



Project  
**MUSE**<sup>®</sup>

*Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.*

# *The Place of the Hypotyposesis in the Clementine Corpus: An Apology for “The Other Clement of Alexandria”*

---

BOGDAN G. BUCUR

The received scholarly view on Clement of Alexandria's *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, *Eclogae prophetae*, *Adumbrationes*, and *Hypotyposesis* dismisses these writings as inferior in style, dubious in content, and certainly marginal in importance for Clementine studies. This article follows the path suggested by Christian von Bunsen, Theodor von Zahn, André Méhat, and Pierre Nautin, and argues that the *Excerpta*, *Eclogae*, and *Adumbrationes* represent, on the contrary, the pinnacle of Clement's exposition of doctrine. Consequently, further research should pay special attention to the theological speculations contained in these writings, as they are likely to lead to significant insights into Clement's theology.

The current GCS critical edition of Clement of Alexandria's writings includes as fragments from the *Hypotyposesis* several Greek passages—to which a new edition will probably add a new fragment identified by Filippo di Benedetto—and a Latin text entitled *Adumbrationes*. Two other writings, entitled *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and *Eclogae prophetae*, are printed separately from the *Hypotyposesis* fragments.<sup>1</sup> The received scholarly view

1. *Clemens Alexandrinus 3: Stromata VII–VIII, Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae prophetae, Quis dives salvetur, Fragmente*, ed. O. Stählin, L. Früchtel, and U. Treu, GCS 17, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1970); Di Benedetto, “Un nuovo frammento delle *Ipotiposi* di Clemente Alessandrino,” *Sileno* 9 (1983): 75–82. The *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and *Eclogae prophetae* are preserved by a single manuscript, which also contains Clement of Alexandria's *Stromateis*: the eleventh century Codex Laurentianus at the Laurentian Library at Florence (Codex Laur. V 3). Another manuscript, Paris. Suppl. Graec. 250, is only a copy of the first, made some time during the sixteenth

dismisses these writings as inferior in style, dubious in content, and certainly marginal in importance for Clementine studies. In fact, to this day there is no reliable English translation of these writings.<sup>2</sup> In the words of Ronald E. Heine, “neither [the *Excerpta* nor the *Eclogae*] contribute much to our understanding of Clement.”<sup>3</sup> The fragments printed as *Hypotyposesis*

---

century. For details see *Clemens Alexandrinus 1: Protrepticus und Paedagogus*, ed. O. Stählin, L. Früchtel, and U. Treu, GCS 12, 3rd ed. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1972), xxxix–lxi; Carlo Nardi, *Estratti profetici*, Biblioteca patristica 4 (Florence: Centro internazionale del libro, 1985), 33–35. The *Adumbrationes* are a Latin translation, commissioned by Cassiodorus (ca. 485–585), of parts of the *Hypotyposesis*—most likely of excerpts from Books 7 and 8 (Christian K. J. von Bunsen, *Analecta Antenicena* [London, 1854; repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1968], 1:164, 325–40; Theodor Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur III: Supplementum Clementinum* [Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1884], 156). The *Adumbrationes* are extant in the ninth-century Codex Laudunensis 96, the thirteenth-century Codex Berolinensis latinus 45, and the sixteenth-century Codex Vaticanus 6154. By his own admission, Cassiodorus has occasionally “purged” the text of certain doctrinally offensive passages (*offendicula*): *In epistolis autem canonicis Clemens Alexandrinus presbyter, qui et Stromatheus vocatur . . . quaedam Attico sermone declaravit; ubi multa quidem subtiliter, sed aliqua incaute locutus est. Quae nos ita transferri fecimus in Latinum, ut exclusis quibusdam offendiculis, purificata doctrina eius securior potuisset auriri* (Cass. *Div. litt.* 1.8.4 [FC 39/1:160]).

2. The existing English translations are based on a text that differs (at times quite significantly) from the Greek and Latin of the GCS critical edition. The *Adumbrationes* and *Eclogae* are only available in the nineteenth-century translation of William Wilson. Following their London edition of 1867 and 1872, the *Adumbrationes* are reprinted in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* 2, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Buffalo, NY: The Christian Literature Company, 1885), 571–77, while the *Eclogae* appear under the confusing title “Excerpts of Theodotus or, Selections from the Prophetic Scriptures,” in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* 8, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Buffalo, NY: The Christian Literature Company, 1886), 39–50. For the *Excerpta*, see *Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria*, ed. and trans. Robert P. Casey (London: Christophers, 1934). The situation is not much better in continental scholarship. Aside from François Sagnard’s 1948 translation of the *Excerpta* (*Clément d’Alexandrie: Extraits de Théodote*, SC 23 [Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1948]), there exists only Nardi’s edition and Italian translation of the *Eclogae*, noted above. An annotated Czech translation of the entire Clementine corpus (including the *Excerpta*, *Eclogae*, and *Adumbrationes*), prepared by Matyáš Havrda, Veronika Černušková, Miroslav Šedina, and Jana Plátová, is currently underway at the University of Olomouc.

3. Ronald E. Heine, “The Alexandrians,” in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, ed. F. Young, L. Ayres, and A. Louth (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 121; Henny Fiskå Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 62. Similarly, Luis Ladaria, the author of the standard work on Clement’s Pneumatology, thinks that passages from the *Excerpta*, *Adumbrationes*, and *Eclogae propheticae* ought to be treated as a secondary witness—“a brief appendix”—to Clement’s thought (Ladaria, *El espíritu en Clemente Alejandrino: Estudio teológico antropológico* [Madrid: UPCM, 1980], 256).

are sometimes the subject of historical and philological interest, and some passages are relevant to research on the canon of the New Testament.<sup>4</sup> If the *Excerpta* have generally fared slightly better than the *Eclogae* and *Adumbrationes*, this is due only to scholarly interest in the Valentinian doctrines contained therein.

To a considerable extent, the received view reflects the victory of one strand of nineteenth-century German scholarship over another. These two strands can be identified, roughly, with Adolf von Harnack and Otto Stählin, on the one hand, and Christian K. J. von Bunsen and Theodor von Zahn, on the other. Christian K. J. von Bunsen argued that the *Eclogae*, *Excerpta*, and *Adumbrationes* were in fact surviving portions of the *Hypotyposeis*. B. F. Westcott accepted his judgment.<sup>5</sup> Theodor Zahn, however, saw the *Eclogae* and *Excerpta* as distinct from the *Hypotyposeis*, namely as surviving portions of *Stromateis* 8, and argued that the current state of the texts could only be explained as the result of “Verstümmelung und Abkürzung” undertaken by a later “epitomator.”<sup>6</sup>

Harnack rejected these views. Acknowledging the contribution of two doctoral dissertations,<sup>7</sup> and guided by his firm conviction that Clement must have evolved from more “heretical” to more “orthodox” theological

4. Helmut Merkel, “Clemens Alexandrinus über die Reihenfolge der Evangelien,” *ETL* 60 (1984): 382–85; Dénes Farkasfalvy, “The Presbyters’ Witness on the Order of the Gospels as Reported by Clement of Alexandria,” *CBQ* 54 (1992): 260–70; Stephen C. Carlson, “Clement of Alexandria on the Order of the Gospels,” *NTS* 47 (2001): 118–25; Harry A. Echle, “The Baptism of the Apostles: A Fragment of Clement of Alexandria’s Lost Work *Hypotyposeis* in the *Pratum Spirituale* of John Moschus,” *TR* 3 (1945): 365–68; Utto Riedinger, “Neue Hypotyposenfragmente bei Ps.-Caesarius und Isidor von Pelusium,” *ZNW* (1960): 154–96; and “Eine Paraphrase des Engel-Traktates von Klemens von Alexandria in den Erotapokriseis des Pseudo-Kaisarios?,” *ZKG* 73 (1962): 253–71; Di Benedetto, “Un nuovo frammento delle *Ipotiposi*”; Colin Duckworth and Eric Osborn, “Clement of Alexandria’s Hypotyposeis: A French Eighteenth-Century Sighting,” *JTS* n.s. 36 (1985): 67–83; Osborn, “Clement’s *Hypotyposeis*: Macarius Revisited,” *SCe* 10 (1990): 233–35; Jana Plátová, “Bemerkungen zu den Hypotyposen-Fragmenten des Clemens Alexandrinus,” *SP* (forthcoming; I am grateful to the author for sharing with me the manuscript of this study).

5. Bunsen, *Analecta Antenicena* 1:159, 163–65, 325–40; B. F. Westcott, “Clement of Alexandria,” in *A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines*, ed. W. Smith and H. Ware (London: Murray, 1877), 1:559–64.

6. Zahn, *Supplementum Clementinum*, 117–30; for the “epitomator” thesis, see 118.

7. Paul Ruben, “Clementis Alexandrini Excerpta ex Theodoto,” diss. University of Bonn (Leipzig: Teubner, 1892); Hans Friedrich August von Arnim, “De octavo Clementis Stromateorum libro,” diss. University of Rostock (Rostock: Adler, 1894). Both of these works are cited approvingly in Adolf von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* II/2, 2nd rev. ed. (Hinrichs: Leipzig, 1904), 17–18.

positions, Harnack concluded that the *Hypotyposesis* were composed by the young Clement, who later came to develop a more orthodox theology; that they were not related to the so-called *Stromateis* 8, *Excerpta*, and *Eclogae*; that the latter were not excerpts from a book—whether *Stromateis* 8 (Zahn) or *Hypotyposesis* (Bunsen)—but excerpts made in view of a book, whose project, however, was interrupted by the Alexandrian’s death; and that it was Clement’s disciples who started circulating these study notes.<sup>8</sup> The Arnim–Ruben–Harnack hypothesis was endorsed by Stählin, in the introduction to his critical edition of Clement, and became established as the accepted view.<sup>9</sup> The victory of this strand of Clementine scholarship is reflected in the fact that the works of Clement that are edited and translated, researched in books, articles, and dissertations, and taught to students—we might well say “the canonical Clement”—are the *Protreptikos*, *Paidagogos*, and *Stromateis*, rather than that the *Excerpta*, *Eclogae*, and *Adumbrationes*.

The insights of Bunsen and Zahn were vindicated, however. Wilhelm Bousset first conjectured that the fragments were the work of the old Clement, who, once he had left Alexandria, felt free to indulge in the “colorful” speculations he had once heard as a student of Pantaenus, for which he possessed lecture notes.<sup>10</sup> This view was followed by Jules Lebreton and deemed “attractive” by H. E. W. Turner.<sup>11</sup> An important contribution was made in 1966, when André Méhat concluded his study of the sophisticated and purposeful arrangement of the *Stromateis* by stating that the *Hypotyposesis* would have naturally followed after the *Stromateis* and represented

8. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* II/2:18–20.

9. Stählin, ed., *Clemens Alexandrinus I*, GCS 17 (Hinrichs: Leipzig, 1905), xlii. For Anglophone scholarship, see Casey, “Introduction,” in *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 4, 14.

10. Bousset, *Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom: Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenäus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915), 248–63. Bousset (*Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb*, 268) offers the following description of the type of speculations Clement indulged in: “Wir schauen hier in eine bunte, gefährliche, von kirchlicher Kontrolle noch ganz unberührte Gesamtauffassung hinein. Eschatologische Phantasien vom Aufstieg und der Entwicklung der Seele nach dem Tode stehen im Mittelpunkt dieser Gedankenwelt. Damit verbindet sich die Annahme von Stufen innerhalb der Geisterwelt. . . . Christus erscheint als das Haupt und die Krönung dieser ganzen mannigfachen und wunderbaren Welt.” For the hypothesis of lecture notes, see Bousset, *Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb*, 155–271, esp. 198–204.

11. Lebreton, “Le désaccord entre la foi populaire et la théologie savante dans l’église chrétienne du II<sup>e</sup> siècle,” *RHE* 19 (1923–24): 481–506, 5–37, at 496; Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations Between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church*, Bampton Lectures 1954 (London: Mowbray & Co., 1954), 398.

the pinnacle of Clement's exposition of doctrine.<sup>12</sup> A major breakthrough came a few years later, with Pierre Nautin's analysis of the eleventh century Codex Laurentianus (Codex Laur. V 3 = L), the only manuscript containing the *Stromateis*, *Excerpta*, and *Eclogae*.<sup>13</sup> Nautin argues that the writings that follow *Stromateis* 7—"Stromateis 8," *Excerpta*, and *Eclogae*—represent a selection *made by the scribe himself* once he realized that the codex would not suffice for the entire text of the *Stromateis* and *Hypotyposeis*.<sup>14</sup> Since, as he notes, the Tura Codex excerpts from Origen's *Against Celsus*, the *Commentary on Romans*, and the *Homily on the Witch of Endor* offer precedent for such scribal practices, this thesis stands on solid ground.<sup>15</sup> In a way, Nautin's contribution represents a return to and vindication of the views about the *Hypotyposeis*, proposed much earlier by Bunsen, and of the "epitomator" hypothesis set forth by Zahn.

There are, of course, scholars who have not been convinced by Nautin's hypothesis.<sup>16</sup> It is significant, however, that these critics dismiss Nautin's proposal as simply a "personal theory" (van den Hoek), and a "perplexing" one at that (Nardi), while focusing only on his discussion of the Clementine program, without any objection to the first half of his study, which discusses the state of the manuscript, weighs various proposals to explain the situation, and draws the comparison with the Tura Codex II of Origen.

Today Nautin's conclusions are endorsed by Alain le Boulluec, the eminent Clement scholar and author of the edition, translation, and extensive commentary of Clement's fifth and seventh *Stromateis* in *Sources Chrétiennes*, and by Patrick Descourtieux, to whom we owe the edition and translation of the sixth of the *Stromateis* in the same series.<sup>17</sup>

12. André Méhat, *Étude sur les "Stromates" de Clément d'Alexandrie*, Patristica Sorbonensia 7 (Paris: Seuil, 1966), 517–22, 530–33.

13. Pierre Nautin, "La fin des *Stromates* et les *Hypotyposeis* de Clément d'Alexandrie," *VC* 30 (1976): 268–302, esp. 297–98.

14. Nautin, "La fin des *Stromates*," 269–82.

15. "[C]e qui est bien attesté à l'époque ancienne, notamment par le papyrus de Toura, c'est que parfois des copistes, renonçant à transcrire intégralement le texte de leur modèle, n'en ont reproduit que des extraits. Si nous cherchons une explication qui ne soit pas oeuvre de pure imagination, mais qui repose sur des exemples précis fournis par l'histoire des textes, c'est celle-là et nulle autre que nous devenons retenir" (Nautin, "La fin des *Stromates*," 282).

16. For instance, the noted Clement scholar Annewies van den Hoek, who also edited *Stromateis* 4 for *Sources Chrétiennes*, considers it to be the latest in a series of "personal theories" (van den Hoek, "Introduction," in *Clément d'Alexandrie: Stromate IV*, SC 463 [Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2001], 13 and n. 7). Similarly, Nardi, *Estratti profetici*, 11.

17. Patrick Descourtieux, *Clément d'Alexandrie: Stromate VI*, SC 446 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1999), 399 n. 4; Alain Le Boulluec, "Commentaire," in *Clément*

Unfortunately, however, Clement's *Eclogae*, *Excerpta*, and *Adumbrationes*—what I like to call “the other Clement of Alexandria”—continue to be sorely neglected in scholarship.<sup>18</sup> For my part, I have already shown elsewhere that a study of specific passages in these writings can be very fruitful both for our understanding of Clement—especially of his cosmological, angelological, and pneumatological views—and for a more accurate mapping of the various exegetical and doctrinal traditions of early Christianity.<sup>19</sup> In this article I take a different (and complementary) approach, no longer pointing to the substance of these texts, but to their likely role in Clement's theological curriculum. If the place of a given text in the corpus determines the relative theological “weight” of that text, the passages from the *Excerpta*, *Eclogae*, and *Adumbrationes* bear particular importance for understanding Clement's thought. Given the received view on Clement, which hardly ever mentions—let alone studies—these writings, I view the pages to follow as an apology of sorts: an apology for “the other Clement.”

#### A CLEMENTINE MYSTAGOGICAL CURRICULUM?

To speak, as do Méhat and Nautin, of Clement's *Hypotyposes* as the pinnacle of a Clementine corpus organized according to a hierarchic architecture and offering a progressive disclosure of Christian tradition organized according to specific pedagogical principles—a mystagogy of sorts—is begging the question. Indeed, is there a Clementine “master plan” to begin

---

*d'Alexandrie: Stromate VI*, SC 279 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1981), 286–88; *Clément d'Alexandrie: Stromate VII*, SC 428 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1997), 7 n. 1, 11 n. 6, 330 n. 2. See also Le Boulluec, “Extraits d'oeuvres de Clément d'Alexandrie: La transmission et le sens de leur titres,” in *Titres et articulations du texte dans les oeuvres antiques: Actes du colloque international de Chantilly 13–15 décembre 1994*, ed. J.-C. Fredouille et al. (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1997), 287–300, esp. 289, 292, 296, 300; and his “Pour qui, pourquoi, comment? Les ‘Stromates’ de Clément d'Alexandrie,” in *Entrer en matière: Les prologues*, ed. J.-D. Dubois and B. Roussel (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1998), 23–36, esp. 24 n. 10.

18. I note the following major exceptions: Christian Oeyen, “Eine frühchristliche Engelpneumatologie bei Klemens von Alexandrien,” *IKZ* 55 (1965): 102–20 and 56 (1966): 27–47; Carlo Nardi, *Il battesimo in Clemente Alessandrino: Interpretazione di Eclogae propheticæ 1–26* (Rome: Institutum Patristicum “Augustinianum,” 1984), and his “Note di Clemente Alessandrino al Salmo 18: EP 51–63,” *VH* 6 (1995): 9–42.

19. Bogdan G. Bucur, “The Other Clement of Alexandria: Cosmic Hierarchy and Interiorized Apocalypticism,” *VC* 60 (2006): 251–68; “Revisiting Christian Oeyen: ‘The Other Clement’ on Father, Son, and the Angelomorphic Spirit,” *VC* 61 (2007): 381–413.

with? If there is, did Clement proceed to write according to such a plan? If he did, what place did the author assign to his various writings?

Scholars do not agree on this subject. Eugène de Faye faults Clement precisely for his alleged inability to organize his writing according to a plan.<sup>20</sup> At the other end of the spectrum, some scholars have proposed elaborate schemes describing not only Clement's actual writings, but also writings that he would have—one is tempted to say "should have"—composed.<sup>21</sup> This approach elicited the reaction of Walther Völker (contra Munck) and Annewies Van den Hoeck (contra Nautin), who both warned against overinterpreting Clement's repeated introductory announcements in order to recreate a scheme of Clementine works.<sup>22</sup>

### PROTREPTIKOS—PAIDAGOGOS—DIDASKALOS

For Clement, there is an organic relation between the oral tradition of the "elders" and his own writing, and, more generally, between teaching

20. De Faye, *Clément d'Alexandrie: étude sur les rapports du christianisme et de la philosophie grecque au II<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris: Leroux, 1898), 113: "L'idée ne lui vient pas, avant d'écrire, d'analyser sa pensée, d'en ordonner toutes les parties, d'en disposer avec soin les éléments, en un mot de dresser un plan mûri et logique . . . Ce qui manque à cet ouvrage, ce n'est pas la logique de la pensée; c'est le talent d'en disposer en bon ordre les développements. . . ." This harsh judgment concerns, however, only the *Stromateis*.

21. Such are the proposals of Carl Heussi ("Die Stromateis des Clemens Alexandrinus und ihr Verhältnis zum Protreptikos und Pädagogos," *ZWT* 45 [1902]: 465–512); *Stromates* 1–3 was composed before the *Protreptikos*, and followed by the trilogy *Protreptikos—Paidagogos—Stromateis* 6–8; Johannes Munck (*Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandria* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933], 9–126, esp. 98, 108–9, 111, 121, 125–26): two trilogies, *Protreptikos—Paidagogos—Didaskalos* and *Stromateis* 1–3—*Stromateis* 4–8—*Physiologia*, of which Clement would not have finished the *Didaskalos* and *Physiologia*; Giuseppe Lazzati (*Introduzione allo studio di Clemente Alessandrino* [Milan: Vita e pensiero, 1939]): the trilogy *Protreptikos—Paidagogos—Quis dives*, destined for the exoteric audience, and *Stromateis* and *Hypotyposeis* for the esoteric circle.

22. According to Völker (*Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus*, TU 57 [Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1952], 29, 30 n. 3), Munck's hypothesis "leidet . . . an dem Grundfehler, daß sie Clemens viel zu einheitlich auffaßt, alle Anspielungen und Hinweise ernst nimmt und deshalb ein förmliches System von Plänen aufbaut. . . . Hatte Clemens von seinen Plänen eine so genaue Vorstellung? . . . Wird damit nicht alles künstlich systematisiert?" Annewies Van den Hoek ("Introduction," in *Clément d'Alexandrie: Stromate IV*, SC 463 [Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2001], 13–15) notes the following: "Le contraste entre les préambules structurés et le corps de l'ouvrage organisé de façon plutôt lâche a été cause de confusion. On a utilisé ces exordes pour conforter des théories personnelles sur la cohésion des oeuvres de Clément prises comme un tout." The latest of such hypotheses, as noted above, is that of Nautin.

and writing.<sup>23</sup> As Osborn notes, “[t]he *Stromateis* are not merely notes which teach. They are also notes which have taught. . . . The *Stromateis* are a record of teaching.”<sup>24</sup> Since Clement understood his oral instruction as proceeding in accordance with principles of intellectual and spiritual formation, it is quite likely that he would organize—or at least *intend* to organize—his own writing on the same principle of progressive initiation.<sup>25</sup> The following two passages occur at the beginning and the end of Clement’s *Paidagogos*:

Eagerly desiring, then, to render us perfect by a salvific gradation, the Logos, entirely a lover of mankind, makes use of a beautiful dispensation (τῆ καλῆ . . . οἰκονομία) suited for efficacious discipline: first exhorting, then training, finally teaching (προτρέπων . . . παιδαγωγῶν . . . ἐκδιδάσκων).

Many things are spoken in enigmas, many in parables. . . . However, it does not behoove me to teach about these things further, says the Instructor (παιδαγωγός). But we need a Teacher (διδασκάλου) for the interpretation of those sacred words, to whom we must direct our steps. And now, in truth, it is time for me to cease from my pedagogy (παιδαγωγίας), and for you to listen to the Teacher (διδασκάλου).<sup>26</sup>

23. *ecl.* 27.1–7 (GCS 17:144–45): “Now, the elders would not write, because they did not want to undermine their preoccupation with the teaching of the tradition by another, namely writing (it) down; nor did they want to expend on writing the time dedicated to pondering what was to be said. But, convinced perhaps that getting the composition right, and the substance of the teaching are entirely separate matters, they deferred to others naturally endowed (as writers). . . . But that which will be repeatedly consulted by those who have access to it [i.e., the book] is worth even the utmost effort, and is, as it were, the written confirmation of the instruction and of the voice so transmitted to (our) descendants by means of the (written) composition. Speaking in writing, the elders’ ‘circulating deposit’ uses the writer for the purpose of a transmission that leads to the salvation of those who are to read. So, just like a magnet, which repels all substance and only attracts iron, on account of affinity, books also attract only those who are capable of understanding them, even though there are many who engage them. . . . As for jealousy—far be it from the Gnostic! This is actually why he seeks (to determine) whether it be worse to give to the unworthy or not to hand down to the worthy; and out of (so) much love he runs the risk of sharing (knowledge) not only with the person fit (for such teaching), but—as it sometimes happens—also with some unworthy person that entreats him slyly.”

24. Osborn, “Teaching and Writing in the First Chapter of the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria,” *JTS* n.s. 10 (1959): 335–43, at 343.

25. See in this respect Judith Kovacs, “Divine Pedagogy and the Gnostic Teacher According to Clement of Alexandria,” *J ECS* 9 (2001): 3–25. This point was also emphasized by De Faye, who notes about Clement’s planned trilogy: “Ce plan lui a été exclusivement imposé par la forme de son enseignement catéchétique et par la conception toute pédagogique de la tâche qu’il s’est donnée” (De Faye, *Clément d’Alexandrie*, 53).

26. *paed.* 1.1.3 (GCS 12:91), 3.12.97 (GCS 12:289).

Clement describes three stages: *exhortation* (which leads to baptism), continued by ethical *training*, and subsequent doctrinal *instruction*. The text of the *Paidagogos* is presented as a continuation of the *Protreptikos*, and explicitly mentions “listening to the *didaskalos*” as the next stage in the curriculum. But does this necessarily refer to written work?

This question was raised forcefully by Friedrich Quatember, who observed that Clement’s text does not speak about a human teacher: it is rather *the divine Logos* that is said to exhort, train, and teach. Moreover, when Clement points the reader to a treatise he has already composed, or announces that he will expand on a certain problem in the course of a later writing, his references tend to be explicit: “our treatise On Marriage,” “our writing On the Resurrection,” “this we shall show at another place,” etc. By contrast, Clement never mentions a writing entitled *Didaskalos*.<sup>27</sup> All of this suggests that the search for *Didaskalos* as part of a curriculum of writings is utterly misguided: Clement refers to “the objective plan of salvation (*Heilsplan*) of the personal Logos,” and would never have thought of committing to writing the doctrines that a *Didaskalos* would have required.<sup>28</sup> Quatember’s arguments, coming at a moment of general dissatisfaction with the multitude of hypotheses regarding Clement’s literary plans, struck the scholarly community as fresh and worthy of serious consideration.<sup>29</sup>

The fact remains, however, that there is an intimate link between the activity of the Logos and that of the Christian teacher.<sup>30</sup> The work of the Logos as *προτρέπων* and *παιδαγωγῶν* finds its counterpart in Clement’s *Logos Protreptikos* and *Logos Paidagogos*. The question is to determine what corresponds to the divine Logos as *ἐκδιδάσκων*. It is clear that Clement derives the sequence of catechetical activity from the *οἰκονομία* of the divine Logos. In the words of Kovacs,

[t]he Gnostic teacher follows the Logos in thoughtfully arranging the order of the curriculum, knowing that certain things must be learned before others, just as in secular education the *ἐγκύκλια* need to be mastered before

27. Quatember, *Die christliche Lebenshaltung des Klemens nach seinem Pädagogus* (Vienna: Herder, 1946), 34, 36.

28. Quatember, *Christliche Lebenshaltung*, 38, 41.

29. E.g., Claude Mondésert, “Introduction,” in *Clément d’Alexandrie: Stromate I*, SC 30 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1951), 20; Walter H. Wagner, “Another Look at the Literary Problem in Clement of Alexandria’s Major Writings,” *CH* 37 (1968): 251–60, at 253; Osborn, *Clement*, 6.

30. So also Ulrich Neymeyr, *Die christlichen Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert: Ihre Lehrtätigkeit, ihr Selbstverständnis und ihre Geschichte*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 64–65.

the student is ready for rhetoric and philosophy. The Logos has provided a model for this. . . .<sup>31</sup>

The unity and coherence of the curriculum is given by the fact that it is the same Logos who exhorts, trains, and teaches. The variety of levels, on the other hand, is a natural result of the different levels occupied by the addressees of the Logos. Progression from one level to the next is a matter of biblical exegesis. As the passage discussed above (*paed.* 3.12.97) states explicitly: “we need a διδάσκαλος for the interpretation (εις τὴν ἐξήγησιν) of those sacred words.” This can be exemplified with another passage from the *Paidagogos*. At one point, while pondering whether Christians should crown themselves with flowers, Clement ventures into more mystical territory (adding what he calls “a mystic meaning”), and connects the manifestation of the Logos in the burning bush—“the bush is a thorny plant,” he explains—with the crown of thorns worn by the incarnate Logos. He then comments on his excursus of mystical exegesis in the following way: “I have departed from the *paedagogic* manner of speech, introducing the *didaskalic* one. I return accordingly to my subject.”<sup>32</sup>

The *Protreptikos*—*Paidagogos*—*Didaskalos* sequence is problematic, however, insofar as it is not clear which of Clement’s writings correspond to the *Didaskalos*. This issue “has vexed scholars for almost a century.”<sup>33</sup> The traditional scholarly view was to consider the *Didaskalos* as a written document, and to identify it with the *Stromateis*.<sup>34</sup> “Scholarly” should be stressed here, because neither Clement himself nor any of the patristic writers who refer to him ever mention a work under this name. The *Didaskalos*—*Stromateis* identification was challenged vigorously in 1898 by De Faye, who observed that the *Stromateis* kept deferring the exposi-

31. Kovacs, “Divine Pedagogy,” 7. The Gnostic mimics the pedagogical methods of the Logos. In the words of Kovacs (“Divine Pedagogy,” 17, 25), “[h]e organizes the curriculum in an orderly way, so as to facilitate the upward progress of his students”; he “follows the Logos in addressing a wide variety of students and in adapting his teaching to the capabilities and the readiness of each one. Like the divine teacher he designs an orderly progression through the sacred curriculum. . . . In order to protect his less mature students, he mimics the concealment practiced by the Logos.” Similarly, Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, 141, 143.

32. *paed.* 2.8.76 (GCS 12:203).

33. Wagner, “Another Look,” 251. Wagner’s study offers the most complete and substantive expositions of the debate concerning the *Didaskalos*. See also Mondésert, “Introduction,” 11–22; Osborn, *Clement*, 5–15; Osborn, “One Hundred Years of Books on Clement,” *VC* 60 (2006): 367–88. The quotation is from Wagner, “Another Look,” 251.

34. Zahn, *Supplementum Clementinum*, 108–14.

tion of specific doctrines (e.g., creation of the world, treatise on the soul, on prophecy, on the resurrection, on the Holy Spirit), and concluded that it was much rather a *preparatory* work for the *Didaskalos*.<sup>35</sup> The same argument was also made by Gustave Bardy, Salvatore Lilla, and, with important modifications, André Méhat.<sup>36</sup> Other scholars (e.g., Heussi contra De Faye) have replied that the *Stromateis* are replete with doctrine, and thus to be identified with the *Didaskalos*.<sup>37</sup> This position is championed by Osborn, who claims that today “[i]t has become increasingly easy to believe that the *Stromateis* are the *Didascalus*.” His argument is essentially the following:

In view of . . . the explicit use of διδάσκαλος and διδασκαλία it is right to regard the argument as the justification of teaching through writing. . . . There is no point whatever in filling the first chapter of the *Stromateis* with intricate argument in favour of written teaching if the *Stromateis* are not going to teach.<sup>38</sup>

The doctrinal exposition of the *Stromateis* is, however, presented “in a literary form appropriate to Clement’s understanding of teaching”—namely by means of Clement’s special technique of simultaneous disclosure and concealment.<sup>39</sup> E. L. Fortin mentions elliptical and allusive speech, judicious selection of words and symbols, apparent contradictions, deliberate

35. De Faye, *Clément d’Alexandrie*, 81–83. He characterizes the *Stromateis* as a parenthesis between *Paidagogos* and *Didaskalos*, a protracted introduction to the latter, designed to justify his intended use of philosophy in the *Didaskalos*, and to provide a higher level of ethics, more suitable to advanced students than that of the *Paidagogos*. Although Clement had initially set out to write a single volume (*str.* 4.1.1), the *Stromateis* soon grew out of proportion, turning into an amorphous body because of the writer’s inability to channel the flow of his ideas according to a definite plan (De Faye, *Clément d’Alexandrie*, 106, 108, 113–14). Cf. Méhat, *Étude* 522: “L’idée de cette ouvrage a dû lui venir progressivement à mesure que les Stromates prenaient une ampleur qu’il n’avait pas prévue au départ.”

36. According to Gustave Bardy (*Clément d’Alexandrie* [Paris: Gabalda, 1926], 22), the *Didaskalos* “had to be something else entirely. Would one not have found precisely those explanations on the resurrection, on prophecy, on the soul, on birth, on the devil, on prayer, on the origin of the world, which are promised in various passages of the *Stromateis* . . . and which one encounters nowhere?” See also Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 189 n. 4. For Méhat (*Étude*, 491), the *Stromateis* are a “preparation for gnosis,” designed for Gnostic education. Yet, Méhat (*Étude*, 516) also notes that the gnosis was present in the *Stromateis*, albeit in the form of veiled and dispersed allusions.

37. Heussi, “Die Stromateis des Clemens Alexandrinus,” 487–90.

38. Osborn, *Clement*, 15 n. 45; “Teaching and Writing,” 342.

39. Osborn, “Teaching and Writing,” 343.

omissions, and explains that such techniques were designed to make it possible that “the content of the oral teaching or tradition should find its way into the written text, but in such a way that its presence will be missed by the casual or unprepared reader and sniffed, as it were, by the student who has somehow been made aware of the deeper issues (*str.* 1.1.15).”<sup>40</sup> These techniques are not accidental; they grow out of Clement’s understanding of the pedagogical work of the Logos:

Clement’s practice of concealment is closely connected to his idea of the sacred *oikonomia*, the orderly lesson plan of the divine pedagogy. . . . Clement sees his own practice of concealment as an imitation of the parabolic, enigmatic character of Scripture. (6.15.115.5–6, 124.4–125.3, 127.5, 131.3–132.5)<sup>41</sup>

It should be noted, however, that the “disclosure” aspect was equally important. As Méhat observes, the *Stromateis* were destined not only for readers who were already initiated, but also—in fact, chiefly—to readers who were in the course of initiation.<sup>42</sup>

The debate over the relation between the *Didaskalos* and the *Stromateis* left out of sight those works that constitute, in De Faye’s formulation, “the torment of scholars”: the *Eclogae*, the *Excerpta*, and the *Adumbrationes*. Naturally, those scholars who see the *Didaskalos* realized in the *Stromateis* have almost nothing to say about the place of the *Hypotyposeis* in the Clementine corpus. Kovacs, for instance, suggests that Clement avoided writing “a *Didaskalos* that was to contain the highest level of Christian teaching,” because “with written works, it is impossible for the teacher to control his audience, or to make a careful selection of the level of teaching appropriate for each student”; he wrote the *Stromateis* instead because their literary genre “allowed him to reveal and conceal at the same time.”<sup>43</sup> In this case, whatever doctrine Clement was prepared to communicate is found in the *Stromateis*, and there is obviously no room

40. Fortin, “Clement of Alexandria and the Esoteric Tradition,” *SP* 9 (1966)/*TU* 94: 41–56.

41. Kovacs, “Divine Pedagogy,” 20, 23. Similarly, Hägg, *Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, 140–50.

42. Méhat, *Étude*, 491.

43. Kovacs, “Divine Pedagogy,” 24. Cf. also Hägg, *Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, 142, 144. A similar view was formulated earlier by Richard B. Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Liberalism*, 2 vols. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1914), 1:14: “the fact that Clement chose to write a series of *Stromateis* in the place of the projected ‘Master’ must in the main be set down to the character of his public. . . . In a word, the *Stromateis* are and yet are not the projected ‘Master.’ In writing them Clement realised, in part, his purpose of higher teaching.”

for any consideration of the *Hypotyposeis*. Even more interesting is the case of Osborn, whose two monographs on Clement preface and bring to a close half a century's worth of research on the Alexandrian. Osborn also spent a great amount of time and energy in an attempt to locate a copy of the *Hypotyposeis* in the Egyptian "St. Macarius" monastery. He knows well "how important they [the *Hypotyposeis*] are and why they deserve our attention": "they provide a unique source for early Christian thought," and especially "examples of the use of scripture in a distinctive way."<sup>44</sup> Yet Osborn, whose interest has always been to find the coherence of Clement's thought, simply does not take into account the *Hypotyposeis*.<sup>45</sup> And even though he insists on the eminently exegetical method of the *Hypotyposeis*, and points out that Clement's secret tradition "was a way of interpreting Scripture, not an additional document," he never discusses the possible relevance of the *Hypotyposeis* for shedding light on the content of Clement's secret tradition.<sup>46</sup>

On the contrary, scholars who deny the identity of *Stromateis* and *Didaskalos* leave open the possibility that the lost *Hypotyposeis* should present a better candidate. Méhat, for instance, concluded that the *Eclogae* and *Excerpta* represent "notes by Clement containing elements of logic and *physics*," thus constituting "indispensable complements" for understanding the Alexandrian's gnosis in the *Stromateis*, and that the latter would have been followed naturally by the *Hypotyposeis*.<sup>47</sup>

The reigning scholarly assumption has been that the *Eclogae* and *Excerpta* are "preparatory notes" or "files" that Clement intended to use for the composition of other works, perhaps the *Didaskalos*.<sup>48</sup> This assumption has been laid to rest by Nautin. As I mentioned earlier, Nautin's "erudite analysis" and "certain" conclusions have been endorsed more

44. Duckworth and Osborn, "Eighteenth-Century Sighting," 83; Osborn, "Macarius Revisited," 235.

45. Osborn, *Clement*, 6–7, 14–15.

46. Duckworth and Osborn, "Eighteenth-Century Sighting," 76. Similarly Hägg, *Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, 139.

47. Méhat, *Étude*, 516–17 ("La 'physique' des Stromates"), 517–22 ("La suite des *Stromates*: les *Hypotyposes*"). Méhat does not clarify the relation between "Stromateis 8," *Excerpta*, *Eclogae*, and *Hypotyposeis*, but suggests (*Étude*, 54) that *str.* 7 may have been composed in 203, the *Eclogae* in 204, and the *Hypotyposeis* around 204–210.

48. Paul Collomp, "Une source de Clément d'Alexandrie et des Homélies Pseudo-Clémentines," *RPh* 37 (1913): 20; De Faye, *Clément d'Alexandrie*, 84–85 (following older proposals); Tollinton, *Christian Liberalism*, 202–3; Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker*, 35; Méhat, *Étude*, 517. I mentioned earlier Bousset's hypothesis, now largely dismissed, of class notes taken by Clement during his own instruction under Pantaenus.

recently by Le Boulluec.<sup>49</sup> Some recent scholars remain however strangely unaware of Nautin's groundbreaking contribution.<sup>50</sup>

### ETHICS—PHYSICS—EPOPTICS

At the time of Clement, philosophy was understood, on the one hand, as a corpus consisting of various "parts"—for Plato, *ethics*, *physics*, and *dialectics* (understood as science of the Forms); for Aristotle, *ethics*, *physics*, and *theology* or *first philosophy*; or, since Plutarch, *ethics*, *physics*, and *epoptics*—and, on the other hand, as a transformative pedagogy following a curriculum designed to guide the student along a path of ethical, intellectual, and spiritual formation.<sup>51</sup> This second aspect became increasingly prominent after the first century C.E., so that Clement writes "in an environment that has come to definitively identify philosophy with a spiritual exercise."<sup>52</sup>

Porphyry proceeds to arrange Plotinus's *Enneads* according to this tripartite scheme, and is most likely the source for Calcidius's notion that the *Timaeus* represents Plato's *physics*, and the *Parmenides* his *epoptics*.<sup>53</sup> Perhaps more relevant is the case of Origen, who, in the prologue to his commentary on the Song of Songs, states that the Solomonic writings (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs) illustrate the *ethics—physics—epoptics* sequence, and argues that the Song of Songs is to be classified in the latter category.<sup>54</sup> In fact, Origen's "mystagogical curricu-

49. Le Boulluec, "Extraits d'oeuvres de Clément d'Alexandrie," 289, 292, 296, 300; "Pour qui, pourquoi, comment?," 24 n. 10.

50. Heine, "The Alexandrians," 117–21; Neymeyr, *Die christlichen Lehrer*, 84; Rüdiger Feulner, *Clemens von Alexandrien: sein Leben, Werk und philosophisch-theologisches Denken* (Frankfurt am Main and New York: Peter Lang, 2006), 33–36; Hägg, *Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism*, 61, 198. See also Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* II/2:18. It is noteworthy that even Uwe Swarat's thorough study of Zahn and his contribution to scholarship seems convinced that the Arnim-Ruben-Harnack thesis has definitively triumphed over Zahn's proposal (Swarat, *Alte Kirche und Neues Testament: Theodor Zahn als Patristiker* [Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1991], 201).

51. According to Pierre Hadot ("Les divisions des parties de la philosophie dans l'antiquité," *MH* 36 [1979]: 219–20), "[c]e schéma fondamental: *éthique*, *physique*, *époptique*, sera le noyau du programme des études philosophiques de la fin du I<sup>er</sup> siècle ap. J.–C. jusqu'à la fin de l'Antiquité." Similarly Laura Rizzerio, *Clemente di Alessandria e la "φυσιολογία veramente gnostica": saggio sulle origini e le implicazioni di un'epistemologia e di un'ontologia "cristiane"* (Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 150–61.

52. Rizzerio, *Φυσιολογία*, 159.

53. Hadot, "Les divisions," 219.

54. *Orig. Cant. prol.* 3.1, 4 (ed. Luc Brésard and Henri Crouzel, *Origène. Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques. Livre I–II*. SC 375 [Paris: Éditions du Cerf,

lum” of biblical studies applies the *ethics—physics—epoptics* sequence both to the Old Testament as a whole (Law—Prophets—beginning of Genesis, Ezekiel’s throne-vision, Song of Songs) and to the New Testament (Matthew and Luke—Mark—John). This point is argued in great detail by Michael-Vlad Niculescu.<sup>55</sup>

Clement of Alexandria is also familiar with the *ethics—physics—epoptics* scheme. At the very end of *Stromateis* 6, for instance, Clement looks back on the *ethical* description of the Gnostic (“the greatness and beauty of his character [ἡθους]”), and announces that he will later advance to a new level of the description:

Καθάπερ οὖν ἀνδριάντα ἀποπλασάμενοι τοῦ γνωστικοῦ, ἤδη μὲν ἐπεδείξαμεν, οἷός ἐστι, μέγεθός τε καὶ κάλλος ἡθους αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐν ὑπογραφῇ δηλώσαντες· ὅποιος γὰρ κατὰ τὴν θεωρίαν ἐν τοῖς φυσικοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα δηλωθήσεται ἐπὶν τοῖς γενέσεως κόσμου διαλαμβάνειν ἀρξώμεθα. (*str.* 6.18.168 [SC 446:398])

The standard reading of this text is the following:

Having as it were fashioned a statue of the Gnostic, we have so far indicated *how* he is by showing as in a sketch the greatness and beauty of his *ethos*; *what* he is with respect to natural contemplation (θεωρίαν ἐν τοῖς φυσικοῖς) will be shown presently, when we begin to treat of the making of the world.

An alternative reading, advocated by Méhat, takes ἐν τοῖς φυσικοῖς together with δηλωθήσεται rather than with θεωρίαν, rendering the text even clearer:

Having as it were fashioned a statue of the Gnostic, we have so far indicated *how* he is by showing as in a sketch the greatness and beauty of

---

1991], 128, 130): *Generales disciplinae quibus ad rerum scientiam pervenitur tres sunt, quas Graeci ethicam, physicam, epopticen appellarunt. . . . Haec ergo, ut mihi videtur, sapientes quique Graecorum sumpta a Solomone . . . tamquam propria inventa protulerunt.* The English translations of both R. P. Lawson (*Origen, The Song of Songs: Commentary and Homilies*, ACW 26 [New York: Newman, 1956]) and Rowan A. Greer (*Classics of Western Spirituality: Origen* [New York: Paulist Press, 1979]) mention “enoptics,” because they are based on the older GCS edition, which chose to follow a manuscript that reads *ethicam, physicam, enopticen*. For the correction of *enopticen* into *epopticen*, on both linguistic and doctrinal grounds, see J. Kirchmeyer, “Origène, Commentaire sur le Cantique, prol. (GCS Origenes 8, Baehrens, p. 75, ligne 8),” *SP* 10 (1970): 230–35.

55. Niculescu, “Spiritual Leavening: The Communication and Reception of the Good News in Origen’s Biblical Exegesis and Transformative Pedagogy,” *J ECS* 15 (2007): 447–81; *Origen’s Mystagogic Paideia* (New York: Gorgias, 2009). I am grateful to the author for generously sharing with me the manuscript of his book prior to its publication.

his *ethos*; *what* he is with respect to contemplation will be shown presently in the *physics* (ἐν τοῖς φυσικοῖς δηλωθήσεται), when we begin to treat of the making of the world.<sup>56</sup>

Regardless of what reading is preferred, Clement has in mind three stages of advancement. First, *ethics*; second *physics*, which is a matter of *theōria* whether or not one accepts the reading “natural contemplation” (θεωρίαν ἐν τοῖς φυσικοῖς);<sup>57</sup> third, according to *Stromateis* 1.1.15, *epoptics*: “the gnosis according to the *epoptic* contemplation” (τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἐποπτικὴν θεωρίαν γνώσεως). As Descourtieux notes, for Clement “the study of nature, θεωρία φυσική, is a preamble to theology, which itself contains the study of creation (cf. *str.* 1.15.2, 1.60.4). This reflection, announced several times (cf. *str.* 4.3.1), has only reached us in snippets, in the *Eclogae propheticae*.”<sup>58</sup> At the end of *Stromateis* 7, Clement had not yet fulfilled his promise, as can be seen from his progress report:

These points, then, having been formerly thoroughly treated, and the department of *ethics* having been sketched summarily in a fragmentary way, as we promised; and having here and there interspersed the dogmas which are the gems of true knowledge, so that the discovery of the sacred traditions may not be easy to any one of the uninitiated, let us proceed to what we promised. . . . And now, after this seventh *Miscellany* of ours, we shall give the account of what follows in order from a new beginning.<sup>59</sup>

In other words, even though Clement says explicitly that he has here and there interspersed the dogmas which are the gems of true knowledge, “at the end of *Stromateis* 7, we are still not out of the *ethics*.”<sup>60</sup> As for the puzzling reference to a “new beginning,” Méhat thinks that it announced

56. Méhat, *Étude*, 443 n. 115. This reading also has the advantage of breaking up the phrase κατὰ τὴν θεωρίαν ἐν τοῖς φυσικοῖς, which Clement would have perhaps expressed as κατὰ τὴν ἐν τοῖς φυσικοῖς θεωρίαν (cf. *str.* 1.1.15: κατὰ τὴν ἐποπτικὴν θεωρίαν).

57. According to *str.* 1.1.15 (SC 30:54), the exposition of the “gnosis according to the *epoptic* contemplation” will start ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσεως, with considerations of natural contemplation (φυσικῆς θεωρίας). And *str.* 4.1.3 (SC 463:60) even speaks of “physiology, or rather contemplation” (φυσιολογία, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐποπτεία). This phrase should not surprise in an author as philosophically eclectic as Clement. Hadot (“Les divisions,” 208) notes that, for Stoics, “Platonic dialectics, as the science of the Forms, being eliminated, all theoretical activity is concentrated in *physics*. It absorbs theology, which corresponds to a widening of the notion of physics, which no longer designates, as in Aristotle, a particular domain, but the totality of the cosmos and the force that animates it.”

58. Descourtieux, *Clément d’Alexandrie: Stromate VI*, SC 446 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1999), 399 n. 4.

59. *str.* 7.18.110 (SC 428:328, 330).

60. Méhat, *Étude*, 516.

the beginning of *Hypotyposeis*, which must have “overflowed” with *physics*.<sup>61</sup> Nautin observed, however, that only a couple of chapters earlier (*str.* 7.15.89 [SC 428:272]) Clement had announced his plan to “move on to the next Stroma.” It appears, by way of consequence, that at least one more book of the *Stromateis* existed before the *Hypotyposeis*, of which the fragment entitled “Stromateis 8” is a remnant.<sup>62</sup>

As I noted above, Nautin broke new ground in scholarship by founding his discussion of Clement’s “program” on an analysis of the actual manuscript in which the writings are contained and a cogent explanation of the text’s fragmentary shape on the basis of similarities with the preservation of Origen in the Tura Codex II. This makes much less vulnerable to critique—*pace* van den Hoek and Nardi<sup>63</sup>—Nautin’s conclusion that the *Excerpta* and *Eclogae* are excerpts from the *Hypotyposeis*, which, within the program of Clementine works, represent Clement’s *physics* and *epoptics*.<sup>64</sup>

#### PHYSICS TO EPOPTICS: MA’ASSE BERESHĪT TO MA’ASSE MERKAVAH

But what was *epoptics* about? On the basis of his detailed analysis of Clement’s statement about *gnosis*, Méhat came to the conclusion that the so-called secret doctrine consisted essentially in an exposition of the Johannine “God is love,” shedding light on the reason for creation, the angels, *apokatastasis*.<sup>65</sup> Indeed, like Origen later on, Clement viewed the Gospel of John as a “spiritual Gospel.”<sup>66</sup> Before entering into a more detailed discussion about Clement, it is useful to consider briefly Origen’s views on this topic.

61. Méhat, *Étude*, 521–22.

62. Nautin, “La fin des *Stromates*,” 295–96.

63. See my earlier note.

64. Nautin, “La fin des *Stromates*,” 297–98.

65. Méhat, “Θεὸς Ἀγάπη: Une hypothèse sur l’objet de la gnose orthodoxe,” *SP 9/TU 94* [1966]: 82–86; *Étude*, 488: “a doctrine having as its basis the primacy of love, developed into a theology of the Logos, of creation and end of the world, of the angels, finally of the human being, and which served as a foundation for a morals of progressive likening to God through obedience and contemplation.”

66. In a passage attributed to the *Hypotyposeis*, quoted by Eusebius (*b.e.* 6.14.7; ed. Gustave Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique II. Livre V–VII*. SC 41 [Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1955], 107), he writes: “But, last of all, John, perceiving that the corporeal aspects (τὰ σωματικά) had been made plain in the Gospel, being urged by his friends [and] inspired by the Spirit, composed a spiritual gospel (πνευματικὸν . . . εὐαγγέλιον).”

I noted earlier that Origen classified the Song of Songs as an “epoptic” writing. In the same prologue to the commentary on the Song of Songs, however, he had also spoken (with obvious approval) of Jewish traditions that placed the Song of Songs, together with the beginning of Genesis, and the throne-vision and Temple-vision in Ezekiel, among the so-called δευτερώσεις—writings that “should be reserved for study till the last,” because they concern the highest mysteries of the divinity.<sup>67</sup>

Origen’s fusion of Greek ἐποπτεία and Jewish δευτερώσεις may have been anticipated by Clement. Relevant in this respect are texts such as *Stromateis* 1.28.176, where Clement characteristically reconciles “the fourfold division of Moses’s philosophy” with the threefold scheme of *ethics, physics, and epoptics*,<sup>68</sup> and *Stromateis* 4.1.3, where, according to Gedaliahu Guy Stroumsa, he lays out something similar to the “secret tradition” of rabbinic circles (*Mishna Hagiga* 2.1): an initiation into “the things pertaining to creation” (*ma’asse bereshit*) and the mysteries of the

67. Origen, *Cant. prol.* 1.7 (SC 375:84). The relevance of Origen’s reference to Jewish δευτερώσεις for Jewish mystical exegesis has been argued by Gershom Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965), 38–40. Scholem noted (*Jewish Gnosticism*, 38) that the Song of Songs was “a favorite subject for the public aggadic teachings of the rabbis in the second and third centuries.” Among certain strands of Judaism, however, the Song’s “detailed description of the limbs of the lover” suggested a connection with the anthropomorphic depiction of the enthroned deity in Ezekiel’s vision. As a result, “instead of interpreting the Song of Songs as an allegory within the framework of the generally accepted midrashic interpretations, saw it as a strictly esoteric text containing sublime and tremendous mysteries regarding God in his appearance upon the throne of the Merkabah” (*Jewish Gnosticism*, 39). This interpretation of Origen’s reference to δευτερώσεις is accepted by Marguerite Harl (“Les prologue des commentaries sur le Cantique des Cantiques,” in *Texte und Textkritik: Eine Aufsatzsammlung*, ed. J. Dummer et al., TU 133 [Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1987], 249–69, at 253). For a discussion of the parallels between Origen’s and his rabbinic contemporaries’ interpretation of the Song of Songs and of Ezekiel’s throne-vision see Reuven Kimelman, “Rabbi Yohanan and Origen on the Song of Songs: A Third-Century Jewish-Christian Disputation,” *HTR* 73 (1980): 567–95; David J. Halperin, “Origen, Ezekiel’s Merkabah, and the Ascension of Moses,” *CH* 50 (1981): 261–75.

68. *str.* 1.28.176 (SC 30:173): Ἡ μὲν οὖν κατὰ Μωϋσῆα φιλοσοφία τετραχῆ τέμνεται, εἰς τε τὸ ἱστορικὸν καὶ τὸ κυρίως λεγόμενον νομοθετικόν, ἄπερ ἂν εἴη τῆς ἠθικῆς πραγματείας ἴδια, τὸ τρίτον δὲ εἰς τὸ ἱερουργικόν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡδὴ τῆς φυσικῆς θεωρίας· καὶ τέταρτον ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὸ θεολογικὸν εἶδος, ἢ ἐποπτεία, ἣν φησὶν ὁ Πλάτων τῶν μεγάλων ὄντων εἶναι μυστηρίων, Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ τὸ εἶδος τοῦτο μετὰ τὰ φυσικὰ καλεῖ (“Now, Moses’s philosophy is divided into four parts: the historical part and the part properly called legislative [these would properly belong to the study of *ethics*]; the third part, sacred rites, which belongs to natural contemplation; and fourth, above all, there is the subject-matter of theology, the vision, so Plato says, of the truly great mysteries . . .”).

divine chariot-throne (*ma'asse merkavah*), on the basis of mystical exegesis of key texts in Genesis and Ezekiel.<sup>69</sup>

According to Clement, “the gnostic tradition according to the canon of the truth” comprises, first, an account of the world’s coming into being (περὶ κοσμογονίας), beginning with “the prophetically-uttered Genesis” (ἀπὸ τῆς προφητευθείσης . . . γενέσεως), followed by an ascent to “the subject matter of theology” (ἐπὶ τὸ θεολογικὸν εἶδος).<sup>70</sup> This is not the only time that Clement states that his “physiology” begins with a discussion of Genesis. After discussing the relevant passages Méhat concludes that they “announce, as clearly as one can expect from Clement, a commentary on the beginning of Genesis, which must have been part of the first book of the *Hypotyposeis*.”<sup>71</sup>

As for the θεολογικὸν εἶδος, *Stromateis* 1.28.176 (quoted in an earlier footnote) explains it as a matter of visionary contemplation, ἐποπτεία, the highest part of philosophy according to Plato and Aristotle. Indeed, ἐποπτεία, a term whose roots lie in the language of the Eleusinian mysteries, had come to designate, since Plutarch, the highest part of both Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy.<sup>72</sup> Clement does the same, by equating

69. Stroumsa, “‘Paradosis’: Esoteric Traditions in Early Christianity,” in *Hidden Wisdom: Esoteric Traditions and the Roots of Christian Mysticism*, SHR 70 (Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1996), 42–43. It should be noted, however, that Clement, unlike Origen, “does not reflect living contacts with Jewish scholars” (Van den Hoek, “The ‘Catechetical’ School of Early Christian Alexandria and Its Philonic Heritage,” *HTR* 90 [1997]: 59–87, at 80).

70. *str.* 4.1.3 (SC 463:58, 60): ἡ γοῦν κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας κανόνα γνωστικῆς παραδόσεως φυσιολογία, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐποπτεία, ἐκ τοῦ περὶ κοσμογονίας ἤρτηται λόγου, ἐνθένδε ἀναβαίνουσα ἐπὶ τὸ θεολογικὸν εἶδος. ὅθεν εἰκότως τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς παραδόσεως ἀπὸ τῆς προφητευθείσης ποιησόμεθα γενέσεως (“The science of nature, then—or rather vision—as contained in the gnostic tradition according to the rule of the truth, depends on the account of the world’s coming into being [or, with Méhat, *Étude*, 442–43: “starts with the treatise ‘On the creation of world’], ascending from there to the subject-matter of theology. Whence, then, we shall begin our account of what is handed down with the prophetically-uttered Genesis”).

71. Méhat, *Étude*, 442–43 and 443 n. 117. “Commentary” is not the right term, as the work was most likely a *capitulus* rather than a large work. Eusebius, who claims to know the *Hypotyposeis*, also notes that in the *Stromateis* Clement “promises to write a commentary on Genesis,” but never identifies the latter with a section of the *Hypotyposeis*. See *h.e.* 6.13.9 (SC 41:106).

72. Hadot, “Les divisions,” 218. See *Is. Os. 77* (Plutarch’s *de Iside et Osiride*, ed. and trans. J. Gwyn Griffith [Cambridge: University of Wales Press, 1970], 242): “For this reason both Plato (*Symp.* 210A) and Aristotle call this branch of philosophy that concerned with the highest mysteries (ἐποπτικὸν), in that those who have passed beyond these conjectural, confused and widely varied matters spring by force of reason to that primal, simple and immaterial element; and having directly grasped

it with Plato's "dialectics" and Aristotle's "metaphysics." Rizzerio is certainly correct to conclude that "ἐποπτεία represents for Clement the highest knowledge that a human being can obtain, corresponding to that very vision of God, accessible only to a few, without thereby growing into a non-rational (*arazionale*) mystical knowledge."<sup>73</sup>

Yet εἶδος also happens to be a term used in several LXX renderings of visionary texts. In Gen 32.31–32 εἶδος θεοῦ is used in connection with God's anthropomorphic appearance as the warrior who wrestled Jacob; in Num 12.8 Moses sees the glory of God ἐν εἶδει; finally, in Ezek 1.26 the anthropomorphic "glory of God" on the chariot-throne is referred to as ὁμοίωμα ὡς εἶδος ἀνθρώπου. Moreover, we know that Jews and Christians of the Greek Diaspora were fond of drawing a connection between Ezek 1.26 and the Platonic theory of forms (e.g., εἶδος ἀνθρώπου in Parm. 130C).<sup>74</sup> Perhaps Clement intended to suggest, in the subtle manner characteristic of the *Stromateis*, that "the subject-matter of theology" is both Plato's "vision of truly great mysteries" and the biblical notion of God's anthropomorphic appearance on the divine chariot-throne.<sup>75</sup>

#### THE *HYPOTYPOSEIS* AND LATER ORTHODOXY

The *Hypotyposesis* were judged as heretical by later guardians of orthodoxy.<sup>76</sup> The fatal element was undoubtedly the growing association with Origen and later Origenism. Ironically enough, it is none other than Rufinus who bears part of the responsibility for this association. In defending Origen of the charge of occasionally calling the Son a creature, Rufinus

---

the pure truth attached to it, they believe that they hold the ultimate end of philosophy in the manner of a mystic revelation." Plutarch has in mind *Symp.* 210A, where Diotima refers to the highest goal of instruction (by anticipation of her subsequent exposition on the upward flight of the soul) as τὰ τέλεα καὶ ἐποπτικά.

73. Rizzerio, *Physiologia*, 49.

74. Jarl Fossum, "Colossians 1.15–18a in the Light of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism," *NTS* 35 (1989): 183–201, at 188; Alan Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990), 42.

75. For Clement's style of concealment through veiled allusions, see Fortin, "Clement and the Esoteric Tradition," 52.

76. For the reception of Clement, see Adolf Knauber, "Die patrologische Schätzung des Clemens von Alexandrien bis zu seinem neuerlichen Bekanntwerden durch die ersten Druckeditionen des 16. Jahrhunderts," in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, ed. P. Granfield and J. A. Jungmann (Münster: Aschendorff, 1970), 289–308; Wagner, "A Father's Fate: Attitudes Toward and Interpretations of Clement of Alexandria," *JRH* 6 (1971): 209–31.

argued that similar statements occur in some Clementine writings, and that this can only be due to interpolations: how else could anyone believe that a man so catholic in all respects and so erudite as Clement would have written such dreadful impieties?<sup>77</sup> Rufinus's ultimately unsuccessful defense of Origen also planted the seed of future accusations against Clement. By the ninth century, this seed has come to fruition: according to George the Monk, writing around 850, God had revealed the truth about Clement to one of the fathers: Clement had been an "Origenist!"<sup>78</sup>

Most notorious and of lasting influence is the harsh criticism of Clement by Photius of Constantinople. The Byzantine patriarch is scandalized by the heresies he finds in the *Hypotyposesis*: distinguishing between the Father's Logos and the Logos that took flesh, reducing Christ to a mere creature, the doctrine of "metempsychosis," the idea that there existed "many worlds before Adam."<sup>79</sup> The Photian evaluation of Clement's theology has been much discussed in scholarship.<sup>80</sup> It is now clear that "the embattled patriarch judged the work in the light of an orthodoxy

77. Ruf. *apol. adv. Hier.* 4 (ed. René Amacker and Éric Junod, *Pamphile et Eusèbe de Césarée, Apologie pour Origène: suivi de Rufin d'Aquilée, Sur la falsification des livres d'Origène*, SC 464 [Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2002], 204): *Numquid credibile est de tanto viro, tam in omnibus catholico, tam erudito ut uel sibi contraria senserit uel ea quae de Deo, non dicam credere se uel audire quidem impium est, scripta reliquerit?*

78. Georgius Monachus (Hamartolos), *Chronicon Breve* 26 (PG 110:84): Κλήμησ δὲ ὁ Στρωματεὺς, Ὑριγενιαστῆς ὢν, ὡς τινὶ τῶν Πατέρων ἀπεκαλύφθη. It is interesting that this reference occurs in a section that deals with the transmission of wisdom and letters from the Hebrews to the pagans. George the Monk simply indicates his sources, adding some offhand remarks: on the one hand, there is Josephus, a "blind" Jew (ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ μείνας τυφλότων); on the other, there is Clement, who is not a Jew (μὴ ἐν κολάσει Ἰουδαϊοῦ ὢν), but an "Origenist" heretic. In the section dedicated to the reign of Commodus (*Chronicon Breve* 140 [PG 110:532]), Clement of Alexandria is, once again, linked to Origen—"Origen was his pupil"—and listed among the heretics who flourished during that period: Paul of Samosata, Theodotion, and Montanus.

79. Phot. *cod.* 109 (Photius, *Bibliothèque*, ed. and trans. René Henry, 9 vols. [Paris: Société d'édition les Belles lettres, 1960], 2:80).

80. Knauber, "Patrologische Schätzung des Clemens," 297–304; Casey, "Clement and the Two Divine Logoi," *JTS* 25 (1923): 43–56; Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria* 199–212; Raoul Mortley, Carsten Colpe, "Gnosis I (Erkenntnislehre)," *RAC* 11 (1981): 446–537, at 479–80; Osborn, "Clement of Alexandria's Hypotyposesis," 77–83; M. J. Edwards, "Clement of Alexandria and His Doctrine of the Logos," *VC* 54 (2000): 159–77, at 168–71; Christoph Marksches, "Die wunderliche Mär von zwei Logoi: Clemens Alexandrinus, Fragment 23—Zeugnis eines Arius ante Arium oder des arianischen Streits selbst?," in *Logos: FS Luise Abramowski*, BZNW 67 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1993), 193–219. The text was republished in Marksches, *Alta Trinità Beata: Gesammelte Studien zur altkirchlichen Trinitätstheologie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 70–98.

hammered out on anti-Origenist and anti-Arian anvils,”<sup>81</sup> and that his accusations were without ground, based on misreadings, misunderstandings, or misinterpretations of the text.<sup>82</sup> The question is further complicated by the fact that the Clementine authenticity of the text quoted by Photius (now “fragment 23”) is still open to debate.<sup>83</sup>

My concern here is not with the substance of Photius’s critique of Clement, and with the authenticity of the texts attributed to the Alexandrian, but with what this critique suggests about the structure of the Clementine corpus. Photius claims that the *Hypotyposeis* were replete with “impieties,” “fables,” and “blasphemous nonsense”; he finds the *Stromateis* much more acceptable, although they are also “unsound” in some parts; finally, he notes that the *Paidagogos* has nothing in common with the *Hypotyposeis*, and is entirely free from idle and blasphemous opinions. This is an important insight into the hierarchical organization of the Clementine writings. Even though Photius reverses the value of the Clementine hierarchy, such that the summit of theology becomes the abyss of heresy, his evaluation provides confirmation of the fact that Clement had intended for the *Hypotyposeis* to initiate his students into the highest level of “gnosis.”

## CONCLUSIONS

Like most teachers of wisdom in his time—whether Platonists, Stoics, Jews, or Christians—Clement paid foremost attention to the pedagogical element in producing his works. His Logos-doctrine offered the hermeneutical basis for a curriculum designed to meet the students at their lowest level—paganism, exhort them “to the laver, to salvation, to illumination” (*prot.* 10.94 [GCS 12:69]), then train them in virtue, and instruct them into increasingly higher levels of the revelation by means of gradual descent into the depths of Scripture.

This pedagogical method, however, did not make use of a fixed nomenclature for the various stages of instruction. Clement speaks of *Protrep-tikos*—*Paidagogos*—*Didaskalos*, but he also uses the *Ethics*—*Physics*—*Epoptics* sequence, and seems to be aware of the special place held by the opening verses of Genesis and the account of Ezekiel’s throne-vision, a tradition which surfaces explicitly with Origen and the Tannaim. Ecler-

81. Wagner, “A Father’s Fate,” 213.

82. See especially the above-mentioned studies of Knauber, Osborn, and Edwards.

83. Markschie’s painstaking analysis has shown that there are good reasons to at least label Fragment 23 as “pseudo-(?) Clement,” thus indicating strong doubts as to its authenticity.

ticism and fluidity are, after all, the characteristic features of Clement's thought.<sup>84</sup>

The *Stromateis* fulfill Clement's projected doctrinal exposition only in part: "having here and there interspersed the dogmas which are the gems of true knowledge." A still higher and clearer exposition of Christian doctrine would have followed, using Scripture in such a way—selection of certain themes and passages, use of allegory—as to move from *ethics* to *physics* and *epoptics* and offer students the possibility to "listen to the *Didaskalos*."

For several reasons, the most likely candidate for this next stage is the work known as the *Hypotyposeis*. According to unanimous patristic verdict, the *Hypotyposeis* were exegetical in method and doctrinal in character.<sup>85</sup> Some ideas that are discussed in both the *Stromateis* and the *Hypotyposeis* (e.g., the angelic hierarchy, the *apokatastasis*, Pneumatology) are presented "mostly in a dispersed, allusive form" in the former, and more explicitly in the latter.<sup>86</sup> Finally, the doctrines contained in the *Hypotyposeis* were judged as heretical by later guardians of orthodoxy.

Studying Clement of Alexandria's *Excerpta, Eclogae*, and *Adumbrationes* promises to be very rewarding in terms of a better understanding of Clement's theology. Our first and indispensable step should be a new translation of these works into English. The time has come to take more interest in "the other Clement," the Clement of the *Excerpta, Eclogae*, and *Adumbrationes*. If the reader has become convinced of this point, my article has fulfilled its purpose.

*Bogdan G. Bucur is Assistant Professor of Theology at  
Duquesne University*

84. Méhat, *Étude*, 426–27: "Par une habitude constante de sa langue, Clément use selon les circonstances d'un grand nombre de synonymes pour exprimer la même idée. Ainsi pour la gnose. . . . Il faut donc se fier moins au vocabulaire qu'au contexte."

85. Eusebius (*h.e.* 6.13.2, 6.14.1 [SC 41:104, 106]), Cassiodorus (*Div. litt. praef.* 4 [FC 39/1:98]), and Photius (*cod.* 109 [*Bibliothèque*, 2:79]) all state that the *Hypotyposeis* were concise expositions of biblical passages. For a reconstruction of their content, see Zahn, *Supplementum Clementinum*, 156.

86. Méhat, *Étude*, 516, 519; Le Boulluec, "Introduction," 185 n. 7.