

Finally, this book could have used an editor capable of transforming it from a German dissertation to a monograph for an English-speaking readership. Redundant material, typographical errors, chaotic use of quotation marks, and bibliographical references and citations in German where English was possible, make the book tedious to read and difficult to understand.

South Bend, Ind.

FABIAN E. UDOH

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA AND THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIAN APOPHATICISM. By Henny Fiskå Hägg. Oxford Early Christian Studies. New York: Oxford University, 2006. Pp. xii + 314. \$85.

A revision of Hägg's 1997 dissertation at the University of Bergen, this book is a valuable contribution to the study of Clement of Alexandria's theological thought. After an introduction to the cultural, religious, social, and political milieu of imperial Alexandria and a presentation of Clement's life and writings (15–51), the reader is treated to a robust study of Clementine apophaticism as reflected in the Alexandrian's theological metaphysics, epistemology, cosmology, and theory of language. For every topic under discussion, H. offers a careful presentation of relevant middle Platonic sources (Alcinous, Numenius, and Atticus) that then illumines her interpretation of Clementine texts. Her reading of Clement against this background is impressive both in its mastery of sources and relevant scholarly literature and in the clarity and persuasiveness of the arguments. Clement emerges as an informed but independent and creative thinker, thoroughly Christian, yet perfectly at home in the philosophical traditions of his time.

As the title indicates, the work also discusses Clement's place in the history of Christian thought. In H.'s estimation Clement's importance lies in his anticipation of the complex conjunction of apophaticism, ascetical epistemology, and the distinction between divine transcendence and immanence. She argues convincingly that Clement's apophaticism contrasts with the lack thereof in Origen (255–58) and shows clear affinities with that of the Cappadocians. Clement's influence over the latter, possibly mediated by Evagrius, is greater than usually assumed (259–60).

Compared with her reading of Clement against the background of middle Platonism, H.'s presentation of Clement's inheritance of earlier Jewish and Christian traditions is less detailed and substantial. It would have been possible, for instance, to complement the otherwise excellent treatment of Clement's Logos-theology (197–206; 227–37) with a discussion of the mediation of the vision and knowledge of God from the Logos as "Face" through the various angelic "powers" down to the human world. This emendation would have called for more serious consideration of the apocalyptic elements in Clement's *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, *Eclogae prophetae*, and *Adumbrationes*.

According to H., "Clement even claims co-substantiality for the Spirit,

the third person of the Trinity” (201). Some readers will certainly disagree, especially since H.’s discussion of Clementine Pneumatology takes up no more than one paragraph, by contrast to the solid 50 pages dedicated to Clement’s reflections on God and the Logos (153–206). Other writers (Johannes Frangoulis, Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, Christian Oeyen, Luis Ladaria, Henning Ziebritzki) have conducted much more extensive and detailed research, and come to conclusions very different from H.’s.

Another criticism concerns the overall argument of the book, an argument governed by two different principles. On the one hand, H. offers a study of Clement’s apophaticism in light of middle Platonic sources, selecting Alcinoüs, Numenius, and Atticus on the basis of “their relevance for the study of Clement that follows” (71). On the other hand, she is at pains to show that Clement’s apophaticism and distinction between *ousia* and *dynamis* “anticipates a later dogma of the Orthodox church” (238, 261)—presumably the Palamite essence/energy distinction. From this perspective, the study seems designed as a corrective to “the scepticism that Clement is still being met within Orthodox theological circles” (256). H.’s thesis of Clement as a precursor of the Cappadocians and of later developments in Byzantine theology (127) does indeed fill a gap in scholarship. However, the scattered considerations of Clement’s influence “through the Cappadocians . . . further into the Eastern Orthodox tradition and into our own time” (267) are insufficiently documented (H. refers to Vladimir Lossky [264 n. 23] yet seems unaware of the substantial treatment of Clement in Lossky’s *Vision of God*) and seem out of place in a work of patristic scholarship.

The above-mentioned shortcomings do not diminish the value of this study, which resides primarily in the excellent treatment of Clement’s apophaticism against its middle Platonic background. This book belongs in every serious university and research library, as it is indispensable for research on Clement of Alexandria and very useful, more generally, for the study of philosophy and theology in late antiquity. It should also be of interest to students of the Eastern Orthodox theological tradition. Readers of this book would also benefit from two other recent studies of Clement: Eric Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria* (2005) and Rüdiger Feulner, *Clemens von Alexandrien* (2006).

Duquesne University, Pittsburgh

BOGDAN G. BUCUR

FIVE MODELS OF SPIRITUAL DIRECTION IN THE EARLY CHURCH. By George E. Demacopoulos. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame, 2007. Pp. x + 275. \$30.

Demacopoulos opens his interesting study by clearly defining spiritual direction as “the modus operandi by which religious authorities (in both lay and monastic communities) sought to advance the spiritual condition of those under their care” (1). The definition serves as D.’s tool for examining developments within the one church shaped by different ways of life and