ἐπεφάνη ἀνθρώποις αὐτὸς οὗτος ὁ λόγος, ὁ μόνος ἄμφω, θεός τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος, ἀπάντων ἡμῖν αἴτιος ἀγαθῶν.

⁷⁴⁰ *Paid.* I.3.7.1, πάντα ὀνίνησιν ὁ κύριος καὶ πάντα ὠφελεῖ καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὡς θεός, τὰ μὲν ἀμαρτήματα ὡς θεός ἀφίεις, εἰς δὲ τὸ μὴ ἐξαμαρτάνειν παραπαιδαγωγῶν ὡς ἄνθρωπος.

them how not to sin. The discussion turns now to Clement's doctrine of the Incarnation and an examination of his useage of John 1:14.

3. Clement's Use of John 1:14

Clement preserves pieces of the story about the virgin birth of Jesus that was common currency in some Christian circles in the second century. He recalls that 'the majority had thought, even until now, that Mary seemed to be pregnant because of the birth of her child, though she was not as a woman who had just given birth, for even after she gave birth, some say they examined her to have found a virgin.'⁷⁴¹ The virgin birth of the *Logos*-Son was difficult for the early Christians to grasp, because as Clement claims, 'the one who created the universe had assumed flesh and was conceived in the womb of the virgin [in which] his sensible flesh had been begotten.'⁷⁴² He asserts that, although Mary conceived miraculously, she still gave birth to a human baby, just as any other woman. The child conceived in her womb developed sensible flesh as any other child, and as a result, 'the Lord, the Christ, is the fruit of the virgin' (that is, a woman).⁷⁴³ Clement would deem it nonsensical to think Mary could have given birth to any being other than a human being. He in fact claims that 'the *Logos* himself has come from heaven [to be] like us.'⁷⁴⁴

Making sense of this theological claim—the Creator of the universe had assumed flesh—occupied ecclesiastical thinkers during the second century and for hundreds of years that followed. Early in the second century, Ignatius of Antioch made numerous claims about the Incarnation, most read this way: 'There is only one physician, who is both flesh and spirit. [He is] born and unborn [γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος], God in man

⁷⁴¹ *Str.* VII.16.93.7, ἀλλ', ὡς ἔοικεν, τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ μέχρι νῦν δοκεῖ ἡ Μαριάμ λεχῶ εἶναι διὰ τὴν τοῦ παιδίου γέννησιν, οὐκ οἶσα λεχῶ (καὶ γὰρ μετὰ τὸ τεκεῖν αὐτὴν μαιωθεῖσάν φασί τινες παρθένον εὐρεθῆναι).

⁷⁴² *Str.* VI.15.127.1.

⁷⁴³ *Paid.* I.6.41.3, ὁ δὲ κύριος ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ τῆς παρθένου καρπός.

⁷⁴⁴ *Prot.* XI.112.1, ἐπεὶ αὐτὸς ἦκεν ὡς ἡμᾶς οὐρανόθεν ὁ λόγος.

[ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός], true life in death, both from Mary and from God, first subject to suffering and then beyond it, Jesus Christ our Lord.⁷⁴⁵ *Circa AD 170*, Melito of Sardis set forth the claim that the *Logos*-Son was ‘led forth as a lamb, sacrificed as a sheep, buried as a man, he rose from the dead as a God, for he was by nature God and man.’⁷⁴⁶ A few years later, Irenaeus announced that Christ ‘united man with God and brought about a communion of God and man...so the Word was made flesh...and therefore our Lord took up the same first formation for an Incarnation.’⁷⁴⁷ Irenaeus means Christ was *anthropos* like Adam. In the fourth century and north of the cradle of civilization in the city of Edessa, St. Ephrem (AD 306-373), who was called, the ‘Lyre of the Holy Spirit,’ penned his *Song of Praise*, depicting the Incarnation, this way:

Awake, my harp, your songs
in praise of the Virgin Mary!
Lift up your voice and sing
the wonderful history
Of the Virgin, and the daughter of David,
Who gave birth to the Life of the World.

In the Womb of Mary the infant was formed,
Who from eternity is equal to the Father.
He imparted to us his greatness,
And took our infirmity.
He became mortal like us and joined his life to ours,
So that we might die no more.⁷⁴⁸

Clement’s doctrine of the incarnate God is notable, but with the exception of one significant passage, *Stromateis* VII.2.6.2-8.6, which we shall observe later, it is unsystematic. Throughout Clement’s writings, we find many succinct passages that depict his viewpoint of the Incarnation. From these texts we can catalogue the verbs he uses, such as ἀναλαμβάνω (to take up, assume), γίνομαι (to become, come into existence as), ἐνδέω (to bind to), ἐνδύω (to put on, be clothed with), καταβαίνω (to

⁷⁴⁵ Ign.Eph. 7.2.

⁷⁴⁶ Melito, *Apol.*, 8-10.

⁷⁴⁷ *Dem.* 31.

⁷⁴⁸ St. Ephrem, ‘The Song of Praise,’ in William A. Jurgens, *The Faith of the Early Fathers Volume One*, (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1970), 312.

descend, come down), φανερόω (to appear, manifest), and φέρω (to bear, carry). By collating these passages, we can reconstruct Clement’s view of the Incarnation. The verb he uses more frequently is γίνομαι, drawn from John 1:14.

Clement refers to John 1:14—ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο—and uses the verb γίνομαι no less than thirteen times to draw attention to the Incarnation. The following four paragraphs summarize the thirteen passages in which Clement uses γίνομαι with either ἄνθρωπος (six mentions) or σὰρξ (seven mentions) to convey his doctrine that the *Logos*-Son became a real human being with actual flesh. The passages with the other verbs, especially Clement’s choice of ἀναλαμβάνω and ἐνδύω, will be utilized throughout this chapter.⁷⁴⁹

1. The Israelites had an older covenant and ‘the law was teaching them with fear and the *Logos* was a Messenger; but the newer covenant has been given to the renewed people, because the *Logos* became flesh [ὁ λόγος «σὰρξ» γεγένηται]. As a result, fear has been turned into love and that mystic Messenger, Jesus, was born into the world [καὶ μυστικὸς ἐκεῖνος ἄγγελος Ἰησοῦς τίττεται].⁷⁵⁰ ‘But even the disposition of anger, if it is necessary to call his admonition anger, is human loving, since God descended into emotion for humanity [εἰς πάθη καταβαίνοντος τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον], for whom even the *Logos* of God became a man [ὄν καὶ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ].⁷⁵¹ In this way, ‘there is only one who was without desire from the beginning, the philanthropic Lord, who even [became] a man for us [ὁ καὶ δι’ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος]; and as many that are eager to be assimilated to the stamp given by him, press hard to become without desire through rigorous exercise.’⁷⁵² ‘But most of all, [the heretics] do not perceive [God’s] philanthropy, especially seeing that on account of us, he became a man [δι’ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο].⁷⁵³

2. “‘And the *Logos* became flesh [ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο]” not only when he became a man at his *parousia*,’ but ‘he also “became flesh [σὰρξ ἐγένετο]” when he worked through the prophets.’⁷⁵⁴ At the time of the *parousia*, ‘the *Logos* of God became a human being [ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος] in order that you might learn from a man how a person might become god [ἄνθρωπος γένηται θεός].⁷⁵⁵ ‘The *Logos*, after advancing forward, was the cause of creation, and

⁷⁴⁹ For a catalogue of all the passages in sequence, see Appendix A; not all references in the Appendix are used in the document.

⁷⁵⁰ *Paid.* I.7.59.1.

⁷⁵¹ *Paid.* I.8.74.4.

⁷⁵² *Str.* VII.12.72.1. Here the verb ἐγένετο is understood.

⁷⁵³ *Paid.* I.8.62.1.

⁷⁵⁴ *Exc.Thdot.* 1.19.1-2.

⁷⁵⁵ *Prot.* I.8.4.

then, he generated himself when the *Logos* became flesh, in order that he also might be seen [ἐαυτὸν γεννᾶ, ὅταν ὁ λόγος σὰρξ γένηται, ἵνα καὶ θεαθῆ].⁷⁵⁶ ‘After “becoming flesh [σὰρξ γενόμενος],” the *Logos* blossomed and bore fruit [ὁ λόγος ἤνθησεν τε καὶ ἐκαρποφόρησεν]; and then, he made alive [ἐζωοποίησεν] those who tasted of his graciousness.’⁷⁵⁷ ‘For even the *Logos* himself clearly became flesh [ὁ λόγος αὐτὸς ἐναργῶς σὰρξ γενόμενος], pointing out that the same virtue is at once practical and contemplative.’⁷⁵⁸

3. Clement explains that Scripture likens humans to birds and other animals, such as sheep and doves. He illustrates that the children of God are like doves, and therefore, Moses allowed doves to be sacrificed in the Old Testament as a sin offering, because the ‘harmlessness and innocence of these birds are acceptable to God.’⁷⁵⁹ Clement then states the operative principle: ‘Like is purification for like,’ which is an allusion to the Platonic precept that ‘like agrees with like.’⁷⁶⁰ Further on, he draws the conclusion: ‘since the Scripture names the infant children lambs, God the *Logos*, [that is], the one who became a human being for us [τὸν θεὸν τὸν λόγον τὸν δι’ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος γενόμενον], while wishing to become like us in every way [κατὰ πάντα ἡμῖν ἀπεικάζεσθαι βουλόμενον], was called by name: “the Lamb of God.”’⁷⁶¹ As the Lamb of God, Christ became the purification for the lambs (people), since like is the cleansing offering for like. Thus, when the *Logos*-Son became a flesh-bearing human being, he was sacrificed as a human being for human beings: the sin offering of like for like. In view of this, ‘the prophet prays in these [words]: ‘Remember us, because we are dust’ [Psalm 103:14]; that is, sympathize with us [συμπάθησον ἡμῖν], because speaking from experience, you [God] suffered the weakness of the flesh [ὅτι τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοπαθῶς ἐπείρασας].’⁷⁶²

4. Concerning a bodily function, Clement asks ‘how do you think the Lord drank, at the time he became a man for us [ὀπηνίκα δι’ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο]?’⁷⁶³ He answers, ‘you know very well that the Lord himself partook of wine, for he also was a man [ἄνθρωπος καὶ αὐτός].’⁷⁶⁴ When it comes to the bread of the Eucharist, the flesh [of humanity is united] to the *Logos*, because ‘the *Logos* became flesh [δι’ ἣν ὁ λόγος γέγονεν σὰρξ],’ not something else.⁷⁶⁵

There is enough evidence here to demonstrate that Clement believes the eternal *Logos*-Son became *anthropos* and *sarx*, a real human being, with bodily functions. Moreover, from these paragraphs, an important construction emerges. Clement utilizes the phrase

⁷⁵⁶ *Str.* V.3.16.4-5.

⁷⁵⁷ *Str.* V.11.72.3.

⁷⁵⁸ *Paid.* I.3.9.4.

⁷⁵⁹ *Paid.* I.5.14.3.

⁷⁶⁰ *Paid.* I.5.14.3. The term καθάρσιον means a cleansing or purification from guilt. For Plato’s precept of like, see *Laws*, IV.716d.

⁷⁶¹ *Paid.* I.5.24.4.

⁷⁶² *Paid.* I.8.62.2.

⁷⁶³ *Paid.* II.2.32.2.

⁷⁶⁴ *Paid.* II.2.32.2.

⁷⁶⁵ *Paid.* II.2.20.1.

‘for us’ (δι’ ἡμῶς) to highlight God’s philanthropic character and to point out his sacrificial move to save humankind through the Incarnation.

E. Incarnation and *Stromateis* VII.2

In the first chapter of the *Protreptikos*, Clement sets up his doctrine of the Incarnation as a mission by narrating the myth about the musician Eunomos, the Locrian. At a religious festival in Pythos, Eunomos was playing a song on his lyre in honor of the dead dragon, and a string broke. Nearby and being warmed by the sun, grasshoppers were chirping along the hills, singing not to the dead reptile, but to ‘the all-wise God.’⁷⁶⁶ Aware of the Locrian’s disrupted melody, a grasshopper landed upon the neck of the lyre, as upon a branch, and supplied the missing notation, thus completing the song for Eunomos.⁷⁶⁷ Clement suggests that the grasshopper’s additional music was directing the Greeks beyond idolatry and daemon worship toward the only truly existent God. The broken string signaled an interruption in the pagan ceremony, as the *Logos*-Son was about to appear as the New Song of salvation.

Thomas Halton observes that throughout the *Protreptikos*, Clement would ‘mount a campaign to abolish the games at the four great Hellenistic centers—Isthmian, Nemean, Pythian, and Olympian.’⁷⁶⁸ Clement begins his campaign at Pythos, where Eunomos was silenced by the *Logos*, who is ‘the eternal *Nomos* [τὸν αἰδίον νόμον], who bears the name of God: the New Song [τὸ ἄσμα τὸ καινόν].’⁷⁶⁹ Subsequently, in chapters II-VII, Clement systematically breaks every string of Hellenistic customs, silencing even the music of Homer: ‘Stop the song, Homer, it is not beautiful; it teaches

⁷⁶⁶ *Prot.* I.1.2.

⁷⁶⁷ For more of Clement’s account of the story, see *Prot.* I.1.2-2.2.

⁷⁶⁸ Halton, ‘Clement’s Lyre: A Broken String, a New Song,’ *Second Century: A Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 3:4 (1983): 81. By ‘games,’ Halton means the ἀγῶνας. In each city center, there is a tragic story and games held in honor of the dead. Clement called them ‘funeral sacrifices.’

⁷⁶⁹ *Prot.* I.2.4.

adultery.⁷⁷⁰ In contrast, the New Song comforts the grieving soul and heals all evils, because his music provides the ‘sweet and true medicine for sadness.’⁷⁷¹ This divine Song ‘loosens the bitter bondage of the tyrannizing demons and, upon leading us by his mild and human loving yoke of godliness, he calls again into the heavens those [of us] who had been helplessly cast down into the earth.’⁷⁷² Thus, in the following five chapters (VIII-XII), Clement hails the *Logos*-Son as the Conqueror over the tyrant death, and through such a victory, the Saviour reverses the plight of Adam.

For example, in *Protreptikos* XI, Clement portrays his version of the encounter between the *Logos*-Son and the tyrant death—*viz.*, serpent and the malevolent powers—including the salvific results:

The Lord willed to loose humanity again from the bonds [τῶν δεσμῶν λύσαι τοῦτον ὁ κύριος αὐτίς ἠθέλησεν]; and so, being bound to flesh [καὶ σαρκὶ ἐνδεθεῖς]—this is a divine mystery—he conquered the serpent and enslaved the tyrant death [τὸν ὄφιν ἐχειρώσατο καὶ τὸν τύραννον ἐδουλώσατο, τὸν θάνατον]. And most wonderful of all, that man who had been deceived by pleasure, who had been enslaved by corruption [τὸν τῇ φθορᾷ δεδεμένον], was shown to have been loosened by outstretched hands [χερσὶν ἠπλωμένοις ἔδειξε λελύμενον]. Oh, mystic wonder, the Lord was brought down [ὡς θαύματος μυστικοῦ· κέκλιται μὲν ὁ κύριος], but man was raised up [ἀνέστη δὲ ἄνθρωπος] and the one who fell from paradise receives a greater prize of obedience, the heavens [ὁ ἐκ τοῦ παραδείσου πεσὼν μείζον ὑπακοῆς ἄθλον, οὐρανοῦς, ἀπολαμβάνει].⁷⁷³

In Clement’s account, the appearing of the divine Champion—*Christus Victor*—was a sovereign eruption in the tyrannical rule of the forces of evil, rendering the tyrant over humanity powerless. The two verbs in the sentence, τὸν ὄφιν ἐχειρώσατο καὶ τὸν τύραννον ἐδουλώσατο τὸν θάνατον, are potent and describe one dramatic event: The *Logos*-Son took in hand (ἐχειρώσατο) the serpent and trounced it, and simultaneously, he enslaved (ἐδουλώσατο) the tyrant, that is death. The *Logos*-Son with humble

⁷⁷⁰ *Prot.* IV.59.2, κατάπασσον, Ὅμηρε, τὴν ὠδὴν, οὐκ ἔστι καλή, μοιχείαν διδάσκει.

⁷⁷¹ *Prot.* I.2.4, τὸ γλυκύ τι καὶ ἀληθινὸν φάρμακον πένθους.

⁷⁷² *Prot.* I.3.2, ἀλλ’ οὐ τοιόσδε ὁ ἐμὸς οὐδ’ | εἰς μακρὰν καταλύσων ἀφίκται τὴν δουλείαν τὴν πικρὰν τῶν τυραννούντων δαιμόνων, ὡς δὲ τὸν πρᾶον καὶ φιλόανθρωπον τῆς θεοσεβείας μετὰ γων ζυγὸν αὐτίς εἰς οὐρανοῦς ἀνακαλεῖται τοὺς εἰς γῆν ἐρριμμένους.

⁷⁷³ *Prot.* XI.111.2-3.

obedience on the cross—‘outstretched hands’—overpowered death (the serpent). Clement imports the biblical imagery of Paradise into the narrative to show that this conquest was an act of obedience and mercy, correcting Adam’s disobedience and fall.

Clement highlights the *Logos*-Son’s move to conquer the malevolent powers through the weakness of human flesh.⁷⁷⁴ In one way, this Champion is *theos*.⁷⁷⁵ However, in another way, this Champion is *anthropos*. Clement accentuates the mystery of the Incarnation to indicate that the *Logos*-Son assumed flesh in order to take the stage of the salvific drama:

The divine *Logos*, who is the most manifest God, being equal to the Master of the universe [ὁ θεῖος λόγος, ὁ φανερώτατος ὄντως θεός ὁ τῷ δεσπότῃ τῶν ὄλων ἐξισωθεὶς]..., while assuming the role of humanity, was formed in flesh [τὸ ἀνθρώπου προσωπεῖον ἀναλαβὼν καὶ σαρκὶ ἀναπλασάμενος] and though being undetected, he took to the stage in the salvific drama of humanity [τὸ σωτήριον δράμα τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος ὑπεκρίνετο, ἀγνοηθεὶς]. For he was the genuine Champion [γνήσιος γὰρ ἦν ἀγωνιστῆς].⁷⁷⁶

The significance of this narrative, for Clement, is that the *Logos*-Son became *anthropos* in order to qualify for the contest, as only like could fight for like.⁷⁷⁷ In this light, Irenaeus, against the Gnostics and because of this salvific mission, maintains that the first part of the exchange—God became *anthropos*—is necessary because ‘unless man had overcome the enemy of man, the enemy would not have been legitimately vanquished. And again: Unless it had been God who had freely given salvation, we could never have possessed it securely.’⁷⁷⁸ Both Clement and Irenaeus settle that the *Logos* became *anthropos* and *sarx* to secure the salvation of humankind.

⁷⁷⁴ *Prot.* I.4.3; I.8.4; *Paid.* I.8.62.2; I.8.74.4; *Paid.* II.2.32.2.

⁷⁷⁵ *Str.* I.19.94.6, τὸν σωτήρα οἶμαι θεὸν εἰρησθαι ἡμῖν: ‘I think the Saviour is declared to us as God.’ *Str.* II.9.45.7, θεῶ, θεῶ λέγω τῷ σωτήρι: ‘by God, I mean God the Saviour.’ *Str.* VII.10.58.5, ὁ σωτήρ ἡμῶν καὶ θεός: ‘our Saviour and God.’

⁷⁷⁶ *Prot.* X.110.1-2.

⁷⁷⁷ *Q.d.s.* 8.2.

⁷⁷⁸ *A.H.* III.18.7.

1. Allegation of Docetism

As shown earlier, Clement uses the term γίνομαι with λόγος, ἄνθρωπος, and σάρξ. His christological position, as Floyd concludes, ‘involves a genuine *communicatio idiomatum*’; that is, ‘God clothed himself in human flesh.’⁷⁷⁹ Albeit, one of the heresies directed at the Incarnation and ‘frequently condemned in the age of Clement was Docetism, which admitted a real epiphany, but only in phantasmal flesh and blood. This heresy is sometimes laid at the door of Clement.’⁷⁸⁰ Docetism asserts that since the body of Christ was not fully human, his sufferings were not actual; he only ‘seemed’ to suffer.

Early in the second century, Ignatius of Antioch was a fierce opponent of docetic teachings. He defined Docetism this way: ‘They [the Gnostics] abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, because they refuse to acknowledge that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins and which the Father by his goodness raised up.’⁷⁸¹ Against Docetism, Ignatius emphasizes the humanity of ‘Jesus Christ, who was of the family of David, who was the son of Mary, who really was born, who both ate and drank; who really was persecuted under Pontius Pilate, who really was crucified and died.’⁷⁸² For Ignatius, the Incarnation was essential to salvation, because ‘the ancient kingdom [of death] was abolished, when God appeared in human form (θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνως φανερουμένου) to bring the newness of eternal life and what had been prepared by God began to take effect.’⁷⁸³

⁷⁷⁹ Floyd, *Clement of Alexandria's Treatment of the Problem of Evil*, 77.

⁷⁸⁰ Edwards, *Origen against Plato*, 22.

⁷⁸¹ Ign.Smyr. 6.2.

⁷⁸² Ign.Tral. 9.1; see also Ign.Mag. 11; Ign.Smyr. 1:1-2; 2; 3.1-2.

⁷⁸³ Ign.Eph. 19.3.

Docetism was a common doctrine among some Gnostic sects.⁷⁸⁴ In the *First Apocalypse of James*, Jesus refers to his passions and reportedly reassures James, who was distressed at the sufferings of Christ: ‘James, do not be concerned for me or for this people. I am he who was within me. Never have I suffered in any way, nor have been distressed. And this people has done me no harm.’⁷⁸⁵ In the *Second Treatise of the Great Seth*, the author explains—repeating Basilides doctrine of the crucifixion—that Simon (the Cyrene) was a substitute for Christ: ‘They struck me with the reed; it was another, Simon, who bore the cross on his shoulder. It was another upon whom they placed the crown of thorns. But I was rejoicing...and laughing at their ignorance.’⁷⁸⁶ Similarly, the *Apocalypse of Peter* shows the body of Jesus that was crucified was not the actual Christ. The ‘Jesus’ from above, is the ‘living’ Jesus, ‘but this one into whose hands and feet they drive the nails is his fleshly part, which is the substitute being put to shame.’⁷⁸⁷

Not all Gnostic tractates are Docetic, however. Using similar language as Ignatius of Antioch, the author of *Melchizedek* warns that some

will say of him that he does not eat even though he eats, (that) he does not drink even though he drinks, (that) he is uncircumcised even though he has been circumcised, (that) he is unfleshly even though he has come in the flesh (that) he did not come suffering <though> he came to suffering.⁷⁸⁸

The christology in Gnosticism is more complicated, because even though some tractates depict a physical body of Jesus, the Saviour figure is neither God nor the second divine *hypostasis*. In *Trimorphic Protennoia*, the Saviour figure is First-thought, not the Son of God incarnated in Jesus. In the end of the disclosure, Pronoia reveals that ‘I put on Jesus. I bore him from the cursed wood and established him in the dwelling places of

⁷⁸⁴ David Brakke, *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), 68-69.

⁷⁸⁵ *IApoc.James* V.31.14-22.

⁷⁸⁶ *Treat.Seth* VII.56.8-20. For Basilides version, *A.H.* I.24.4.

⁷⁸⁷ *Apoc.Peter* VII.3.81.

⁷⁸⁸ *Melch.* IX.1.5.

his Father.⁷⁸⁹ In *The Gospel to the Egyptians*, the great Seth was clothed with Jesus.⁷⁹⁰

Although Gnosticism is complex and diverse, it can be maintained, with some exceptions, that Docetism was a common tenet.⁷⁹¹

As seen in chapter two, Clement advances what he calls a ‘gnostic tradition,’ but was he docetic, and did he advance a form of Docetism? Photius, the great Patriarch of Constantinople, was the first to accuse Clement of Docetism, but from the *Hypotyposesis*: ‘According to his wild dreams...even the Word was not incarnate, but appeared to be so.’⁷⁹² More recently, others have extended this charge, but from three passages: a reference in Cassiodorus’s *Adumbrationes, Stromateis* III.7.59.3, and *Stromateis* VI.9.71.1-2.⁷⁹³ The first passage comes to us, not in Clement’s Greek, but in Cassiodorus’s Latin. Scholars generally agree that Cassiodorus (*ca.* AD 490-583), a Roman statesman and polymath (not a theologian), preserves some fragments of Clement’s now lost work *Hypotyposesis* in his composition: *Adumbrationes Clementi Alexandrini in Epistolas Canonicas*.⁷⁹⁴ The *Adumbrationes* contain pieces of Clement’s concise comments on the General Epistles. While translating Clement’s notes on 1John 1:1-2, concerning the appearing and ‘tangibility’ of the *Logos*, Cassiodorus includes this comment:

⁷⁸⁹ *Trim.Prot.* XIII.1.50.13-14.

⁷⁹⁰ *Gos.Egypt.* III.62-65.

⁷⁹¹ For discussion on docetic christologies in Gnosticism, see Ashwin-Siejkowski, *Clement of Alexandria on Trial*, 105-111.

⁷⁹² Photius, *The Bibliotheca*, 89a: ὄνειροπολεῖ...καὶ μὴ σαρκωθῆναι τὸν λόγον ἀλλὰ δόξαι.

⁷⁹³ Ferguson, ‘The Achievement of Clement of Alexandria,’ *RS* 12:1 (1976): 71; Thomas Weinandy, *In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh: an Essay on the Humanity of Christ*, (Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark, 1993), 23-24; W.H. Wagner, *After the Apostles: Christianity in the Second Century*, (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1994), 178-179; and Bart Ehrman, *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew*, (Oxford: OUP, 2003), 178. Defending Clement against Photius’s charge of Docetism, see Ashwin-Siejkowski, *Clement of Alexandria on Trial*, 95-111; and Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, 194-197.

⁷⁹⁴ The Latin text is available in Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus Dritter Band Stromata Buch VII-VIII, Excerpta Ex Theodoto, Eclogae Propheticae, Quis Dives Salvetur, Fragmente*, (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1970), 203-215.

*Fertur ergo in traditionibus quoniam Iohannes ipsum corpus quod erat extrinsecus tangens, manum suam in profunda misisse et ei duritiam carnis nullo modo reluctatam esse, sed locum manui praeuisse discipuli.*⁷⁹⁵

‘Therefore, it is reported in the tradition that John, touching the outward body itself, sent his hand deep into [the body] and the solidity of the flesh did not resist, but gave way to the disciple’s hand.’

Three problems arise when attributing this passage to Clement. Firstly, the clause, ‘Therefore, it is reported in the tradition,’ and what follows, appears a reference to the apocryphal *Acts of John*. In the *Acts of John*, this sentence comes after John’s description of the transfiguration of Christ, and of another reference of Christ ‘glowing’ with bright light while in prayer.⁷⁹⁶ Was John recalling touching Christ after the transfiguration, thus his body was changed at that time? The passage in question is not clear. Secondly, by the use of *ergo*, it is uncertain whether the author is suggesting that Clement used the reference as support for his exegesis, which is possible; or was Clement noting how it was imaginable for the ‘tradition’ to make such a claim—that John ‘handled the *Logos* of life’—but Clement himself was not certifying it, just reporting? Thirdly, the translator of the *Acts of John*, Knut Schäferdiek, argues that although the two passages are similar in content, ‘the differences in formulation are so great that we cannot understand Clement’s remark as a reference to the Acts of John.’⁷⁹⁷ Thus, the fact that Cassiodorus stands between us and Clement, and we neither know the Greek nor the intention behind *ergo*, nor the authorship of the statement (did Clement actually write it?), makes it difficult to assign conclusively this passage to Clement’s theology.

The second passage is not Clement’s words, but a quotation from a letter Valentinus wrote to Agathopus. It reads:

⁷⁹⁵ *Adum.* 1Jn. 1:1-2.

⁷⁹⁶ *Acts of John* 90-93; for discussion and translation, see Knut Schäferdiek, ‘The Acts of John,’ in *New Testament Apocrypha*, Vol. 2, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher, (Louisville, KY: JKP, 2003), 152-212.

⁷⁹⁷ Schäferdiek, ‘The Acts of John,’ in *New Testament Apocrypha*, 152.

Jesus showed his self-control in all that he endured. He lived in the practice of godhead. He ate and drank in a way individual to himself without excreting his food. Such was his power of self-control that the food was not corrupted within him, since he was not subject to corruption.⁷⁹⁸

The operative concept Clement pulls from this text is not Valentinus's description of the body of Jesus, but rather the Lord's example of self-control: 'So we embrace the self-control [ἐγκρατείαν] out of the love we bear for the Lord.'⁷⁹⁹ It is, however, surprising that Clement is uncritical of Valentinus's description, which is why some scholars could think Clement agrees with him.⁸⁰⁰ Nevertheless, since these are the words of Valentinus, not explicitly of Clement, we cannot justly accuse him of Docetism, because we would need to know more clearly Clement's use of the ideas.

The final passage is more problematic and is referred to frequently in the scholarly debate to sustain the docetic charge. It reads:

But in the case of the Saviour, it is absurd to think that the body, as a body, required the necessary aids to be sustained. He ate, not for the sake of the body, which was kept together by a holy energy [δυνάμει συνεχόμενον ἁγία], but in order that it might not enter the minds of those who were with Him to entertain a different opinion about him; in like manner as certainly some afterwards supposed that he appeared to be a phantom [ὡσπερ ἀμέλει ὕστερον δοκήσει τινὲς αὐτὸν πεφανερωῖσθαι ὑπέλαβον]. But He was impassible (ἀπαθής), inaccessible to any movement of feeling—either pleasure or pain [οὔτε ἡδονὴ οὔτε λύπη].⁸⁰¹

Looking at this text in isolation, one could presume it indicates a docetic christology. For example, Thomas Weinandy remarks: 'Heavily influenced by Stoic philosophy, Clement did not allow even the most ordinary of human tribulations to touch Jesus.'⁸⁰² Also commenting on the passage, Bart Ehrman reacts this way: 'Jesus ate simply to keep people from entertaining docetic notions about him, even though in fact he did not

⁷⁹⁸ *Str.* III.7.59.3.

⁷⁹⁹ *Str.* III.7.59.4.

⁸⁰⁰ See Ashwin-Siejkowski, *Clement of Alexandria on Trial*, 96-98.

⁸⁰¹ *Str.* VI.9.71.1-2.

⁸⁰² Weinandy, *In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh: An Essay on the Humanity of Christ*, 24.

need to eat and could not feel pleasure or pain. It is hard to imagine how that is the same thing as having a real body of flesh and blood.⁸⁰³

There are, however, two contextual points that challenge these readings. Firstly, in the section preceding this text, Clement refers to the sufferings of Christ: ‘He who suffered on account of his love for us [ὁ δι’ ἀγάπην τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς παθὼν], would withhold nothing unto the teaching of knowledge’ (*Stromateis* VI.9.70.2). The alleged docetic passage comes on the heels of a mention about Christ suffering. Secondly, in the section following the above quote, Clement refers to Jesus after his resurrection, denoting that the apostles, through the teachings of the Lord, mastered ‘anger, fear, and lust.’⁸⁰⁴ The apostles continued ‘in a state of training after the resurrection of the Lord’ (*Stromateis* VI.9.71.3). Hence, regarding the passage in question, was Clement noting that Christ ate after his resurrection—a time in which his body was ‘kept together by a holy energy’—to show he was not a phantom? This view makes sense because the disciples and others may have thought Christ to have been a phantom after he was raised from the dead, not before. Scholars who advance the docetic charge have not yet provided analysis of the larger context (*Stromateis* VI.9.70.2-VI.9.71.3). However, as Ashwin-Siejkowski notices, Clement emphasizes that Christ ate food in order to prevent a docetic notion. He concludes: ‘As we can see, Clement opposed this opinion.’⁸⁰⁵

Moreover, it is important not to overlook the fact that Clement explicitly rejects Docetism. After reading Julius Cassian’s book, *Concerning Self-control*, Clement reports that ‘Cassian is the founder of Docetism [ὁ τῆς δοκίσεως ἐξάρχων] Ιούλιος Κασσιανός].’⁸⁰⁶ Cassian, like Tatian, was an encratite favoring strict self-control; he argues against marriage, sexual pleasure, and therefore childbirth, calling these

⁸⁰³ Ehrman, *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew*, 178-179.

⁸⁰⁴ *Str.* VI.9.71.3.

⁸⁰⁵ Ashwin-Siejkowski, *Clement of Alexandria on Trial*, 98.

⁸⁰⁶ *Str.* III.13.91.1.

practices evil. Responding to his teachings, Clement reasons that, since Cassian calls birth evil, he has spoken against Mary and the physical birth of Jesus. It is at this point that Clement levels the docetic charge against Cassian:

If birth is an evil, then the blasphemers must place the Lord who went through birth and the virgin who gave him birth in the category of evil: Abominable people! In attacking childbirth, they are maligning the will of God and the mystery of creation [procreation]. This is the basis of Cassian's Docetism [διὰ ταῦτα ἡ δόκησις Κασσιανῶ].⁸⁰⁷

According to Clement, the *Logos*-Son experienced a normal, physical birth from the womb of Mary, a human being. Clement even maintains with Paul that 'God sent his Son who was born [made] from a woman [γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός].'⁸⁰⁸ It is hard to imagine that Mary could have given birth to a phantasmal being. Given that Clement was aware of docetic views of Christ, and refuted them, it is unwarranted to lay this charge at his door. Going beyond the three texts in question, it is requisite to draw out Clement's definitive evidence for the Incarnation.

2. *Logos*-Son Assumes *Sarx*

There is additional evidence to demonstrate that Clement believed in the physical, passionate, and sensible flesh of the *Logos*-Son. In *Stromateis* VII.2.6.5-8.6, Clement composed a four-part outline to describe Christ's flesh, using four terms in sequence: παθητός, ἔμπαθής, εὐπάθεια, and αἰσθητός. He chose the verb ἀναλαμβάνω (to assume, take up) for the adjectives παθητός, ἔμπαθής, and αἰσθητός, but uses ἐνδύω (put on, to clothe) for the noun εὐπάθεια. Prior to this discussion on the Incarnation, Clement notes that the divine Teacher 'instructs the Gnostic by mysteries

⁸⁰⁷ *Str.* III.17.102.1-3 (JF translation). Following this passage, Clement accuses Marcion and Valentinus of docetic teachings; Valentinus's doctrine of the *psychikos* body is a form of Docetism (*Str.* III.17.102.3).

⁸⁰⁸ *Paid.* I.6.33.4; Gal. 4:4.

[μυστηρίοις].⁸⁰⁹ Clement’s portrayal of the *Logos*-Son assuming real human flesh is one of these mysteries.

The first reference (VII.2.6.5-6) contains Clement’s only use of the term παθητός to describe the flesh of Jesus. This *hapax legomenon* suggests—against Docetism—that the passible state of Christ is a central mystery in Clement’s teachings on the Incarnation. He claims that the Lord ‘assumed the suffering flesh for us [ὁ δι’ ἡμᾶς τὴν παθητὴν ἀναλαβὼν σάρκα].’⁸¹⁰ His hardships ‘from birth to the cross,’ implies that Jesus suffered just by becoming a human being.⁸¹¹ He willingly took up flesh that was susceptible to wounds, pain, sufferings, and even death, because of his love for humankind.⁸¹² Since he was faithful to his mission, he did not allow suffering, adversity, and pain in his flesh to detour or terminate his purpose, because he serves ‘the will of the good and almighty Father.’⁸¹³

Clement introduces the second passage (VII.2.7.2-5), emphasizing the impassibility of the pre-existing *Logos*-Son: ‘But envy did not touch the Lord, who without beginning was impassible.’⁸¹⁴ Such corruptible emotions were not part of his pre-incarnate state. Nevertheless, in another passage, Clement explains that ‘God descended into a state of emotion [εἰς πάθη καταβαίνοντος τοῦ θεοῦ], because of [his love for] humanity, for whom the *Logos* of God became a human being.’⁸¹⁵ This

⁸⁰⁹ *Str.* VII.2.6.1, ὁ διδάσκαλος οὗτος ὁ παιδεύων μυστηρίοις μὲν τὸν γνωστικόν.

⁸¹⁰ *Str.* VII.2.6.5, ὁ δι’ ἡμᾶς τὴν παθητὴν ἀναλαβὼν σάρκα. L&S define παθητός as ‘one who has suffered, subject to suffering.’ L&S, ‘παθαίνω, –ητός,’ 1285. LMP defines παθητός as ‘passible, liable to suffering and death.’ LMP, ‘παθητός,’ 991-992. See also *Acts* 26:23, εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός.

⁸¹¹ *Q.d.s.* 8.2, πάσχει δι’ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ γενέσεως μέχρι τοῦ σημείου.

⁸¹² *Str.* VII.2.6.6.

⁸¹³ *Str.* VII.2.7.1.

⁸¹⁴ *Str.* VII.2.7.2, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἄπτεται τοῦ κυρίου ἀπαθοῦς ἀνάρχως γενομένου φθόνος. See also, *Str.* II.16.72.2, τὸ βούλημα τοῦ ἀπαθοῦς θεοῦ: ‘The will of the impassible God.’ *Str.* II.18.81.1, ἀνευδεὲς μὲν γὰρ τὸ θεῖον καὶ ἀπαθές: ‘For the divinity needs nothing and is impassionate.’ *Str.* IV.23.151.1, θεὸς δὲ ἀπαθὴς τε καὶ ἀνεπιθύμητος: ‘God is impassible being without anger and desire.’ *Str.* VI.9.73.6, τὸν ἀπαθῆ θεόν: ‘The dispassionate God.’ *Ecl.Proph.* 52.2, στερέωμα λέγει τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἀπαθῆ καὶ ἀμετάβλητον: ‘He says the impassible God is steadfast and unchangeable.’

⁸¹⁵ *Paid.* I.8.74.4, εἰς πάθη καταβαίνοντος τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, δι’ ὃν καὶ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.

viewpoint was common currency for Clement, as elsewhere he states ‘there is only one, who from the beginning, was without desire, that is, the human loving Lord, who even became a human being for us.’⁸¹⁶ In eternity, he was impassionate, and then he became, as Ignatius of Antioch states, ‘subject to suffering and then beyond it.’⁸¹⁷ This means that through the process of the Incarnation, the *Logos*-Son experienced and completed the cycle: Prior to the Incarnation he was impassionate; through the Incarnation he became passionate; and as a human being, he attained again the impassionate state, which he retains in eternity.⁸¹⁸

In this second passage, Clement uses the adjective ἐμπαθής to describe σάρξ: emotional, passionate flesh.⁸¹⁹ The *Logos*-Son was susceptible to good and bad states of emotion, but he was cognizant of the divine will guiding him. He assumed passionate flesh and stayed his course ‘because of his love for us.’⁸²⁰ ‘He never forsakes the attention of people by being drawn aside by any pleasure, who while assuming flesh, which is passionate by nature [ὅς γε καὶ τὴν σάρκα τὴν ἐμπαθῆ φύσει γενομένην ἀναλαβὼν], trained it to the disciplined habit of *apatheia* [εἰς ἕξις ἀπαθείας ἐπαίδευσεν].’⁸²¹ The implication here is that the *Logos*-Son could have fallen to pleasure, but rather than succumbing (as Adam did), he surrendered to the wisdom and power of God. He was obedient to divine commands and exercised his passionate flesh to a dispassionate state. This training explicitly denotes that he was born with passible flesh that required discipline.

In the third section (VII.2.8.1-3), Clement chose the terms ἐνδύω and εὐπάθεια, meaning that the *Logos*-Son put on the kind of flesh that could enjoy good things, such

⁸¹⁶ *Str.* VII.12.72.1, εἷς μὲν οὖν μόνος ὁ ἀνεπιθύμητος ἐξ ἀρχῆς· ὁ κύριος ὁ φιλόανθρωπος ὁ καὶ δι’ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος.

⁸¹⁷ *Ign.Eph.* 7.2.

⁸¹⁸ *Paid.* I.2.4.1.

⁸¹⁹ *Str.* VII.2.7.5.

⁸²⁰ *Str.* VI.8.70.2, ὁ γὰρ δι’ ἀγάπην τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς παθὼν.

⁸²¹ *Str.* VII.2.7.4-5,

as food, wine, and comfort, and therefore, he could experience pleasure. Since good feelings are a part of human existence and the *Logos*-Son became a legitimate flesh and blood person, Clement continues to argue:

The Saviour at no time is a man-hater; he, through the surpassing love for human flesh [διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν φιλανθρωπίαν σαρκὸς ἀνθρωπίνης], did not despise the enjoyment of good feelings [εὐπάθειαν οὐχ ὑπεριδών], but upon being clothed with it [ἀλλ' ἐνδυσάμενος], he came for the common salvation of humanity.⁸²²

The Saviour did not loathe the enjoyment of good feelings that human flesh is capable of experiencing, because he loves every aspect of his own creation. Thus, rather than denying positive sensations, he became the master of good feelings. As seen earlier, Clement asks, ‘how do you think the Lord drank, at the time he became a man for us [όπηνίκα δι’ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο].’⁸²³ He answers, ‘you know very well that the Lord himself partook of wine, for even he was a man [γὰρ ἄνθρωπος καὶ αὐτός].’⁸²⁴ For Clement, the primary implication here is that the *Logos*-Son was clothed with the flesh of enjoyment, but he was not tricked by the serpent of pleasure. The trickster could not push him into excess and trap him into disobedience, and thereby derail his mission.

In the fourth passage (VII.2.8.5-6), Clement attributes the adjective αἰσθητός to σάρξ: sensible, perceptible flesh.⁸²⁵ ‘Upon assuming sensible flesh [αἰσθητὴν δὲ ἀναλαβὼν σάρκα], he came demonstrating to people what is possible by obedience to the commandments.’⁸²⁶ By the Incarnation, the *Logos*-Son ‘became flesh-bearing with

⁸²² *Str.* VII.2.8.1, οὐκ ἂν οὖν ποτε ὁ σωτὴρ μισάνθρωπος, ὅς γε διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν φιλανθρωπίαν σαρκὸς ἀνθρωπίνης εὐπάθειαν οὐχ ὑπεριδών, ἀλλ' ἐνδυσάμενος, ἐπὶ τὴν κοινὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐλήλυθεν σωτηρίαν.

⁸²³ *Paid.* II.2.32.2.

⁸²⁴ *Paid.* II.2.32.2.

⁸²⁵ See *Exc.Thdot.* 3.59.4, αἰσθητοῦ σώματος: ‘the sensible body.’

⁸²⁶ *Str.* VII.2.8.6, αἰσθητὴν δὲ ἀναλαβὼν σάρκα τὸ δυνατὸν ἀνθρώποις κατὰ τὴν ὑπακοὴν τῶν ἐντολῶν δεῖξων ἀφίκετο.

five of the [physical] senses.⁸²⁷ Through the sensible flesh, he experienced the physical world and shared life experiences with other human beings, such as eating and drinking. Important for Clement is the obedience of the *Logos*-Son, because in view of his passionate flesh, disobedience and corruption, and thus failure, were possible.

At this point, we can see that Clement explicitly taught that the *Logos*-Son assumed flesh that was susceptible to:

1. παθητός: pain, suffering, and death
2. ἐμπαθής: emotions good or evil
3. εὐπάθεια: enjoyment of good things, pleasure
4. αἰσθητός: physical, sensible perceptions

Clement's God loves the whole person, including the weakness of flesh, and 'that is why he willingly suffered for humanity, that after being measured to our weakness [flesh], which he loves, he might measure back to us his own power.'⁸²⁸ Kallistos Ware notices that because of God's love for humankind, 'Clement stresses the importance of the Incarnation. The unknown God has made himself known to us in Jesus Christ.'⁸²⁹ In another light, Floyd concludes—against the Platonists and Gnostics—that 'God became a man was positive proof of the essential worth of matter, mankind and the world.'⁸³⁰

F. Clement and the *Stauros*

Because of God's *philanthropia*, the *Logos*-Son entered the world to conquer malevolent powers by taking on human flesh and subjected it to death on the cross. How did the *Logos*-Son overcome the powers of death? Clement portrays the conquest in two ways. Firstly, the *Logos*-Son overcame death through obedience to the

⁸²⁷ *Str.* V.6.34.1, πρόσωπον εἶρηται τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱός, αἰσθήσεων πεντάδι σαρκοφόρος γενόμενος.

⁸²⁸ *Q.d.s.* 37.3, διὰ τοῦτο ἀνθρώπων ἐκὼν ἔπαθεν, ἵνα πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀσθένειαν οὐς ἠγάπησε μετρηθεῖς ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν ἀντιμετρήσῃ.

⁸²⁹ Ware, 'Clement of Alexandria,' in *Journey to the Heart: Christian Contemplation through the Centuries*, ed. Kim Nataraja, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2012), 44.

⁸³⁰ Floyd, *Clement of Alexandria's Treatment of the Problem of Evil*, 75.

commandments of God. During his time on earth, the *Logos*-Son wrestled internally with evil powers, being tempted by the passions working through the *sarx*; however, he dominated them by bearing his sensible flesh upon the ‘unseen cross’ of obedience, through which he attained *apatheia*.⁸³¹ Accordingly, the *Logos*-Son subjected to obedience that which was susceptible to disobedience and death.

During his temptation in the wilderness, Jesus resisted wild beasts and their ruler the same way people struggle with these powers. In his notes, Clement recorded:

Even the Lord, after his baptism, was shaken and tossed about [σαλεύεται] as any human being; and he was first [struggling] with the wild beasts in the desert [μετὰ θηρίων ἐν τῷ ἐρήμῳ]. Then, after prevailing over them and their ruler [κρατήσας τούτων καὶ τοῦ ἄρχοντος αὐτῶν] as if already the true king [ὡς ἂν ἤδη βασιλεὺς ἀληθῆς], angels attended to him.⁸³²

The *Logos*-Son was shaken, but he overcame the beastly energies and their ruler. The Gospel authors show this ruler to be the devil, which as already shown, is a name for the power of death.⁸³³ Justin comments similarly about this event, noting that

when he became a man, as I said before, the devil came to him; that is, that power which is called the Serpent and Satan [προσηλθεν αὐτῷ ὁ διάβολος, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ἡ δύναμις ἐκείνη ἢ καὶ ὄφιν κεκλημένη καὶ σατανᾶς], tempting him and contending against him for the prize, to cast him down by demanding that he worship him.⁸³⁴

However, as a skilled dialectician in the Scriptures, Jesus outwitted the ‘sophistry’ of the devil.⁸³⁵ For this reason, Clement uses dialectics to sharpen the mind against deception. He argues that, though the devil hurled deceit against Jesus, seeking to

⁸³¹ *Str.* VII.2.7.5.

⁸³² *Exc.Thdot.* 4.85.1-2, αὐτίκα ὁ κύριος μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα σαλεύεται, εἰς ἡμέτερον τύπον, καὶ γίνεται πρῶτον «μετὰ θηρίων» ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· εἶτα κρατήσας τούτων καὶ τοῦ ἄρχοντος αὐτῶν, ὡς ἂν ἤδη βασιλεὺς ἀληθῆς, ὑπ’ ἀγγέλων ἤδη διακονεῖται. The verb σαλεύεται means ‘to be tossed at sea by the force of waves.’

⁸³³ Matt. 4:1-11; Mk. 1:12-13; Lk. 4:1-13. For a literal reading of the devil and wild beasts, see Richard Bauckham, ‘Jesus and the Renewal of Nature: Reading Isaiah and the Gospels Ecologically,’ A lecture given at St. Tikhon’s Orthodox Seminary, Moscow (October 2009): 1-10. He states: ‘Whereas Satan is simply an enemy of Jesus and the angels simply his friends, the wild animals, placed by Mark between those two, are enemies of whom Jesus makes friends’ (4).

⁸³⁴ *Dial.* 125.4, ὅτε γὰρ ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν ὡς προεῖπεν, προσηλθεν αὐτῷ ὁ διάβολος, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ἡ δύναμις ἐκείνη ἢ καὶ ὄφιν κεκλημένη καὶ σατανᾶς, πειράζων αὐτὸν καὶ ἀγωνιζόμενος καταβαλεῖν διὰ τοῦ ἀξιούν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτόν.

⁸³⁵ *Str.* I.9.44.4.

sabotage his mission and damage him, Jesus conquered his adversary because he himself did not succumb to the deception of fleshly pleasures.⁸³⁶ Having overcome the malevolent powers in his mission on earth, Jesus led the salvific drama to the mystery of the cross, the decisive conquest over the powers of death.

The second way the *Logos*-Son defeated the power of death was through his own death on the cross. Taking into account that Clement believes the *Logos*-Son to be equal to the transcendent God, his teaching that divine *Logos* assumed flesh and then was crucified, seemed outrageous to Jews and Greeks. Addressing this issue, Clement remarks: ‘Those who are wise in their own conceit consider it fabulous [a fable] that the Son of God spoke through a man, that God has a Son, and especially, that he suffered.’⁸³⁷ Clement observes from Paul’s point of view that the death of Jesus continued to generate scandal in his own generation:

Even now, the entire administration that was prophesied about the Lord truly appears a parable to those who do not know the truth. Whenever one says and others hear that the Son of God—the one who created the universe [τοῦ τὰ πάντα πεποιηκότος]—had assumed flesh and was conceived in the womb of the virgin, just as his sensible flesh was begotten [σάρκα ἀνειληφότα καὶ ἐν μήτρα παρθένου κυοφορηθέντα, καθὸ γηγέννηται τὸ αἰσθητὸν αὐτοῦ σαρκίον]. Subsequently, just as it happened, he suffered and then was raised again [τοῦτο πεπονθότα καὶ ἀνεσταμένον], it is ‘to the Jews a stumbling block and to the Greeks foolishness,’ as the Apostle states.⁸³⁸

In this text, Clement broaches Paul’s theme of the crucifixion of Christ, which Clement sums up in general terms: ‘he suffered’ = crucifixion. What follows the reference to ‘suffering’—in Clement’s passage—is the resurrection: ‘He suffered and then was raised again.’ The idea of ‘suffering’ here is the crucifixion, which was prophesied. KP claims the apostles found the mystery of the cross (σταυρός) hidden in the Jewish

⁸³⁶ *Prot.* XI.111.1-3; *Str.* VII.2.7.4-5.

⁸³⁷ *Str.* I.18.88.5, μυθῶδες γὰρ ἵστανται οἱ δοκησισοφοὶ διὰ τε ἀνθρώπου υἱὸν θεοῦ λαλεῖν υἱὸν τε ἔχειν τὸν θεὸν καὶ δὴ καὶ πεπονθέναι τοῦτον.

⁸³⁸ *Str.* VI.15.127.1; 1Cor. 1:22-23.

scrolls of the prophets, which was determined by God a salvific event.⁸³⁹ A fragment, attributed to Clement, states that ‘our Master Jesus Christ appeared on earth and saved humankind through his cross and resurrection.’⁸⁴⁰

Drawing again from Paul’s letter to the Corinthians, which depicts the cross as the ‘power and wisdom of God’ (1Corinthians 1:18-24), Clement maintains:

We speak wisdom among the perfected, a wisdom not of this age nor of the *archons* of this age, who are being abolished. But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, the hidden [wisdom], which God determined beforehand for our glory, which none of the *archons* of this age knew, because if they had known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory [εἰ γὰρ ἔγνωσαν, οὐκ ἂν τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης ἐσταύρωσαν].⁸⁴¹

The hiddenness of this wisdom indicates that, in Clement’s view, the death of Jesus on the cross is a great mystery of the wisdom of God. Accordingly, speaking on behalf of the Saviour, Clement expounds on this mystery:

I am the one who rears you, giving myself [to you] as bread [ἐγὼ σου τροφεὺς ἄρτον ἑμαυτὸν διδούς], of which, no one after tasting it receives any longer [the] piercing of death [οὐ γευσάμενος οὐδεὶς ἔτι πείραν θανάτου λαμβάνει]; and I give [you] the drink of immortality daily [πόμα καθ’ ἡμέραν ἐνδιδοὺς ἀθανασίας]. I am the teacher of super-celestial lessons [ἐγὼ διδάσκαλος ὑπερουρανίων παιδευμάτων]; for you I contended with death [ὑπὲρ σοῦ πρὸς τὸν θάνατον διηγωνισάμην] and I paid in full your death [τὸν σὸν ἐξέτισα θάνατον], which you owed for earlier sins and unbelief toward God [ὄν ὥφειλες ἐπὶ τοῖς προημαρτημένοις καὶ τῇ πρὸς θεὸν ἀπιστίᾳ].⁸⁴²

The *Logos*-Son’s obedience in life and especially his obedience in death upon the cross, by which he conquered death, are ‘super-celestial lessons.’ As a way to point believers to this knowledge of God, Clement designates the cross as the ‘sign’ (τὸ σημεῖον).⁸⁴³

For Clement, the cross indicates at least four ‘super-celestial lessons’ concerning salvation. Firstly, the cross signifies protection from former sins: ‘We have the boundary [ὄρος], that is, the cross of the Lord [τὸν σταυρὸν τοῦ κυρίου] by which we

⁸³⁹ *Str.* VI.15.128.1.

⁸⁴⁰ *Frag.* 72.3, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐφάνη ὁ δεσπότης ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ ἔσωσεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως.

⁸⁴¹ *Str.* V.4.25.2; 1Cor. 2:6-8. Clement’s Greek text is a mirror of the Pauline text.

⁸⁴² *Q.d.s.* 23.4.

⁸⁴³ *Str.* II.20.108.4, τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ σταυρὸς σημείνει; *Exc.Thdot.* 2.42.1, ὁ σταυρὸς σημείον ἐστίν.

have been enclosed and fenced in from our former sins.⁸⁴⁴ As a *horos*, the cross is a palisade that protects believers from the ‘piercings’ of previous faults. Hippolytus mentions the Valentinian doctrine of the cross, identifying the ὄρος as a σταυρός because of its stability and immobility in the cosmos.⁸⁴⁵ The horizontal bar of the cross separates the sensible region from the intellectual region, or the cosmos from the Pleroma. In this thinking, the cross is like a ‘T’ not a typical cross with the vertical part appearing above the horizontal bar. While Theodotus says that ‘the cross’—*viz.* the horizontal crossbar—‘separates the cosmos from the Pleroma [ὁ σταυρὸς...χωρίζει...τὸν κόσμον τοῦ πληρώματος],’ in a similar way, Clement maintains that the cross as the *horos* existentially and ethically ‘separates unbelievers from believers [χωρίζει...τοὺς ἀπίστους τῶν πιστῶν].’⁸⁴⁶ The cross is a separator that protects.

Secondly, the teachings of Christ and the apostles about ‘taking up’ or ‘bearing’ the cross signifies that one is doing the will of God.⁸⁴⁷ Clement adopted the term, τὸ ξύλον from the Scriptures, which in the writings of the apostles refers to the ‘wooden’ cross of Christ.⁸⁴⁸ By way of analogy, Clement depicts Isaac and Jesus bearing wood for their respective sacrifices: ‘Isaac carried the wood [τὰ ξύλα] for the sacrifice, as the Lord carried the cross [τὸ ξύλον].’⁸⁴⁹ These related events point to the spiritual discipline of cross-bearing that became the sign of ‘doing the will of the Father.’⁸⁵⁰ Isaac carried τὰ ξύλα, because he submitted to his father, Abraham; Jesus carried τὸ ξύλον, because he submitted to the will of his Father, God. Ultimately, the will of God

⁸⁴⁴ *Paid.* III.12.85.3, ὄρον ἔχωμεν τὸν σταυρὸν τοῦ κυρίου ᾧ περισταυρούμεθα καὶ περιθριγκούμεθα τῶν προτέρων ἀματιῶν.

⁸⁴⁵ *Ref.* VI.31.6.

⁸⁴⁶ *Exc.Thdot.* 2.42.1; *Exc.Thdot.* 1.22.4, εἰς τὸ πλήρωμα παρελθεῖν τῷ ὄρω καὶ τῷ σταυρῷ. For Irenaeus’s discussion on the σταυρός as ὄρος see *A.H.* I.3.5.

⁸⁴⁷ Matt. 16:24-26; Lk. 9:23-25; 14:27; Mk. 8:34-37; Gal. 2:20; 5:24; 6:14; 1Pet. 2:21-24.

⁸⁴⁸ *Prot.* XII.118.4; XII.119.3; *Paid.* III.3.25.3; *Str.* I.24.164.4; *Str.* V.11.72.3. In the NT, τὸ ξύλον is used for the cross of Christ: Acts 5:30; 10:39; 13:29; Gal. 3:13 (Deut. 21:22-23); 1Pet. 2:24. The term ξύλον is used for the ‘tree of life’: Rev. 2:7, φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς; and Rev. 22:2, 14, 19.

⁸⁴⁹ *Paid.* I.5.23.2, μόνον ἐβάστασε τὰ ξύλα τῆς ἱερουργίας ὁ Ἰσαάκ, ὡς ὁ κύριος τὸ ξύλον.

⁸⁵⁰ *Str.* II.4.19.1; Matt. 7:21.

is that humanity overcomes corruption through the cross. Thus, Isaac ‘was laughing mystically, because he was prophesying that the Lord would fill with joy those who have been redeemed from corruption by the blood of the Lord.’⁸⁵¹

Thirdly, in view of the efficacy of the blood of Christ, Clement sees the cross as the ‘soul cleansing’ principle that ‘crucifies’ the passions. Renouncing inordinate passions and separating sin from the soul demonstrates that one is carrying the cross, because ‘the cross signifies’ *apatheia*.⁸⁵² Following Jesus in cross-bearing depicts obedience to the precepts of God:

Those who accomplish the commandments of the Saviour, bear witness by each deed, they are doing what he wills. In accordance with this, those who have crucified the flesh with the lusts and the passions [οἱ τὴν σάρκα σὺν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ τοῖς παθήμασι σταυρώσαντες], while naming the Lord even through action are testifying to whom it is they are obeying. He [Paul] said, ‘if we live by the Spirit, let us walk in line with the Spirit.’⁸⁵³

In Clement’s thinking, obedience to God’s commands is the energetic principle that crucifies deceitful lusts. Such endurance ‘reaps the fruit of *apatheia*,’ because obedience is sharing in the life of God, which reconstitutes the human condition.⁸⁵⁴ In other words, obedience is

a straightening out of all the distortions and the corruptions that we have brought upon our humanity by misusing—abusing—our human capacities, and by living out our lives in accordance with the values and principles that fall a long way short of the values and principles inherent in creation as God intended it.⁸⁵⁵

⁸⁵¹ *Paid.* I.5.23.2, ἐγέλα δὲ μυστικῶς ἐμπλήσαι ἡμᾶς προφητεύων χαρᾶς τὸν κύριον τοὺς αἵματι κυρίου ἐκ φθορᾶς λελυτρωμένους.

⁸⁵² *Str.* II.20.108.4, τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ σταυρὸς σημαίνει. *Str.* VII.12.79.6-7, «ἡ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος» [Gal. 5:17]. τὸ σημεῖον δὲ βαστάσαι τὸν θάνατόν ἐστιν περιφέρειν, ἔτι ζῶντα πᾶσιν ἀποταξάμενον. For Paul’s statement ‘bearing about death,’ see 2Cor. 4:10.

⁸⁵³ Compare Gal. 5:24-25, τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσιν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις, with *Str.* IV.7.43.4, οἱ τὴν σάρκα σὺν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ τοῖς παθήμασι σταυρώσαντες. «εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν» λεγεί.

⁸⁵⁴ *Str.* II.20.103.1-104.1.

⁸⁵⁵ Andrew Louth, ‘The Place of *Theosis* in Orthodox Theology,’ in *Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions*, eds. M.J. Christensen and J.A. Wittung, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 37.

The ability to pursue obedience and reshape human nature according to a cruciform spirituality is ‘impossible without the grace of God.’⁸⁵⁶ In the words of Clement: ‘For a man by himself working and toiling at freedom from passion achieves nothing. But if he plainly shows himself very desirous and earnest about this, he attains it by the addition of the power [grace] of God. For God conspires with willing souls.’⁸⁵⁷

Along these lines, Clement sees that, by the grace of God and obedience to the Gospel, the apostle Paul became an example of someone who attained a state of holiness (*apatheia*) through cross-bearing:

‘The world’ it is said, ‘had been crucified to him [Paul] and he to the world.’ This one, while bearing about the cross of the Saviour [οὗτος τὸν σταυρὸν τοῦ σωτῆρος περιφέρων] and following in his tracks, as being of God, ‘became a holy of holies’ [ἅγιος ἁγίων γενόμενος].⁸⁵⁸

Clement follows Paul’s teachings, maintaining that, while we live in the flesh, there is a death to its passions, so that we might live as ‘citizens of heaven.’⁸⁵⁹ Accordingly, Socrates was correct when he claimed that true philosophy is the ‘practice of death [μελέτη θανάτου].’⁸⁶⁰ While Clement is sympathetic to Socrates, he nevertheless follows Paul’s vision of the Gospel of Christ by renouncing the inordinate desires of the flesh, which is the sign that one is ‘bearing the cross.’⁸⁶¹

Fourthly, in a context wherein Clement discusses the crown of thorns and the final passion of Christ, he depicts the crucifixion as the decisive victory over the devil, and re-exclaims the notable Pauline vocative addressed to death:

For he by his own suffering, having rescued us from offences and sins, and such like thorns and having destroyed the devil [τὸν διάβολον καταργήσας], and

⁸⁵⁶ Louth, ‘The Place of *Theosis* in Orthodox Theology,’ 37.

⁸⁵⁷ *Q.d.s.* 21.1.

⁸⁵⁸ *Str.* II.20.104.3; Gal. 6:14; *Frag.* 7.12 (*ANF2*: 578) indicates that Clement wrote about ‘crucifying’ the passions (explaining Gal. 6:14) in the fifth *Hypotyposeis*.

⁸⁵⁹ *Str.* IV.3.12.6; Gal. 6:14; Phil. 3:20.

⁸⁶⁰ *Str.* V.11.67.2.

⁸⁶¹ *Str.* VII.12.79.5-6.

quite suitably, while glorying over this [triumph], he said: ‘Where death is the [your] sting’ [πού σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον];⁸⁶²

Clement combines two biblical passages, Hebrews 2:14 and 1Corinthians 15:55. The former verse tells us that through death, the *Logos*-Son ‘destroyed the one possessing the power of death, that is, the devil.’⁸⁶³ Jesus was put to death ‘in order that death by death might be destroyed [ἵνα θάνατος θανάτω λυθῆ].’⁸⁶⁴ The latter verse shows Christ’s crushing victory over death through the resurrection.⁸⁶⁵ By joining these two texts, Clement asserts that the *Logos*-Son destroyed death and the devil in the same event, because for Clement, death and the devil are one thing.⁸⁶⁶

Through his sufferings and the conquest of death, the *Logos*-Son rescues believers from ‘offences and sins, and such like thorns,’ because he ‘bore with his head, even the authoritative part of his body, all of our painful offences, by which we were being stung.’⁸⁶⁷ If we ask, what are the thorns? Clement tells us that ‘lust and other faults are called briars and thorns.’⁸⁶⁸ The Saviour-Champion eradicated the sting of death—the biting pain of mistakes—by taking upon himself the piercings (the sting) of the crown of thorns.⁸⁶⁹

Along these lines, Clement believes the cross to be the meeting place where corruption is crucified and humanity is brought by grace into the experience of the divine life. Through the sufferings of the incorrupt one, those who were corrupt now share his incorruption, as Irenaeus announces it:

⁸⁶² Heb. 2:14; 1Cor. 15:55; *Paid.* II.8.74.3, αὐτὸς γὰρ τῷ ἰδίῳ πάθει ῥυσάμενος ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκανδάλων καὶ ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἀκανθῶν καὶ τὸ διάβολον καταργήσας εἰκότως ἐπευχόμενος εἶρηκεν «πού σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον;»

⁸⁶³ Heb. 2:14, καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου τὸν διάβολον.

⁸⁶⁴ *Exc.Thdot.* 4.80.2, καὶ ἀποθνήσκουσιν μὲν τῷ κόσμῳ, ζῶσι δὲ τῷ θεῷ, ἵνα θάνατος θανάτω λυθῆ, ἀναστᾶσει δὲ ἡ φθορά.

⁸⁶⁵ See also *Dial.* 94.2, the power of the serpent was broken by the cross.

⁸⁶⁶ 1Cor. 15:54-56. In this passage, Paul uses θάνατος four times, but never mentions διάβολος; interpreting Paul, Clement reads θάνατος to mean διάβολος.

⁸⁶⁷ *Paid.* II.8.74.3, βαστάσαντος αὐτοῦ τῆ κεφαλῆ καὶ τῷ ἡγεμονικῷ τοῦ σώματος πάντα ἡμῶν τὰ πονηρά, δι’ ὧν ἐνκεντούμεθα.

⁸⁶⁸ *Str.* VII.12.74.1, ἐπιθυμίαι δὲ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἁμαρτήματα τρίβολοι καὶ σκόλοπες εἶρηνται.

⁸⁶⁹ *Paid.* II.8.74.1-75.2.

For by no other means could we have attained to incorruptibility and immortality, unless we had been united to incorruptibility and immortality. But how could we be joined to incorruptibility and immortality, unless, first, incorruptibility and immortality had become that which we also are, so that the corruptible might be swallowed up by incorruptibility and the mortal by immortality, that we might receive the adoption of sons?⁸⁷⁰

In this light, Clement sees the crucifixion as an event by which the *Logos*-Son

transferred sunset into sunrise and crucified death unto life [καὶ τὸν θάνατον εἰς ζῶν ἀνασταυρώσει]; after snatching a human being from destruction, he suspends that person above the sky, transplanting corruption into incorruption and transferring earth into heaven.⁸⁷¹

When, therefore, Clement wrote the *Protreptikos*, he exhorted the Greeks—who were perishing in what he thought were diabolical pleasures—to choose the cross, because it is the means of transformation and incorruption. Clement urges them to choose:

If you only wish, you have overcome destruction, having been bound to the cross [τῷ ξύλῳ] you shall be loosened from all corruption. The *Logos* of God [ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ] shall pilot you and the Holy Spirit [τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον] shall bring you to anchor in the harbors of the heavens. Then you shall observe my God and be perfected in these sacred mysteries and you shall enjoy the hidden things, those things that have been kept for me.⁸⁷²

Miguel Herrero points out Clement’s choice for τῷ ξύλῳ (‘to the wood’) in this passage ‘is used in the double sense of the post of the ship to which Odysseus was tied and the Cross which brings salvation.’⁸⁷³ Odysseus was tied to the mast to elude the temptations of the singing Sirens, which lured sailors towards unseen rocks, causing shipwreck.⁸⁷⁴ Clement plays on the terms ‘bound’ and ‘loosened’ and intimates that being bound to the cross—as Odysseus was tied to the post—means one is loosened from temptations, leading to destruction (shipwreck). Clement directs the Greeks to the

⁸⁷⁰ *A.H.* III.19.1.

⁸⁷¹ *Prot.* XI.114.4, οὗτος τὴν δύσιν εἰς ἀνατολὴν μετήγαγεν καὶ τὸν θάνατον εἰς ζῶν ἀνασταυρώσει, ἔξαρπάσας δὲ τῆς ἀπωλείας τὸν ἄνθρωπον προσεκρέμασεν αἰθέρι, μεταφυτεύων τὴν φθορὰν εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ γῆν μεταβάλλων εἰς οὐρανοῦς.

⁸⁷² *Prot.* XII.118.4. Clement’s Greek in this passage is especially emphatic. He clarifies the theological categories: To identify the *Logos*-Son, he writes, ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ; identifying the Holy Spirit, he states, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.

⁸⁷³ Herrero, ‘The Protrepticus of Clement of Alexandria: A Commentary,’ 263.

⁸⁷⁴ Homer, *Odyssey* 12.165-217.

cross because (1) it terminates corruption and (2) beyond the cross are the ‘harbors of the heavens.’ This account is an allusion to the exchange doctrine: Once corruption is in remission, it is possible for one to ascend to the heavens.

In view of the *Logos*-Son’s conquest of the evil powers through his life and death, it is important to look closer at Clement’s emphasis on the obedience of Christ and his sufferings. Firstly, Clement places import on obedience, arguing that if there is a generative cause in disobedience, there must be a productive cause in obedience. He cites David’s point that as a result of ‘*anthropos* having sinned against the *Logos* [ὁ ἄνθρωπος παρὰ τὸν λόγον ἐξαμαρτῶν], *anthropos* became like animals, being rightly regarded as irrational [εἰκότως ἄλογος νομισθεῖς].’⁸⁷⁵ Clement then deduces the following logic:

If disobedience to the *Logos* is the generative cause of sin [ἡ πρὸς τὸν λόγον ἀπειθεία ἀμαρτίας ἐστὶ γεννητική], how is it not from necessity [that] obedience to the *Logos* [ἡ τοῦ λόγου ὑπακοή], which we say is faith [ἥς δὴ πίστιν φαμέν], shall be that which is called the productive cause of what is proper [τοῦ καλουμένου καθήκοντος ἔσται περιποιητική]?⁸⁷⁶

If disobedience can cause a fall and the disorientation of human existence, then obedience can cause a rise and a restoration of human reality. Disobedience disconnects human reason (*logikos*) from the *Logos*, and renders humankind irrational, ignorant, and weak. Conversely, obedience reconnects human reason to the *Logos*, rendering believers rational and wise. In this light, Clement lays salvific importance on the *Logos*-Son’s obedience in life because he resisted every temptation, bested the trickster, and attained *apatheia*; he made these victories, including his obedience, accessible to others by sharing his life with them.

Secondly, Clement’s doctrine of the sufferings of Christ requires closer inspection of more evidence crucial to his soteriology, specifically the Eucharist. Clement states

⁸⁷⁵ *Paid.* I.13.101.3; Ps. 49:12, 20.

⁸⁷⁶ *Paid.* I.13.101.1.

plainly that the *Logos*-Son ‘poured out his blood on behalf of us [ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν].’⁸⁷⁷ He recalls that before the death of Jesus, he ‘blessed the wine [and said]: “Take, drink; this is my blood,” the blood of the vine.’ This vine is ‘the *Logos*, the one being poured out for the forgiveness of sins for many.’⁸⁷⁸ Regarding the bread of the Eucharist, the *Logos*-Son ‘descended from heaven [ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων],’ and became flesh, ‘giving his life’ for humankind.⁸⁷⁹ The blood that flowed from Christ’s flesh became a vivifying power that eradicates existential corruption from the human constitution. Through the blood of Christ, believers ‘have been redeemed from corruption’ and ‘partake of the Lord’s immortality.’⁸⁸⁰ By his sufferings, therefore, the ‘*Logos* himself, the one who is beloved and who nourishes us, has poured out his blood for us,’ and through his blood, ‘he saves humanity.’⁸⁸¹

Clement calls forgiveness through the blood of Christ ‘the holy stream of gladness.’⁸⁸² It is a sacred stream of joy because ‘in every way and in all things, we are brought into union with Christ, and into relationship [with him] through his blood, by which we are redeemed [διὰ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ᾧ λυτρούμεθα], and into sympathy [with him] through the nourishment that comes from the *Logos* [εἰς συμπάθειαν διὰ τὴν ἀνατροφήν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ λόγου], and into immortality through his guidance [εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τὴν ἀγωγήν τὴν αὐτοῦ].’⁸⁸³ The sufferings of his body and the bleeding of his flesh became for Clement what Ignatius of Antioch believed: The Eucharist is ‘the medicine of immortality, the antidote we take in order not to die but to

⁸⁷⁷ *Paid.* I.6.43.3.

⁸⁷⁸ *Paid.* II.2.32.2.

⁸⁷⁹ *Paid.* I.6.46.2-3, ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων καὶ ζῶν διδούς τῷ κόσμῳ. καὶ ὁ ἄρτος, ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς.

⁸⁸⁰ *Paid.* II.2.19.4, ᾧ τῆς φθορᾶς λελυτρώμεθα; and καὶ τοῦτ’ ἐστὶ πιεῖν τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τῆς κυριακῆς μεταλαβεῖν ἀφθαρσίας.

⁸⁸¹ *Paid.* I.6.43.3, αὐτὸς γοῦν ὁ «ἡγαπημένος» καὶ τροφεὺς ἡμῶν λόγος τὸ αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐξέχεεν αἷμα σώζων τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.

⁸⁸² *Paid.* II.2.32.2, εὐφροσύνης ἅγιον νᾶμα.

⁸⁸³ *Paid.* I.6.49.4.

live forever in Jesus Christ.⁸⁸⁴ Because of this, the Alexandrian teacher styles the Eucharist as ‘a glorious and beautiful grace.’⁸⁸⁵

Importantly, Clement’s adherence to the doctrine of the Incarnation is seen where he disapproves of Gnostic sects that administered the Eucharist not with wine, but water only. By rejecting the wine, the Gnostics disavowed the sufferings and death of Christ. Clement corrects them ‘according to the canon of the Church [κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἐκκλησίας].’⁸⁸⁶ This canon upholds the administration of the Eucharist, mixing water with wine, thus receiving the antidote for death. In this way, Clement preserves Peter’s doctrine of salvation, echoing the apostle’s teaching: ‘We were redeemed, not with corruptible things [such as] silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.’⁸⁸⁷ Moreover, Clement aligns himself with the *kerygmatic* message of Paul, declaring that “‘We preach Jesus Christ who was crucified [ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον].’”⁸⁸⁸

G. Conclusion

Chapter Three focuses on the first aspect of the exchange doctrine: The *Logos*-Son became *anthropos* and *sarx* with the aim to enter the contest for salvation, defeat the powers of evil, and loosen human beings from existential corruption. It identifies Clement’s understanding of the malevolent powers: *viz.*, the tyrant death, which is also named the serpent, satan, and the devil. These evil authorities are energies behind the human struggle that tempt and deceive people into sub-human existence. This chapter also shows Clement’s description of the divine *Logos* and the eternal Son as the Saviour, especially highlighting salvation as central to Clement’s literary works.

⁸⁸⁴ Ign.Eph. 20.2.

⁸⁸⁵ *Paid.* II.2.20.1, εὐχαριστία κέκληται, χάρις ἐπαινουμένη καὶ καλή.

⁸⁸⁶ *Str.* I.19.96.1.

⁸⁸⁷ *Paid.* III.12.85.1; 1Pet. 1:18-19.

⁸⁸⁸ *Str.* I.18.88.4-8; 1Cor. 1:23-24.

Concerning the docetic challenge, the research shows that overall scholars acknowledge Clement's doctrine of the Incarnation, affirming that the *Logos* became flesh. However, the treatment in secondary literature tends to veer away from research on the Incarnation and broaches two theological issues: the multiple *logoi* theories and the docetic problem. Because Clement clearly shows the *Logos* became real flesh, the three passages in question *Stromateis* III.7.59.3, *Stromateis* VI.9.71.1-2, and Cassiodorus's *Adumbrationes* 1John 1:1-2, cast considerable doubt to his position. Consequently, it is difficult to defend Clement, and scholars tend to surrender to the docetic charge (Weinandy, Ehrman) or rationalize the passage in *Stromateis* VI.9 (Patrick, Hägg, Ashwin-Siejkowski). The thought is that Clement emphasizes Christ's *apatheia* so that catechumens will emulate his spirituality. Christ did not need to eat or drink, because he is a spiritual exemplar.

However, we discover better results by digging up the gold—as Clement hopes we will do—of the positive textual data about his doctrine of the Incarnation. The evidence shows thirteen references to John 1:14. By classifying Clement's use of γίνομαι with λόγος, ἄνθρωπος and σὰρξ, the evidence gives us six mentions of γίνομαι with λόγος and ἄνθρωπος and seven mentions of γίνομαι with λόγος and σὰρξ. This information demonstrates that Clement taught that the *Logos*-Son became *anthropos* with actual *sarx*. In addition, this chapter highlights Clement's specific utility of ἀναλαμβάνω and ἐνδύω in Clement's four-part outline in *Stromateis* VII.2.6.5-8.6. This passage verifies that Christ's flesh was παθητός, ἐμπαθής, εὐπάθεια, and αἰσθητός. Here, the data demonstrates that Clement taught the *Logos*-Son became *sarx*, and his flesh was susceptible to good and bad emotions, physical sensibilities, suffering, and death. Along these lines, this chapter also discusses Clement's doctrine of the cross, taking note of his teachings about the blood of Christ. By suffering in the

flesh, Christ shed real blood that became a vivifying power—the Eucharist, a ‘glorious grace’—ending the reign of moral corruption in believers and uniting them to the Lord’s immortality. The findings reveal that Clement believes in a real flesh and blood Incarnation through which the *Logos*-Son became the Source of salvation for humankind.

In the next chapter, attention turns to the second aspect of the exchange doctrine. Through the Incarnation, the *Logos*-Son *came* to teach rightly the Scriptures, disclose their secrets, and lead *anthropos* to become *theos*.

Chapter Four: Incarnation and Didactic Mission

A. Introduction

The preceding chapter focuses on the Incarnation and salvific mission of the *Logos-Son*, envisaged by Clement through the first part of the exchange. The *Logos-Son* became *anthropos* and assumed suffering *sarx* in order to enter the contest of the human drama, to overcome the powers of evil, and to cleanse humanity from corruption. He triumphed over malevolent powers through his obedience in life and in his death on the cross, thus preparing the way for salvation. This chapter concentrates on the Incarnation and the second half of the exchange: The *Logos-Son came* to teach humanity divine knowledge in order to guide followers to become *theos*.

The early Christian teaching that claims a divine Messenger descended from heaven (or the *pleroma*) in order to awaken people to the knowledge of God is found in Gnostic teachings. The *Apocalypse of Adam* emphasizes ‘eternal knowledge’ and mentions the ‘illuminator of knowledge.’⁸⁸⁹ This illuminator redeems those possessing the fruit of knowledge ‘from the day of death.’⁸⁹⁰ In some Gnostic texts, Sophia and the biblical figures Adam or Seth are the intermediaries of enlightenment. Most Christian Gnostics, especially Valentinians, believed Christ to be the Agent of revelation who awakens people from forgetfulness by disclosing knowledge of God.⁸⁹¹ From the opening lines of the *Gospel of Truth*, we read: ‘This is the Gospel of the one who is searched for...Jesus, the Christ. Through it, he enlightened those who were in darkness. Out of oblivion, he enlightened them; he showed (them) a way. And the way is the truth which he taught them.’⁸⁹² Some Gnostics thought those who awaken and ‘reflect

⁸⁸⁹ *Apoc.Adam* V.76.17-18.

⁸⁹⁰ *Apoc.Adam* V.76.10, 29.

⁸⁹¹ For examples, see *Ap.James* II.1.9-2.26; *Ap.John* II.2.9-25; *Dial.Saviour* III.1201ff; *Apoc.Peter* VII.70.14-72.4; *1Apoc.James* V.24.10ff; *Gos.Mary* BG.7.3-17.10.

⁸⁹² *Gos.Truth* I.18.13-20.

upon the knowledge of the eternal God in their hearts will not perish.’⁸⁹³ The authors of these tractates claim *gnosis* enables Gnostics to recognize that their root is in the pleroma from which they experience true human destiny.

Similarly, Clement portrays Christ as the Illuminator. Lilla notices this and remarks: ‘[F]or Clement Christ is, first of all, a gnostic teacher who has come down to earth in order to lead a few selected persons to the higher *gnosis* of his father.’⁸⁹⁴

Writing like the Gnostics, but drawing from Paul, Clement claims Christ

awakens those who have wandered in error from the sleep of darkness itself. ‘Awaken [ἐγείρε],’ he says, ‘you who are sleeping and arise [ἀνάστα] from the dead, and Christ the Lord will shine upon you;’ the sun of the resurrection, the one who was begotten before the Morning star, will give you life by his own beams of light.’⁸⁹⁵

Clement understands the ‘awakening’ as a resurrection: ‘His wisdom, which is his *Logos*, raises us up to the truth; this is the first resurrection from the fall [αὕτη πρώτη τοῦ παραπτώματος ἀνάστασις].’⁸⁹⁶ Accordingly, as ‘those who have shaken off sleep,’ we are ‘immediately fully awake from within [εὐθέως ἔνδοθεν ἐγρηγόρασιν].’⁸⁹⁷ Clement has no extant teaching about a resurrection into the future life, but gives a passing reference to ‘the resurrection of the dead’ and ‘in the resurrection.’ These phrases seem to allude to a ‘general’ resurrection, but he does not expound on them.⁸⁹⁸ Where he could have stated his views on a future resurrection, he postpones explication, and on at least two occasions, promises to write ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἀναστάσεως.⁸⁹⁹ This treatise is, however, either lost or Clement never wrote it.

⁸⁹³ *Apoc.Adam* V.76.23-24.

⁸⁹⁴ Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, 159.

⁸⁹⁵ *Prot.* IX.84.1-2; *Eph.* 5:14.

⁸⁹⁶ *Prot.* VIII.80.3-4; *Exc.Thdot.* 1.3.1, ἐλθὼν οὖν ὁ σωτὴρ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξύπνισεν: ‘After coming, the Saviour awakened the soul.’

⁸⁹⁷ *Paid.* I.6.28.1.

⁸⁹⁸ *Str.* III.12.87.2, περὶ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως...κατὰ τὴν ἀναστασεως.

⁸⁹⁹ Both *Paid.* I.6.47.1 and *Paid.* II.10.104.3 use the verb δηλωθήσεται (‘it will be shown’).

Clement's accord with some Gnostic doctrines—*viz.*, the agent of revelation—does not mean he joined their camp. Where Clement differs with the Gnostics is in (1) the manner in which the Messenger came to humankind, which is through the Incarnation (2) the identity of the Messenger, which is the *Logos-Son*, (3) the source of *gnosis*, which is the Scriptures, and (4) the purpose for *gnosis*, which is an 'awakening' to the destiny of deification. Salvation for the Gnostic is to awaken from ignorance and gain insight into the knowledge of the Father and of one's existence; *gnosis* is insight and insight is salvation. In the *Testimony of Truth*, the author confesses that salvation 'is the true testimony: when a man comes to know himself and God who is over the truth, he will be saved.'⁹⁰⁰ Clement agrees with this tenet, but he surpasses the Gnostics: 'The greatest of all lessons is to know one's self. For if one knows himself, he will know God; and knowing God, one shall be made like God.'⁹⁰¹ As will be shown later, the reception of *gnosis* entails a radical assimilation to the likeness of God by the transforming power of the indwelling *Logos-Son*, through imbibing Scripture, and obedience to his teachings.⁹⁰²

Clement's teachings on the Incarnation are interspersed throughout this chapter at suitable points to accentuate the second part of the exchange doctrine. This chapter enhances Clement's discussion on the Incarnation by bringing to the fore his teachings on the coming (παρουσία) and appearing (ἐπιφάνεια) of the *Logos-Son*. Through the Incarnation, the *Logos-Son* was present in history as Teacher, and interpreted precisely the prophets, disclosing the mysteries of God as the clear voice of Scripture. Moreover, *via* the Incarnation, the Teacher appeared to disclose hidden knowledge about the way of salvation. This *gnosis* removes ignorance from the *nous* and *logikos*. For this Alexandrine teacher, the *Logos-Son* is the heavenly *Paidagogos*, who heals believers

⁹⁰⁰ *Test.Truth* IX.44.30-45.5.

⁹⁰¹ *Paid.* III.1.1.1.

⁹⁰² *Paid.* III.1.1.5; *Prot.* IX.87.1.

with the balm of instruction, cleansing the soul of ignorance and evil energy. In Clement's thinking, this assimilation fulfils the 'prophetic' utterance announced at the proto-formation: 'Let us make man in our image and likeness.' Taken from Platonic phrasing, 'assimilation to the likeness of God' is an idiom with which Clement talks about the way to deification. This chapter further shows that deification fulfils another prophetic statement: 'I said you are gods.'⁹⁰³ Becoming a god is a process of transformation by grace, realized by participation in the power of God through *gnosis*. The descent of the *Logos*-Son into the sensible region set up the possibility for people to ascend into the spiritual regions and become gods. For Clement, the ascent of humankind is consequential to the descent of the *Logos*-Son.⁹⁰⁴ In other words, the 'response to the Incarnation, through which we receive deification, imitates the action of the Word in the Incarnation—our deification mirrors his Incarnation.'⁹⁰⁵

B. *Logos*-Son as Teacher

Central to Clement's exchange doctrine is that the *Logos*-Son teaches *anthropos* the way to become *theos*. Whereas the first part of the exchange emphasizes the salvific mission of the *Logos*-Son, the second part of the exchange accentuates his didactic mission, highlighting his agency of revelation. Since the *Logos*-Son came in the flesh, Clement sees true *gnosis* coming to people through the Incarnation. The following section portrays Clement's portrait of the divine *Logos* and the eternal Son as the Teacher.

Sometime in his journey, Clement terminated his search for 'human learning' (ἀνθρωπίνην διδασκαλίαν) in 'Athens, the rest of Greece, and Ionia,' because he found the 'Teacher who filled the universe with his holy energies in creation, salvation,

⁹⁰³ Ps. 82:6.

⁹⁰⁴ Kallistos Ware, 'Clement of Alexandria,' in *Journey to the Heart: Christian Contemplation through the Centuries*, 42-43.

⁹⁰⁵ Louth, 'The Place of *Theosis* in Orthodox Theology,' 38.

goodness, law, prophecy, and teaching.⁹⁰⁶ Who is this Teacher? Clement identifies the divine *Logos* and the eternal Son as the Teacher (Διδάσκαλος).⁹⁰⁷ Concerning the *Logos*, Clement draws from the Prologue of John’s Gospel and adds: ‘The truly existent *Logos*, who “was with God” and “by whom all things were created,” appeared as the Teacher.’⁹⁰⁸ Clement ‘openly proclaim[s] the *Logos* as the only Teacher’ for humankind.⁹⁰⁹ Should we ask what doctrine the *Logos* teaches? Clement would answer: ‘The *Logos* alone is the Teacher of true godliness.’⁹¹⁰ Clement also professes that ‘our Teacher is the Son of God.’⁹¹¹ If we inquire, what does the Son teach? Clement will tell us: ‘The Son is the true Teacher concerning the Father.’⁹¹² In addition, ‘the *Logos*-Son [ὁ λόγος υἱός] is the only Teacher of the mind of the Father, the one who instructs humanity.’⁹¹³ The *Logos*-Son conveys to people the *gnosis* concealed in the thoughts of God. These divine thoughts have come to humankind, which ‘the Lord himself taught [αὐτὸς ἐδίδαξεν ὁ κύριος]’ as the Gospel that perfects the Gnostic with ‘the closest likeness [ὁμοιότητα],’ that is, ‘the intelligence of the Teacher [τὴν διάνοιαν τὴν τοῦ διδασκάλου].’⁹¹⁴ Thus, in Clement’s thinking, this Teacher ‘rightly interprets the Scriptures’ and ‘the oracles of God.’⁹¹⁵

This arrangement of relations—the *Logos* and the Son as the divine Teacher—is essential to Clement’s didactic mission, because the ‘Son is the power of God, the most

⁹⁰⁶ *Prot.* XI.112.1.

⁹⁰⁷ For a treatment of Christ as the *Didaskalos*, see Oleh Kindiy, *Christos Didaskalos: The Christology of Clement of Alexandria*, 150-182. See also, Adolph Knauber, «Der ‘Didaskalos’ des Clements von Alexandrien.» *SP XVI:2* (1985): 175-185.

⁹⁰⁸ *Prot.* I.7.3, ἐπεφάνη ὁ ἐν τῷ ὄντι ὢν, ὅτι «ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν,» διδάσκαλος, ἐπεφάνη ὡς τὰ πάντα δεδημιούργηται λόγος

⁹⁰⁹ *Str.* II.4.16.2, τὸ δὲ πείθεσθαι τῷ λόγῳ, ὃν διδάσκαλον ἀνηγορεύσαμεν.

⁹¹⁰ *Str.* II.2.9.4, ἀληθῆς θεοσεβείας αὐτῆς, ἧς μόνος διδάσκαλος ὁ λόγος.

⁹¹¹ *Str.* V.13.85.2, ὁ υἱὸς ἐστὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν.

⁹¹² *Str.* V.1.1.4, υἱὸς δὲ περὶ πατρὸς ἀληθῆς διδάσκαλος.

⁹¹³ *Str.* IV.25.162.5, ὅθεν καὶ διδάσκαλος μόνος ὁ λόγος, υἱὸς τοῦ νοῦ πατρὸς, ὁ παιδεύων τὸν ἄνθρωπον. The comma after λόγος is misleading, since separates υἱὸς from the previous nominatives. If we omit the comma and translate τοῦ νοῦ as the modifier of διδάσκαλος μόνος, so that it reads: ‘the *Logos* Son is the only Teacher of the mind of the Father,’ then it seems more consistent with Clement’s theology. See *Str.* V.1.1.4, υἱὸς δὲ περὶ πατρὸς ἀληθῆς διδάσκαλος.

⁹¹⁴ *Str.* VI.14.114.6-15.115.1.

⁹¹⁵ *Paid.* III.12.87.1; *Paid.* III.12.98.1.

ancient *Logos* of the Father, and is called the Teacher of those who were formed by him.⁹¹⁶ From this viewpoint, Clement argues: ‘It is fitting that God,’ meaning the *Logos*-Son, ‘is designated as the suitable Teacher’ because ‘he alone can correctly fashion a person to the likeness of God.’⁹¹⁷ When recipients receive the teachings of the mind of the Father, they are transformed and participate in the likeness of the mind of the Teacher, as like produces like, so *gnosis* of God produces gods.

Clement highlights the mystical dimension of the knowledge of God. *Quis Dives Salvetur* informs us that Christ is ‘the Teacher of super-celestial lessons,’ a knowledge not from this world.⁹¹⁸ This structure of knowledge is hidden within the ‘holy of holies’ from whence the Teacher derives and discloses the *gnosis* that “‘eye has not seen, ear has not heard, and [which] has not entered into the heart of humankind.’”⁹¹⁹ In this way, the ‘super-celestial instructions’ are called ‘illumination’ because they ‘unveil hidden [truth],’ and only this Teacher—‘the great High Priest’ (*Stromateis* V.6.32.1-40.4)—‘can uncover the lid of the ark.’⁹²⁰ The Cherubim that sit above the Ark of Covenant ‘signify much knowledge [ἐπίγνωσιν πολλήν].’⁹²¹ In view of the mystical nature of this knowledge, Clement advises believers to approach these celestial teachings, ‘not in a human way,’ but ‘with wonder and with a super-celestial depth of mind [θαυμαστῶ καὶ ὑπερουρανίῳ διανοίας βάθει],’ which arises through contemplation of Scripture.⁹²² However, since ‘the things recorded within this sacred Ark reveal the properties of the world of thought [τὰ τοῦ νοητοῦ κόσμου],’ they are

⁹¹⁶ *Str.* VII.2.7.4, καὶ διδάσκαλος λεχθείη τῶν δι’ αὐτοῦ πλασθέντων; *Str.* VI.7.58.1, οὗτος [ὁ θεός] ἔστιν ὁ τῶν γεννητῶν ἀπάντων διδάσκαλος.

⁹¹⁷ *Prot.* IX.86.2.

⁹¹⁸ *Q.d.s.* 23.4, ἐγὼ διδάσκαλος ὑπερουρανίων παιδευμάτων.

⁹¹⁹ 1Cor. 2:9; *Str.* VI.8.68.1, διασαφῆναι τὸν περὶ τούτων λόγον ἡμῖν τὸν διδάσκαλον, ἄγια ἄγιων.

⁹²⁰ *Str.* V.10.64.4, ἀποκαλύψαντος μόνου τοῦ διδασκάλου τὸ πῶμα τῆς κιβωτοῦ. For a discussion on Clements teaching on Christ as Ἀρχιερεὺς, see Kindiy, *Christos Didaskalos: The Christology of Clement of Alexandria*, 183-196.

⁹²¹ *Str.* V.6.35.7, ἐθέλει δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τῶν Χερουβὶμ δηλοῦν ἐπίγνωσιν πολλήν.

⁹²² *Q.d.s.* 5.1, 4.

essentially ‘hidden and closed off to the majority [τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου καὶ ἀποκεκλεισμένου τοῖς πολλοῖς].’⁹²³ Of necessity, Clement points believers to the *Logos*-Son, the Agent of revelation, as the only Teacher of this ‘sanctuary of knowledge [ἀγίασμα γνώσεως].’⁹²⁴ The question here is what are the common problems that hinder people from hearing or learning the knowledge of God? Clement’s answers are problems of impediments in human existence.

C. Problem: Impediments in Human Existence

The didactic mission redirects humanity from the sensible region to the intellectual (or spiritual) region, which is a major focus in Clement’s work, *Paidagogos*. As a pearl is hidden in the oyster and the oyster hidden in the sea, so the *telos* of human existence is concealed in mystery and the requisite *gnosis* is hidden in the intellectual region.⁹²⁵ Clement condemns wearing pearls (or precious stones) belonging to the sensible world, and leads catechumens to search for the *Logos* (the true precious stone) in the ‘heavenly’ world. The ‘radiance of the stones [τὸ ἄνθος τῶν λίθων]’ in this region are perceived as ‘the matchless brilliancy of the Spirit and the undefiled sanctity of existence [τὸ ἀμίμητον τὸ ἄνθος τοῦ πνεύματος τὸ ἀκήρατον καὶ ἅγιον τῆς οὐσίας νενοήκασιν].’⁹²⁶ Clement’s spiritual *paideia* redirects believers beyond the ‘earthly’ precious stones to the value of the heavenly region where life is ‘spiritually built up [πνευματικῶς οἰκοδομουμένη]’ with eternal value.⁹²⁷

This refocus toward the spiritual dimension is depicted in a passage describing the Incarnation as a mission. Clement explains that the ‘sacred mysteries of the prophecies are concealed in parables...for the style of Scripture is parabolic. Wherefore, the Lord, who was not of this world [κοσμικός], came as one from this world [κοσμικός] to

⁹²³ *Str.* V.6.35.5.

⁹²⁴ *Paid.* III.12.98.1.

⁹²⁵ *Paid.* II.12.118.4-120.1.

⁹²⁶ *Ibid.*

⁹²⁷ *Paid.* II.12.119.2.

humanity.’⁹²⁸ He entered this cosmos as a human being. The *Logos*-Son came as a parable and ‘he was destined to lead people who were raised by this world upward to the intellectual and divine realities through knowledge [ἐπὶ τὰ νοητὰ καὶ κύρια διὰ τῆς γνώσεως ἀνάγειν], that is, from this world to another world.’⁹²⁹ The problem is that people could not apprehend that he entered a world foreign to him (the sensible region) in order to lead people to a world foreign to them (the spiritual region). This is not the same kind of ascent as found, for example, in Plato’s analogy of the *Cave*: the ascent of the *nous* through opening the mind’s eye to forgotten knowledge.⁹³⁰ Clement’s version is accomplished, not only by awakening the soul to *gnosis*, but also by ‘divine care [θείας κοιμηθῆς]’ given by the *Logos*-Son.⁹³¹ Clement observes that people have impediments and need assistance to work through problems, learn about their destiny, and find the *telos*. He therefore points them to ‘the *Logos*, the Guide of all humanity.’⁹³²

Clement pinpoints three impediments to perceiving the intellectual and divine realm: (1) the sensible body, (2) ignorance, and (3) the passions. These three subjects comprise the following section. Firstly, in Clement’s anthropogony, God created the body (*soma/sarx*) to apprehend the sensible region. For Clement, this rules out the sensible realm for apprehending ‘parabolic’ knowledge, as one cannot grasp spiritual reality through bodily senses. He argues:

Having been bound to the earthly body [τῷ γεώδει σώματι], we grasp the sensible things through the body, but we observe the intellectual powers through the *logikos* itself [τῶν δὲ νοητῶν δι’ αὐτῆς τῆς λογικῆς ἐφαπτόμεθα δυνάμεων]. If someone expects to apprehend all things [τὰ πάντα καταλήψεσθαι] sensibly [αἰσθητῶς], one has fallen very far from the truth.

⁹²⁸ *Str.* VI.15.126.2-3.

⁹²⁹ *Str.* VI.15.126.3.

⁹³⁰ *Rep.* VII.

⁹³¹ *Prot.* X.110.1.

⁹³² *Paid.* I.7.55.2.

Certainly, the Apostle writes spiritually about the knowledge of God [ἐπὶ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ].⁹³³

Clement is neither critical of sensible knowledge nor is he pejorative of the physical body, as are Platonists and Gnostics. His point is that the physical senses correspond to the sensible region, just as the intellectual abilities correspond to the spiritual region. Since God is not observable by senses, one should not expect sensible capabilities to perform a job they were not designed to execute. As he elsewhere states: ‘For that which he [Christ] was [could] not be seen by those unable to make [intellectual] space, because of the weakness of the flesh [διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός].’⁹³⁴ One apprehends the truth with the *logikos*—the guiding faculty of the soul—that Clement claims God breathed into humankind at proto-formation. Clement’s argument is a basic tenet of his anthropogony. The sensible region is an impediment because people are reared by the cosmos, unaware of the invisible region of divine existence. The problem is, therefore, due to ignorance of God.

Secondly, similar to the Gnostics, Clement shows, because of corruption (as sketched in chapter three), humankind has fallen into the ‘darkness of ignorance’ by closing the eyelids to the light of knowledge.⁹³⁵ For Clement, the problem is people ‘have been blinded concerning the truth’ and therefore err.⁹³⁶ He states:

Ignorance of the Father is death [τὸ δὲ ἀνοεῖν τὸν πατέρα θάνατός ἐστιν], so as to know him is eternal life through participation in the power of the deathless one [ὡς τὸ γνῶναι ζωὴ αἰώνιος κατὰ μετουσίαν τῆς τοῦ ἀφθάρτου δυνάμεως]. To be without corruption is to participate in divinity [θειότητος], but apostasy from the knowledge of God promotes corruption.⁹³⁷

Clement holds this position, because at one time ‘there was an implanted, original relationship [ἔμφυτος ἀρχαία κοινωνία] between heaven and humankind,’ but it was

⁹³³ *Str.* V.1.7.4-6.

⁹³⁴ *Str.* VII.2.8.6.

⁹³⁵ *Paid.* II.9.80.1-3.

⁹³⁶ *Paid.* I.6.29.4.

⁹³⁷ *Str.* V.10.63.8; *Q.d.s.* 7.3.

‘darkened by ignorance [ἀνοία ἐσκοτισμένη].’⁹³⁸ As a result, those who seek for the good life through opinion rather than knowledge of God are only dreaming, and ‘life for them here is a deep sleep of ignorance [καὶ ἔστιν αὐτοῖς ὁ τῆδε βίος ἀγνοίας ὕπνος βαθύς].’⁹³⁹ Clement deems it ‘necessary for darkness to disappear by illumination [τῷ φωτισμῷ].’⁹⁴⁰ Thus, through the light of the knowledge of God, people make their way out of sins and ascend toward the spiritual region.

Thirdly, Clement identifies the struggle with passions as an impediment to learning knowledge of God. The passions obscure the vision of the truth, blinding the mind with ‘the gloom of ignorance.’⁹⁴¹ At the outset of the *Paidagogos*, emphasizing his direction for spiritual *paideia*, Clement argues that one who is struggling with the passions is similar to one physically sick; thus, one who is ill will not learn readily, because ill health distracts the reception of knowledge. Likewise, one who is ‘diseased’ with passions will not easily admit divine *gnosis*. Clement concludes the section: ‘Therefore, those of us who are diseased in body need a physician, so also those who are diseased in soul require a *Paidagogos* to heal the passions [ἴν’ ἡμῶν ἰάσηται τὰ πάθη]. Then [they need] a Teacher to guide the soul to clean health for [the reception of] *gnosis*, upon being able to make room for the revelation of the *Logos*.’⁹⁴²

Illustrating the impediments of the passions further, Clement calls attention to the strife among the Christians at Corinth that Paul addressed in 1Corinthians 3:1-3. He interprets the Pauline passage this way: ‘He [Paul] called those, who had already believed in the Holy Spirit, the spiritual ones [τοὺς πνευματικούς], and those who had been recently catechized [τοὺς νεωστὶ νεοκατηχουμένους], but had not yet been

⁹³⁸ *Prot.* II.25.3.

⁹³⁹ *Paid.* II.10.106.2.

⁹⁴⁰ *Paid.* I.6.29.4.

⁹⁴¹ *Str.* I.28.178.1.

⁹⁴² *Paid.* I.1.3.3.

cleansed [μηδέπω κεκαθαμένους], he called the fleshly ones [τοὺς σαρκικούς].⁹⁴³ Those who had been newly catechized, but were still governed by fleshly passions (τοὺς σαρκικούς) were ‘unable’ to grasp the knowledge of God, because they ‘were fleshly, minding the things of the flesh: that is, desiring, lusting, and becoming jealous, angry and envious.’⁹⁴⁴ The spiritual ones (τοὺς πνευματικούς) had ‘crucified’ the desires of the flesh and were able to grasp truth.

Unlike the Gnostics, who believed that the malevolent powers in this cosmos were mythical archons, lesser deities created by Yaldabaoth who plot and even control human sufferings, Clement views the ‘malevolent powers’ (τοῖς κακούργοις δυνάμεσιν) as internal passions.⁹⁴⁵ In *Quis Dives Salvetur*, he testifies that the Saviour ‘pitied us, who had been nearly given over to death by the world powers of darkness [τῶν κοσμοκρατόρων τοῦ σκότους]; that is, by many traumas, fears, lusts, tempers, sorrows, deceits, and pleasures.’⁹⁴⁶ Addressing the effects of these powers, Clement describes that ‘the blindness of the eyes and deafness of the ears are more painful than all the other wounds [inflicted] by the evil [powers]. By the first of these, one is cheated of the heavenly vision [τῆς οὐρανίου προσόψεως]; by the second, one is deprived of divine teaching [τῆς θείας μαθήσεως].’⁹⁴⁷

To show that these passions are not mythical archons but emotional sufferings, Clement refers to Ephesians 6:10-12, and explains that the struggle people face is ‘not with blood and flesh [οὐ πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα], but with the spiritual authorities working through the flesh [ἀλλὰ τὰς διὰ σαρκῶν ἐνεργούσας πνευματικὰς

⁹⁴³ *Paid.* I.6.36.3.

⁹⁴⁴ 1Cor. 3:1-3; *Paid.* I.6.36.6, «ἔτι γὰρ σαρκικοί ἐστε» τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονοῦντες, ἐπιθυμοῦντες, ἐρώντες, ζηλοῦντες, μνηϊῶντες, φθονοῦντες.

⁹⁴⁵ See *Hyp.Arch.* II.86.20-27; *Ap.John* II.20.1-9; Pagels, ‘Exegesis and Exposition of the Genesis Creation Accounts in Selected Texts from Nag Hammadi,’ in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*, 257-285.

⁹⁴⁶ *Q.d.s.* 29.2-3, τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν κοσμοκρατόρων τοῦ σκάτους ὀλίγου τεθανατωμένους τοῖς πολλοῖς τραύμασι, φόβοις, ἐπιθυμίαις, ὀργαῖς, λύπαις, ἀπάταις, ἡδοναῖς.

⁹⁴⁷ *Prot.* X.104.4.

ἔξουσίας], that is, these emotional sufferings [ἐμπαθῶν παθῶν τούτων].⁹⁴⁸ Thus, sufferings are the painful energies. Clement sums up his view on this subject:

The simple account of our philosophy asserts that all the passions are the impressions of a soft and yielding soul, and become like the signatures of the spiritual powers with whom we struggle. I think for the maleficent powers to execute a work somewhat of their own way with all and each one, [they] attempt to conquer and make their own even those who have renounced them.⁹⁴⁹

As seen in the previous chapter, Clement calls the maleficent powers—*viz.*, lust, tempers, deceit, and pleasure—by the mythical names, serpent, dragon, satan, devil, and the tyrant death.⁹⁵⁰ During the first part of the exchange, the incarnate *Logos*-Son came to defeat these powers: the salvific mission; in the second part of the exchange, he teaches followers to overcome them: the didactic mission.

D. *Parousia* and *Appearing* of *Logos*-Son

In addition to the verbs Clement uses to depict the Incarnation—such as ἀναλαμβάνω, γίνομαι, and ἐνδύω—he frames his dogma with other terms found in the New Testament: παρουσία (*parousia*) and ἐπιφάνεια (appearing). Where Clement speaks of the *parousia*, he emphasizes the exegetical and didactic work of the *Logos*-Son, who interprets the salvific message from the prophets. He tells us that ‘[w]isdom is well-tested knowledge of things divine and human, which the Lord taught us, both by his *parousia* and through the prophets [ἐδιδάξατο ἡμᾶς διὰ τε τῆς παρουσίας ὁ κύριος].’⁹⁵¹ Where Clement refers to the *appearing* of the *Logos*-Son, he emphasizes salvific grace and revelatory agency. These two terms—παρουσία and ἐπιφάνεια—indicate a demarcation in Clement’s former learning, bringing the apostolic tradition to

⁹⁴⁸ *Str.* VII.3.20.4-5; Eph. 6:10-12.

⁹⁴⁹ *Str.* II.20.110.1-2.

⁹⁵⁰ The subject of maleficent powers in Clement’s work is unexplored and needs additional research.

⁹⁵¹ *Str.* VI.7.54.1, ἦν ἐδιδάξατο ἡμᾶς διὰ τε τῆς παρουσίας διὰ τε τῶν προφητῶν ὁ κύριος.

the fore. They also signal a shift in Clement’s theological vocabulary; the words are New Testament antecedents, found in Pauline and Petrine writings.⁹⁵²

1. *Parousia*

The term παρουσία means ‘advent,’ ‘arrival,’ ‘coming’ or ‘presence.’⁹⁵³ The basic concept is that a *parousia* is the coming of the *presence* of someone. For Clement, the *parousia* is always a reference to the coming of the presence of God through the Incarnation: ‘God was made known by the *parousia* of Christ [ἐγνωσται ὁ θεὸς κατὰ τὴν Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν]. For “no one knows God except the Son and to whom the Son makes [him] known.”⁹⁵⁴ God came to humanity in Christ to reveal himself to humanity.

Clement uses the term σάρκωσις (‘growth of flesh’) to refer to the Incarnation only once. What is interesting is that he includes it in a context with the term παρουσία, using both words in similar prepositional phrases:

πρὸ τῆς τοῦ λόγου σαρκώσεως: ‘before the Incarnation of the *Logos*.’
πρὸ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου: ‘before the coming of the Lord’⁹⁵⁵

Clement indicates the *parousia* is an event that came through the Incarnation, and as argued in the previous chapter, the *Logos*-Son had flesh as any other human being. Affirming this point, Clement comments on John 8:56, where Jesus told certain Pharisees that their ‘Father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it and was glad.’ What Abraham saw, according to Clement, was ‘the *parousia* in the flesh [τὴν

⁹⁵² For examples of παρουσία in the apostolic letters, see 2Thess. 2:8; 2Pet. 1:16; for ἐπιφάνω, see Tit. 2:11; 3:4; for ἐπιφανεῖα, Tit. 2:13. For παρουσία and ἐπιφανεῖα used together, see 2Thess. 2:8; for ἐπιφάνω and ἐπιφανεῖα together, see 2Tim. 1:10, φανερωθεῖσαν δὲ νῦν διὰ τῆς ἐπιφανεῖας τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. For the cognate φανερώω (to manifest, show forth), see Jn. 2:11; 17:6; 21:1, 14; 2Cor. 4:11; Col. 3:4; and 1Tim. 3:16, μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστηρίου· ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί: ‘great is the mystery of godliness; he appeared in the flesh.’

⁹⁵³ L&S, ‘παρουσία,’ 1343. By NT times παρουσία became a technical term for the Incarnation, but also for a future coming of Christ, see BAGD, παρουσία, 629-630.

⁹⁵⁴ *Paid.* I.5.20.2; Matt. 11:27.

⁹⁵⁵ *Str.* I.17.81.1.

ἐν σαρκὶ παρουσίαν].⁹⁵⁶ Clement uses παρουσία with σάρξ, showing the coming of the *Logos* is reference to the Incarnation. In addition, Clement denotes that the imagery of the name engraved on the plate of the High Priest—‘Holy to the Lord’ (Exodus 28:36)—‘was inscribed on account of the written commandments and because of the perceptible *parousia* [διὰ τε τὴν αισθητὴν παρουσίαν]; it is God’s name being expressed [ὄνομα δὲ εἴρηται θεοῦ].⁹⁵⁷ As the nameplate was perceivable to the senses, so God was made ‘sensible’ (αἰσθητὴν) during his *parousia*.

The proclamation of the *parousia* in the early years of the Church evoked intellectual objections from the Greeks who boasted in their wisdom. Following Paul, Clement recognized that the Greeks deemed the notion of the *parousia*—the event during which God became flesh and blood and was crucified—to be foolish.⁹⁵⁸ The teaching of the *parousia* also provoked hermeneutical scandal among the Jews, who adhered to their traditional interpretation of the law and prophets. Having known the prophecies, ‘they did not believe in the descent’ (μὴ πιστεύειν τῇ ἐκβάσει), *viz.*, the Incarnation; thus, they judged the claims of Jesus to be blasphemous.⁹⁵⁹ In response to both sets of objections, Clement composed *Stromateis* VI ‘according to the character of the *Miscellanies* to resolve the difficulties proposed to [him] by the Greeks and the Barbarians about the *parousia* of the Lord [περὶ τῆς τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίας].⁹⁶⁰

Throughout the *Stromateis*, especially Book VI, Clement sets forth three primary arguments to answer the objections to the *parousia*.⁹⁶¹ Firstly, Christ came as the Interpreter of Scripture to explain rightly the prophecies. Secondly, since the Scriptures

⁹⁵⁶ *Exc.Thdot.* 1.18.2.

⁹⁵⁷ *Str.* V.6.38.

⁹⁵⁸ *Str.* I.18.88.1-4.

⁹⁵⁹ *Str.* VI.15.127.1-5; 1Cor. 1:18-23.

⁹⁶⁰ *Str.* VI.1.1.4, ἐπιλυτέον τά τε ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων τά τε ὑπὸ βαρβάρων προσσπορούμενα ἡμῖν περὶ τῆς τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίας.

⁹⁶¹ There are no less than fourteen references to παρουσία in *Str.* VI. See *Str.* VI.5.43.2; 6.48.4, 5; 6.51.3; 7.54.1; 7.59.3; 7.61.1; 9.77.1; 15.122.1; 15.127.3; 15.127.5; 15.128.1; 17.157.2; and *Str.* VI.17.159.9.

foretold the *parousia*, there is unity between the Old Testament and the event of the *parousia*, which defines the Gospel. Thirdly, since Christ explained the meaning and fulfilment of Scripture—and in Clement’s view, Christ is the fulfilment of all cultural knowledge, including Hellenic philosophy—both Jews and Greeks should move beyond preparatory teachings and advance to the perfection effected by Christ through *gnosis*.

1.1. *Logos*-Son as Interpreter of Scripture

An important aspect to Clement’s doctrine of the Incarnation, especially the movement toward the ascent to deification, is the didactic mission of the *Logos*-Son. He came to interpret the Scriptures, disclosing their hidden meanings, and to reveal the *presence* of God to humankind. One reason for this mission is that ‘before the *parousia* [πρὸ τῆς τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίας], the explanation of the prophetic writings had not yet been revealed.’⁹⁶² Nevertheless, Clement observes that John the Baptist understood that the Old Testament prophecies, ‘concerning the *parousia* of the Lord preceded [Christ’s] arrival.’⁹⁶³ Prior to the Baptism of Jesus, ‘John, the preacher of the *Logos* [ὁ κῆρυξ τοῦ λόγου], called [people] to become ready for the *parousia* of God [παρακάλει ἐτοιμούς γίνεσθαι εἰς θεοῦ παρουσίαν].’⁹⁶⁴ In his works, Clement sets out to show how the *parousia* confirms and explains the prophetic mysteries. For this reason, he applies the words of Isaiah—‘I shall give you treasures, concealed, obscure, and invisible [δώσω σοι θησαυροὺς ἀποκρύφους, σκοτεινοὺς, ἀοράτους], so they might know I am the Lord God [ἵνα γινῶσιν, ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός]’—to the *parousia* of the *Logos*-Son.⁹⁶⁵

Clement identifies the *Logos*-Son as the Interpreter of the laws of God and of God himself, suggesting that it takes ‘power and wisdom’ to explain God:

⁹⁶² *Str.* V.14.90.3; *Str.* V.8.55.3, τὴν διὰ τῆς παρουσίας ἐπικρυπτομένην τῷ τῆς προφητείας ἀνίγματι: ‘For the *parousia* was concealed by the enigmas of the prophetic writings.’

⁹⁶³ *Str.* VI.15.122.1.

⁹⁶⁴ *Prot.* I.10.1.

⁹⁶⁵ *Str.* V.10.64.1; Isa. 45:3.

The *Logos* is the “power and wisdom of God.” This same one himself is the interpreter of the laws [νόμων ἐξηγητής], through whom “the law was given [δι’ οὗ ὁ νόμος ἐδόθη].” The first interpreter of the divine ordinances [ὁ πρῶτος ἐξηγητής τῶν θείων προσταγμάτων] is the only begotten Son explaining the bosom of the Father [ὁ τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξηγούμενος υἱὸς μονογενής].⁹⁶⁶

During the time of the *parousia*, ‘the only-begotten God [ὁ μονογενὴς θεός], the one in the bosom of the Father, explained him [ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο].’⁹⁶⁷ According to Clement, the didactic mission includes research and inquiry into the Scriptures. He recounts that ‘Peter, in his *Preaching*, spoke about the apostles, saying, “Having unrolled the books of the prophets, which we possess, which through parables and enigmas, and which authentically express the Christ, naming [him] Jesus, we found ‘his coming [τὴν παρουσίαν], his death [τὸν θάνατον], and his cross [τὸν σταυρόν].”’⁹⁶⁸

Based on this kind of knowledge, Clement asserts that

the discovery of the research about God is the teaching through his Son [τῆς τοίνυν περὶ θεοῦ ζητήσεως εὔρεσις μὲν ἢ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ διδασκαλία]; and the sign that our Saviour himself is [the] Son of God [σημεῖον δὲ τοῦ εἶναι τὸν σωτῆρα ἡμῶν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ] is the prophecies preceding his *parousia* that proclaim him [προηγούμεναι τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ προφητεῖαι, τοῦτον κηρύσσουσαι].⁹⁶⁹

As seen in chapter two, Clement argues that the *Logos*-Son gave the prophecies, and it was his ‘*energeia* that worked through the prophets.’ Through this same activity ‘one learns the gnostic tradition [ἐστὶ τὴν γνωστικὴν παράδοσιν ἐκμανθάνειν], just as he himself taught the holy apostles by his *parousia* [ὡς αὐτὸς κατὰ τὴν παρουσίαν τοὺς ἁγίους ἐδίδαξεν ἀποστόλους].’⁹⁷⁰ Clement is saying that through the revelatory agency of Christ, believers learn the deeper meanings of Scripture. Therefore, since the *parousia* interprets the Old Testament,

⁹⁶⁶ *Str.* I.26.169.4; 1Cor. 1:24.

⁹⁶⁷ *Str.* V.12.81.3; Jn. 1:18.

⁹⁶⁸ *Str.* VI.15.128.1.

⁹⁶⁹ *Str.* VI.15.122.1-2.

⁹⁷⁰ *Str.* VI.7.61.1, ὡς αὐτὸς κατὰ τὴν παρουσίαν τοὺς ἁγίους ἐδίδαξεν ἀποστόλους.

it is said to the Hebrews, “If you do not believe, you will not understand.”⁹⁷¹ That is, if you do not believe in what is prophesied through the law and foretold by the law [ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσητε τῷ διὰ νόμου προφητευθέντι καὶ ὑπὸ νόμου θεσπισθέντι], you will not understand the Old Testament, which he himself explained by his own *parousia* [κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐξηγήσατο παρουσίαν].⁹⁷²

For Clement, the teachings of Jesus are crucial to an accurate understanding of the prophetic utterances in the Old Testament. In this way, the *parousia* through the Incarnation and the disclosure of the mysteries of prophecy provide, for Clement, essential content of the apostolic tradition.

1.2. Gospel and Unity of Scripture

The manner in which Christ taught the Scriptures as a fulfilment of prophecies naturally links the *parousia* with the Old Testament. Christ’s disclosure and interpretation of the prophetic mysteries transformed the Old Testament into the New Testament Gospel, because the law and the prophets conceal the Gospel. Explaining the events surrounding the birth of John the Baptist, Clement explains allegorically that ‘this is what the silence of Zacharias signified: the *Logos* of the prophetic enigmas, upon becoming the Gospel loosened the mystic silence [ὁ λόγος τῶν προφητικῶν αἰνιγμάτων τὴν μυστικὴν ἀπολύσεται σιωπὴν, εὐαγγέλιον γενόμενος].’⁹⁷³ Zacharias was mute, because God was not yet unveiling the mysteries. At the *parousia* of the *Logos*-Son—a time to disclose the mysteries of God from the prophets as the Gospel—the divine silence ended, and Zachariah spoke. What emerges through the *parousia* and from the Old Testament is the Gospel of God. Where, therefore, Clement appeals to what he calls the ‘ecclesiastical canon’ for a claim to proper doctrinal belief, he explains it as ‘the agreement and harmony of the law and the prophets with the

⁹⁷¹ Isa. 7:9.

⁹⁷² *Str.* IV.21.134.3-4. In *Str.* II.2.8.2-3, Clement combines Hab. 2:4 with Isa. 7:9 and argues that it is not possible for the soul ‘to admit higher contemplation [ὑπερφυσὴ θεωρίαν χωρήσαι], while unbelief concerning the teaching contends within’ the person. Isaiah 7:9 is cited in *Str.* I.1.8.2; *Str.* II.4.17.4; *Str.* IV.21.134.4; *Str.* V.13.85.1.

⁹⁷³ *Prot.* I.10.1.

covenant that was passed down by the *parousia* of the Lord [τῆ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίαν παραδιδόμενη διαθήκη].⁹⁷⁴ As a correction to the Gnostics, Clement holds to the unity of Old and New Testaments based upon the *parousia* being a fulfillment of the prophecies.

Another way Clement conveys the harmony between the two covenants is through his teaching of the ‘double descent,’ which he alludes to in several passages. It goes like this: ‘Righteousness came down to humanity both in the writing and in the body, by *Logos* and by law, constraining humanity unto saving repentance.’⁹⁷⁵ The *Logos* first descended in the letters of the law and as divine knowledge breathed into the prophets; then, the *Logos* descended a second time and became a human being. In *Paidagogos* I.7, Clement states it simply: The *Logos* gave the law through Moses, ‘but eternal grace and truth were by Jesus Christ.’⁹⁷⁶ Here the *Logos* was in the law; and then to fulfil the law, the *Logos* became flesh in Jesus. Clement puts it another way, ‘the Lord wanted to gather Jerusalem as a hen gathers her chickens two times; once ‘by the prophets [διὰ τε προφητῶν]’ and once ‘by the *parousia* [διὰ τῆς παρουσίας].’⁹⁷⁷ Moreover, there is an extended version of the double descent in *Excerpta ex Theodoto*:

And the ‘Word became flesh’ not only while becoming human at his coming [οὐ κατὰ τὴν παρουσίαν μόνον ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος], but also in the beginning. The identical *Logos* became Son by being circumscribed, and not according to essence [ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ ἐν ταυτότητι λόγος κατὰ περιγραφὴν καὶ οὐ κατ’ οὐσίαν γενόμενος υἱός]. Again, he became flesh when working through the prophets [σὰρξ ἐγένετο διὰ προφητῶν ἐνεργήσας]. And the Saviour is referred to as the offspring [τέκνον] of the same *Logos*; therefore, ‘in the beginning was the *Logos* and the *Logos* was with God,’ which became life in him [the Son].⁹⁷⁸

⁹⁷⁴ *Str.* VI.15.125.3, κανὼν δὲ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἡ συνωδία καὶ ἡ συμφωνία νόμου τε καὶ προφητῶν τῆ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίαν παραδιδόμενη διαθήκη.

⁹⁷⁵ *Paid.* I.9.88.3, ἔπειτα δὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄνθρώπους καταβέβηκεν ἡ δικαιοσύνη καὶ γράμματι καὶ σώματι, τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τῷ νόμῳ, εἰς μετάνοιαν τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα βιαζομένη σωτήριον (an AB-BA chiasm).

⁹⁷⁶ *Paid.* I.7.60.2.

⁹⁷⁷ *Str.* I.5.29.5.

⁹⁷⁸ *Exc.Thdot.* 1.19.1-2.

The *Logos* in the prophets and in the *parousia* is a natural harmony of Scripture, because: ‘the law and the Gospel are the energy of one Lord who is the “power and wisdom of God.”’⁹⁷⁹ Clement reads this power mystically: the very *Logos*, who spoke to Moses from the bush, is the same *Logos* who wore the thorns. This association between the bush (Moses) and the crown of thorns (Jesus) ‘demonstrates the work of one power,’ a divine *dynamis* linking both covenants.⁹⁸⁰ Accordingly, ‘in the *Preaching of Peter* you will find the Lord addressed as ‘law and *Logos*’ [νόμον καὶ λόγον].’⁹⁸¹ The double descent depicts the inherent unity between the two covenants in the sense that the second descent, when the *Logos*-Son entered the earth as *anthropos*, was the fulfilment of the first descent, when he entered the world as law and prophets.

The ‘operation’ of the double descent is found in the *Protrepitkos*, illustrating the way Clement applies Isaiah’s eschatological vision of the New Jerusalem—and the proclamation of law and *Logos*—to the overthrow of the Hellenistic religious centers and their practices. In view of the brightness of the truth, Clement urges the Greeks to abandon their customs:

Let us bring down from above, out of heaven, the truth with bright intention, and the holy prophetic choir unto the holy mountain of God. While shining [her] light to the farthest points, let [her] illuminate those who are wallowing around in darkness, and let [her] set free these people from error by reaching out her uppermost right hand; that is, the quick understanding in respect to salvation. And those who shake their heads and lift up their thoughts, let them abandon Helicon and Cithaeron and let them occupy Zion, ‘For the law goes out from Zion and the *Logos* of the Lord from Jerusalem,’ that is, the heavenly *Logos*, the true Champion, who is being crowned upon the stage of the whole world.⁹⁸²

Clement interprets Isaiah’s prophecy as the victorious mission of the double descent.

The perfect law and everlasting *Logos* go forth from Zion and Jerusalem as the true

⁹⁷⁹ *Str.* I.27.174.3; 1Cor. 1:24.

⁹⁸⁰ *Paid.* I.8.75.2.

⁹⁸¹ *Str.* I.29.182.3, ἐν δὲ τῷ Πέτρου Κηρύγματι εὐροῖς ἂν «νόμον καὶ λόγον» τὸν κύριον προσαγορευόμενον; *Str.* II.15.68.2, Πέτρος ἐν τῷ Κηρύγματι «νόμον καὶ λόγον» τὸν κύριον προσεῖπεν.

⁹⁸² *Isa.* 2:2-3; *Prot.* I.2.3, ἐκ γὰρ Σιών ἐξελεύσεται νόμος, καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ.

Champion. As a divine *propaideia*, the law effectively leads believers to the gateway of perfection; as the true *gnosis*, the *Logos*-Son opens the gate and perfects those who ascend the holy mountain. Clement identifies the mountain as ‘the Church, which towers above the clouds and touches heaven.’⁹⁸³ He therefore sees his Christian community teaching the law (and philosophy) as preparatory instructions, but the *Logos* as *gnosis* leading to perfection.

1.3. From *Propaideia* to *Gnosis*

Philo linked the two intellectual worlds of Scripture and Greek philosophy for Alexandrian Christianity, showing the preparatory relationship between them. As Hagar the Egyptian was handmaiden to Sarah, Abraham’s wife, so Philo assigns Greek encyclical studies and philosophy as handmaiden to the law of Moses.⁹⁸⁴ This correlation helped Clement draw the parallel between the preparatory function of his philosophical background and its relationship to Scripture.⁹⁸⁵ One main connection between them is they both originate with God. Philo tells us that ‘heaven showered philosophy upon us; it is the human mind which has received and which contains it.’⁹⁸⁶ Clement follows Philo’s thought and claims ‘Greek *propaideia* with philosophy itself has come down from God [θεόθεν].’⁹⁸⁷ However, by grasping the import of the *parousia*, and the interpretation of Scripture as Gospel—and Gospel as *gnosis*, Clement makes encyclical studies, philosophy, and even the Old Testament to be handmaidens to the knowledge of God revealed by the coming of the *Logos*.⁹⁸⁸ Knowledge of the *parousia* makes Clement surpasses Philo. Osborn observes that there is a ‘rational

⁹⁸³ *Paid.* I.8.84.3.

⁹⁸⁴ *Congr.* 71-80; *Str.* I.5.30.1-2.

⁹⁸⁵ For discussion on the usage of Philo in Clement, see David T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 132-156; van den Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and his use of Philo in the Stromateis: an Early Christian Reshaping of a Jewish Model*.

⁹⁸⁶ *Spec. Leg.* III. 185-186.

⁹⁸⁷ *Str.* I.7.37.1.

⁹⁸⁸ *Str.* I.5.28.1--31.2.

reconstruction of the two writers,' Philo and Clement, which 'shows common ground in their essential monotheism; but there are differences which point to a great gulf.'⁹⁸⁹ The dissimilarity is, whereas 'Philo moves from divine oracle to true philosophy with a centre in Moses' and the law, 'Clement moves from divine oracle to true philosophy with a centre in Jesus and the gospel.'⁹⁹⁰

The *parousia* of the *Logos*-Son demarcates knowledge structures for both Jews and Greeks. Clement understands Greek philosophy to be a divine deposit, but limited in its scope and purpose.⁹⁹¹ Just as *Torah* was preparatory for the Jews, philosophy was preparatory for the Greeks.⁹⁹² Nevertheless, God gave it to them so that it might prepare the Greeks to recognize and receive the true Christian philosophy. Until the *parousia*, both Hebrew law and some parts of Hellenistic philosophy functioned as a *Paidagogos* leading humanity to a greater purpose for human existence, as Clement explains:

God is the cause of all good things, but on the one hand, some things are according to what leads the way, as the covenant, both the old and the new; on the other hand, some things are according to consequence, as philosophy. Perhaps also, it [philosophy] was given previously to the Greeks at that time when the Lord called also the Greeks; for this [philosophy] trains the Greek as the law trains the Hebrew unto Christ. Therefore, philosophy prepares beforehand [the Greek], while paving the way for the one who is to be perfected by Christ [τὸν ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ τελειούμενον].⁹⁹³

Predicated upon the *parousia*, Clement designed his teachings to move Greeks and Jews beyond *propaideia* towards the perfection that is accomplished by Christ.

⁹⁸⁹ Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria*, 82.

⁹⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹⁹¹ See J.T. Muckle, 'Clement of Alexandria as Divine Testament for the Greeks,' *Classical Association of Canada: Phoenix* 5:3/4 (1951): 79-86.

⁹⁹² For references to Greek and Jewish *propaideia*, see *Str.* I.1.15.3-5; *Str.* I.5.28.1, I.5.29.3, I.5.30.2, and I.5.32.4; *Str.* I.6.35.4; *Str.* I.7.37.1; *Str.* I.20.99.1; *Str.* VI.8.62.1; *Str.* VI.11.94.2; and philosophy as *propaideia*, *Str.* VI.6.44.1. For Paul's mention of law as a παιδαγωγός, see Gal. 3:24; *Paid.* I.11.97.2. For Clement's use of προγυμνασία (pre-training), see *Str.* I.6.33.1; I.23.156.3; *Str.* VII.10.56.2; for προγύμνασμα, *Str.* IV.21.132.1; and *Str.* VI.10.82.4.

⁹⁹³ *Str.* I.5.28.2-3; Gal. 3:22-23.

After finishing a lengthy discussion on divine providence affirming preparatory instructions for both Jews and Greeks, Clement goes farther and has this to say:

Rightly therefore, the law is for the Jews and philosophy is for the Greeks until the *parousia* [μέχρι τῆς παρουσίας]. Afterwards, there is a universal calling [ἡ κλήσις ἡ καθολικῆ] into the abundance of righteousness, to be a people according to the teaching of faith, bringing together both through one Lord, the only God, for both Greeks and Barbarians, or rather for the whole race of humankind.⁹⁹⁴

Throughout the *Stromateis*, Clement continues to stress this line of demarcation, calling Greeks and Jews forwards to the knowledge of God. Concerning the Greeks, Clement comments: ‘Before the *parousia* of the Lord, philosophy was necessary to the Greeks for righteousness.’⁹⁹⁵ However, philosophy was merely ‘rudimentary and preparatory training for the truth.’⁹⁹⁶ He appeals to Colossians 2:8 and counsels the Greeks not to return to philosophy, which was mere ‘elementary teaching [τὴν στοιχειώδη διδασκαλίαν].’⁹⁹⁷ Rather, they ought to seek the mystery of the knowledge of God in Christ, because ‘in him are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge [ἐν ᾧ εἰσι πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ τῆς γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοι].’⁹⁹⁸

Concerning the Jews, Clement adopts Paul’s approach and asserts, the *parousia* is the fulfilment of the law. He brings in Paul’s letter to the Romans to persuade the Jews that ‘Christ is the *telos* of the law unto righteousness, the [very] one who was prophesied by the law.’⁹⁹⁹ Since the *parousia* is a fulfilment of prophetic promises, it testifies that God is trustworthy, and therefore, the Jews should believe in the *parousia*, because it demonstrates divine providence.¹⁰⁰⁰ Should anyone believe in the *parousia* as the fulfilment of the Old Testament, then one ‘has believed through the prophecies

⁹⁹⁴ *Str.* VI.17.159.9.

⁹⁹⁵ *Str.* I.5.28.1.

⁹⁹⁶ *Str.* VI.8.62.1, στοιχειωτικὴν τινα οὔσαν καὶ προπαιδείαν τῆς ἀληθείας.

⁹⁹⁷ Col. 2:8; *Str.* VI.8.62.3, τὴν στοιχειώδη διδασκαλίαν.

⁹⁹⁸ *Str.* V.10.61.4; Col. 2:3.

⁹⁹⁹ Rom. 10:4; *Str.* II.9.42.5, «τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην,» ὁ ὑπὸ νόμου προφητευθεὶς.

¹⁰⁰⁰ *Str.* VI.9.76.4-77.3.

and the *parousia* in the God who does not lie.’¹⁰⁰¹ Concerning both races of people, Clement presses the point that the *Logos*-Son ‘leads away from each singular journey, both Greeks and Barbarians, to the perfection that is through faith.’¹⁰⁰² Thus, the *parousia* demarcates philosophy and law, setting the teachings of Christ to the fore.

One of the results of the *parousia*, as Clement sees it, is that the *Logos*-Son prepared people for the reception of God. In this way, ‘God pities richly because he is good and gives commands by the law and the prophets; and more nearly still, he is already saving and showing mercy through the *parousia* of his Son [ἤδη διὰ τῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ παρουσίας σώζων καὶ ἐλεῶν].’¹⁰⁰³ In this light, ‘[t]he *parousia* of the Saviour [ἡ γὰρ παρουσία τοῦ σωτῆρος] did not make people foolish [μωρούς], hard-hearted [σκληροκαρδίους], or unbelieving [ἀπιστούς] but made them intelligent [συνετούς], ready to obey [εὐπειθεῖς], and believing [πιστούς].’¹⁰⁰⁴ The *parousia* attracted responsive Jews and Greeks, enabling some to become zealous to obey God and to be resolute in faith. As a result, ‘those of them who were persuaded by the *parousia* of the Lord [οἱ πεισθέντες δε αὐτῶν τῇ τε τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίᾳ] and in the clearness of the Scriptures [τῇ τῶν γραφῶν σαφηνείᾳ], come into a new state of being by knowledge [ἐν ἐπιγνώσει] of the law.’¹⁰⁰⁵ Clement characterizes this new existence with love, because “‘Love is the fullness of the law [πλήρωμα νόμου ἢ ἀγάπη].”’¹⁰⁰⁶

This demarcation in knowledge can be seen in another form of *propaideia*: *Theologia*, the science and discourse of divine things. In the fourth century, Gregory the Theologian used the term *theologia* in his theological *Oration*s to classify his

¹⁰⁰¹ *Str.* VI.9.77.1, πεπίστευκεν γὰρ διὰ τε τῆς προφητείας διὰ τε τῆς παρουσίας τῷ μὴ ψευδομένῳ θεῷ.

¹⁰⁰² *Str.* VII.2.11.2, ἄγει γὰρ ἐξ ἑκατέρας προκοπῆς Ἑλληνικῆς τε καὶ βαρβάρου ἐπὶ τὴν διὰ πίστεως τελείωσιν ἐλόμενος.

¹⁰⁰³ *Str.* II.16.73.3.

¹⁰⁰⁴ *Str.* I.18.88.6.

¹⁰⁰⁵ *Str.* VI.7.59.3.

¹⁰⁰⁶ *Str.* IV.18.113.5; Rom. 13:10.

discussion about the Holy Trinity. At the outset of his fifth *Oration*, the theologian refers to the Father, the Son, and the ‘Other Comforter’ as the ‘true light.’ After a brief but dense theological discussion, he adds: ‘Now we have both seen and proclaim concisely and simply the *theologia* of the trinity [τῆς τριάδος θεολογίαν].¹⁰⁰⁷ Christopher Beeley observes this and argues that, for Gregory, *theologia* is ‘the knowledge of the Trinity as it is revealed within the divine economy.’¹⁰⁰⁸ Clement, however, seldom uses the term *theologia*; yet, as will be shown, with striking contrast his references in his compositions to *gnosis*, as knowledge of God, are numerous.¹⁰⁰⁹ He views the *gnosis* handed down by the Apostles as the ‘full knowledge of the truth.’¹⁰¹⁰

This delimitation in knowledge can be observed in the way Clement classifies the terms theologian (θεολόγος) and theology (θεολογία).¹⁰¹¹ He mentions some of the ancient poets, philosophers, and even prophets as a θεολόγος. ‘Orpheus was a theologian.’¹⁰¹² Clement notes that Philolaus, the Pythagorean, talked about ‘ancient theologians and seers.’¹⁰¹³ Clement reports that ‘Moses was a theologian and a prophet.’¹⁰¹⁴ Moreover, some of the ancients had developed a θεολογία, but amongst Hellenistic theologians there was an admixture of useful and useless theology. For

¹⁰⁰⁷ *Or.* 31.3, *De Spiritu Sancto*; NPNF7: 318.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Beeley, *Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and Knowledge of God: In your Light We Shall See Light*, (Oxford: OUP, 2008), 197. For his full discussion on Gregory’s use of θεολογία, see 194-201.

¹⁰⁰⁹ For Clement’s references to θεολογία, see *Prot.* IV.61.1; *Prot.* VI.72.1; *Prot.* VII.74.3; *Str.* I.13.57.6; *Str.* IV.1.2.2; *Str.* V.4.24.1; V.8.46.1; V.8.50.3; V.9.56.4; *Q.d.s.* 26.8.

¹⁰¹⁰ For the phrase, ‘the knowledge of the truth,’ Clement uses the terms γνῶσις or ἐπίγνωσις. For γνῶσις, see *Paid.* I.1.3.1; I.6.36.5; *Str.* II.11.52.3; *Str.* III.17.104.2, ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας γνῶσις (*veritatis cognito*, ANF2: 401); *Str.* V.1.5.2. For ἐπίγνωσις, see *Prot.* IX.85.3; *Paid.* I.7.53.3; *Str.* VII.15.91.8.5; VII.16.95.6, πρὸς τὴν ἐπίγνωσις τῆς ἀληθείας; VII.16.98.3.

¹⁰¹¹ L&S, ‘θεολογῆιον,’ 790. θεολογῆω means to pursue study of divine beings; θεολογία is a science that examines and discourses on things divine; the θεολογῆιον was a place above the stage in a theatre where the gods appeared; the noun θεολόγος is a theologian.

¹⁰¹² *Str.* V.12.78.4, Ὀρφεύς τε αὐτὸς θεολόγος.

¹⁰¹³ *Str.* III.3.17.1, οἱ παλαιοὶ θεολόγοι τε καὶ μάντιες.

¹⁰¹⁴ *Str.* I.22.150.4. Clement drew distinction between Plato and Moses, by quoting a statement from Numenius: ‘What is Plato but Moses speaking Attic Greek?’ He followed that statement with: οὗτος ὁ Μωυσῆς θεολόγος καὶ προφήτης.

example, ‘Cleanthes, the stoic philosopher, demonstrated a true *theologia*.’¹⁰¹⁵ However, the Thracian Orpheus expounded ‘a *theologia* of idols.’¹⁰¹⁶ The philosopher Pherecydes of Syrus had also written a *theologia*, but Clement thought it to be obscure.¹⁰¹⁷ He also deems the compositions on the gods, particularly Zeus, to be ‘theologies of insolence.’¹⁰¹⁸ In stark contrast, Clement considers the philosophy of the Hebrews to be the proper *theologia*.¹⁰¹⁹ The study of θεολογία (the department of θεολογικόν) is styled as Moses’s fourth and highest branch of learning, which ‘Plato calls vision’ (ἡ ἐποπτεία) and ‘Aristotle terms metaphysics’ (μετὰ τὰ φυσικά).¹⁰²⁰ Clement allocates these subjects to the department of *propaideia*, but subordinates Plato and Aristotle to Moses. It can be also be observed that Clement calls neither an Apostle nor a Christian author a θεολόγος, nor does he use the term θεολογία to describe theological discourse beyond ancient theologians and prophets. It is important to observe that all of the theologians who composed a *theologia* that Clement mentions lived before the time of the Incarnation.

Two passages demonstrate in what ways Clement placed Hellenistic *propaideia* beneath the Hebrew Scriptures. Firstly, he claims that the Hebrew prophets taught ‘Orpheus, Linus, Musæus, Homer, and Hesiod’ a *theologia* and showed them how to philosophize (φιλοσοφουῖσι) in a deeper way (ὑπονοία) in order to arrive at the real meanings of truth.¹⁰²¹ In Clement’s thinking, the Hebrew seers taught the Greeks how

¹⁰¹⁵ *Prot.* VI.72.1, Κλεάνθης δὲ ὁ Πηδασεύς, ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς φιλόσοφος, οὐ θεογονίαν ποιητικὴν, θεολογίαν δὲ ἀληθινήν ἐνδείκνυται.

¹⁰¹⁶ *Prot.* VII.74.3, τῶν εἰδώλων τὴν θεολογίαν.

¹⁰¹⁷ *Str.* V.8.50.3, ὁμοία τούτῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ καὶ ἡ Φερεκύδους θεολογίαν τοῦ Συρίου. Clement tells us that this *theologia* was similar to the work written by Heraclitus, *On Nature*, suggesting it too was a *theologia*.

¹⁰¹⁸ *Prot.* IV.61.1, αἱ τῆς ὑβρεως αἱ θεολογίαι.

¹⁰¹⁹ *Str.* V.9.56.3.

¹⁰²⁰ *Str.* I.28.176.1-2, καὶ τέταρτον ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὸ θεολογικὸν εἶδος, ἡ ἐποπτεία, ἣν φησὶν ὁ Πλάτων τῶν μεγάλων ὄντως εἶναι μυστηρίων, Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ τὸ εἶδος τοῦτο μετὰ τὰ φυσικὰ καλεῖ.

¹⁰²¹ *Str.* V.4.24.1-2, οἱ παρὰ τούτων τῶν προφητῶν τὴν θεολογίαν δεδιδασμένοι ποιηταὶ δι’ ὑπονοίας.

to do a proper *theologia*. Secondly, Clement recalls the event from the Gospels in which Jesus fed thousands of people with two fish and five loaves of barley bread. He interprets one fish (an image of Gentiles) to represent encyclical studies and the other fish to be Greek philosophy. The barley bread depicts the Jewish law, the preparatory food that represents the bread of heaven.¹⁰²² In this respect, Clement shows that Jesus fed people Greek and Hebrew *propaideia* before he served the ‘living’ bread of heaven, the divine *gnosis*. Although, he claims that both streams of knowledge were preparatory, Clement considers the Hebrew *propaideia* to be ‘the really living philosophy and the true *theologia*.’¹⁰²³ He discovered that this theology needed no revision and that it pointed perfectly to the true knowledge of God. He therefore subordinates all other preparatory knowledge to the law and the prophets.

Clement is not, however, the first to make this kind of demarcation. Werner Jaeger observes that ‘Xenophanes of Colophon, with his violent attacks against the gods of Homer and Hesiod, was the first Greek philosopher who drew the line of demarcation between popular philosophy and theology.’¹⁰²⁴ In his time, Clement ‘drew the line of demarcation between philosophy (and *theologia*) and the knowledge of God. Perhaps, this demarcation is one reason why Clement wrote so little about *theologia*. Unlike Gregory the Theologian, Clement’s use of the term *theologia* is a preparatory structure of knowledge. In *Quis Dives Salvetur*, he mentions his work, *περὶ ἀρχῶν καὶ θεολογίας*, but is unwilling to elaborate on it.¹⁰²⁵ He lacks interest in discussing *theologia*, but is energetic to write about the knowledge of God disclosed by the *parousia* and appearing of the *Logos*-Son, because Clement has salvific intentions.¹⁰²⁶

¹⁰²² *Str.* VI.11.94.1-5.

¹⁰²³ *Str.* V.9.56.2-3, αὐτῆς βαρβάρου φιλοσοφίας γραφαί...τὴν ὄντως οὐσίαν φιλοσοφίαν καὶ τὴν ἀληθῆ θεολογίαν.

¹⁰²⁴ Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*, 118, en. 6.

¹⁰²⁵ *Q.d.s.* 26.8.

¹⁰²⁶ *Str.* IV.1.3.1-4.

2. Appearing

In addition to the term *parousia*, Clement utilizes the noun ἐπιφάνεια (appearance, manifestation) and the verb ἐπιφάνω (to shew forth, to appear) to refer to the *appearance* of the *Logos-Son* *via* the Incarnation, and subsequently, throughout history.¹⁰²⁷ Clement's teaching on the appearing has a double significance; he appeared and continues to appear as Saviour and Teacher. As Saviour, the *Logos-Son* provides salvific grace by which people inherit eternal life; as Teacher, he provides revelatory agency by which people apprehend the knowledge of God.

In a concise but dense section—*Protreptikos* I.7.1-4—Clement interlaces passages from the apostles, John and Paul—who on the whole affirm the Incarnation—with his theology of the appearing of the *Logos* as Saviour and Teacher.¹⁰²⁸ This literary move, portrayed in the passage below, shows that the appearing of the *Logos-Son* came through the Incarnation, and continues throughout time.

2.1. *Protreptikos* I.7.1-4.

Prot. I.7.1: This *Logos*, the Christ, is the cause of both of our being long ago—for 'he was in God' [ἦν ἐν θεῶ] and of our well-being. Now indeed, this same *Logos* appeared to humankind [ἐπεφάνη ἀνθρώποις αὐτὸς οὗτος ὁ λόγος], who alone is both God and man [ὁ μόνος ἄμφω, θεὸς τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος] the Cause of all good things for us; from whom while learning how to live the good life, [we] are sent to eternal life.

Prot. I.7.2: For in the words of that divinely sounding apostle of the Lord, 'the saving grace of God has appeared to all humanity [πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐπεφάνη], instructing us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we are to live soberly, justly, and godly in the present age, while anticipating with favour the blessed hope and the appearing [τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν] of the glory of the great God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ.'¹⁰²⁹

Prot. I.7.3: This is the New Song, the appearing that is now shining among us [ἡ ἐπιφάνεια ἡ νῦν ἐκλάμψασα ἐν ἡμῖν], the one who exists in the beginning, even the preexisting *Logos*. Recently, the pre-existing Saviour appeared [ἐπεφάνη

¹⁰²⁷ Clement also uses passive forms of ὀράω to refer to the appearing: ὀφθεῖς, 'having been seen' (*Paid.* II.8.75.2.); and ὤφθη, 'was seen' (*Str.* V.6.39.2; *Str.* VII.2.8.6).

¹⁰²⁸ For John and *Logos*: Jn. 1:1-3, 14 and 1Jn. 1:1-2; and for John's *apologia* against Docetism, see 1Jn. 4:2-3. For Paul and the coming of the Son in the flesh: Rom. 1:3-4; Gal. 4:4; Phil. 2:6-7.

¹⁰²⁹ Tit. 2:11-13.

ἔναγχος ὁ προὖν σωτήρ]; the one who really exists appeared [ἐπεφάνη ὁ ἐν τῷ ὄντι ὢν]; for ‘the *Logos* who was with God’ [appeared] as [our] Teacher, [viz.] the *Logos* appeared by whom ‘all things were created [ἐπιφάνη ᾧ τὰ πάντα δεδημιούργηται λόγος].’¹⁰³⁰ And when in the beginning, as the Artisan who along with [our] formation provided life, appeared as [our] Teacher, he taught us the good life [τὸ εὖ ζῆν ἐδίδαξεν ἐπιφανείς ὡς διδάσκαλος], in order that finally as God, he might supply everlasting life.

Prot. I.7.4: And now, after appearing, [the *Logos*] saved alive those who were perishing [νῦν δὲ ἤδη ἀπολλυμένους ἐπιφανείς περισέσωκεν].

Where a verbal form is found in this passage (whether the aorist ἐπεφάνη, or the participle ἐπιφανείς), Clement points to the appearing of the *Logos* as a past event (but rows 2 and 9 in the table below could refer also to ongoing appearances); where he uses the noun (ἐπιφάνεια), he denotes recurrent appearances as they seem to refer to manifestations of the *Logos*-Son in Clement’s generation. The final passage (Row 9) pictures salvific appearances from the Incarnation onward.

¹⁰³⁰ Jn. 1:1, 3.

Summary Table: *Protreptikos* I.7.1-4

Row	Text	Incarnation and Appearing	Continuous Appearing	Greek Term
1	<i>Prot.</i> I.7.1 <i>Jn.</i> 1:1	This <i>Logos</i> , the Christ, is the cause of our being long ago—for ‘he was in God’ and of our well-being, this same <i>Logos</i> appeared to humankind.		ἐπεφάνη
2	<i>Prot.</i> I.7.2 <i>Titus</i> 2:11	‘The saving grace of God has appeared to all humanity.’ →		ἐπεφάνη
3	<i>Prot.</i> I.7.2 <i>Titus</i> 2:13		Anticipating with favour the blessed hope and the appearing of the glory.	ἐπιφάνειαν
4	<i>Prot.</i> I.7.3		This is the New Song, the appearing that is now shining among us.	ἐπιφάνεια
5	<i>Prot.</i> I.7.3	Recently, the pre-existing Saviour appeared.		ἐπεφάνη
6	<i>Prot.</i> I.7.3 <i>Jn.</i> 1:1	The one [<i>Logos</i>] who really exists appeared; the <i>Logos</i> who ‘was with God’ [appeared] as [our] Teacher		ἐπεφάνη [ἐπεφάνη]
7	<i>Prot.</i> I.7.3 <i>Jn.</i> 1:3	The <i>Logos</i> appeared by whom ‘all things were created.’		ἐπεφάνη
8	<i>Prot.</i> I.7.3	The Artisan...appeared as [our] Teacher.		ἐπιφανεῖς
9	<i>Prot.</i> I.7.4	And now, having appeared, [the <i>Logos</i>] saved alive those who were perishing. →		ἐπιφανεῖς

Noting that the main topic in *Protreptikos* I is the Incarnation of the *Logos* of God (I.8.4), and observing that the primary subject of *Protreptikos* I.7.1-4 is the preexisting *Logos*, Clement’s use of John 1:1-3 in this section is key, because the apostle uses John 1:1-3 to set the backdrop for his doctrine of the Incarnation in John 1:14-18. The *Logos* who is God and the Creator of all things became flesh and gave of his fullness to

people. Clement has in mind to use John 1:1-3 in this passage to indicate that the appearing of the *Logos* was as *anthropos* (*Protreptikos* I.7.1), and that the *Logos*-Son appeared to humankind as both Saviour and Teacher (*Protreptikos* I.7.3). The argument here is to show that Clement's doctrine of the appearing is rooted in Scripture, focused on salvation, consequential to the Incarnation, and reflects more vividly the function of his claim to a gnostic tradition.

2.2. Appearing as Salvific Event

Referring to the Christ-event, Clement draws from Paul's theology in Titus: 'According to that divinely sounding [θεσπέσιον] apostle of the Lord, "the salvific grace of God [ἡ χάρις ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος] has appeared to all of humanity."¹⁰³¹ This saving grace came to humanity, not through Moses, but 'through Jesus Christ' (John 1:17), whom Clement calls the New Song.¹⁰³² He reports that 'the apostolic writing' tells us:

'After that the kindness and philanthropy of God our Saviour appeared [ἐπιφάνη], not from works which we have done in righteousness, but according to his mercy he saved us.' Behold the might of the New Song; it has made men out of stones, men out of beasts. Those that were as dead, not being partakers of the truly existing life, have come to life again, simply by becoming hearers of this song.¹⁰³³

Clement claims that the saving activity, described by Paul, was taking place during his own lifetime, illustrating that 'the appearing of this *Logos* [ἐπιφανέντος τοῦ λόγου τοῦδε]' is an ongoing salvific work, expressing divine grace and making men (true humans) out of beasts.

To measure the magnitude of this salvific work, Clement provides a mystical interpretation of the 360 bells suspended from the robe of the Hebrew High Priest, which signify the space of a year; thus, the bells proclaim the 'acceptable year of the

¹⁰³¹ *Prot.* I.7.2; *Tit.* 2:11.

¹⁰³² *Paid.* I.7.60.2; *Q.d.s.* 8.1.

¹⁰³³ *Prot.* I.4.4; *Tit.* 3:4-5.

Lord.¹⁰³⁴ As a kerygmatic symbol, they symbolize the ‘preaching and catechizing [of] the greatest appearing of the Saviour [κηρύσσων καὶ κατηχῶν τὴν μεγίστην τοῦ σωτηῆρος ἐπιφάνειαν].¹⁰³⁵ Clement also confirms that this appearing was through the Incarnation: ‘The robe prophesied his economy in the flesh [τὴν κατὰ σάρκα προφητεύειν οἰκονομίαν], through which he was seen [ὡφθη] in closer proximity to the world.¹⁰³⁶ In another place, he asks his students ‘where was the window through which the Lord was shown?’ He tells them that it was through ‘the flesh, by which he was manifested [ἡ σὰρξ, δι’ ἧς πεφανέρωται].¹⁰³⁷ The appearing of the *Logos*-Son is salvific activity, rooted in Pauline theology, and was an appearing in the flesh that was consequential to the Incarnation.

2.3. Appearing as Revelatory Agency

Similar to some Gnostics regarding the disclosure of hidden *gnosis*, Clement reports that Clement of Rome wrote in his letter to the Corinthians: “‘Through Jesus Christ our foolish and darkened mind springs up again into the light [διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ ἀσύνητος καὶ ἐσκοτισμένη διάνοια ἡμῶν ἀναθάλλει εἰς τὸ φῶς]. Through this, the Master wished for us to taste the knowledge of immortality [διὰ τούτου ἠθέλησεν ὁ δεσπότης τῆς ἀθανάτου γνώσεως ἡμᾶς γεύσασθαι].”¹⁰³⁸ The ‘knowledge of immortality’ is hidden under the plain reading of Scripture, but revealed by the appearing of Christ. Revelatory agency is divine inspiration into the human intellect (*logikos*) that dispels ignorance. Clement gives the details:

Such also is the manner according to the appearing of the Lord [ὁ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ κυρίου τρόπος]. At the time when the divine power breathes down upon the thoughts of humans and their reflections [κατὰ ἐπινοίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τοὺς ἐπιλογισμοὺς ἐμπνέει τι [καὶ] ἡ δύναμις], it places in their hearts both

¹⁰³⁴ Lk. 4:19.

¹⁰³⁵ *Str.* V.6.37.4; Lk. 4:19.

¹⁰³⁶ *Str.* V.6.39.2.

¹⁰³⁷ *Paid.* I.5.23.1; here, Clement uses φανερόω, to ‘make manifest.’

¹⁰³⁸ *Str.* IV.17.110.2; 1Clem. 36.2. See *Gos.Truth* I.3.21.26-22.13; *Ap.John* II.1.30.33-31.22.

strength and a more accurate perception [ἐντίθησι ταῖς φρεσὶν ἰσχύν τε καὶ συναίσθησιν ἀκριβεστέραν], while furnishing proficiency and the grounds of confidence for the purpose of research and works [μένος τε καὶ θάρσος προθυμίας ἐπὶ τε τὰς ζητήσεις ἐπὶ τε τὰ ἔργα παρέχουσα].¹⁰³⁹

Mystically speaking, the moment a person receives inspiration and understanding in the knowledge of God is an appearing of the *Logos*-Son.

Unlike the Gnostics, who revised Scripture, Clement advances the diligent practice of studying Scripture, because inquiry into prophetic and apostolic knowledge of God is the spiritual posture that anticipates an appearing. ‘To those who ask questions in the Scriptures, there is given from God (that at which they aim) the gift of the God-given knowledge.’¹⁰⁴⁰ He expands on this revelatory phenomenon with his reading of Jesus’s parable of the wise virgins:

The lamps of the wise virgins were lit up during the night amidst a great darkness of ignorance [ἐν πολλῷ τῷ τῆς ἀγνοίας σκότει], which the Scripture intimates as the dark of night [ἦν νύκτα ἠνίξατο ἡ γραφή]. Prudent souls, pure as virgins, understanding themselves to be located in the ignorance of the world [ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ καθεστῶσας κοσμικῇ], they cling to the light [τὸ φῶς ἀνάπτουσι], raise up the mind [τὸν νοῦν ἐγείρουσι], enlighten the darkness [φωτίζουσι τὸ σκότος], drive out ignorance [τὴν ἀγνοίαν ἐξελαύνουσι], seek the truth [ζητοῦσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν], and they patiently wait for the appearing of the teacher [τοῦ διδασκάλου τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν ἀναμένουσι].¹⁰⁴¹

Clement uses a mixed metaphor to make his point: rather than virgins waiting for the ‘bridegroom’ (Matthew 25:10), they await the Teacher.¹⁰⁴² The implication is that the virgins are those ‘wise souls’ who keep themselves pure by resisting heretical teachings and seek the truth hidden in Scripture. ‘Such are the Gnostic souls,’ Clement muses, ‘which the Gospel likens to the consecrated virgins who wait for the Lord.’¹⁰⁴³ The truth that appears is the Teacher himself, not a Gnostic myth. This Teacher provides the epistemic agency to grasp the truth and appears as the content of the truth.

¹⁰³⁹ *Str.* VI.17.161.2-3.

¹⁰⁴⁰ *Str.* VIII.1.2.1; *ANF2*: 558.

¹⁰⁴¹ *Str.* V.3.17.3; Matt. 25:1-10.

¹⁰⁴² It is not known if Clement had a version of the Gospel that contained the term διδάσκαλος, or if this reading was common currency in Christian circles.

¹⁰⁴³ *Str.* VII.12.72.5.

The two functions of the appearing of the *Logos*-Son—saving and teaching—are characterized by the way Clement coordinates the two roles of the ‘Saviour and Teacher.’¹⁰⁴⁴ Clement reasons that, since people are unable to see the regions of God because they are fraught with impediments and are in need healing, the ‘Saviour was sent as a Teacher and Leader for the possession of the good.’¹⁰⁴⁵ This coordination means that there are two operations in one event. While the Saviour saves, the saving power is also teaching; while the Teacher teaches, the knowledge apprehended is saving. The Saviour appeared as Teacher, because ‘the teaching according to the Saviour is the wisdom and power of God.’¹⁰⁴⁶ To our Alexandrine teacher, the *parousia* and appearing of the *Logos*-Son as Saviour and Teacher gave to humankind a form of teaching inimitable to his former learning, because this knowledge is energetic to lead people to become gods.

E. *Anthropos* Becomes *Theos*

An interesting way to envisage the Incarnation’s link to the doctrine of the exchange in Clement’s works is through his imagery of a yoke. His teaching on the yoke is reserved for this section, because it illustrates well the purpose of the Incarnation as it presents the second part of the exchange: The *Logos*-Son as Teacher ‘yokes’ human beings to God through the knowledge of God.

1. Yoked to *Logos*-Son

In *Protreptikos* I, Clement cites Jesus’s statement: ‘No one knows God except the Son, and to whom the Son reveals [God].’¹⁰⁴⁷ This is the only place Clement uses θεόν rather than πατέρα, where quoting Matthew 11:27; all other references use

¹⁰⁴⁴ See *Prot.* I.7.3; *Str.* II.5.24.3. In this passage, Clement adds God to the equation: ἀξιόπιστῳ διδασκάλῳ τῷ μόνῳ σωτῆρι θεῷ: ‘to the worthy teacher, the only Saviour, God.’ Also, see *Str.* VII.3.21.4 and *Q.d.s.* 6.1.

¹⁰⁴⁵ *Str.* V.1.7.8, καταπέμπεται ὁ σωτῆρ, τῆς ἀγαθοῦ κτήσεως διδάσκαλός τε καὶ χορηγός.

¹⁰⁴⁶ *Str.* I.20.100.1, ἡ κατὰ τὸν σωτῆρα διδασκαλία, «δύναμις» οὖσα καὶ «σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ.»

¹⁰⁴⁷ Matt. 11:27; *Prot.* I.10.3, θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἔγνω, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύπτει.

πατέρα.¹⁰⁴⁸ In the *Paidagogos* and *Stromateis*, Clement quotes Matthew 11:27 verbatim: “No one knows the Father except the Son and to whom he wishes to reveal [the Father].”¹⁰⁴⁹ Clement interprets this relation between the Father and the Son as an ‘equal balance.’ He comments on Matthew 11:27 this way: ‘He announced earlier the good righteousness from heaven that “no one knows the Son except the Father,” and then said, “no one [knows] the Father except the Son.” This knowledge is a counter-balance for equality, the symbol of ancient righteousness.’¹⁰⁵⁰ The relationship between the Father and the Son is a ‘counter-balance for equality,’ because the Father knows the Son; and equally, the Son knows the Father. There is an equal yoke of knowing each other upon Father and Son. However, between God and humans, there is imbalance; God knows people, but people do not know God. For this reason, Clement sets the Incarnation as central to his teachings, because by it, ‘God has made known to us the face of the good yoke of righteousness [ἀγαθοῦ ζυγοῦ πρόσωπον ἡμῖν δικαιοσύνης γνωρίσαντος τοῦ θεοῦ], which is Jesus, through whom we know God by the equally balanced scale.’¹⁰⁵¹

Accordingly, the incarnate *Logos*-Son is the ‘face of the good yoke of righteousness,’ because as God, he properly sees the face of *anthropos*, and as *anthropos*, he rightly sees the face of God. Through the Incarnation, God became yoked to *anthropos*, and through knowledge of God, *anthropos* becomes yoked to God; this is the balanced scale. Through this yoke, believers cast off corruption and ascend to God. Clement conveys Christ’s movement to lead *anthropos* upward this way

¹⁰⁴⁸ Stählin’s *Citenregister* shows eleven mentions of Matthew 11:27 in Clement’s works. See Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus Vierter Band die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, (1936) 12.

¹⁰⁴⁹ See *Paid.* I.9.88.3; *Str.* I.28.178.2; *Str.* V.13.85.1; *Str.* VII.18.109.5.

¹⁰⁵⁰ *Paid.* I.9.88.2-3, καὶ πρῶτος οὗτος τὴν ἐξ οὐρανῶν ἀγαθὴν κατήγγειλεν δικαιοσύνην, «οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ» λέγων, «οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός.» αὕτη ἡ ἀντιταλαντεύουσα γνώσις ἐπ’ Ἰησοῦ δικαιοσύνης ἀρχαίας σύμβολον.

¹⁰⁵¹ *Paid.* I.8.71.3, ἀγαθοῦ ζυγοῦ πρόσωπον ἡμῖν [δικαιοσύνης] τὸν Ἰησοῦν γνωρίσαντος τοῦ θεοῦ, δι’ οὗ καὶ τὸν θεόν, οἶον ἐκ τρυτάνης ἰσοσθενοῦς, ἔγνωμεν.

I wish to restore you to the original model [ἀρχέτυπον], in order that you may become also like me [ἵνα μοι καὶ ὅμοιοι γένησθε]. I shall anoint you with the unguent of faith, by which you cast off corruption; I shall show you the bare form of righteousness through which you ascend to God [δι' οὗ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀναβαίνετε]. 'Come to me all that labour and are heavy laden, and I shall rest you [κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς]; take my yoke upon you and learn from me [ἄρατε τὸν ζυγὸν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς καὶ μάθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ], because I am meek and humble in heart, and you shall find rest for your souls. For my yoke is useful [χρηστός] and my load is light [ἐλαφρόν].'¹⁰⁵²

The Teacher yokes *anthropos* to God through 'super-celestial' lessons: 'Learn from me,' he says. Clement understands Christ saying: I am God and equally I have become man, but people are human and must learn the way to become God from the *Logos*-Son.

In his own didactic work, Clement attempts to yoke people to the knowledge of God, calling them to forsake the heavy yoke of iniquity, for even the 'Poets agree with Scripture and call sin a heavy yoke.'¹⁰⁵³ In exchange for this weighty yoke, which keeps people earth-bound to the sensible region, Clement offers the Teacher's light and divine yoke (τὸν θεῖον ζυγόν), the knowledge of righteousness, as the way believers ascend to God.¹⁰⁵⁴ In this way, the *Logos*-Son 'leads us by his mild and human loving yoke of godliness [πρᾶον καὶ φιλόανθρωπον τῆς θεοσεβείας μετάγων ἡμᾶς ζυγόν], calling again to the heavens those who had been helplessly hurled down to the ground [αὐθις εἰς οὐρανούς ἀνακαλεῖται τοὺς εἰς γῆν ἐρριμμένους].'¹⁰⁵⁵ He redirects humanity toward the heavens, so that

while we attempt piously to advance, we receive the useful yoke of the Lord [ἐκδέξεται ὁ χρηστός τοῦ κυρίου ζυγός] from faith to faith, one Charioteer driving each one of us onward to salvation, in such a way that the appropriate fruit of happiness might be attained [ὅπως ὁ προσήκων τῆς εὐδαιμονίας περιγένηται καρπός].¹⁰⁵⁶

¹⁰⁵² *Prot.* XII.120.5; *Matt.* 11:29; *Str.* V.5.30.3.

¹⁰⁵³ *Str.* II.5.22.4-5.

¹⁰⁵⁴ *Str.* II.20.123.2.

¹⁰⁵⁵ *Prot.* I.3.2.

¹⁰⁵⁶ *Str.* II.20.126.3.

Through the Incarnation and didactic mission, this ‘good Charioteer of human beings’ has ‘yoked the team of humankind to God,’ in order to ‘lead each one to incorruption,’ which for Clement, yields happiness.¹⁰⁵⁷

Accordingly, Clement portrays Christ balancing the scale in the divine and human relationship in the sense that the Son came as the Revealer of the Father and as the yoke between God and humankind. The imagery of the yoke illustrates how the divine *Logos*, in becoming *anthropos*, functions as the Agent of revelation—revealing God as Father—yoking humankind to God through his teachings. Considering Clement’s emphasis on the knowledge of God, particularly through the *Logos* and Scripture, it will be helpful to examine in part his usage of relevant knowledge terms.

2. Knowledge Terminology

Clement regularly uses three knowledge terms set in two categories: (1) observable knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) and (2) revealed knowledge (γνώσις and ἐπίγνωσις). The term ἐπιστήμη means empirical, scientific, and technical knowledge; it is contrasted with ‘opinion’ (δόξα), or indemonstrable propositions.¹⁰⁵⁸ Clement stresses the accuracy of ἐπιστήμη, because it is visible, reliable knowledge.¹⁰⁵⁹ He therefore uses ἐπιστήμη to describe the ‘observable narrative’ of the *Logos*-Son:

On the one hand, God being indemonstrable [θεὸς ἀναπόδεικτος ὧν] is not an object for empirical knowledge [οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιστημονικός]. But, on the other hand, the Son is wisdom, knowledge, truth [ὁ δὲ υἱὸς σοφία τε ἔστι καὶ ἐπιστήμη καὶ ἀλήθεια], and other things similar to this; and in fact, he even has a demonstration of proof and a detailed narrative [ἀπόδειξιν ἔχει καὶ διέξοδον].¹⁰⁶⁰

¹⁰⁵⁷ *Prot.* XII.121.1.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Clement rarely uses ἐπιστήμη for knowledge of God, but see *Str.* VII.5.29.8, ἐπιστήμην θεοῦ; *Q.d.s.* 7.2, ἐπιστήμη θεοῦ.

¹⁰⁵⁹ *Paid.* II.7.58.2, λάλησον καὶ ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ ἐπιστήμης: ‘to speak even with accuracy of knowledge.’

¹⁰⁶⁰ *Str.* IV.25.156.1.

The life of Christ was a visible story, disclosing what God does and exposing who God is, and this self-exposition through the Incarnation and narrative of the *Logos*-Son is reliable knowledge.

An intelligent movement from ἐπιστήμη ascending towards γνῶσις can be identified in Clement’s epistemology: ‘The real knowledge [ἡ τῷ ὄντι ἐπιστήμη], which we say only the Gnostic has, is reliable comprehension through true and steadfast words, leading upward to the knowledge of the cause [ἐπὶ τὴν τῆς αἰτίας γνῶσιν ἀνάγουσα].’¹⁰⁶¹ Clement is saying that γνῶσις explains the unseen causes of the effects that ἐπιστήμη observes. Thus, ἐπιστήμη can recognize the visible narrative of the *Logos*-Son, but γνῶσις helps one go beyond his flesh to behold the Saviour and Teacher. Likewise, ἐπιστήμη can identify the sun, moon, and stars and may surmise there is a transcendent Creator, but γνῶσις helps one go beyond the cosmic bodies to discover the Creator as the cause. As reliable knowledge, ἐπιστήμη points believers upward, leading those who ‘take the adventure to go beyond to the God of the universe [τολμᾶ τε ἐπέκεινα ἐπὶ τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεόν].’¹⁰⁶² The term ἐπιστήμη does not appear in the New Testament.¹⁰⁶³ It follows consistently that the terms used in the letters of the apostles for the knowledge of God are γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις.¹⁰⁶⁴

The terms γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις speak of revealed and intellectual (spiritual) knowledge taught by the *Logos*-Son.¹⁰⁶⁵ To point out his teachings on the knowledge of God, Clement composed the phrase ἡ γνῶσις τοῦ θεοῦ and ἡ ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ θεοῦ

¹⁰⁶¹ *Str.* VI.18.162.4, ἡ γὰρ τῷ ὄντι ἐπιστήμη ἦν φαμεν μόνον ἔχειν τὸν γνωστικόν, κατάληψις ἐστὶ βεβαία διὰ λόγων ἀληθῶν καὶ βεβαίων ἐπὶ τὴν τῆς αἰτίας γνῶσιν ἀνάγουσα.

¹⁰⁶² *Str.* I.28.177.1.

¹⁰⁶³ In the NT, the verb ἐπίσταμαι is found fourteen times, and only one is in a ‘knowledge of God’ context. Acts 18:25 refers to Apollo ‘knowing only the baptism of John’ (ἐπιστάμενος μόνον τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου). This use is consistent, as the baptism of John was *propaideia* (Heb. 6:1-3), preparing the way for *gnosis* (Christ).

¹⁰⁶⁴ The term γνῶσις shows up at least 28 times in the NT; with the exception of two references—Lk. 1:77 and Lk. 11:52—all other references are by Peter and Paul. The word ἐπίγνωσις appears at least 20 times and all references are by Peter and Paul.

¹⁰⁶⁵ *Str.* VI.7.61.1.

in variant forms.¹⁰⁶⁶ It is important to keep this observation in mind, because Clement frequently modifies γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις with τοῦ θεοῦ. His idea of *gnosis* is specified knowledge ‘of God.’ He writes: ‘the will of God is ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ θεοῦ [θέλημα δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ θεοῦ], which is participation in immortality [ἥτις ἐστὶ κοινωνία ἀφθαρσίας].’¹⁰⁶⁷ The will of God is to live a pure and virtuous life ‘by the ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, which is to obey his precepts.’¹⁰⁶⁸ To understand the knowledge of God or divine commands is to apprehend the thoughts of God, and therefore, it is to have intimate knowledge of God himself. Accordingly, when the true Gnostic is given the opportunity ‘to choose τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ θεοῦ or everlasting salvation,’ the Gnostic ‘without any hesitation would choose τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ θεοῦ,’ because the knowledge leads easily to salvation.¹⁰⁶⁹ In this way, Clement emphasizes that it is worthwhile for us ‘to reach τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ θεοῦ.’¹⁰⁷⁰ These texts show that when discussing *gnosis* in his works, Clement is referring to a living knowledge about divine and human relations.

Generally, γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις are interchangeable terms; however, Clement uses γνῶσις far more frequently than ἐπίγνωσις. Perhaps the reason for this

¹⁰⁶⁶ Clement provides no less than twenty-eight explicit references using γνῶσις with θεοῦ. Some examples are: *Prot.* X.105.2, τῷ σπεύδοντι πρὸς γνῶσιν θεοῦ; *Paid.* I.3.7.3, τὸν δὲ εἰς γνῶσιν ἀφικέσθαι θεοῦ; *Str.* III.5.43.1, θεοῦ δὲ γνῶσιν λάβειν; *Str.* IV.4.16.3, τὴν τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος γνῶσιν θεοῦ; *Str.* V.1.8.6, τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ ἐνὸς καὶ μόνου θεοῦ; *Str.* VI.7.55.2, τουτέστι γνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ; *Str.* VII.5.29.5, ἡ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ γνῶσις; *Ecl.Proph.* 3.57.2, ἔχει τὴν περὶ θεοῦ γνῶσιν. For other passages, see *Prot.* VIII.77.3; X.100.3; XII.120.3; *Paid.* I.3.7.3; *Str.* II.11.51.1; II.20.109.2; III.5.42.1, γνῶσιν ἔχειν θεοῦ (*Dei habeat cognitionem*, ANF2: 388); *Str.* III.17.103.2, ἡ γνῶσις τοῦ θεοῦ (*Dei cognitio*, ANF2: 401); *Str.* IV.3.12.2; IV.4.15.5; IV.22.136.5; V.1.7.5; VII.5.29.5. ἡ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ γνῶσις. There are at least fifteen direct references using ἐπίγνωσις with θεοῦ. Some examples are: *Prot.* VI.72.5, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν θεοῦ ἐπιπνοία θεοῦ; *Paid.* II.1.14.6, ἵνα ὦμεν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν γεγονότες τοῦ θεοῦ; *Str.* IV.6.27.2, θέλημα δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ θεοῦ; *Str.* V.10.60.2, αὐξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ; *Str.* VI.11.88.4, κατ’ ἐπιπνοίαν τοῦ λόγου καὶ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ; and *Str.* VI.15.122.3, εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ παντοκράτορος θεοῦ ἀφικοίμεθα. For other passages, see *Paid.* I.5.18.3; *Str.* IV.3.9.6, IV.4.15.3, IV.6.39.4, IV.21.132.1; *Str.* VI.8.65.6; *Str.* VII.2.5.2. Here, neither the indirect references to the knowledge of God using γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις nor the use of αὐτοῦ, such as ἡ δὲ ἐπίγνωσις αὐτοῦ (*Q.d.s.* 7.3.) have been adduced.

¹⁰⁶⁷ *Str.* IV.6.27.2,

¹⁰⁶⁸ *Str.* IV.4.15.3, μετ’ ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡ ταῖς ἐντωλαῖς ὑπακηροῦσα.

¹⁰⁶⁹ *Str.* IV.22.136.5.

¹⁰⁷⁰ *Str.* II.11.51.1, ἐπὶ τὴν ἀφικνεῖσθαι γνῶσιν τοῦ θεοῦ.

convention is that Paul uses the term γνῶσις exclusively in his Corinthian correspondence.¹⁰⁷¹ Clement draws from these letters repeatedly to advance his theological discourse.¹⁰⁷² Where Clement uses ἐπίγνωσις for the mystery of the knowledge of God, he generally quotes from Paul's two letters: Ephesians and Colossians.¹⁰⁷³ When Clement employs γνῶσις to mean both γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις as knowledge of God, the term γνῶσις takes on an overarching characteristic.

Clement's criterion for obtaining *gnosis* is *pistis* (faith). He argues that knowledge is not without faith and faith is not without knowledge, just as the Father is not without the Son and the Son is not without the Father.¹⁰⁷⁴ Theologically speaking, the Son is always with the Father and the Father is always with the Son; epistemologically speaking, *gnosis* contains faith and faith contains *gnosis*. Clement is saying that the Father and Son are indivisible, so also, faith and knowledge are inseparable. In this light, when one believes, one will know; when one receives true *gnosis*, one believes: 'Knowledge, accordingly, is characterized by faith; and faith, by a certain divine mutual and reciprocal correspondence, becomes characterized by knowledge.'¹⁰⁷⁵

3. Assuming Γνῶσις as Λόγος

Looking back to the *proto*-formation, Clement emphasizes that 'humanity previously came into existence for the knowledge of God.'¹⁰⁷⁶ He reiterates this point in relation to the regeneration: 'but we have come into a new state of being in order that we might exist for the knowledge of God.'¹⁰⁷⁷ As explained in the section on the

¹⁰⁷¹ Paul uses the term γνῶσις sixteen times in the letters to the Corinthians: 1Cor. 1:5; 8:1 (twice), 8:7, 10, 11; 12:8; 13:2, 8; 14:6; and 2Cor. 2:14; 4:6; 6:6; 8:7; 10:5; 11:6. In other NT letters, Paul uses ἐπίγνωσις almost exclusively.

¹⁰⁷² Stählin's register shows Clement cited from 1Cor. more than 365 times, and from 2Cor. at least 104; see Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus Vierter Band*, 19-22.

¹⁰⁷³ Eph. 3:3-5; *Str.* I.28.179.1; *Str.* V.10.60.1; Col. 1:9-10; 2:2; *Str.* V.10.60.2.

¹⁰⁷⁴ *Str.* V.1.1.2-3.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Wilson, *ANF2*: 350; *Str.* II.4.16.2.

¹⁰⁷⁶ *Str.* VI.8.65.6, ἄνθρωπος προηγουμένως γέγονεν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν θεοῦ.

¹⁰⁷⁷ *Paid.* II.1.14.6, γεγόναμεν δὲ οὐχ ἵνα ἐσθίωμεν καὶ πίνωμεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ὦμεν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν γεγονότες τοῦ θεοῦ.

parousia—specifically the double descent and the unity of the two covenants—the *Logos*-Son is the divine *gnosis* revealed from the Scriptures, which is the deifying potency for those who are awakened to the knowledge of God. This explains Clement’s emphasis on both *Logos* and *gnosis* throughout his writings: he equates *gnosis* with *Logos*. For instance, Clement speaks on God’s behalf: ‘I give you *Logos*, the *gnosis* of God; I give myself perfectly.’¹⁰⁷⁸ When God gives true *gnosis*, he gives himself; when he gives himself, he gives true knowledge. Since the *Logos* is God, then to receive *gnosis* is to imbibe God, the *Logos*.¹⁰⁷⁹ For, ‘the food and drink of the divine *Logos* is *gnosis* of the divine essence.’¹⁰⁸⁰ In this way, people become gods ‘by the inspiration of the *Logos* [ἐπίπνοιαν τοῦ λόγου] and the knowledge of God [ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ θεοῦ].’¹⁰⁸¹ Such *epignosis* bears the ontological stamp of the divine *Logos*, which impresses the soul with ‘the image of God, the divine and royal *Logos*, the impassible *anthropos* [εἰκὼν μὲν γὰρ θεοῦ λόγος θεῖος καὶ βασιλικός, ἄνθρωπος ἀπαθής].’¹⁰⁸² We can now crack open the gate and begin to discern that Clement’s path to becoming *theos* is through assuming *gnosis* as *Logos*.

4. Psalms 82:6 and Becoming God

Clement’s teaching on becoming *theos* is grounded in his reading of the prophetic statement in Psalms 82:6 that declares human beings are gods. With his teaching on the second aspect of the exchange formula that *anthropos* becomes *theos*, Clement places before the Christian community a towering objective for human existence. It is requisite, therefore, to sketch out what Clement lays out as the process for becoming God and to illustrate what becoming *theos* is for *anthropos*.

¹⁰⁷⁸ *Prot.* XII.120.3, λόγον χαρίζομαι ὑμῖν, τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ θεοῦ τέλειον ἑμαυτὸν χαρίζομαι.

¹⁰⁷⁹ *Str.* VII.5.29.5, ὁ γνωστικός ἐν ᾧ ὁ θεὸς ἐνίδρυται, τουτέστιν ἡ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ γνῶσις καθιέρωται: ‘the Gnostic in whom God is placed, that is, the knowledge devoted about God.’

¹⁰⁸⁰ *Str.* V.10.66.3, βρῶσις γὰρ πόσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ἢ γνῶσις ἐστὶ τῆς θείας οὐσίας.

¹⁰⁸¹ *Str.* VI.11.88.4, κατ’ ἐπίπνοιαν τοῦ λόγου καὶ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ.

¹⁰⁸² *Str.* V.14.94.5.

Clement interprets the divine utterance in Psalms 82:6, ‘I said, “You are gods and all of you are sons of the Highest,”’ as a prophetic declaration concerning human destiny.¹⁰⁸³ He utilizes this passage in his doctrine of baptism, professing that water baptism is initiation into the process of becoming a god: ‘Upon being baptized, we are enlightened; being enlightened, we become sons; upon becoming sons, we are made perfect; and being perfected, we become immortal. “I,” he says, “have said that you are gods and all sons of the Highest.”’¹⁰⁸⁴ Clement inserts Psalms 82:6 into this text to show that baptism is the liminal passage from being mortal to entering the early stages of deification.¹⁰⁸⁵ Norman Russell reads the passage to say that the one baptized is immediately made a god, but Clement actually believes ‘perfection and immortality need to be brought to fulfilment in eternity,’ because they are ‘simultaneously both realized and unrealized.’¹⁰⁸⁶ This concept is not without difficulty to discern in Clement’s works, and Russell may be correct. Nevertheless, with a closer look at the evidence, it is difficult to conclude that Clement believes anything promised by God through prophecy and carried out by divine providence—such as the economy of salvation—could go ‘unrealized.’ He never tells the true Gnostic, even when reaching the ‘endless end,’ that they have ‘realized’ too much. What follows, therefore, is a sketch of how Clement thinks a true Christian becomes a god in this lifetime.

Clement’s strategy to lead people to become gods is three-fold. Firstly, as seen in the discussion above on ‘assuming *gnosis* as *Logos*,’ one becomes *theos* by receiving God, the *Logos*. A way to see what Clement means by becoming *theos* is to return to

¹⁰⁸³ For Clement’s mentions of Ps. 82:6, see *Prot.* XII.123.1; *Paid.* I.6.26.1-2; *Str.* II.20.125.4-5; *Str.* IV.23.149.8; *Str.* VI.16.146.1-2; and *Str.* VII.16.101.4.

¹⁰⁸⁴ Ps. 82:6; *Paid.* I.6.26.1.

¹⁰⁸⁵ For Clement’s use of Ps. 82:6, see Carl Mosser, ‘The Earliest Patristic Interpretations of Psalm 82, Jewish Antecedents, and the Origin of Christian Deification,’ *Journal of Theological Studies NS* 56:1 (2005): 55. For discussion on Clement and Ps. 82:6 in relation to deification, see Norman Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition*, (Oxford: OUP, 2004), 128-130.

¹⁰⁸⁶ Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition*, 128.

his exchange statement in *Protreptikos* I.8.4. He ends the sentence with ἄνθρωπος γένεται θεός, but he begins it with ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος, which suggests that to become *theos* means to become like *Logos*. The exchange implies that becoming *Logos* mirrors the Incarnation: The *Logos*-Son became *anthropos* by assuming *sarx*; that is, he became what we are. To mirror this, *anthropos* becomes God by assuming *Logos*; that is, *anthropos* becomes what he is. Clement explicitly shows this in *Paidagogos* III.1:

But that man in whom the *Logos* dwells [ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος, ὡς σύνοικος ὁ λόγος] does not embellish or fabricate himself; he has the form of the *Logos* [μορφὴν ἔχει τὴν τοῦ λόγου]; he is made like to God [ἐξομοιοῦται τῷ θεῷ]; he is beautiful, and he does not show off [his appearance]; he is the true beauty, and he is God [κάλλος ἐστὶ τὸ ἀληθινόν, καὶ ὁ θεός ἐστίν]. That person becomes god [θεὸς δὲ ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἄνθρωπος γίνεται], because God wills it [ὅτι βούλεται ὁ θεός].¹⁰⁸⁷

This passage raises the important point: Assimilation to the likeness of God and becoming *theos* are made possible by receiving *Logos*. Notably, Clement uses the term γίνομαι and reverses the order of the change. Rather than God becoming *anthropos*, *anthropos* ‘becomes’ *theos*. How is this possible? Through the indwelling of the *Logos*, *anthropos* ‘possesses the form of the *Logos*.’ Clement thinks taking on the form of the *Logos* happens because the *Logos* ‘is God in the form of man...the *Logos* who is God, who is in the Father, who is at the Father’s right hand, and with the form of God is God. He is to us a spotless image; to him we must attempt with all of our strength to assimilate our soul.’¹⁰⁸⁸

The Incarnation made this indwelling possible in the sense that, when the *Logos* became a human being, he took on the form of *anthropos* and can therefore enter humankind as the divine man and stamp his image upon the soul.¹⁰⁸⁹ In this way,

¹⁰⁸⁷ *Paid.* III.1.1.5.

¹⁰⁸⁸ *Paid.* I.2.4.2

¹⁰⁸⁹ *Str.* VII.3.16.6.

humans take on the form of the *Logos*. Irenaeus puts it this way: ‘It was for this end that the Word of God became man, and He who was the Son of God became the Son of man, that man, having been taken into the Word, and receiving the adoption, might become the son of God.’¹⁰⁹⁰

Secondly, inquiry into Scripture and the disclosure of hidden *gnosis* by the *Logos*-Son provide deifying potency. One term Clement uses to depict the process of deification is θεοποιέω. Russell observes that in ‘each of the three occasions on which [Clement] uses the term θεοποιέω in a Christian context it denotes the effect of the communication of Christ’s teaching through the Scriptures.’¹⁰⁹¹ In effect, the Scriptures are energetic for ‘sanctifying and deifying humankind [τὰ ἱεροποιούντα καὶ θεοποιούντα γράμματα].’¹⁰⁹² Similarly, God ‘deifies humanity with heavenly teaching [οὐρανίῳ διδασκαλίᾳ θεοποιῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον], putting laws into our minds and writing them upon our hearts.’¹⁰⁹³ Clement, therefore, exhorts believers to ‘fulfil the Father’s will, listen to the *Logos* [ἀκούωμεν τοῦ λόγου], take on the impress of the truly saving life of our Saviour,’ and from the Scriptures, ‘study the heavenly mode of life by which we are being deified [καθ’ ἣν ἐκθεοούμεθα].’¹⁰⁹⁴ Consequently, for those who study to be God, ‘prudence is divine *gnosis* and it springs up in those who are being deified [ἐν τοῖς θεοποιουμένοις].’¹⁰⁹⁵ Since Clement has established that the Scriptures are deifying, he further asserts that ‘we must follow the divine Scripture [κατακολουθήσασι δὲ τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ], through which path the faithful do travel, being assimilated as far as possible to the Lord.’¹⁰⁹⁶ For the reason that we read the Scriptures here, Clement must be pointing out that the results of deification are for

¹⁰⁹⁰ *A.H.* III.19.1.

¹⁰⁹¹ Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition*, 139.

¹⁰⁹² *Prot.* IX.87.1.

¹⁰⁹³ *Prot.* XI.114.4; Jer. 31:33; Heb. 8:10; 10:16; *Str.* VI.15.125.4.

¹⁰⁹⁴ *Paid.* I.12.98.3.

¹⁰⁹⁵ *Str.* VI.15.125.4.

¹⁰⁹⁶ *Str.* III.5.42.5.

this lifetime. Living amongst beasts and in an unsafe cosmic environment, Clement wants us to become gods and transcend malevolent energies.

Thirdly, one assimilates to the likeness of God through ‘following’ the teachings of the *Logos*-Son. Clement imports the Mosaic principle of ‘following’ the Lord into the Platonic use of the term ὁμοίωσις; he connects the Platonic language of ‘becoming like God’ with Moses’s admonition to ‘follow’ the Lord in order to reflect his Christian teachings.¹⁰⁹⁷ This synthesis is easy for Clement because he adopts the theory that the philosophers, especially Pythagoras and Plato, borrowed the idea of assimilation to God from Moses. By this borrowing, the philosophers were able to make Greek philosophy glow, but only as a candle in the night in comparison to the brilliance of the knowledge given to Moses, which luminosity is like the brightness of the sun at midday.¹⁰⁹⁸

Clement explains that ‘the law names the assimilation [to God] a following [τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἑξομοίωσιν ὁ νόμος ἀκολουθίαν ὀνομάζει ἀκολουθίαν], and such a following as far as possible assimilates’ one to the likeness of God.¹⁰⁹⁹ This kind of ‘following’ is rigorous practice of the teachings of the *Logos*-Son, and because the *Logos* dwells within, one is constrained by the indwelling Word to become *theos*. ‘Let one but follow the *Logos*,’ Clement announces, ‘and one becomes a man of god [ἄνθρωπος γίνεται θεου].’¹¹⁰⁰ Clement is sure that when one hears the *Logos*, repents of error, and receives the *Logos* as the truth, that one is changed from being a mere mortal to being ‘completed a god [θεὸς ἀποτελεῖται].’¹¹⁰¹ The one who follows the *Logos* and is ‘completely perfected according to the image of the Teacher, goes

¹⁰⁹⁷ For Clement’s references to Plato, especially *Theaet.* 176b, see *Prot.* XII.122.4; *Str.* II.19.100.3; II.22.131.5-6; II.22.132.1; II.22.133.3; *Str.* V.14.95.2.

¹⁰⁹⁸ *Str.* V.5.29.1-6.

¹⁰⁹⁹ *Str.* II.19.100.4.

¹¹⁰⁰ *Prot.* I.4.3, ἐπόμενος δὴ τῷ λόγῳ ἄνθρωπος γίνεται θεοῦ.

¹¹⁰¹ *Str.* VII.16.95.1-2, οἶον ἐξ ἀνθρώπου θεὸς ἀποτελεῖται.

about in the flesh [made] a god.¹¹⁰² One is able to follow the teachings of the *Logos*-Son through the aid of divine power: ‘Upon receiving the Lord’s power [δυναμιν λαβοῦσα κυριακὴν], the soul practices to be God [ἡ ψυχὴ μελετᾷ εἶναι θεός].’¹¹⁰³ This practice entails rejecting ignorance and actions contrary to reason, and speaking pure words toward God and doing just deeds toward people.¹¹⁰⁴ This, Clement argues, is the pursuit of godliness, the journey to be like God in this lifetime.

In three passages, Clement uses the adverb ἤδη to emphasize that Christians can already be made *theos*. For example, he teaches godliness as the habit which preserves what is becoming to God. The godly person is the only lover of God and such will be the one who knows what is becoming, both in respect of knowledge and of the life which must be lived ‘by the one who exists [destined], and indeed is already being assimilated to God [κτῶ] ἐσομένῳ καὶ δὴ ἑξομοιούμενῳ ἤδη θεῶ].’¹¹⁰⁵ In addition, Clement emphasizes that to be God is to practice trusting in God with one’s heart and mind and to live without the fear of evil. Upon attaining this calm of soul and ‘this manner of living, it is possible for the Gnostic to have already become God [τούτῳ δυνατὸν τῶ τρόπῳ τὸν γνωστικὸν ἤδη γενέσθαι θεόν]; as “I said, you are gods and sons of the Highest.”’¹¹⁰⁶ Notably, when concluding the final chapter of the *Protreptikos*, Clement identifies ‘the godly Christian alone,’ to be the ‘image of God and also his likeness, having become righteous, holy and wise by Jesus Christ, and is already like God [ὅμοιον ἤδη καὶ θεῶ]. The prophet indicates this grace while saying: “I said that you are gods and all are sons of the Highest.”’¹¹⁰⁷ In these three passages,

¹¹⁰² Ps. 82:6; *Str.* VII.16.101.4, τελέως ἐκτελεῖται κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ διδασκάλου ἐν σαρκὶ περιπολῶν θεός.

¹¹⁰³ *Str.* VI.14.113.3.

¹¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁰⁵ *Str.* VII.1.3.6.

¹¹⁰⁶ Ps. 82:6; *Str.* IV.23.149.8.

¹¹⁰⁷ *Prot.* XII.122.4-123.1.

Clement chooses the adverb ἤδη, asserting that in this lifetime a true Christian can ‘already’ be made a god without any sense that godliness is ‘unrealized.’

Moreover, Clement provides the broader context in which Psalms 82:6 is located: “‘God stood in the congregation of the gods; he judges in the midst of the gods’” (Psalms 82:1). Clement then asks, ‘who are they?’ He replies, these gods are ‘[t]hose who are superior to pleasure [τοὺς ἡδονᾶς κρείττονας], who rise above the passions [τοὺς τῶν παθῶν διαφέροντας]. They are greater than the world [τοὺς τοῦ κόσμου μείζονας]; as “I said, you are gods and sons of the Highest.”’¹¹⁰⁸ In these passages, Clement claims that believers can become *theoi* in this lifetime by overcoming the sub-human energies; therefore, ‘those who know God are [already] proclaimed as sons and gods [τοὺς ἐπιγνόντας αὐτὸν υἱοὺς ἀναγορεύει καὶ θεούς].’¹¹⁰⁹ The three main factors for becoming a god are: (1) the indwelling of the *Logos* through *gnosis* (2) the faithful inquiry into the Scriptures, and (3) the ardent following of the *Logos*-Son.

F. Likeness to *Logos*-Son

For Clement, attaining the knowledge of God and becoming like him is ‘the only life.’¹¹¹⁰ He pushes the limit of becoming like God with the limiter: ‘as far as humanly possible.’¹¹¹¹ He sets forth the journey ‘as far as possible’—in reference to the ‘orthos *Logos*’—as the *telos* [ἢ τε πρὸς τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον ὡς οἶόν τε ἐξομοίωσις τέλος ἐστί]’ for human existence.¹¹¹² This limitation means people do not cease to be human, when they become like God, but instead, they become truly human. Christians are not like the *Logos*-Son in essence [οὐ κατ’ οὐσίαν], but become like him through

¹¹⁰⁸ *Str.* II.20.125.4-5; Ps. 82:1, 6.

¹¹⁰⁹ *Str.* VI.16.146.1.

¹¹¹⁰ *Q.d.s.* 7.3.

¹¹¹¹ *Str.* II.18.80.5, ἐξομοιούμενοι τῷ κυρίῳ κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν ἡμῖν.

¹¹¹² *Str.* II.22.134.2; *Str.* IV.22.139.4.

participation in the power of God and eternal life.¹¹¹³ The following section portrays assimilation to the likeness of God in terms of character and function.

Clement borrows the language of ‘likeness to God as far as possible’ from Plato.¹¹¹⁴ In five passages, Clement imports Plato’s concise virtue list that defines for Plato what characterizes likeness to God. For example, Clement writes: ‘Likeness to God as far as possible [is] to become righteous and pure with prudence.’¹¹¹⁵ Clement agrees with Plato, and adds elsewhere that to be like God is to partner up with endurance (καρτερία), which constrains one to press through trials and bear the fruit of *apatheia*.¹¹¹⁶ *Apatheia* is not axiomatic for Clement. He agrees with the Stoic sense of *apatheia*: it means to be free of anger and envy.¹¹¹⁷ It also means to rise above temper and desire and attain self-control.¹¹¹⁸ However, while the Stoics want to be free of all passions, Clement maintains that to be like God is to possess ‘philanthropy and godliness befitting a great person [φιλανθρωπία καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῆς θεοσέβεια].’¹¹¹⁹ It means to imitate God and walk in love, the evidence of Christian perfection.¹¹²⁰ To walk in love means to become merciful and compassionate.¹¹²¹ Clement’s view of *apatheia* is to be free of corruptible passions, such as anger and revenge; and his view of godliness is to possess incorruptible energies, such as mercy and compassion.

Advancing the thematic developments sketched in chapters three and four about the *Logos*-Son’s roles as Saviour and Teacher, the remaining section of this thesis shows that Clement wants believers to share in the salvific mission of the Saviour and engage

¹¹¹³ *Str.* II.17.77.4.

¹¹¹⁴ *Theaet.* 176b, ὁμοίωσις δὲ δίκαιον καὶ ὄσιον μετὰ φρονήσεως γενέσθαι.

¹¹¹⁵ *Str.* II.22.136.6, τὴν ἐξομοίωσιν τοίνυν τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὅσον οἶόν τε ἦν δίκαιον καὶ ὄσιον μετὰ φρονήσεως γενέσθαι; *Prot.* XII.122.4; *Str.* II.18.81.1; *Str.* II.22.131.5; *Str.* II.22.133.3.

¹¹¹⁶ *Str.* II.20.103.1.

¹¹¹⁷ *Str.* VI.9.71.5.

¹¹¹⁸ *Str.* III.10.69.3.

¹¹¹⁹ *Str.* VII.3.14.1.

¹¹²⁰ *Str.* III.4.28.4; Eph. 5:1.

¹¹²¹ *Str.* II.19.100.4.

in the doctrines of the Teacher. In the final analysis, Clement argues that to complete the exchange and become *theos* is to function like the Saviour and live like the Teacher.

1. Likeness to the Saviour

Clement tells us that the activity of ‘assimilation to the Saviour arises in the Gnostic as far as is allowed for human nature.’¹¹²² The indwelling *gnosis* arises in the believer impressing the mark of the Saviour upon the soul. Accordingly, ‘this is really [what it means] to follow the Saviour: When we set out on a quest for his blamelessness and perfection, and while adorning and amending the soul as a mirror [κἀτοπτρον] before him, we arrange everything to be like to him.’¹¹²³ Upon assimilating to the Saviour, a Christian ‘will pray that as many as possible may become like him. For the one who is being assimilated to the Saviour is one who saves.’¹¹²⁴ Clement imagines that Christians will seek the well-being of others, just as the human-loving Saviour seeks the salvation of people. For the Saviour himself

prayed while giving thanks for the things he accomplished [in his] ministry, praying that as many as possible [might] come into existence by knowledge, in order that God might be glorified among those who are being saved through the salvation according to knowledge [ἐπίγνωσιν], in order that throughout eternity, he [God] might be made known [ἐπιγινώσκηται] through the Son.¹¹²⁵

In Clement’s philosophy of ministry, the person who is saved according to knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις) is mindful of others. ‘The real image of God’ Clement asserts, ‘is the person who does good things, for whom also good things are being done. As the pilot at the same time is being saved, so also he is saving others.’¹¹²⁶ In this way, Clement

¹¹²² *Str.* VI.12.104.2, ἡ ἕξομοίωσις ἡ πρὸς τὸν σωτήρα θεὸν ἀνακύπτει τῷ γνωστικῷ εἰς ὅσον ἀνθρωπίνῃ θεμετὸν φύσει.

¹¹²³ *Q.d.s.* 21.6; *Matt.* 5:48.

¹¹²⁴ *Str.* VI.9.77.4-78.1, σωτήριος γὰρ τι ὁ τῷ σωτῆρι ἕξομοιούμενος.

¹¹²⁵ *Str.* VII.7.41.7, ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις διὰ τῆς σωτηρίας κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν ὁ θεὸς δοξάζεται καὶ ὁ μόνος ἀγαθὸς καὶ ὁ μόνος σωτὴρ δι’ υἱοῦ ἐξ αἰῶνος εἰς αἰῶνα ἐπιγινώσκηται.

¹¹²⁶ *Str.* II.19.102.2.

teaches believers to follow the *Logos* and ‘obtain the impression [ἀναμαξώμεθα] of the truly saving life of our Saviour.’¹¹²⁷

2. Likeness to the Teacher

Clement’s path of likeness to God is to ‘follow in the steps of the divine Teacher.’¹¹²⁸ His reasoning for pursuing this route is because ‘the best disciples become imitators of the Teacher.’¹¹²⁹ The working principle he sets forth is this:

If one devotes himself to Ischomas, he will make him a farmer; and if to Lampis, a mariner; and if to Homer a poet; and if to Pyrrho, a wrangler; and if to Demosthenes, an orator; and if to Chrysippus, a dialectician; and if to Aristotle, a naturalist; and if to Plato, a philosopher. So then, he who listens to the Lord and follows in the prophecy given through Him will be perfected completely in the likeness of the teacher [κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ διδασκάλου]—made a god going about in the flesh.¹¹³⁰

Clement’s point is that students assimilate to the likeness of the teacher they follow. Considering his reasoning, if one were to follow a Middle Platonist, then one could only rise as high as a philosopher. Clement’s goal is to be like the *Logos*-Son. For this *telos*, he cites Jesus (the Teacher), who stated, ‘It is sufficient for the disciple to become as the Teacher.’¹¹³¹ Such likeness is possible, because the teacher is the living and practicing doctrine; The Teacher is in character what he knows and teaches. Following this, Clement wants to advance the idea that one does not merely acquire the knowledge of God as a teaching, but one ‘becomes the knowledge.’¹¹³² Becoming the knowledge of God is becoming God.

This section is useful because it offers responses to the queries some might ask about Clement’s doctrine of deification: What does Clement think it means to become a

¹¹²⁷ *Paid.* I.12.98.3.

¹¹²⁸ *Q.d.s.* 21.6, ἔπονται κατ’ ἴχνος τοῦ διδασκάλου.

¹¹²⁹ *Str.* VI.6.45.5, οὕτως δὲ κάκεισε τοὺς ἀρίστους τῶν μαθητῶν μιμητὰς γενέσθαι τοῦ διδασκάλου.

¹¹³⁰ *Str.* VII.16.101.4, οὕτως ὁ τῷ πειθόμενος καὶ τῇ δοθείσῃ δι’ αὐτοῦ κατακολουθήσας προφητεία τελέως ἐκτελεῖται κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ διδασκάλου ἐν σαρκὶ περιπολῶν θεός.

¹¹³¹ *Matt.* 10:24-25; *Lk.* 6:40; *Str.* II.17.77.4; *Str.* VI.14.114.6, ἀρκετὸν γὰρ τῷ μαθητῇ γενέσθαι ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει ὁ διδάσκαλος.

¹¹³² *Str.* IV.6.40.1.

god? His answer is that people who follow the Saviour eventually become involved in saving others—participating in some type of ministry (official or unofficial) that heals, instructs, and saves human existence. Moreover, those who follow the Teacher, in due course, embody the knowledge of God and live the character of the Teacher.

In view of his portrayal of the Teacher, Clement exhorts the Greeks to terminate their search for a human instructor in Athens, Ionia, and indeed all of Greece, because the *Logos*-Son, who ‘fills the universe with his holy powers, creation, salvation, good energy, laws, prophecy, and teaching [ὁ πληρώσας τὰ πάντα δυνάμεσιν ἁγίαις, δημιουργία σωτηρία εὐεργεσία νομοθεσία προφητεία διδασκαλία],’ is our Teacher.¹¹³³ It is well known that Clement travelled through these earthly regions *en route* to Alexandria, while searching for a teacher, who could explain the prophets and the apostles. Although he honoured his teachers, especially Pantaenus, Clement claims to have found the heavenly Teacher, who taught perfectly the knowledge of God. He therefore insists: ‘Since we have one Teacher in heaven, as the writing states, then confessedly, all upon the earth are called disciples.’¹¹³⁴ Clement’s personal record is that he was a disciple of the *Logos*, and exclaims: ‘We have the Teacher who teaches everything.’¹¹³⁵ For Clement, ‘everything’ includes the way the *Logos*-Son became *anthropos* in order to teach *anthropos* the true knowledge of God, which leads on to become *theos*.

G. Conclusion

Chapter Four depicts the second aspect of Clement’s doctrine of the exchange: Christians learn from the *Logos*-Son how *anthropos* becomes *theos*. This happens, in Clement’s work through the didactic mission of the *Logos*-Son. Two essential

¹¹³³ *Prot.* XI.112.1.

¹¹³⁴ *Paid.* I.5.17.3, εἰ δὲ «εἷς διδάσκαλος ἐν οὐρανοῖς», ὡς φησιν ἡ γραφή, ὁμολογουμένως οἱ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰκότως ἂν πάντες κεκληθῶσιν μαθηταί.

¹¹³⁵ *Prot.* XI.112.1, πάντα νῦν ὁ διδάσκαλος κατηχεῖ.

doctrines come to the foreground: the *parousia* and the appearing of the *Logos*-Son as Teacher of Scripture and Revelator of divine *gnosis*. For Clement, both the *parousia* and appearing came to pass because of the Incarnation. Clement connects the term *parousia* with the word σάρκωσις (to grow flesh); and more than once said that the ‘appearing’ of the *Logos* was through his flesh. Central to the *parousia* is Christ’s interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies, which point to his coming, the unveiling of the Gospel, and especially his sufferings. The *parousia* demarcates all preparatory forms of knowledge (encyclical studies, philosophy, *theologia*, and the Old Testament), because it opens the door for *gnosis*, which is the compelling power leading to the likeness of God. Clement sees the didactic mission, through the *parousia* and the appearing of the *Logos*-Son as the events that deposited the content of the apostolic tradition.

Through his ongoing appearing, the *Logos*-Son dispels the ignorance lying over peoples’ minds, clearing the way to understand the yoke of knowledge that joins *anthropos* with God. Through the Incarnation, the *Logos*-Son became yoked to *anthropos*, and as believers yoke themselves to the knowledge of God, *gnosis* leads them upward to become god. Clement argues three ways a person becomes a god: (1) by the indwelling of the *Logos*, (2) by sincere inquiry into Scripture, and (3) by the ardent following of the *Logos*-Son. Clement talks about becoming God with Platonic language: ‘likeness to God,’ but he renders ‘likeness to God’ to be likeness to the *Logos*-Son, both by becoming like the Saviour and the Teacher.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has two main objectives. Firstly, it locates Clement in the intellectual climates of Platonism and Gnosticism. Having been trained in Platonism and informed about Gnosticism, he interacts with both schools of thought, but claims to know the ‘true philosophy’ and the ‘true *gnosis*,’ which he thinks came to light through the Incarnation and mission of the *Logos*-Son. The Platonists repudiated the thought of the Incarnation of God; varying Gnostic sects observed no *regula fidei* for the Incarnation or the identity of the divine Messenger. Nevertheless, Clement engages with Platonism and Gnosticism, and it is noticeable that he speaks the language of the philosophers and of the Gnostics without being restricted to philosophical speculations or drawn away by Gnostic myths. While Clement maintains aspects of Platonism, such as love for truth and virtue, and his views have similarities with Christian Gnosticism, such as the disclosure of secret knowledge, his proto-orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation sets him apart from both intellectual backgrounds. Accordingly, one outcome of this research situates Clement in his preferred intellectual background, showing that he viewed himself an heir of the apostolic tradition and as a teacher standing in apostolic succession.

Secondly, this thesis demonstrates that the Incarnation is central to Clement’s version of Christianity. Clement argues that the Creator of the universe became the historical Jesus, born of Mary. Drawing from John 1:14, Clement maintains that ‘the Word of God became *anthropos*,’ and that ‘the *Logos* himself visibly became *sarx*.’ Two questions arise. First, how does Clement envisage the Incarnation? He views it as an exchange: The *Logos*-Son became *anthropos* so that *anthropos* might become *theos*; he took upon human weakness so that human beings might participate in his power. This divine movement was motivated by God’s immense *philanthropia*. Thus, the

second question is to what end does Clement imagine the exchange? Since he reports that the salvific economy was brought about by divine providence, as witnessed by the *parousia* and fulfillment of the prophets, Clement avows that God acted through the Incarnation for two reasons: The *Logos-Son came* as Savior and Teacher to inaugurate both salvific and didactic missions for the salvation of humankind.

To demonstrate the above position, Part I presents a summary of Clement's intellectual context in Alexandria. Chapter One provides a sketch of contemporary Platonism, using Plato's primary texts along with Alcinous's *Didaskalikos*; and it sketches second century Gnostic belief in Alexandria, according to the outline of the myth from the *Apocryphon of John* and other Gnostic tractates in NHL. The discussion includes a four-part outline: (1) theology, (2) the demiurge, (3) anthropogony, and (4) teleology for Platonism, but soteriology for Gnosticism. This outline shows the similarities and differences between both groups. For instance, the Platonists and the Gnostics agreed on the theology of the supreme God, but only in the sense that he is transcendent and unknowable. The ultimate Good of Platonism and the Virginal Spirit of Gnosticism are not the same divine beings. The outline offers a context to observe how Clement is distinct concerning his own theological discourse in Alexandria.

Chapter Two argues that Clement views himself an heir of the apostolic tradition in which he accords with Irenaeus. However, he also situates himself as a participant in apostolic succession, not as a bishop, but as a teacher of true *gnosis*; in this move, he departs from the bishop of Lyons. Accordingly, this chapter offers new research as it delineates Clement's version of a 'gnostic tradition.' Clement locates himself in line with (1) 'the Gnostic Moses' and divine disclosures of true knowledge, (2) Christ as the revelatory Agent of *gnosis*, (3) Paul's version (not Valentinus's) of the fullness (pleroma) of Christ, (4) Barnabas's approach to allegorical exegesis of the Old

Testament (Clement calls this style of interpretation the ‘trace of the Gnostic tradition’), and (5) Clement of Rome’s version of the Gnostic’s character. It would be worthwhile to explore Clement’s intellectual context more by further study of his use of the Apostolic Fathers.

The second chapter also includes a parallel outline of Clement’s theology, including the demiurge, anthropogony, and soteriology. With the exception of the transcendence of God, Clement differs radically with the Platonists and the Gnostics on nearly every subject, especially the demiurge, the creation of humankind, his positive view of sensible flesh, and the *telos* of salvation. Although, with the Platonists and Gnostics, Clement believes God to be transcendent, he nevertheless argues from the prophets that God is close to humanity by his power and from the apostles that by grace and through the *Logos* the ‘unknown’ God can be known. Clement’s doctrine of the Demiurge, differing vastly from the Platonic and Gnostic intermediary gods, shows both the Father and the *Logos* to be the Agents of Creation. This thesis also adds a section about Clement’s view of God as the only truly existent God and a proto-orthodox view of the holy *Triad*. The outline of Clement’s theology shows not only the similarities and differences between the Platonists, the Gnostics, and Clement, but it tells us ‘what’ God became incarnate, ‘what’ kind of human being the *Logos* became, and ‘what’ kind of salvific mission God accomplished through the Incarnation. Because of Clement’s background in Platonism and his interest in Gnosticism, he sometimes portrays his theological discourse with philosophical terminology and Gnostic taxonomies, but his theology is clearly freighted with biblical knowledge.

There remains more research to be conducted, notably on how Clement aligns with the proto-orthodox episcopate, but moves towards the gnostic view of divine disclosers of secret knowledge, and then finds his own central path. His attempt to glean the best

aspects of both streams of thought and to synthesize them into his own brand of a Christian way of life is worthy of attention and consideration.

Part II depicts Clement's view of the Incarnation and divine mission of the *Logos-Son*, a theological discourse focused on soteriology and human destiny. Chapter Three demonstrates that the *Logos-Son* became a real flesh and blood human being, who suffered and died to vanquish death and rescue humankind from the maleficent powers and existential corruption, resulting from disobedience to the moral order of creation. This chapter classifies the main elements of Clement's doctrine of the Incarnation and it challenges the docetic interpretation both by looking at the broader context of the passages and by looking at the positive evidence of Clement's doctrine of the Incarnation. The evidence is five-fold and, with the exception of some discussion of the docetic issue (paragraph 4), is original research.

1. Chapter Three offers an interpretation of Clement's reading of the maleficent powers—as the source of human corruption—that tempt human beings into sub-human existence. As far as I know, there is no prior work done on Clement's view of the devil, the serpent, satan, or the tyrant death. More work, however, needs to be carried out on this subject, specifically to see exactly where Clement stands in relation to Gnosticism concerning the cosmic-rulers and *archons* of darkness.

2. Chapter Three details Clement's use of John 1:14 and the verb γίνομαι linked with the terms λόγος, ἄνθρωπος, and σάρξ to depict the Incarnation. Clement uses γίνομαι alluding to John 1:14 thirteen times; six mentions with ἄνθρωπος and seven mentions with σάρξ convey clearly that Clement believes the *Logos-Son* became a real human being with actual flesh.

3. Chapter Three analyzes *Stromateis* VII.2.6.5-8.6, Clement's only systematic passage on the Incarnation, identifying his use of ἀναλαμβάνω and ἐνδύω. With these two verbs, Clement sketched a four-part outline in *Stromateis* VII.2.6.5-8.6, utilizing four terms in sequence: παθητός, ἐμπαθής, εὐπάθεια, and αἰσθητός to depict the flesh of Christ. Clement explicitly denotes that the *Logos-Son* assumed flesh susceptible to suffering and death (παθητός), good and bad emotions (ἐμπαθής), enjoyment of good things (εὐπάθεια), and physical sensibilities (αἰσθητός). An exposition of this passage is not found (to my knowledge) in secondary literature.

4. Chapter Four addresses the question of Clement's alleged Docetism by looking at the broader context in light of the positive evidence from the above paragraphs 2-3. The inherent problems with the three suspect passages are that *Stromateis*

III.7.59.3 is a quote from Valentinus and not Clement's own words; true he does not criticize it, but neither does he develop it. *Stromateis* VI.9.71.1-2 seems a reference to the body of Christ after the resurrection, and therefore, not the same body as the incarnate Christ. The quote by Cassiodorus could be an allusion to the *Acts of John* where John discusses the transfiguration of Christ and an event watching Christ glow as he was in prayer. Was John alluding to these incidents and their effects on Christ's body? Looking at these passages narrowly could cause confusion over Clement's view of the flesh of Christ. However, if Clement's references to John 1:14 (his use of γίνομαι), his outline in *Stromateis* VII.2.6.5-8.6 (παθητός, ἔμπαθής, εὐπάθεια, and αἰσθητός), and his teachings on the sufferings of Christ are brought into the discussion, we discover that Clement overwhelmingly taught that the *Logos*-Son became *anthropos* and took on actual human *sarx*, in order to suffer for the salvation of humankind.

5. Chapter Three contributes to Clement's soteriology by explaining his doctrine of the cross both from Pauline passages and his own analogy from Homer's *Odyssey* (the mast of the ship as the cross of Christ). Important to Clement's soteriology are the effects of the crucifixion of Christ; he sees the cross as God's provision to loosen people from corruption and teaches cross-bearing is the mode for attaining *apatheia*. The wine of the Eucharist—representing the blood of Christ—became for Clement, participation in the Lord's immortality.

In addition, Part II illustrates Clement's version of the didactic mission of the *Logos*-Son. Chapter Four identifies him as the revelatory agent of divine *gnosis*, who *came* to explain the Scriptures. From a proper reading of the knowledge of God, believers who know Christ in a saving way can imbibe true *gnosis*, which for Clement is equal to *Logos*, and thereby one can assimilate to his likeness. Clement argues that likeness to the *Logos* fulfills the prophetic statement: 'Let us make *anthropos* in our image and likeness.' It also fulfills another prophetic word: 'I said you are gods.' Through the work of the Saviour and Teacher, *anthropos* becomes *theos*. The primary evidence is seven-fold, and with the exception of some parts of paragraphs one (1) and six (6), Chapter Four offers original research.

1. Chapter Four identifies Clement's view of the impediments in human existence that prevent knowledge of God. These disablements are three: (1) The body is limited because it was created for sensible and empirical knowledge, not spiritual insight or contemplation of divine realities; (2) people are plagued with ignorance and cannot know God, thus the need for a revelatory Agent; and (3) the struggle with the passions blind humanity from the vision of God and deafen them to the divine instructions.

2. Chapter Four highlights Clement's doctrine of the *parousia* of the *Logos*-Son, whose coming is consequential to the Incarnation. Concerning the *parousia*, Clement emphasizes the exegetical and didactic work of the *Logos*-Son, who interprets the salvific message of the prophets, and thus, directly connects the *parousia* to the Old Testament. This move unifies the apostolic teachings with the Scriptures and demarcates philosophy as *propaideia*.

3. Chapter Four also includes Clement's doctrine of the appearing of the *Logos*-Son, which is consequential to the Incarnation. Concerning the appearing, Clement points out the roles of the *Logos*-Son: God appeared in the flesh as Saviour and Teacher. This is vividly portrayed in *Protreptikos* I.7.1-4, where Clement uses ἐπιφάνεια two times and ἐπιφάνω seven times. He interlaces his theology of the appearing of the *Logos* with passages from the apostles, John and Paul, to connect the appearing to the days of the apostles. For both apostles, Christ appeared in the flesh (John 1:14; Romans 1:3) and after the resurrection in order to disclose knowledge. The appearing is salvific grace and revelatory agency by which the *Logos*-Son awakens people to the knowledge of God, illuminating the way to salvation. These two terms—παρουσία and ἐπιφάνεια—indicate a demarcation in Clement's former learning (*propaideia*), bringing the apostolic teachings to the fore.

The significance of Clement's doctrines of the *parousia* and the appearing is that they form an intellectual bridge between *propaideia* and *gnosis*. They bring together—in Clement's version of Christianity—the proto-orthodox episcopate with the gnostic sense of secret *gnosis*. In his teachings on the *parousia*, Clement maintains the unity of Scripture as recorded by the prophets, interpreted by Christ, and handed down by the apostles. Thus, he shows fidelity to the ecclesiastical canon, the *proto-orthodox* episcopate, and accords with Irenaeus. Clement's reading of the appearing also advances revelatory agency, but of hidden *gnosis* concealed in mystery that is revealed; here he accords with other Gnostics.

4. Chapter Four explores Clement's imagery of the yoke. Clement argues that the *Logos*-Son is equally yoked to the Father, and that through the Incarnation, his divinity became yoked to our humanity. Clement makes special mention of where Christ calls his followers to take up his yoke and learn from him (Matthew 11:29). Through this knowledge, the *Logos*-Son yokes people to himself, which inherently yokes them to God. In this way, people participate in God's power and thus assimilate to the likeness of God.

5. Chapter Four discusses Clement's knowledge terminology in two categories: (1) observable knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) and (2) revealed knowledge (γνώσις and ἐπίγνωσις). This section shows that Clement lacks interest in discussing *theologia*, because it is a preparatory form of knowledge, but he is eager to write about the *gnosis* of God disclosed by the *parousia* and appearing. Clement argues that divine *gnosis* moves believers along to the *telos* of human destiny: likeness to God.

6. Chapter Four treats Clement's use of Psalms 82:6 and explains his path to deification. For Clement, the way is three-fold. Firstly, one becomes a god by receiving God, mediated through the *Logos*-Son. Secondly, inquiry into Scripture

and the disclosure of concealed *gnosis* by the *Logos*-Son provide deifying potency. Clement uses the term θεοποιέω to depict this process of deification, since God ‘deifies humanity with heavenly teaching.’ Thirdly, one assimilates to the likeness of God through ‘following’ the teachings of the *Logos*-Son. Clement imports the Mosaic principle of ‘following’ the Lord into the Platonic use of the term ὁμοίωσις. Clement borrows the language of ‘likeness to God’ from Plato, agreeing with Plato that likeness to God is to become ‘righteous and pure with wisdom.’ However, Clement envisages likeness to God differently than Plato, and sees it as likeness to the *Logos*-Son.

7. Chapter Four takes into account the two roles of the *Logos*-Son, and points out that Clement wants believers to share in the salvific mission of the Saviour and emulate the doctrines of the Teacher. Thus, the one who is like the Saviour (like God) will help others reach their salvation. Moreover, he reports that Christ said: ‘It is sufficient for the disciple to become as the Teacher’ (Matt. 10:24-25). Therefore, the one who follows Christ’s teachings ‘will be perfected completely in the likeness of the teacher made a god going about in the flesh.’ This explanation of Clement’s teaching about likeness to God is important because it offers concrete answers to the questions some might ask about what Clement thinks it means to become *theos*. His soteriological curriculum tells us that to become a god is to function like the Saviour and become like the Teacher.

Since the Incarnation is essential to Clement’s path to salvation, especially the theology of the exchange doctrine as a mission, it is surprising that Clement did not write additional explicit passages explaining it. It is possible he may have written more on the Incarnation, imaginably in his *Hypotyposesis* or *On First Principles*, but these works are lost. Perhaps, because the Incarnation provoked scandal among the Platonists (who rejected the Incarnation), and the Gnostics (who with docetic christologies, denied it), Clement may have tried to conceal this mystery. Consequently, it is probable that important passages—still hidden in the pages (ground) of Clement’s surviving works—were missed in this present research, and so, there could be opportunity for scholars to take Clement’s doctrine of the Incarnation farther.

A. Incarnation and the Virgin Birth

1. *Str. VII.16.93.7*, ἀλλ', ὡς ἔοικεν, τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ μέχρι νῦν δοκεῖ ἡ Μαριάμ λεχῶ εἶναι διὰ τὴν τοῦ παιδίου γέννησιν, οὐκ οὔσα λεχῶ (καὶ γὰρ μετὰ τὸ τεκεῖν αὐτὴν μαιωθεῖσάν φασί τινες παρθένον εὔρεθῆναι).

‘But as the majority had thought, even until now, that Mary seemed to be pregnant because of the birth of her child, though she was not as a woman who had just given birth, (for even after she gave birth, some say they examined her to have found a virgin).’

2. *Str. VI.15.127.1*, ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἡ οἰκονομία πᾶσα ἡ περὶ τὸν κύριον προφητευθεῖσα παραβολὴ ὡς ἀληθῶς φαίνεται τοῖς μὴ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐγνωκόσιν, ὅταν τις τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ τὰ πάντα πεποιηκότος σάρκα ἀνειληφότα καὶ ἐν μήτρᾳ παρθένου κυοφορηθέντα, καθὸ γεγέννηται τὸ αἰσθητὸν αὐτοῦ σαρκίον, ἀκολουθῶς δέ, καθὸ γέγονεν τοῦτο πεπονθότα καὶ ἀνεσταμένον ὃ μὲν λέγει, οἱ δὲ ἀκούωσιν.

‘Even now, the whole administration that was prophesied about the Lord appears a parable to those who do not know the truth. Whenever one says and others hear that the Son of God—the one who created the universe—had assumed flesh and was conceived in the womb of the virgin, according as his sensible flesh had been begotten, and subsequently, according as this happened: he suffered and then was raised again.’

3. *Paid. I.6.41.3*, ὁ δὲ κύριος ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ τῆς παρθένου καρπός.

‘And the Lord, the Christ, is the fruit of the virgin.’

B. Incarnation and John 1:14.

1. *Exc.Thdot. 1.19.1*, καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, οὐ κατὰ τὴν παρουσίαν μόνον ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ ἐν ταύτοτητι λόγος κατὰ περιγραφὴν καὶ οὐ κατ’ οὐσίαν γενόμενος υἱός.

‘And “the *Logos* became flesh” not only when he became a man at his *parousia*, but also in the beginning; the essential *Logos*, by circumscription and not according to essence, became a Son.’

2. *Exc.Thdot. 1.19.2*, καὶ πάλιν σὰρξ ἐγένετο διὰ προφητῶν ἐνεργήσας.

‘And he even “became flesh,” when he worked through the prophets.’

¹¹³⁶ For texts on ἐπιφάνω, see the table on page 213.

3. Prot. I.8.4, ὁ φιλοκτίρμων θεός, σῶσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον γλιχόμενος· καὶ αὐτὸς ἤδη σοὶ ἐναργῶς ὁ λόγος λαλεῖ, δυσωπῶν τὴν ἀπιστίαν, ναί φημι, ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος, ἵνα δὴ καὶ σὺ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου μάθῃς, πῆ ποτε ἄρα ἄνθρωπος γένηται θεός.

‘The compassionate God is longing to save humanity; and already, the *Logos* himself speaks clearly to you, shaming your unbelief. Yes, I say, the *Logos* of God became a man, in order that you may even learn from a man how a person might become God.’

4. Paid. I.3.9.4, ἀγαπῶμεν οὖν τὰς ἐντολὰς δι’ ἔργων τοῦ κύριου (καὶ γὰρ ὁ λόγος αὐτὸς ἐναργῶς σὰρξ γενόμενος τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρετὴν πρακτικὴν ἅμα καὶ θεωρητικὴν ἐπιδεικνύς) καὶ δὴ νόμον ὑπολαμβάνοντες τὸν λόγον, τὰς ἐντολὰς καὶ τὰς ὑπόθημοσύνας αὐτοῦ ὡς συντόμους ὁδοὺς καὶ συντόνους εἰς αἰδιότητα γνωρίσωμεν.

‘Therefore, let us love the commandments through the works of the Lord (for even the *Logos* himself clearly became flesh, pointing out that the same virtue is at once practical and contemplative). Moreover, while upholding [the] law as the *Logos*, let us make known the commandments and his counsels as the straight ways and short cuts unto immortality [eternity].’

5. Paid. I.5.24.4, ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἄρνας ὀνομάζει ἡ γραφὴ τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς νηπίους, τὸν θεὸν τὸν λόγον τὸν δι’ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος γενόμενον, κατὰ πάντα ἡμῖν ἀπεικάζεσθαι βουλόμενον, ἀμνὸν κέκληκεν τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν νήπιον τοῦ πατρός.

‘Since the Scripture names the infant children lambs, God the *Logos*, [that is], the one who became a human being for us, while wishing to become like us in every way, was called by name: the Lamb of God, the Son of God, the Child of the Father.’

6. Paid. I.7.59.1, τὸ μὲν οὖν πρότερον τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ λαῷ πρεσβυτέρα διαθήκη ἦν καὶ νόμος ἐπαιδαγωγεῖ τὸν λαὸν μετὰ φόβου καὶ λόγος ἄγγελος ἦν καινῷ δὲ καὶ νέῳ λαῷ καινὴ καὶ νέα διαθήκη δεδώρηται καὶ ὁ λόγος «σὰρξ» γεγένηται καὶ ὁ φόβος εἰς ἀγάπην μετατέτραπται καὶ μυστικὸς ἐκεῖνος ἄγγελος Ἰησοῦς τίκεται.

‘Formerly, on the one hand, the older people had an older covenant and the law was teaching the people with fear and the *Logos* was a Messenger [Angel]; but on the other hand, a new and fresh covenant has been given to the new people, and the *Logos* has become flesh, and fear has been turned into love and that mystic Messenger [Angel], Jesus, was brought into the world.’

7. Paid. I.8.62.1-2, ἐκλαθόμενος δὲ τὸ μέγιστον αὐτοῦ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας, ὅτι δι’ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο. καὶ δὴ οἰκειότερον αὐτῷ ὁ προφήτης προσεύχεται διὰ τούτων «μνήσθητι ἡμῶν. ὅτι χουὶς ἐσμεν», τουτέστι συμπάθησον ἡμῖν, ὅτι τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοπαθῶς ἐπέειρασας. ταύτη γοῦν ἄριστος καὶ ἀνεπίληπτος ἐστὶν ὁ παιδαγωγὸς ὁ κύριος, τῆς ἐκάστου τῶν ἀνθρώπων δι’ ὑπερβολὴν φιλανθρωπίας συμπαθήσας φύσει.

‘And most of all, [the heretics] do not perceive [God’s] philanthropy, especially seeing that on account of us, he became a man. Indeed, most suitably for him the prophet prays in these [words]: “Remember us, because we are disturbed soil [dust]” [Ps. 103:14]: That is, sympathize with us, because speaking from your own experience, you [God] suffered the weakness of the flesh. In this way, therefore, the Instructor, the Lord, is most good and blameless; on account of exceeding philanthropy, he is sympathetic to the nature of each [person] among all humans.’

8. Paid. I.8.74.4, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἐμπαθὲς τῆς ὀργῆς, εἰ δὴ ὀργὴν τὴν νοουθεσίαν αὐτοῦ χρῆ καλεῖν, φιλόανθρωπόν ἐστιν εἰς πάθη καταβαίνοντος τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, δι’ ὃν καὶ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.

‘But even the disposition of anger, if it is necessary to call his admonition anger, is human loving, since God descended into emotion for humanity, because of whom, even the *Logos* of God became a man.’

9. Paid. II.2.20.1, καὶ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς μὲν τὸ πνεῦμα ὠκείωται τῇ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ φερομένη ψυχῇ, ἢ δὲ σὰρξ τῷ λόγῳ, δι’ ἣν «ὁ λόγος γέγονεν σὰρξ».

‘For truly the Spirit is united to the soul, being borne along by it; and the flesh [is united] to the *Logos* on account of which, “the *Logos* became flesh.”’

10. Paid. II.2.32.2, πῶς οἴεσθε πεπωκέναι τὸν κύριον, ὀπηνίκα δι’ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο;

‘How do you think the Lord drank, at the time he became a man for us.’

11. Paid. II.2.32.2 (connected to previous passage), εὐ γὰρ ἴσατε μετέλαβεν οἴνου καὶ αὐτός· καὶ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος καὶ αὐτός· καὶ εὐλόγησεν γε τὸν οἶνον· «λάβετε, πίετε· τοῦτό μου ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα·» αἷμα τῆς ἀμπέλου τὸν λόγον τὸν «περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχεόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.»

‘For you know well that he himself also partook of wine, for even he was a man. And he blessed the wine [and said]: “take, drink; this is my blood,” the blood of the vine, the *Logos*, the one being poured out unto the forgiveness of sins for many [people].’

12. Str. V.3.16.5, προελθὼν δὲ ὁ λόγος δημιουργίας αἴτιος ἔπειτα καὶ ἑαυτὸν γεννᾷ, ὅταν ὁ λόγος σὰρξ γένηται, ἵνα καὶ θεαθῇ.

‘The *Logos*, after advancing forwards, was the cause of creation, and then, he generated himself when the “*Logos* became flesh,” in order that he also might be seen.’

13. Str. V.11.72.3, ἐν τούτῳ καὶ ὁ λόγος ἠνθησέν τε καὶ ἐκαρποφόρησεν σὰρξ γενόμενος καὶ τοὺς γευσάμενους τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ ἐζωοποίησεν, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ ἄνευ τοῦ ξύλου εἰς γινώσιν ἡμῖν ἀφίκται ἐκερμάσθη γὰρ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν εἰς πίστιν ἡμῶν

‘In this place [material cosmos] even the *Logos*, after becoming flesh, blossomed and bore fruit, and [then], he made alive [all] those who tasted of his graciousness, since it is not without the cross he reached unto knowledge for us. For our life was suspended by our faith.’

14. Str. VII.12.72.1, εἷς μὲν οὖν μόνος ὁ ἀνεπιθύμητος ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ὁ κύριος ὁ φιλόανθρωπος ὁ καὶ δι’ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος [ἐγένετο] ὅσοι δὲ ἐξομοιούσθαι σπεύδουσι τῷ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ δεδομένῳ χαρακτήρι ἀνεπιθύμητοι ἐξ ἀσκήσεως γενέσθαι βιάζονται.

‘There is only one who was without desire from the beginning, the philanthropic Lord, who even [became] a man for us; and as many that are eager to be assimilated to the impress [stamp] given by him, press hard to become without desire by exercise.’

C. Incarnation and ἀναλαμβάνω:

NB: There are three references with ἀναλαμβάνω in *Stromateis* VII.2.

1. Str. VII.2.6.5, οὐκ οὖν ὑπὸ τρυφῆς ῥάθυμος ὁ δι’ ἡμᾶς τὴν παθητὴν ἀναλαβὼν σάρκα ἢ κήδεταί τῶν συμπάντων. ὅπερ καὶ καθήκει τῷ κυρίῳ πάντων γενομένῳ. σωτὴρ γὰρ ἔστιν, οὐχὶ τῶν μὲν, τῶν δὲ οὐ.

‘It is not therefore, from under a luxurious, indifferent [disposition that] the one, who for our sakes, assumed suffering flesh. He does care for everyone, which is fitting for the one who has become the Lord of all. For he is Saviour, not of some and others not [Saviour].’

2. Str. VII.2.7.5, οὐδὲ μὴν ὑπὸ τινος ἡδονῆς περισπώμενος καταλείπει ποτ’ ἂν τὴν ἀνθρώπων κηδεμονίαν, ὅς γε καὶ τὴν σάρκα τὴν ἐμπαθῆ φύσει γενομένην ἀναλαβὼν, εἰς ἕξιν ἀπαθείας ἐπαίδευσεν.

‘And not being drawn aside by a certain pleasure, he does not abandon the care of humanity, who also, when assuming flesh, which became susceptible to emotion by nature, he disciplined [it] unto the habit of *apatheia*.’

3. Str. VII.2.8.6, οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἦν, τοῦτο ὥφθη τοῖς χωρῆσαι μὴ δυναμένοις διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός, αἰσθητὴν δὲ ἀναλαβὼν σάρκα τὸ δυνατόν ἀνθρώποις κατὰ τὴν ὑπακοὴν τῶν ἐντολῶν δείξων ἀφίκετο.

‘For what he was, this was not seen by those unable to make intellectual space [for him] because of the weakness of their flesh, but having assumed sensible flesh, he came to this condition, bringing to light for humankind what is possible through obedience to the commandments.’

Also note: *Str.* V.6.34.1, πρόσωπον εἶρηται τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱός, αἰσθήσεωσ πεντάδι σαρκοφόρος γενόμενος.

‘The Son is said to be the face of the Father, having become flesh-bearing with five of the senses.’

Other texts (beyond *Str.* VII.2) using ἀναλαμβάνω:

4. *Prot.* X.110.2, οὐθ' ὅτε τὸ ἀνθρώπου προσωπείον ἀναλαβὼν καὶ σαρκὶ ἀναπλασάμενος τὸ σωτήριον δράμα τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος ὑπεκρίνετο ἀγνοηθεῖς.

‘Not being perceived, while assuming the disguise of man, and after being fashioned anew with flesh, he played the part for the salvific drama of humankind.’

5. *Str.* VI.15.127.2, δισνοιχθεῖσα δὲ αἱ γραφαὶ καὶ τοῖς ὦτα ἔχουσιν ἐμφήνασαι τὸ ἀληθὲς αὐτὸ ἐκεῖνο, ὃ πέπονθεν ἢ σὰρξ, ἣν ἀνείληφεν ὁ κύριος, «δύναμις θεοῦ καὶ σωφία» καταγγέλλουσιν.

‘The Scriptures, upon being opened up and declaring to those having ears [to hear] that very truth itself, they [the Scriptures] are proclaiming that the flesh which had suffered, which the Lord had assumed, is the “power and wisdom of God.”’

6. *Str.* VII.11.61.1, εἰδὼς εὖ μάλα ὅτι «ὁ διδάσκων ἄνθρωπον γνῶσιν» κατὰ τὸν προφήτην «κύριος» ἐστίν, διὰ στόματος ἀνθρωπίνου κύριος ἐνεργῶν ταύτη καὶ σὰρκα ἀνείληφεν.

‘Knowing very well that “the one who teaches a man knowledge” according to the prophet is the “Lord,” the Lord working through the mouth of humanity; by this also he had assumed flesh.’

D. Incarnation and ἐνδέω (#1) and ἐνδύω (2-4):

1. *Prot.* XI.111.1-2, παρήγετο ἐπιθυμίαις, ὁ παῖς ἀνδριζόμενος ἀπειθεία καὶ παρακούσας τοῦ πατρὸς ἠσχύνετο τὸν θεόν. οἶον ἴσχυσεν ἡδονή· ὁ δι' ἀπλότητα λελυμένος ἄνθρωπος ἀμαρτίαις εὐρέθη δεδεμένος. τῶν δεσμῶν λῦσαι τοῦτον ὁ κύριος αὐτῆς ἠθέλησεν, καὶ σαρκὶ ἐνδεθεῖς—μυστήριον θεῖον τοῦτο—τὸν ὄφιν ἐχειρώσατο καὶ τὸν τύραννον ἐδουλώσατο, τὸν θάνατον.

‘Induced by lusts, the child, while growing old by disobedience and having misunderstood the Father, dishonored God. In such a way, pleasure is strong. The man who had been free by simplicity, was found having been bound by sins. The Lord wished to lose him again from his bonds, and having been clothed with flesh—this is a divine mystery—he trounced the serpent and enslaved the tyrant, that is, death.’

2. *Str.* IV.21.130.2, πάντα δὲ ὁμοῦ τέλειος οὐκ οἶδ' εἴ τις ἀνθρώπων, ἔτι ἄνθρωπος ὢν, πλὴν μόνον ὁ δι' ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπον ἐνδυσάμενος.

‘I do not know if anyone of humanity is complete in all things at once, still being a human being, except only the one who was clothed with humanity for us.’

3. *Str.* VII.2.8.1, πᾶσα δὲ ἡ τοῦ κυρίου ἐνέργεια ἐπὶ τὸν παντοκράτορα τὴν ἀναφορὰν ἔχει, καὶ ἔστιν ὡς εἰπεῖν πατρικὴ τις ἐνέργεια ὁ υἱός. οὐκ ἂν οὖν ποτε ὁ σωτὴρ μισάνθρωπος. ὅς γε διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν φιλανθρωπίαν

σαρκὸς ἀνθρωπίνης εὐπάθειαν οὐχ ὑπεριδὼν, ἀλλ' ἐνδυσάμενος [σαρκὸς ἀνθρωπίνης], ἐπὶ τὴν κοινὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐλήλυθεν σωτηρίαν.

‘All the energy of the Lord is a standard reference to the Almighty; and the Son is, so to say, a certain paternal energy. Therefore, the Saviour is not a human-hater, that is, he through his surpassing philanthropy for human flesh, did not look down upon good feelings, but being clothed [with human flesh], he had come for the common salvation of humanity.’

4. Q.d.s. 37.3, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ αὐτὸς κατήλθε, διὰ τοῦτο ἄνθρωπον ἐνέδου, διὰ τοῦτο τὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐκὼν ἔπαθεν.

‘This is why also he came, this is why he was clothed with humanity, this is why he willingly suffered the things of humankind.’

E. Incarnation and καταβαίνω:

1. Paid. I.6.46.2-3, ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ. καὶ ὁ ἄρτος, ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς.

‘For the bread of God is the one descending out of heaven and gives life to the world. And the bread, which I shall give for the life of the world, is my flesh.’

2. Paid. I.9.88.3, ἔπειτα δὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καταβέβηκεν ἡ δικαιοσύνη καὶ γράμματι καὶ σώματι, τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τῷ νόμῳ, εἰς μετάνοιαν τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα βιαζομένη σωτήριον· ἀγάπη γὰρ ἦν.

‘But then, righteousness descended upon humanity both in letter and in body, in the *Logos* and in the law, for love was constraining humankind unto saving repentance.’

F. Incarnation and φανερώω:

1. Paid. I.5.23.1, καὶ ποῦ ἄρα ἦν ἡ θυρίς, δι’ ἧς ὁ κύριος ἐδείνυτο; ἡ σὰρξ, δι’ ἧς πεφανερώεται.

‘And where was the window through which the Lord was shown? The Flesh through which he was manifested.’

2. Str. V.10.63.4, ἐλπίσατε, φησὶν, ἐπὶ τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ μέλλοντα φανερωσθαι ὑμῖν Ἰησοῦν.

‘Hope it says, in Jesus who is about to be manifested to you in the flesh.’

G. Incarnation and φέρω:

1. Str. IV.3.8.7, «ἠλάττωσας αὐτόν», φησί, «βραχὺ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους» οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἐκδέχονται τὴν γραφὴν (καίτοι κάκεινος σάρκα ἔφερον),

ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ τελείου καὶ γνωστικοῦ τῷ χρόνῳ καὶ τῷ ἐνδύματι ἐλαττουμένου παρὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους.

‘It says, “you made him [*anthropos*] a little lower than the angels” for they do not take up this writing about the Lord, (and further, that one bore flesh) in time, and in the garment of the perfect man and the Gnostic, while being made a little lower than the angels.’

H. Incarnation and ἦκω

1. Prot. XI.112.1, διό μοι δοκεῖ, ἐπεὶ αὐτὸς ἦκεν ὡς ἡμᾶς οὐρανόθεν ὁ λόγος, ἡμᾶς ἐπ’ ἀνθρωπίνην ἵεναι μὴ χρῆναι διδασκαλίαν ἔτι, Ἀθήνας καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα.

‘Wherefore, it seems to be that since the *Logos* himself came as us from heaven, we need not still go to Athens or the rest of Greece for human teaching.’

I. Texts on the Logos-Son as God and Man:

1. Prot. I.7.1, αἴτιος γοῦν ὁ λόγος, ὁ Χριστὸς, καὶ τοῦ εἶναι πάλαι ἡμᾶς (ἦν γὰρ ἐν θεῷ), καὶ τοῦ εἶναι· νῦν δὲ ἐπεφάνη ἀνθρώποις αὐτὸς οὗτος ὁ λόγος, ὁ μόνος ἄμφω, θεὸς τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος, ἀπάντων ἡμῖν αἴτιος ἀγαθῶν.

‘The *Logos*, then, that is the Christ, is the cause of both our well-being long ago (for he was in God) and of our well-being; indeed, this one, the *Logos* himself, has recently appeared, who is both God and man, the cause of all good things for us.’

2. Prot. X.106.4, πιστευον, ἄνθρωπε, ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ θεῷ· πιστευον, ἄνθρωπε, τῷ παθόντι καὶ προσκυνουμένῳ, θεῷ ζῶντι πιστεύσατε οἱ δοῦλοι τῷ νεκρῷ· πάντες ἄνθρωποι πιστεύσατε μόνῳ τῷ πάντων ἀνθρώπων θεῷ· πιστεύσατε καὶ μισθὸν λάβετε σωτηρίαν .

‘O man, trust in [the one who] is both man and God and believe in the one who suffered and is worshipped; servants, believe in the living God, the one who died; everyone, believe in the only God of all of humanity; believe and receive the reward, that is, salvation.’

3. Paid. I.3.7.1, πάντα ὀνίνησιν ὁ κύριος καὶ πάντα ὠφελεῖ καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὡς θεός, τὰ μὲν ἁμαρτήματα ὡς θεὸς ἀφίεις, εἰς δὲ τὸ μὴ ἐξαμαρτάνειν παραπαιδαγωγῶν ὡς ἄνθρωπος.

‘The Lord, both as God and as man, profits everything and helps in every way. On the one hand, as God, he forgives our transgressions; on the other hand, as man, he teaches [us] not to sin [commit a fault].’

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

- Barnard, P. Mordaunt. *Clement of Alexandria: Quis Dives Salvetur*. Re-edited together with an Introduction on the MSS. of Clements Works. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1897.
- Clément d'Alexandrie. Introduction, Traduction et Notes, Claude Mondéserts. *Le Protreptique*. Sources Chrétiennes 2. Paris: Cerf, 1951.
- Clément d'Alexandrie. Texte Grec, Introduction et Notes, Henri-I. Marrou; Traduction de Marduerite Harl. *Le Pédagogue, I*. Sources Chrétiennes 70. Paris: Cerf, 1960.
- Clément d'Alexandrie. Introduction et Notes, Henri-I. Marrou; Traduction de Claude Mondésert. *Le Pédagogue, II*. Sources Chrétiennes 108. Paris: Cerf, 1965.
- Clément d'Alexandrie. Introduction et Notes, Henri-I. Marrou; Traduction de Claude Mondésert and Matray. *Le Pédagogue, III*. Sources Chrétiennes 158. Paris: Cerf, 1970.
- Clément d'Alexandrie. Traduction et Notes de M. Caster (Claude Mondésert, Annewies vanden Hoek); Introduction de Claude Mondésert. *Les Stromates. Tom. I*. Sources Chrétiennes 30. Paris: Cerf, 1951-.
- Clément d'Alexandrie. Traduction et Notes de M. Caster (Claude Mondésert, Annewies van den Hoek); Introduction de Claude Mondésert. *Les Stromates. Tom. II*. Sources Chrétiennes 38. Paris: Cerf, 1954.
- Clément d'Alexandrie. Traduction et Notes de M. Caster (Claude Mondésert, Annewies van den Hoek); Introduction, Claude Mondésert. *Les Stromates. Tom. V*. Sources Chrétiennes 463. Paris: Cerf, 1951-.
- Clément d'Alexandrie. Editor, Introduction, Notes and Commentary, A. Le Boulluec; Traduction de P. Voulet. *Les Stromates. Tom. V*. Sources Chrétiennes 278/279. Paris: Cerf, 1981.
- Clément d'Alexandrie. Editor, Translator, Introduction, et Notes, P. Descourtieux. *Les Stromates. Tom. VI*. Sources Chrétiennes 446. Paris: Cerf, 1999.
- Clément d'Alexandrie. Editor, Traduction, Introduction, et Notes, A. Le Boulluec. *Les Stromates. Tom. VII*. Sources Chrétiennes 428. Paris: Cerf, 1997.
- Clément d'Alexandrie. Texte Grec, O. Stählin et L. Früchtel (GCS 17²); Introduction, Notes et Index par Carlo Nardi et Patrick Descourtieux; Traduction de Patrick Descourtieux. *Quel riche sera sauvé*. Sources Chrétiennes 537. Paris: Cerf, 2011.
- Clément d'Alexandrie. Texte Grec, Introduction, Traduction et Notes, F. Sagnard. *Extraits de Théodote*. Sources Chrétiennes 23. Paris: Cerf, 1948.
- Clément of Alexandria M. Marchovich, Edidit. *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, Volume XXXIV. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1995.
- Nestle-Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, 1898 und 1979.

- Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX Interpretes, Volumen I, Leges et Historiae*. Germany: Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt Stuttgart, 1935, 1971.
- _____. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece Iuxta LXX interpretes, Volumen II, Libri Poetici et Prophetici*. Germany: Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt Stuttgart, 1935, 1971.
- Stählin, Otto. *Clemens Alexandrinus Erster Band Protrepticus und Paedagogus*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1905, 1936.
- _____. *Clemens Alexandrinus Zweiter Band Stromata Buch I-VI*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960.
- _____. *Clemens Alexandrinus Dritter Band Stromata Buch VII-VIII, Excerpta Ex Theodoto, Eclogae Propheticae, Quis Dives Salvetur, Fragmente*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1970.
- _____. *Clemens Alexandrinus Vierter Band die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1936.
- University of California (Research Center). *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Irvine, CA: University of California, 1972.
- Whittiker, Molly, ed. and trans. *Tatian: Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

B. Works in Translation

- Butterworth, G.W., trans., G.P. Gould, ed. *Clement of Alexandria: The Exhortation to the Greeks, The Rich Man's Salvation, and The Fragment of an Address Entitled, to the Newly Baptized*. LCL, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919, 1979.
- Casey, R.P., trans. *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria*. London: Christophers, 1934.
- Chadwick, Henry (trans.). *Origen: Contra Celsum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Chadwick, H., and J.E.L. Oulton, eds. *Alexandrian Christianity: Selected Translations of Clement and Origen*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, reprint from SCM Press, 1954, 2006.
- Cruse, C.F., trans. *Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998.
- Ferguson, John, trans. *Clement of Alexandria: Stromateis Books One to Three*. The Fathers of the Church: 85. D.C.: The Catholic University Press, 1991.
- Fowler, Harold N., trans. *Plato: Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo, Phaedrus*, LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1917, 1999.
- Hoffmann, R. Joseph. *Celsus, On the True Doctrine: A Discourse against the Christians*. NY: Oxford University Press, 1987)
- Holmes, Michael W., Editor. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translation of their Writings* (2nd Edition). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1992.

- James, M.R. *The Apocryphal New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Oulton, J.E.L., trans. *Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History, LCL*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932, 1964.
- Roberts, A., and J. Donaldson eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volumes I*. Reprint from original, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1867. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1986.
- _____. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume II*. Reprint from original, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1867. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1986.
- Robinson, James M., dir. of trans. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1977.
- Wilson, N.G., trans. *Photius: The Bibliotheca*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1994.
- Wood, Simon P., trans. *Clement of Alexandria: Christ the Educator*. The Fathers of the Church, 23. D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1954.

C. Lexicons

- Bauer, Walter, W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich and F.W. Danker (Translators). *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Crane, Gregory, R., ed. Perseus Digital Library. Tufts University: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper>.
- Lampe, G.W.H. ed. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Liddell, H.G., and R. Scott, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed., rev. H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

D. Secondary Sources

1. Works on Clement

- Ashwin-Siejkowski, Piotr. *Clement of Alexandria: A Project in Christian Perfection*. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- _____. *Clement of Alexandria on Trial: the Evidence of 'Heresy' from Photius' Bibliotheca*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae Volume 101. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Baker, R.A. 'Spiritual Contemplation in Clement of Alexandria's Stromateis: Adaption of the Philosophical category of Θεωρία.' PhD Diss., St Mary's College of the University of St. Andrews, 2001.
- Behr, John. *Asceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Bigg, Charles. *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*. The Bampton Lectures 1886. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913.
- Blair, Harold. *The Kaleidoscope of Truth: Types and Archetypes in Clement of Alexandria*. Worthington: Churchman Publication Ltd., 1986.

- Boer, William Den. *De Allegorese in Het Werk van Clement Alexandrinus*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1940.
- Boulluec, Alain Le. *Alexandrie Antique et Chrétienne: Clément et Origène*. Paris: Institut d' Études Augustiniennes, 2012.
- Brontesi, Alfredo. *La soteria in Clemente Alessandrino*. Rome: università gergoriana editrice, 1972.
- Bucur, Bogdan G. *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Buell, Denise K. *Making Christians: Clement of Alexandria and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Chadwick, Henry. *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition: Studies in Justin, Clement, and Origen*. Oxford: Oxford university press, 1966.
- Choufrine, Arkadi. *Gnosis, Theophany, Theosis: Studies in Clement of Alexandria's Appropriation of His Background*. Patristic Studies Volume 5. New York, Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2002.
- Clark, E.A. *Clement's Use of Aristotle: the Aristotelian Contribution to Clement of Alexandria's Refutation of Gnosticism*. New York: E. Mellen Press, 1977.
- Cosaert, Carl P. *The Text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria*. SBL The New Testament in the Greek Fathers. Atlanta, GA: The Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- De Faye, Eugene. *Clément d'Alexandrie, étude sur les rapports du christianisme et de la philosophie grecque a IIe siècle*. Paris, 1898.
- Echle, Harry A. *The Terminology of the Sacrament of Regeneration According to Clement of Alexandria*. Baltimore, MD: The Catholic University Press, 1949.
- Ewing, Jon D. *Clement of Alexandria's Reinterpretation of Divine Providence: The Christianization of the Hellenistic Idea of Pronoia*. Edwin Mellen Press, 2008.
- Ferguson, John. *Clement of Alexandria*, TWAS 289. NY: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1974.
- Feulner, Rüdiger. *Clemens von Alexandrien. Sein Leben, Werk und philosophisch-theologisches Denken*. Bamberger theologische Studien 31. Bern/Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2006.
- Hägg, Henny Fiskå. *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Herrero de Jáuregui, Miguel. 'The Protrepticus of Clement of Alexandria: A Commentary.' Ph.D. Diss., University of Bologna, 2008.
- Hoek, Annewies van den. *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromateis: An Early Christian Reshaping of a Jewish model*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988.
- Hort, Fenton John Anthony & Joseph B. Mayor. *Clement of Alexandria Miscellanies Book VIII: The Greek Text with Introduction, Translation, Notes, Dissertations and Indices*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1902.

- Itter, Andrew C. *Esoteric Teaching in the Stromateis of Clement of Alexandria*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009.
- Lilla, S.R.C. *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1971.
- Karavites, P. *Evil, Freedom, and the Road to Perfection in Clement of Alexandria*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Kindiy, Oleh. *Christos Didaskalos: The Christology of Clement of Alexandria*. Saarbrücken, Germany: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller Aktiengesellschaft & Co., 2008.
- Matyáš, Havrda, Vít Hušek, and Jana Plátová, eds. *The Seventh Book of the Stromateis: Proceedings on Clement of Alexandria*. Olomouc, October 21-23 2010. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae Texts and Studies of Early Christian Life and Language. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Méhat, André. *Études sur les 'Stromates' chez Clément d'Alexandrie*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966.
- Mondésert, C. *Clément d'Alexandrie, introduction à l'étude de sa pensée religieuse à partir de l'écriture*. Paris, 1944.
- Munck, Johannes. *Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandria*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933.
- Osborn, Eric *Clement of Alexandria*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- _____. *Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.
- Patrick, John. *Clement of Alexandria: The Croall Lectures for 1899-1900*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1914.
- Pétrément, Simone. *le Dieu séparé: les origines du gnosticisme*. Paris: les Éditions du cerf, 1984.
- Prunet, Olivier. *La Morale de Clément D'Alexandrie et Le Nouveau Testament*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966.
- Quatember, Friedrich S. J. *Die christliche Lebenshaltung des Klemens von Alexandrien nach seinem Pädagogus: Mit einer kritischen Voruntersuchung über die Person des Klemens und sein Werk, den Pädagogus*. Wien: Verlag Herder, 1946.
- Timothy, H.B. *The Early Christian Apologists and Greek Philosophy: Exemplified by Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria*. The Netherlands: Koninklijke Van Gorcum & Coop., 1972.
- Tollinton, R.B. *Clement of Alexandria VI: A Study in Christian Liberalism (1914)*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1914.
- _____. *Clement of Alexandria V2: A Study in Christian Liberalism (1914)*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1914.
- Völker, Walther. *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1952.
- Wywra, Dietmar. *Die Christliche Platonaneignung in den Stromateis des Clemens von Alexandrien*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter, 1983.

Zandee, Jan. *'The Teachings of Silvanus' and Clement of Alexandria: A New Document of Alexandrian Theology*. Leiden: Ex Oriente Lux, 1977.

2. Related Works

Aland, Barbara. *Was ist Gnosis? Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Alfeyev, Metropolitan Hilarion. *The Mystery of Faith: An Introduction to the Teaching and Spirituality of the Orthodox Church*. New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011.

Arnold, Clinton E. *Powers of Darkness: Principalities and Powers in Paul's Letters*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992.

Aune, David Edward. *Apocalypticism, Prophecy, and Magic in Early Christianity. Collected Essays*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Barnard, L.W. *The Apostolic Fathers and Their Background*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966.

Barnes, Jonathan. *The Presocratic Philosophers*. London: Routledge, 1982.

Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics IV/2*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1958.

_____. *The Humanity of God*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1960.

Bartos, Emil. *Deification in Eastern Orthodox Theology: An Evaluation and Critique of the Theology of Dumitru Staniloae*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster Press, 1999.

Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1971.

Berchman, Robert M. *From Philo to Origen: Middle Platonism in Transition*. Brown Judaic Studies No. 69. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984.

Birnbaum, Ellen. *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought: Israel, Jews, and Proselytes*. Brown Judaic Studies, 290. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996.

Bird, Michael F. & Joseph R. Dodson, (Editors). *Paul and the Second Century*. London: T&T Clark International, 2011.

Boer, William Den. *De Allegorese in Het Werk van Clement Alexandrinus*. Leiden: Brill, 1940.

Bonazzi, Mauro, and Christoph Helmig, eds. *Platonic Stoicism, Stoic Platonism: The Dialogue Between Platonism and stoicism in Antiquity*. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2007.

Boulluec, Alain Le. *La Notion d'hérésie dans la Littérature Grecque II^e-III^e siècles: Tome II, Clément et Origène*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985.

_____. *Alexandrie Antique et Chrétienne: Clément et Origène*. Paris: Institut d' Études Augustiniennes, 2012.

Bradshaw, Paul E., Maxwell E. Johnson, and L. Edward Phillips. *The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2002.

Brakke, David. *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012.

- Brent, Allen. *A Political History of Early Christianity*. London, Great Britain: T & T Clark International, 2009.
- Buxton, R., Editor. *From Myth to Reason?: Studies in the Development of Greek Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Edited by John T. McNeill. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.
- Camps, Josep Rius and Jenny Read-Heirmerdinger. *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: a Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition*. NY: T & T Clark, 2009.
- Carone, Gabriela Roxana. *Plato's Cosmology and Its Ethical Dimensions*. NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Chadwick, Henry. *The Church in Ancient Society: From Galilee to Gregory the Great*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Charlesworth, James, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume One*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009.
- _____. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume Two*. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Christensen, Michael J., and Jeffery A. Wittung, Editors. *Partakers of the Divine Nature The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Chryssavgis, John. *Light through Darkness: The Orthodox Tradition*. Traditions of Christian Spirituality Series. NY: Orbis Books, 2004.
- Clark, E.A. *Clement's Use of Aristotle: the Aristotelian Contribution to Clement of Alexandria's Refutation of Gnosticism*. New York: E. Mellen Press, 1977.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Collobert, C., P. Destrée and F.J. Gonzales, Editors. *Plato and Myth: Studies on the Use and Status of Platonic Myths*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012.
- Congar, Yves. *la Tradition et la Vie de l'Eglise*. Paris: les Éditions de Cerf, 1984.
- Copan, Paul, and William L. Craig. *Creation out of Nothing: A Biblical, Philosophical, and Scientific Exploration*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004.
- Copleston, Frederick S. J. *A History of Philosophy Volume I: Greece and Rome*. NY: Doubleday, 1993.
- Cox, Ronald. *By the Same Word: Creation and Salvation in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Berlin, DE: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.
- Curd, Patricia, and Daniel W. Graham. *The Oxford Handbook of Pre-Socratic Philosophy*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Daley, B.E. *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Daniélou, Jean. *The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea Volume One: The Theology of Jewish Christianity*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd LTD, 1964.

- _____. *A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea Volume Two: Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1973.
- Dawson, David. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*. Berkley, CA; Oxford, England: University of California Press, 1992.
- DeConick, April D., ed. *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*. Atlanta: SBL, 2006.
- DeVries, L.F. *Cities of the Biblical World*. Peabody, MA: Hendricksons Publishers, Inc., 1997.
- Di Berardino, Angelo, and Basil Studer (Editors). *History of Theology I: The Patristic Period*. Collegetown MN: The Liturgical Press, 1997.
- Dillon, John, trans. *Alcinous: The Handbook of Platonism*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1993.
- _____. *Neoplatonic Philosophy: Introductory Readings*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2004.
- _____. *The Middle Platonists 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. NY: Cornell University Press, 1977, 1996.
- _____. *The Platonic Heritage: Further Studies in the History of Platonism and Early Christianity*. England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2012.
- Dix, Gregory and Henry Chadwick. *Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις: The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St Hippolytus of Rome*. London: The Alban Press, 1992.
- Doherty, Earl. *The Jesus Puzzle: Did Christianity begin with a Mythical Christ*. Ottawa, CA: Canadian Humanist Publications, 2001.
- Doresse, Jean. *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics: An Introduction to the Gnostic Coptic Manuscripts Discovered at Chenoboskion*. New York, NY: MJF Books, 1986.
- Drobner, H.R. *The Fathers of the Church: A Comprehensive Introduction*. Translated by S. S. Schatzmann. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007.
- Edwards, Mark Julian. *Catholicity and Heresy in the Early Church*. England: Ashgate, 2009.
- _____. *Origen Against Plato*. Ashgate Studies in Philosophy and Theology in Late Antiquity. England: Ashgate, 2002.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *How Jesus Became God: The Exaltation of a Jewish Preacher from Galilee*. New York: Harper One, 2014.
- Elliot, J.K. *The Apocryphal New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Evans, Craig A., Robert L. Webb, and Richard A. Wiebe. *Nag Hammadi Texts and the Bible: A Synopsis and Index*. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Evans, G.R., ed. *The First Christian Theologians*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Fine, Gail, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Plato*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

- Finland, Stephen, and Vladimir Kharlamov eds. *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2006.
- Florensky, Pavel. *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth: An Essay in Orthodox Theodicy in Twelve Letters*. Translated by Boris Jakim. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Florovsky, Georges. *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View*. Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishing Company, 1972.
- Floyd, W.E.G. *Clement of Alexandria's Treatment of the Problem of Evil*. London; New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Fortescue, Adrian. *The Greek Fathers: Their Lives and Writings*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1908, 2007.
- Foster, Paul, ed. *Early Christian Thinkers: The Lives and Legacies of Twelve Key Figures*. Great Britain, SPCK, 2010.
- Frandos, Georgios D. *Kosmos und Logos nach Philon von Alexandria*. Amsterdam, 1976.
- Frend, W.H.C. *The Rise of Christianity*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Frandos, Georgios D. *Kosmos und Logos nach Philon von Alexandria*. Amsterdam, 1976.
- Froehlich, Karlfried, Translator and Editor. *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: Sources of Early Christian Thought*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Früchtel, Ursula. *Die Kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philo von Alexandrien: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Genesisexegese*. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1968.
- Gerson, Lloyd P. *Ancient Epistemology: Key Themes in Ancient Philosophy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Goodwin, William. *A Greek Grammar*. London: Macmillan Education LTD, 1879, 1983.
- Grant, R.M. *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988.
- Graver, Margaret R. *Stoicism and Emotion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Green, Henry A. *The Economic and Social Origins of Gnosticism*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 77; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Gregg, Robert C. *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments*, Patristics Monograph Series, No. 11, ed. The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, LTD., 1985.
- Gregory, Andrew F. and Christopher M. Tuckett. *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Gregory of Nyssa. *Gregory of Nyssa: The Life of Moses*. Translated by Abraham J. Malherbe and Everett Ferguson. NY: HarperCollins Publishers, 2006.

- Griggs, C. W. *Early Egyptian Christianity from its Origins to 451 C. E.* Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1990.
- Gross, Jules. *The Divinization of the Christian According to the Greek Fathers.* Translated by Paul A. Oncia. Anaheim, CA: A&C Press, 2002.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. *A History of Greek Philosophy Volume IV, Plato: The Man and His Dialogues, Earlier Period.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Hadot, Pierre. *What is Ancient Philosophy?* Translated by Michael Chase. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Hagner, Donald Alfred. *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome.* Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Harker, Andrew. *Loyalty and Dissidence in Roman Egypt: The Case of the Acta Alexandrinorum.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Harnack, Adolph. *Outlines of the History of Dogma.* Translated by E. K. Mitchell. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2001.
- _____. *The History of Dogma, Volume II, N.* Translated by Neil Buchanan. Holland: Motley Press, 1895, 1931.
- Hass, Christopher. *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict.* Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Hedrick, Charles W. and Robert Hodgson, Editors. *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson's Publishers, 1986
- Hilhorst, A., Editor. *The Apostolic Age in Patristic Thought.* Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, Volume 70. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Hill, Charles H. *Regnum Caelorum: Patterns of Millennial Thought in Early Christianity.* Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001.
- Hofmann, R.J. *Celsus, On the True Doctrine: A Discourse against the Christians.* NY: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Hunt, Emily J. *Christianity in the Second Century: The Case of Tatian.* London: Routledge, 2003.
- Jaeger, Werner. *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Jenott, Lance and Sarit Kattan Gribetz, Editors. *Jewish and Christian Cosmogony in Late Antiquity.* Text and Studies in Ancient Judaism 155. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Jones, Peter Rhea. *The Epistle of Jude as expounded by the Fathers--Clement of Alexandria, Didymus of Alexandria, the Scholia of Camer's Catena, Pseudo-Oecumenius and Bede.* Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001.
- Jowett, B. *The Dialogues of Plato.* Revised 4th Ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.
- Kamil, Jill. *Christianity in the Land of the Pharaohs: The Coptic Orthodox Church.* London & NY: Rutledge, 2002.
- Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti. *One with God: Salvation as deification and Justification.* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2004.

- Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. Peabody, MA: Prince Press, 2004.
- King, Karen L. *The Secret Revelation of John*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- _____. *What is Gnosticism?*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Kirk, G.S., Raven, J.E., & Schofield M. *The Pre-socratic Philosophers*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Klijn, A. F. J. *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Koester, H. *History and Literature of Early Christianity*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Krause, Martin, James M. Robinson, and Fredrick Wisse, Editors. *Gnosis and Gnosticism; Papers Read at the Eighth International Conference on Patristic Studies*, NHS XVII. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Ladner, Gerhard B. *God, Cosmos, and Humankind: The World of Early Christian Symbolism*. Translated by Thomas Dunlap. Berkley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Lampe, Peter. *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Levison, John R. *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha. GB: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.
- Lewis, L.W.P., and L.M. Styer. *Foundations for Greek Prose Composition*. London, GB: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd, 1934, 1968.
- Logan, Alistair H.B. *The Gnostics: Identifying an Early Christian Cult*. London: T & T Clark, 2006.
- Long, A.A. *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*. Los Angeles, CA: The University of California Press, 1986.
- Lossky, Vladimir. *In the Image and Likeness of God*. Crestwood NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974, 2001.
- _____. *Orthodox Theology: An Introduction*. Crestwood, NY: SVSP, 1978.
- Louth, Andrew. *Introducing Eastern Orthodox Theology*. London, Great Britain: SPCK, 2013.
- _____. *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition: From Plato to Denys*. NY: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Luttikhuisen, Gerard P. *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions*. Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies Volume 58. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Macaskill, Grant. *Union with Christ in the New Testament*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Madigan, Kevin & Jon D. Levenson. *Resurrection: The Power of God for Christians and Jews*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Manley, Johanna. *The Lament of Eve*. Menlo Park, CA: Monastery Books, 1993.

- Markschies, Christoph. *Gnosis: An Introduction*. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Marlowe, John. *The Golden Age of Alexandria: From its Foundation by Alexander the Great in 331^{BC} to its Capture by the Arabs in 641^{AD}*. London: Ebenezer Baylis and Sons Limited the Trinity Press, 1971.
- May, Gerhard. *Creatio Ex Nihilo: The Doctrine of 'Creation from Nothing' in Early Christian Thought*. Translated by A. S. Worrall. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994, 2004.
- McDowell, John, trans. *Plato: Theaetetus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- McGowan, Andrew B., Brian E. Daley and Timothy J. Gaden, eds. *God in Early Christian Thought: Essays in Memory of Lloyd G Patterson*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae Texts and Studies of Early Christian Life and Language. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Meijer, P.A. *Stoic Theology: Proofs for the Existence of the Cosmic God and of the Traditional Gods: Including a Commentary on Clenathes' Hymn on Zeus*. Delft: Eburon, 2007.
- Modrzejewski, Joseph Mélèze. *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian*. Translated by Robert Cornman. Princeton, NJ: PUP, 1995.
- Mohr, Richard D. *God and Forms in Plato*. Revised edition of *The Platonic Cosmology*, 1985; ParmenidesPublishing, 2005.
- _____. *The Platonic Cosmology*. Leiden, 1985.
- Mojsov, Bojana. *Alexandria Lost: From the Advent of Christianity to the Arab Conquest*. London, Great Britain: CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham, and Eastbourne, 2010.
- Morgan-Wynne, John Eifion. *Studies in Christian History and Thought: Holy Spirit and Religious Experience in Christian Literature ca. AD 90-200*. UK: Paternoster, 2006.
- Murdock, D.M. *Christ in Egypt: The Horus-Jesus Connection*. Stellar House Publishing, 2009.
- Nataraja, Kim. *Journey to the Heart: Christian Contemplation through the Centuries*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2012.
- Nellas, Panayiotis. *Deification in Christ: Orthodox Perspectives on the Nature of the Human Person*. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987.
- Neymeyer, Ulrich. *Die christliche Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert: ihre Lehrtätigkeit ihr Selbstverständnis und ihre Geschichte*. Leiden: Brill, 1989.
- Norris, Richard A. *God and World in Early Christian Theology: A Study in Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen*. London: Adam and Charles Black LTD, 1966.
- O'brien, Carl Séan. *The Demiurge in Ancient Thought: Secondary Gods and Divine Mediators*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Oden, Thomas. *The African Memory of Mark: Reassessing Early Church Tradition*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2011.

- O'Donovan, Oliver & Joan Lockwood O'Donovan, eds. *From Irenaeus to Grotius: A Sourcebook in Christian Political Thought*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999.
- O'Hagan, Angelo P. *Material Re-creation in the Apostolic Fathers*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.
- O'Keefe, John J., and R.R. Reno. *Sanctified Vision: An Introduction to Early Christian Interpretation of the Bible*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University press, 2005.
- Osborn, Eric *Ethical Patterns in Early Christian Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- _____. *The Beginning of Christian Philosophy*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- _____. *The Emergence of Christian Theology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Pagels, Elaine. *The Gnostic Gospels*. Random House, 1979; London: Phoenix, 2006.
- Paget, James Carleton. *Jews, Christians, and Jewish Christianity in Antiquity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen, Germany, Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- _____. *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 1992.
- Partenie, C., Editor. *Plato's Myths*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Patrick, Theodore Hall. *Traditional Egyptian Christianity: A History of the Coptic Orthodox Church*. Greensboro, NC: Fisher Park Press, 1996.
- Pearson, Birger, A. *Ancient Gnosticism: Traditions and Literature*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress press, 2007.
- _____. *Gnosticism and Christianity in Roman and Coptic Egypt*. New York & London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- _____. *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Pearson, Birger A., and E. Goehring. *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity: Studies in Antiquity and Christianity*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Christianity and Classical Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism*. New Haven, 1993.
- _____. *What Has Athens to Do with Jerusalem?: Timaeus and Genesis in Counterpoint*. Jerome Lectures, 21. MI: The University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Perkins, Pheme. *Gnosticism and the New Testament*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Pickett, Raymond. *The Cross in Corinth: The Social Significance of the Death of Jesus*, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 143. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Pollard, Justin, and Howard Reid. *The Rise and Fall of Alexandria: Birthplace of the Modern Mind*. NY: Viking Penguin Group, 2006.

- Pollard, T.E. *Johannine Christology and the Early Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Quasten, J. *Patrology*. 4 Vols. Christian Classics. Note Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, n.d.
- Rasmus, Tuomas, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Isma Dunderberg eds. *Stoicism in Early Christianity*. Ada, MI: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Rhodes, James N. *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomistic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden-Calf Incident*. DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Ridings, Daniel. *The Attic Moses: The Dependency Theme in some Early Christian Writers*. *Studia Graeca et latina Gothoburgensia*, 59. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1995.
- Riel, Gerd van. *Plato's Gods*. Ashgate Studies in the History of Philosophical Theology. England: Ashgate, 2013.
- Roberts, Colin H. *Manuscript, Society, and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*. London: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Runia, David. *Philo and the Church Fathers: A Collection of Papers*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- _____. *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1993.
- _____. *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1986.
- Russell, Norman. *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Salles, Ricardo, ed. *God and Cosmos in Stoicism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Sanders, Karl Olav. *The Challenge of Homer: School, Pagan Poets and Early Christianity*. London: T & T Clark International, 2009.
- Schenck, Kenneth. *A Brief Guide to Philo*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.
- Skarsaune, Oskar, and Reidar Hvalvik, eds. *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*. Ada, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Smith, Morton. *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Smith II, Carl B. *No Longer Jews: The Search for Gnostic Origins*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, LLC, 2004.
- Solovyon, Vladimir. *Lectures on Godmanhood*. San Rafael, CA: Semantron, 2007.
- Sorabji, Richard. *Emotion and Peace of Mind: From Stoic Agitation to Christian Temptation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Steenberg, Matthew C. *Of God and Man: Theology and Anthropology from Irenaeus to Athanasius*. London, UK: T & T Clark, 2009.

- Stone, Michael, Editor. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, CRINT 2/2. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Torrance, Thomas F. *Divine Meanings: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995.
- Treadgold, Warren T. *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1980.
- Turner, H. E. W. *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between and Heresy in the Early Church. The Bampton Lectures, 1954*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, reprinted, 2004.
- Urs von Balthasar, Hans. *The Scandal of the Incarnation: Irenaeus Against Heresies*. Translation by John Saward. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1981.
- Van den Broek, Roelof. *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Vrettos, Theodore. *Alexandria: City of the Western Mind*. NY: The Free Press, 2001.
- Wagner, Walter H. *After the Apostles: Christianity in the Second Century*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1994.
- Waldstein, Michael and Frederick Wisse, Editors. *The Apocryphon of John: Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II,1; III,1 and II,1 with BG 8502,2*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Walls, Jerry L, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Watterson, Barbara. *Coptic Egypt*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1988.
- Weinandy, Thomas. *In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh: an Essay on the Humanity of Christ*. Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Weiss, H.F. *Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des hellenistischen und palästinischen Judentums*. Berlin, 1966.
- Whitehead, Alfred N. *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*. New York: The Free Press, 1979.
- Whittaker, John, trans. *Alcinoos: Enseignement des Doctrines de Plato*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1990.
- Wiles, Maurice F. *The Divine Apostle: The Interpretation of St Paul's Epistles in the Early Church*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Wilken, Robert L. *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975.
- _____. *The Spirit of Early Christian Thought: Seeking the Face of God*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Williams, Michael A. *Rethinking Gnosticism: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Wilson, R. McL., Editor. *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis*. Papers read at the First international Congress of Coptology; Cairo, December 1976. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

- Wink, Walter. *Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Wintersig, Athanasius. *Die Heilsbedeutung der Menschheit Jesu in der vornicanischen griechischen Theologie*. München: Bremer Press, 1932.
- Wolfe, David L. 'Epistemology: The Justification of Belief.' In *Contours of Christian Philosophy*. Edited by C. Stephen Evans. Downers Grove, IL: Inter Varsity Press, 1982.
- Wolfson, H. A. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, Volumes I–II. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947, 1982.
- Wywra, Dietmar. *Die Christliche Platonaneignung in den Stromateis des Clemens von Alexandrien*. Berlin, DE: Walter de Gruyter, 1983.
- Yonge, C.D., trans. *The Works of Philo*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993.
- Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion*. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985, 2004.

E. Articles

1. Articles on Clement

- Ashwin-Siejkowski, Piotr. 'Clement of Alexandria on the Creation of Eve: Exegesis in the Service of a Pedagogical Project.' *Studia Patristica* 66 (2013): 53-59.
- Batovici, Daniel. 'Hermas in Clement of Alexandria.' *Studia Patristica* 66 (2013): 41-51.
- Bergjan, Silke-Petra. 'Logic and Theology in Clement of Alexandria: Purpose of the 8th Book of the Stromata.' *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 12:3 (2008): 396-413.
- Brooks, James A. 'Clement of Alexandria as a Witness to the Development of the New Testament Canon.' *SecCent* 9:1 (1992): 41-55.
- Butterworth, G.W. 'The Deification of Man in Clement of Alexandria.' *JTS* 17 (1916): 157-169.
- Casey, R.P. 'Clement and the Two Divine Logoi.' *JTS* 25 (1923): 43-56.
- _____. 'Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Platonism.' *HTR* 18 (1925): 39-101.
- Choufrine, Arkadi. 'The Aspects of Infinity in Clement of Alexandria.' *Journal of Neoplatonic Studies* 6:1 (1997): 3-44.
- Edwards, M.J. 'Clement of Alexandria and His Doctrine of the Logos.' *Brill: Vigiliae Christianae* 54:2 (2000): 159-177.
- Edwards, Robert G.T. 'Biblical and Platonic Likeness to God in Clement of Alexandria,' *NAPS* annual meeting (May 22-24, 2014): 1-11, on-line: [https://www.academia.edu/7194640/Biblical and Platonic Likeness to God_in_Clement_of_Alexandria](https://www.academia.edu/7194640/Biblical_and_Platonic_Likeness_to_God_in_Clement_of_Alexandria).
- Ferguson, John. 'The Achievement of Clement of Alexandria.' *Religious Studies* 12:1 (March 1976): 59-80.

- Fortin, E.L. 'Clement of Alexandria and the Esoteric Tradition.' *Studia Patristica* 9:3 (1966): 41-56.
- Giulea, Dragos Andrei. "'Demonstrations" from the First Principle: Clement of Alexandria's Phenomenology of Faith.' *The Journal of Religion* 89:2 (April 2009): 187-213.
- Halton, Thomas. 'Clement's Lyre: A Broken String, a New Song.' *SecCent: A Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3:4 (1983): 177-199.
- Havrdá, Matyáš. 'Grace and Free Will According to Clement of Alexandria.' *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 19:1 (2011): 21-48.
- _____. 'Some Observations on Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, Book Five.' *Brill: Vigiliae Christianae* 64:1 (2010): 1-30.
- Heussi, C. 'Die *Stromateis* des Clemens Alexandrinus und ihr Verhältnis zum Protreptikos und Paedagogus.' *ZWth* 45 (1902): 465-512.
- Hoek, Annewies van den. 'God Beyond Knowing: Clement of Alexandria and Discourse on God.' *Brill Essay* (2009): 37-60.
- Hunter, David G. 'The Language of Desire: Clement of Alexandria's Transformation of Ascetic Discourse.' *Semeia* 57 (January 1, 1992): 95-111.
- Irvine, Martin. 'Interpretation and the Semiotics of Allegory in Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Augustine.' *Semiotica* 63-1/2 (1987): 33-72.
- Itter, Andrew C. 'The Restoration of the Elect: Clement of Alexandria's Doctrine of *Apokatastasis*.' *Studia Patristica* XLI (2006): 169-174.
- Jefford, Clayton N. 'Clement of Alexandria and Gnosis: A Dissertation in Review.' *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 20:4 (December 1, 1993): 381-396.
- Kenney, John Peter. 'Divinity and the Intelligible World in Clement of Alexandria.' *Studia Patristica* Vol. XXI (1987-1989): 308-315.
- Klibengajtis, Tomasz. 'Die Wahrheitsbezeichnungen des Clements von Alexandrien in ihrem philosophischen und theologischen Kontext.' *Vigiliae Christianae* 58:3 (January 1, 2004): 316-331.
- Knauber, Adolph. «Der 'Didaskalos' des Clemens von Alexandrien.» *Studia Patristica* XVI:2 (1985): 175-185.
- Kovacs, Judith L. 'Concealment and Gnostic Exegesis: Clement of Alexandria's Interpretation of the Tabernacle.' *Studia Patristica* XXXI (1997): 414-437.
- Louth, Andrew. 'Apathetic Love in Clement of Alexandria.' *Studia Patristica* XVIII: 3 (1989): 413-418.
- Marsh, H. G. 'The Use of MYSTERION in the Writings of Clement of Alexandria.' *JST* 37 (1936): 64-80.
- Mortley Raoul. 'The Mirror and I Cor. 13,12 in the Epistemology of Clement of Alexandria,' *Vigiliae Christianae* 30:2 (June, 1976): 109-120.
- _____. 'The Theme of Silence in Clement of Alexandria.' *Journal of Theological Studies* 24 (1973): 197-202.
- Muckle, J.T. 'Clement of Alexandria on Philosophy as Divine Testament for the Greeks.' *Classical Association of Canada: Phoenix* 5:3/4 (Winter, 1951): 79-86.

- Murphy, Paul E. 'The impassible state of deification in Clement of Alexandria.' *Journal of Theta Alpha Kappa* 3: 1 (September 1979): 29-35.
- Osborn, Eric. 'Clement of Alexandria: God Discarnate and God Incarnate.' *The Expository Times* 118:8 (August 2007): 372-375.
- _____. 'One Hundred Years of Books on Clement.' *Vigiliae Christianae* 60 (2006): 367-388.
- Outler, Albert C. 'The 'Platonism' of Clement of Alexandria.' *The Journal of Religion* 20:3 (July 1940): 217-240.
- Paget, J.C. 'Clement of Alexandria and the Jews.' *SJTh* 51 (1998): 86-97.
- Patterson, L.G. 'The Divine Became Human: Irenaeus Themes in Clement of Alexandria,' *Studia Patristica* 31 (1997): 497-516.
- Paulsen, David. 'Ethical Individualism in Clement of Alexandria.' *Concordia Theological Monthly* 43:1 (January 1, 1972): 3-20.
- Perkins, PHEME. 'Logos Christologies in the Nag Hammadi Codices.' *Vigiliae Christianae* 35:4 (December 1981): 379-396.
- Pratt, Andrew L. 'Clement of Alexandria: Eucharist as Gnosis.' *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 32:2 (June 1, 1987): 163-178.
- Richardson, Williamson. 'The Philonic Patriarchs, Buddha, and Clement of Alexandria's True Gnostic.' *Studia Patristica* 21 (1989): 325-332.
- Rizzi, Marco. 'The work of Clement of Alexandria in the light of his contemporary philosophical teaching.' *Studia Patristica* 66 (2013): 11-17.
- Runia, David T. 'Why Does Clement of Alexandria Call Philo the "Pythagoran?'" *Vigiliae Christianae* 49:1 (March 1995): 1-22.
- Telfer, W. "'Bees" in Clement of Alexandria.' *JTS* 28 (1926/27): 167-168.
- _____. 'How Alexandrian was Clement of Alexandria? Reflections on Clement and His Alexandrian Background.' *HJ* 31 (1990): 179-194.
- Wagner, Walter H. 'A Father's Fate: Attitudes Toward and Interpretation of Clement of Alexandria.' *Journal of Religious History* 6:3 (June 1971): 209-231.
- Witt, R. E. 'The Hellenism of Clement of Alexandria.' *The Classical Quarterly* 25:3/4 (Jul.- Oct., 1931): 195-204.
- Wolfson, H.A. 'Clement of Alexandria on the Generation of the Logos.' *Church History* 20:2 (June 1951): 72-81.
- Wytzes, J. 'Paideia and Pronoia in the Works of Clement of Alexandria.' *Vigiliae Christianae* 9 (1955): 148-158.

2. Related Articles

- Armstrong, John M. 'After the Ascent: Plato on Becoming Like God.' *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*. 26 (2004): 171-183.
- Bagnall, Roger S. 'Alexandria: Library of Dreams.' *The American Philosophical Society* 146:4 (December 2002): 348-362.

- Bauckham, Richard. 'Jesus and the Renewal of Nature: Reading Isaiah and the Gospels Ecologically.' A lecture given at St Tikhon's Orthodox Seminary, Moscow (October, 2009): 1-10.
- Benitez, Eugenio E. 'The Good or The Demiurge: Causation and the Unity of Good in Plato.' *Apeiron: A Journal for Ancient Philosophy and Science* 28: 2 (June 1995): 113-140.
- Betz, H.D. 'The Delphic Maxim Γνωθὶ Σαυτόν in Hermetic Interpretation.' *Harvard Theological Review* 63 (1970): 465-484.
- Clarke, Leonard W. 'Greek Astronomy and Its Debt to the Babylonians.' *The British Journal for the History of Science* 1:1 (June 1961): 65-77.
- Copeland, Edwin Luther. 'Nomos as a Medium of Revelation—Paralleling Logos—in Ante-Nicene Christianity.' *Studia Theologica* 27:1 (1973): 51-61.
- Ferguson, Thomas, C.K. 'The Rule of Truth and Irenaeus Rhetoric in Book I of "Against Heresies."' *Vigiliae Christianae* 55:4 (2001): 356-375.
- Fischer-Mueller, E. Aydeet. 'Yaldabaoth: The Gnostic Female Principle in Its Fallenness.' *Novum Testamentum* 32:1 (1990): 79-95.
- Florovsky, G. 'The Idea of Creation in Christian Philosophy.' *ECQ* 8 (1949): 53-77.
- Gavrilyuk, Paul. 'Harnack's Hellenized Christianity or Florovsky's "sacred Hellenism": questioning two metanarratives of early Christian engagement with late antique culture.' *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 54:3-4 (2010): 323-344.
- Goldstein J. 'The Origins of the Doctrine of Creation *Ex Nihilo*.' *JJS* 35 (1984):127-135.
- Grant, Robert M. 'Early Alexandrian Christianity.' *Church History* 40:2 (June 1971): 133-144.
- Hackforth, R. 'Plato's Theism.' *The Classical Quarterly* 30:1 (January 1936): 4-9.
- Higgins, Jean M. 'The Myth of Eve: The Temptress.' *JAAR* 44:4 (1976): 639-647.
- Hoek, Annewies van den. 'The "Catechetical" School of Early Christian Alexandria and Its Philonic Heritage.' *Harvard Theological Review* 90:1 (January 1, 1997): 59-87.
- Hollon, Bryan C. 'Knowledge of God as Assimilation and Participation: an Essay on Theological Pedagogy in the Light of Biblical Epistemology.' *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 38: 1 (2011): 85-106.
- Hornschuh, M. 'Das Leben des Origenes und die Entstehung der alexandrinischen Schule.' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*. 71 (1960): 1-25, 193-214.
- Horrell, David G. "'Race", "Nation", "People": Ethnic Identity-Construction in 1 Peter 2:9.' *Cambridge Journals NTS* 58:1 (2011): 123-143.
- Horsley, R.A. 'Gnosis in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 8:1-6.' *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 32-51.
- Jordan, Mark D. 'Ancient Philosophic Protreptic and the Problem of Persuasive Genres.' *Rhetorica* 4:4 (1986): 309-33.

- Keyt, David. 'The Mad Craftsman of the Timaeus.' *The Philosophical Review* 80:2 (April, 1971): 230-235.
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. 'The Delphic Oracle.' *Greece and Rome*, Second Series 23:1 (April, 1976): 60-73.
- Louth, Andrew. 'The Place of *Theosis* in Orthodox Theology.' In *Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions*, Edited by M.J. Christensen and J.A. Wittung. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.
- MacDermot, Violet. 'The Concept of Pleroma in Gnosticism.' in *Gnosis and Gnosticism*, NHS XVII, ed. Martin Krause, et al, (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 76-81.
- MacRae, George W. 'The Jewish Background of the Gnostic Sophia Myth.' *Novum Testamentum* 12:2 (April 1970): 86-101.
- Mason, Andrew S. 'Immortality in the "Timaeus."' *Phronesis* 39:1 (1994): 90-97.
- McGuire, Anne. 'Conversion and Gnosis in the "Gospel of Truth."' *Novum Testamentum* 28:4 (October 1986): 338-355.
- Mohr, Richard D. 'Plato's Theology Reconsidered: What the Demiurge Does.' *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 2:2 (April, 1985): 131-144.
- Mortley, Raoul. 'The Fundamentals of the Via Negativa.' *American Journal of Philology* 103 (1982): 429-439.
- Mosser, Carl. 'The Earliest Patristic Interpretations of Psalm 82, Jewish Antecedents, and the Origin of Christian Deification.' *Journal of Theological Studies NS* 56:1 (2005): 30-74.
- Osborne, Robert E. 'Paul and the Wild Beasts.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85:2 (June, 1966): 225-230.
- Pagels, Elaine H. 'The Demiurge and His Archons: A Gnostic View of the Bishop and Presbyters?' *The Harvard Theological Review* 69:3/4 (Jul. - Oct., 1976): 301-324.
- Parrott, Douglas M. 'Gnostic and Orthodox Disciples in the Second and Third Centuries.' In *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*, ed. Charles W. Hedrick et al. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1986, 193-219.
- Pearson, Berger. 'Christians and Jews in First-century Alexandria.' *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 79, No. 1/3, Christians among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday (Jan.-Jul., 1986): 206-216.
- Quilles, Gilles. 'The Original Doctrine of Valentinus the Gnostic.' *Vigiliae Christianae* 50:4 (1996): 327-352.
- Robinson, T.M. 'Demiurge and World Soul in Plato's Politicus.' *The American Journal of Philology* 88:1 (January 1967): 57-66.
- Rordorf, Willy. 'Christus als Logos und Nomos: Das Keryma Petrou in seinem Verhältnis zu Justin.' *Kerygma und Logos*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, (1979): 424-434.
- Scholten, Clemens. 'Die Alexandrinische Katechetenschule,' *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*. 38 (1995): 16-37

- Stead, Christopher. 'The Concept of Divine Substance.' *Vigiliae Christianae* 29 (1975): 1-14.
- Suggit, John N. 'John 17:17: ho logos ho sos aletheia estin.' *JTS* 35:1 (April 1984): 104-117.
- Sumney, Jerry L. 'The Letter of Eugnostos and the Origins of Gnosticism.' *Novum Testamentum* 31:2 (1989): 172-181.
- Webster, John. 'Trinity and Creation.' *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, 12:1 (2010): 4-19.
- Wiles, Maurice F. 'Eternal Generation.' *JTS* 12:2 (January 10, 1961): 284-291.
- Winston, David. 'Philo's Theory of Eternal Creation: "de Prov. 1:6-9."' *American Academy for Jewish Research* 46/47, Jubilee, Volume (1928-29/1978-79) [Part 2] (1979-1980): 593-606.
- _____. 'The Book of Wisdom's Theory of Cosmogony.' *HR* 11 (1971): 191-192.
- Wolfson, H.A. 'Plato's Pre-existent Matter in Patristic Philosophy.' *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*. Edited by in L. Wallach Ithica, (1966).
- _____. 'Patristic Arguments Against the Eternity of the World.' *HTR* 59 (1966): 351-567.
- Young, Frances M. "'Creatio Ex Nihilo": A Context for the Emergence of the Doctrine of Creation.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 44 (1991): 139-152.
- Zeegers-Vander Vorst, Nicole. 'Satan, Ève et le serpent chez Theophile d'Antioche.' *Vigiliae Christianae* 35:2 (June 1981): 152-169.