Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 51 (2005)

Artikel: Apologetic and protreptic discourse in Clement of Alexandria
Autor: Hoek, Annewies van den
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660646

III

ANNEWIES VAN DEN HOEK

APOLOGETIC AND PROTREPTIC DISCOURSE IN CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

The modern English words *apology*, *apologist*, and *apologetic*, are all connected in some way and to some degree with a form of defense. An *apology* has been defined as the 'pleading off from a charge or imputation, whether expressed, implied, or only conceived as possible'.[1] This defense can come from a single person but also can involve a group or institution. It can be written or oral, and it can justify a whole system as well as a specific action or position. The one who does the apology, thus the one who defends by argument, is called an *apologist*, while the nature of a defense can be called *apologetic*. The definitions above are dictionary definitions used in specific contexts, those of the courtroom or of religious and political confrontation. In every-day English we also use the words *apologetic* and *apology*, but then the terms take on a very different meaning; they function as expressions of regret or contrition for some fault or failure, usually minor. For example, one can step on someone's toes in the elevator and offer one's *apology* for this mishap, which is not a crime but just a minor accident. A degree of guilt is accepted and the offender assumes an *apologetic* tone. In the case of a more serious fault, it may be hoped that the apology will spare the offender a reprimand or punishment. Thus there is a reversal from the classical *apologist's* defense of innocence

[1] *The Oxford English Dictionary Online* (Oxford University Press 2004), s.v.

to the every-day acknowledgement of some kind of fault. The words *apologist* or in the plural *apologists* are rare in modern English, but they take on special prominence in the realm of the study of early Christianity.

The term *Apologists* has come to refer to a group of writers who put up a reasoned defense of Christianity against opponents from the 'pagan' or non-Christian side.[2] Although terming these writers *Apologists* is modern, or, at least, as modern as the seventeenth century, the concept apparently goes back to middle-Byzantine times or earlier.[3] Codex Paris. Gr. 451 which was written in 914 already contains a collection of apologetic writings; it was written by the scribe Baanes on the order of Arethas, the learned archbishop of Caesarea, who also covered the manuscript with his notes. It contains works of Clement of Alexandria, Ps. Justin, Athenagoras, and Eusebius of Caesaera.[4] On the other hand, it lacks most of the Apologists as we know them from modern editors, such as Maran in the eighteenth century, Otto in the nineteenth, and Goodspeed in the early twentieth century.[5] The critical edition of Goodspeed provides fragments

[2] On a summary of the term 'paganism', see the http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paganism: "'Paganism' is a catch-all term which has come to (by extension from its original classical meaning of a non-Christian religion) bundle together a very broad set of potentially mutually incompatible religious beliefs and practices; the term has historically been used as a pejorative by adherents of monotheistic religions to indicate a person who doesn't believe in their religion. 'Paganism' is also sometimes used to mean the *lack* of (an accepted monotheistic) religion, and therefore sometimes means essentially the same as *atheism.* 'Paganism' frequently refers to the religions of classical antiquity, most notably Greek mythology or Roman religion, and can be used neutrally or admiringly by those who refer to those complexes of belief."

[3] See *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. by S. HORNBLOWER and A. SPAWFORTH (Oxford-New York ³1996), s.v.

[4] Codex Paris. Gr. 451 contains: Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus*; *Paedagogus*; Ps. Justin, *Epistula ad Zenam*; *Cohortatio ad Graecos*; Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica,* Books 1-5; 6; Athenagoras, *Supplicatio pro Christianis*; *De resurrectione*; Eusebius, *Contra Hieroclem.*

[5] The edition of Prudentius Maranus of the Greek apologists (except Aristides) was reproduced in the *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. VI, and that of J.C.Th. DE OTTO, in the *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi* (Jena 1857-1872); the

and complete texts of Quadratus, Aristides, Justin, Tatian, Melito, and Athenagoras, but for some reason Goodspeed left out Theophilus of Antioch. All these writers belong to the second century and they have become in modern terms the core of the Apologists. One can also name them the 'early' Apologists.

As a group these writers are characterized by a reasoned defense of their beliefs at a time when the legal situation of the new religious associations remained unclear and threats from their local environments were imminent. Some of these writers, such as Aristides, Quadratus, and Justin Martyr defended themselves and their cause to the Roman authorities.[6] Eusebius informs us that they left behind a defense of their faith.[7] Since Eusebius is rather vague in his description, the question whether *Defense* or *Apologia* was the actual title of their writings remains unclear.[8] Others addressed their apologies in the form of an 'embassy' or 'supplication', as in the case of Athenagoras' *Embassy or Supplication for the Christians*.[9] They take the form of petitions to Roman emperors, although it is not generally believed (in spite of some ongoing debate) that this was their real function and that the emperor was their true audience. Other apologies have titles that suggest a more overtly literary point of view. They may be a 'dialogue', as in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*; a 'discourse',[10] such as Tatian's *Discourse to/against the Greeks*; or an 'exhortation', as in Clement of Alexandria's '*Exhortation to the Greeks*'. The diversity of both titles and subject matter shows not only that the circumstances in which these

five volumes devoted to Justin were published in a third edition in 1876-1881; reimpr. Wiesbaden 1969; *Die ältesten Apologeten*, hrsg. von E.J. GOODSPEED (Göttingen 1915; reimpr. 1984).

[6] Others such as Apollinaris of Hierapolis and Miltiades could have been included in this group had their work been preserved.

[7] *Hist.eccl.* 4,3; 12. See also *praep.ev.* 1,3,2,4.

[8] Eusebius is primarily interested in presenting a chronological account of the emperors, the church leaders and the Christian writers of the second century.

[9] Title in Greek: *ΠΡΕΣΒΕΙΑ ΠΕΡΙ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΩΝ*. Traditional title in Latin: *Legatio sive Supplicatio pro Christianis.*

[10] The word in Greek is "logos".

works were produced may have varied, but it is clear that they also signaled different literary genres.[11] The subject matter of these works can differ, and their styles have varying degrees of sophistication. Thus in spite of their long association, these writings are not entirely comfortable under their common heading as 'apologetic'. The question arises of how to define the parameters of apologetic writing and whether apologetic writing should be viewed as a matter of style or of content — or perhaps of both. Should 'apologetics' be defined in a broader or a narrower sense? These problems already play out when the focus is on one author, let alone when two or more authors are grouped together. At this point there is no easy solution for these questions, which I only want to pose here and return to later.

The subject matter of these various 'apologies' tends to have common themes.[12] They often defend by attacking; pagan mythology, religion, and philosophy were criticized with varying degrees of aggressiveness. Some authors such as Tatian tended to be hostile to any kind of Hellenization. He speaks about the folly of Greek philosophy, which in his view has no relationship to Christian beliefs; Greek philosophy had nothing to say about the resurrection, and Greek mythology had little bearing on choices that people had to make.[13] Others such as Hermias and the author of the *Letter to Diognetus*, were equally convinced that the knowledge of Greek philosophy had little relevance for Christian beliefs; philosophers were charlatans, and their work was deemed vane and useless. Other

[11] See M. FIEDROWICZ, *Apologie im frühen Christentum. Die Kontroverse um den christlichen Wahrheitsanspruch in den ersten Jahrhunderten* (Paderborn 2000), 18-23; F. YOUNG, "Greek Apologists of the Second Century", in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire. Pagans, Jews, and Christians*, ed. by M. EDWARDS, M. GOODMAN and S. PRICE (Oxford 1999), 81-104, esp. 90-91.

[12] Many of these themes have been discussed in the volume on Christian Apologists and Greek culture, in *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, ed. by B. POUDERON and J. DORÉ, Théologie historique 105 (Paris 1998).

[13] See G. DORIVAL, "L'apologétique chrétienne et la culture grecque", in *Les apologistes chrétiens*, 423-465, 427.

Apologists, however, showed a greater appreciation of Greek philosophy and had some interest in mythology. The Alexandrians, Clement and Origen, may have gone the farthest using traditional philosophical arguments. Clement even advocated the legitimacy of philosophy and found a place for philosophy within his own theological system. No other Apologist went farther in exploiting these traditions for the benefit of articulating and advancing his own beliefs.

Since a number of the traditional apologetic themes return well beyond the second century, scholars have labeled some later Christian authors also as *Apologists,* grouping them with those of earlier times. In a way Arethas had already done this in the selection he made in the early tenth century. Among the later authors are not only Clement, Origen, and Eusebius, but even writers who were active well into the fourth and fifth centuries, such as Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Theodoretus of Cyrus. Needless to say, in spite of the continuation of apologetic themes, the religious and socio-political outlooks of these authors are rather different, and caution should be used when attempting to group them under the same heading as the second century Apologists. Different historical situations add new perspectives to old apologetic themes, and only careful reading and close comparison can determine the precise functions of the common material.

Like the earlier Apologists, later authors made use of Jewish apologetic traditions: for example, the idea of the 'theft of the Greeks'.[14] The tradition that Greeks had plagiarized the Jewish scriptures was long-lived.[15] Scenarios were reconstructed in which Homer, Plato, and numerous other Greeks either traveled to Egypt or otherwise came into contact with the wisdom of

[14] See D. RIDINGS, *The Attic Moses. The Dependency Theme in Some Early Christian Writers*, Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgiensia 59 (Göteborg 1995); reviewed in *REAug* 44 (1998), 123-125.

[15] For a survey of the early material, see M. ALEXANDRE, "Apologétique judéo-hellénistique et premières apologies chrétiennes", in *Les apologistes chrétiens*, 1-40.

Moses, which they appropriated as their own.[16] This theme was particularly linked to Greek philosophy, above all Plato. The apologetic discourse on plagiarism thus offered a way of addressing philosophical and even appropriating philosophical concepts and aspects of religious practices that were familiar to an educated Graeco-Roman audience. It was a strategy to engage that audience on its own terms and in its own cultural climate. In Alexandria especially, it may have been appealing to communicate in a language that was literary and elegant. To a degree not previously seen, Clement was 'embedded' in Hellenic culture, and his writing reflects the erudition of a literary man with a refined style and a curious mind.[17] He was clearly well versed in literary techniques and had a range that extended from philosophic reasoning, through cultural documentation, to poetry. Most of his writings show his deep involvement in the Classics, whether it was in Greek literature, philosophy, or religion — one might think of his adaptations of words of Homer and other poets, his quotes from Plato, and his precious references to Eleusis and other mystery cults.[18] In order to express his message in a language that was both understandable and resonant, Clement summoned up a myriad of quotations from every corner of Greek civilization. One can deduce that at least one of his works (the *Protreptikos*) was intended for non-Christian, newly Christian, or not-yet-Christian audiences.[19] Whatever the

[16] See DORIVAL, "L'apologétique chrétienne", 426.

[17] Marrou compares him with other erudites of imperial times, such as Pliny the Elder, Solinus, Pollux, Aulus Gellius, Plutarch, Athenaeus, and Aelian; H.-I. MARROU and M. HARL (Eds.), *Clément d'Alexandrie. Le Pédagogue*, Livre I, SChr 70 (Paris 1960), 80.

[18] Chr. RIEDWEG, *Mysterienterminologie bei Platon, Philon und Klemens von Alexandrien*, Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 26 (Berlin-New York 1987); ID., *Jüdisch-hellenistische Imitation eines orphischen Hieros Logos. Beobachtungen zu OF 245 und 247* (sog. Testament des Orpheus) (Tübingen 1993); H.G. MARSH, "The Use of MYSTERION in the Writings of Clement of Alexandria with special reference to his sacramental doctrine", in *JThS* 37 (1936), 64-80.

[19] The idea that the *Protreptikos* was intended for an inner-Christian audience, as Swancutt proposes, is an interesting novelty but hard to support when

background of his audience may have been, it is clear that, at least, they spoke the same cultural language. Not only did Clement communicate his thoughts to his audience in a cultivated fashion, presumably pleasing to his audience, but in a reciprocal movement, he also expressed his own thoughts and beliefs more richly through this Classical material. The apologetic discourse and its inherent polemics against idolatry, sacrifice, and oracles thus supported the position of the author himself. He used his interpretation of Greek philosophy as a powerful apologetic tool and as a means to mark out and explore his own territory.

Clement's *Protreptikos* offers a good point of departure for examining his apologetic discourse. This work, whose title stands in a venerable tradition of rhetorical and philosophical writing, is addressed to Greeks, presumably non-believers but well-educated ones. In the *Protreptikos* Clement invites his listeners to convert from their old and erroneous ways to the new and true Christian beliefs, and in a remarkable juxtaposition he confronts Graeco-Roman beliefs and traditions with the new cult of the Christians.[20] He discusses the views of Greek philosophers on God and the realm of the divine, and he compares their thoughts with the biblical revelation.[21] Clement hammers out his vision of the 'new' versus the 'old', proclaiming that the new beliefs are great and powerful, while the old ways of idolatry are degenerated and despicable. The traditional songs and legends of the Greeks are by far inferior to the new minstrel,

one relates the *Protreptikos* to later works, such as the *Pedagogue* and the *Stromateis*; see D.M. SWANCUTT, *Pax Christi: Romans As Protrepsis To Live As Kings*, Dissertation PhD, Duke University 2001 (UMI Microform 3041314, Ann Arbor, Michigan).

[20] J.K. BRACKETT, *An Analysis of the Literary Structure and Forms in the Protrepticus and Paidagogus of Clement of Alexandria*, Dissertation PhD, Emory University, 1986 (UMI Microform 8629845, Ann Arbor, Michigan), 48-49.

[21] For a discussion of the idea of God as a central element in the *Protreptikos*, see R.P. CASEY, "Clement of Alexandria and the Beginning of Christian Platonism", in *HThR* 18/1 (1925), 39-101, esp. 47-58.

God's logos, which gives order and harmony to the universe. As the new song, the logos, or Christ, sets the tone, but as the pre-existing word, the logos precedes the foundation of the universe; it is the origin of all and the cause of cosmic harmony.[22]

In a broad sweep Clement, brushes aside the traditional worship of sanctuaries, oracles, sacred springs, and characterizes them as old-fashioned and out-dated. He calls the mystery cults unholy, and proclaims that gods are really mortal and perishable men and their temples are truly tombs.[23] False opinions deceived humankind and led to idolatry.[24] Clement strikes hard at idolatry and argues vigorously against — as he sees it — the immorality of the gods, asserting that the Greeks and not the Christians are the 'atheists'.[25] Clement turns traditional values upside down, branding Greek piety as impiety, religion as superstition, legitimacy as illegitimate, and truth as falsehood. There is no equivalency in the comparison, since the one is by far inferior to the other.[26] In Clement's view, the pagan cults were bastardizations of the truth. This turning of the tables may well have had a certain shock effect on his audience. It also gives the modern listener a glimpse into the way Clement understood his own position and defined his new religion. He goes on to denounce the worship of statues and maintains that it makes no sense to adore senseless objects.[27] These images are the work of

[22] *Protr.* 1,1-10. See also D.T. RUNIA, "The Pre-Christian Origins of Early Christian Spirituality", retrieved from http://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/research/cecs/runia.htm.

[23] *Protr.* 2-3,11-45.

[24] *Protr.* 2,25ff.

[25] *Protr.* 2,23,1: Ταῦτα τῶν ἀθέων τὰ μυστήρια· ἀθέους δὲ εἰκότως ἀποκαλῶ τούτους, οἳ τὸν μὲν ὄντως ὄντα θεὸν ἠγνοήκασιν ... These words remind us of old Polycarp in the amphitheater, who returns the threat of the crowd, raising up his fist and mumbling to himself: "away with the atheists!" (αἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους); *Mart. Polyc.* 9. The same rhetorical reversal occurs in the thought of Clement.

[26] See the paper that Miguel Herrero presented in 2003 to the Boston Patristic Group: "From Helicon to Sion: Some Aspects of the Shaping of Paganism in the *Protrepticus* of Clement of Alexandria". This project is part of his forth-coming dissertation at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

[27] *Protr.* 4,46-63.

men, but God's true image is not to be found in material things but in the logos and consequently in the human mind. Clement alludes ingeniously to the Christians themselves as the living images of God.[28]

In the *Protreptikos* Clement's treatment of the search for God in philosophy and poetry is less severe than his scorn for idolatrous cults. He approaches the subject through a survey of the ideas of various philosophical schools about the gods and the divine nature of the universe.[29] His review has the quality of an introductory university course on philosophy. First come the pre-Socratics and others who worship the elements. Next are thinkers who in their search for a higher goal went beyond the elements to reach 'infinity'. In Clement's view, the Stoics conceived divine nature as permeating all matter, while the Peripatetics thought of the soul of the universe as the highest element. While his treatment is generally objective, there is no love lost between Clement and the Epicureans. Clement states that he is happy to forget Epicurus as a particularly impious sage. Arriving at Plato, Clement's tone takes a decidedly positive turn:

> "Whom do I take as helper in the search? For we have not altogether given up on you. Plato, if you wish. How then, Plato, should we trace out God? 'To find the father and maker of this universe is hard enough, and even if you have found him, it is impossible to declare him to everyone'. Why is it then in the name of God? 'Because he can in no way be expressed'. Well done, Plato, you have touched on the truth. But do not give up; join me in the search for the good".[30]

In his lively discourse Clement addresses the 'Greeks' and Plato in a direct way with 'you'. This rhetorical strategy not only

[28] *Protr.* 10,98,4.

[29] *Protr.* 5-7,64-76.

[30] *Protr.* 6,68,1-2: Τίνα δὴ λάβω παρὰ σοῦ συνεργὸν τῆς ζητήσεως; οὐ γὰρ παντάπασιν ἀπεγνώκαμέν σε. Εἰ βούλει, τὸν Πλάτωνα. Πῇ δὴ οὖν ἐξιχνευτέον τὸν θεόν, ὦ Πλάτων; "Τὸν γὰρ πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς εὑρεῖν τε ἔργον καὶ εὑρόντα εἰς ἅπαντας ἐξειπεῖν ἀδύνατον." Διὰ τί δῆτα, ὦ πρὸς αὐτοῦ; "Ῥητέον γὰρ οὐδαμῶς ἐστίν." Εὖ γε, ὦ Πλάτων, ἐπαφᾶσαι τῆς ἀληθείας· ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀποκάμῃς· ξύν μοι λαβοῦ τῆς ζητήσεως τἀγαθοῦ πέρι·

reflects common practice in apologetic discourse, but it also echoes the Socratic method of the Platonic dialogues; it gives Clement the opportunity to patronize Plato, praising him as a teacher would commend a good student and encouraging him to continue his progress. Clement refers to himself now as 'I' and now as 'we'; in the latter case, as a representative of the Christians, who are the source of the right answers his good student comes up with. Clement underlines this by pointing out to Plato the 'barbarian' sources he has been using. Clement employs this rhetorical strategy throughout his *Protreptikos*, as well as in the last two books of his *Pedagogue*.[31] It is an aspect of his attempt to define himself as a well-trained thinker, who is on speaking terms with the most celebrated champion of Greek philosophy. When the question about the sources of Plato's wisdom arises, Clement launches into the old refrain of the dependency of the Greeks. He maintains that, although Plato derives his knowledge from all directions — geometry from the Egyptians, astronomy from the Babylonians, healing incantations from the Thracians — it is particularly in the realms of theology and laws that he was dependent on the Hebrews.[32]

As with Plato, Clement also tries to bring the Pythagoreans into the Christian fold.[33] The attraction in this case is their monotheism, which is an argument that also had attracted other apologists, such as the author of the *Cohortatio ad Graecos*.[34] Clement claims that God inspired these thoughts. He is willing to find some truth among the poets as well, although he concedes that their writing is filled with fiction; Homer, Orpheus,

[31] In his dissertation on the literary structure of the *Protreptikos* and *Pedagogue,* John Brackett considers the usage of the first and second person pronouns (sing. and plur.) a common feature of epideictic literature and the language of the diatribe. Bracket made charts to show consistent patterns in Clement's usage of these pronouns; for the *Protreptikos* see BRACKETT, *An Analysis,* 50-67; 83-85.

[32] *Protr.* 6,70,1.

[33] *Protr.* 6,72,4.

[34] Recent studies have shown the importance of monotheism in late antiquity outside the Judeo-Christian realm, see *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, ed. by P. ATHANASSIADI and M. FREDE (Oxford 1999).

Hesiod, Sophocles, Euripides, Menander, and Aratus are all called on to recite their glimpses of theological truth. It is clear also that Clement demonstrates his own ease and versatility in making use of these exemplary literary figures. As with the Greek philosophers, however, his main point in putting the poets on stage is to uncover and contest the follies of pagan idolatry.[35] At the same time he patronizes them, appropriates them, and, in a way, christianizes them.

As a counterbalance to 'the old Hellenic spirituality',[36] Clement advances the Hebrew prophets, whose writings, as he says, are simple in style but have great power. They are models of virtuous living and short roads to salvation. Clement also maintains that God is a teacher through the scriptures.[37] He pleads for abandoning traditional Hellenic practices, just as children should abandon their childish ways. God offers his children a marvelous inheritance: heaven and earth can be theirs. God's logos is his true image, and the mind of man is an image of the logos; that is, as Clement puts it, the image of God's image. The children of God follow the laws, which are severe but life-giving. Humans were created innocent and free, but they lost their innocence through the love of pleasure. By Christ's incarnation and death on the cross, God redeemed humankind.[38] A final exhortation ends the work and replaces the mysteries of the Greeks with the mysteries of the logos, which are performed by men and women who lead a pure and righteous life. The mysteries of the logos promise to give a vision of God and provide rest and immortality. Humans can become part of the divine reality, and the hearers are called up to a choice between life and destruction.[39]

As seen above, Clement's apologetic themes are largely traditional in themselves: the rejection of temples, oracles, statues

[35] *Protr.* 7,73-76.
[36] RUNIA, "The Pre-Christian Origins", see above n.22.
[37] *Protr.* 8-9,77-88.
[38] *Protr.* 10,89ff.
[39] *Protr.* 12,118-123.

and idolatry; and a critique of the human failings and immorality of the gods. Perhaps more surprising is his attention (albeit negative) to the mystery religions and his high regard for some philosophers and poets. It is particularly in his response to the Greeks about the role of philosophy that these apologetic themes play out. He not only criticizes Greek thought, but he also adapts it. He replaces the Platonic concept of the ascent of the rational soul to its supra terrestrial origins with his own 'gnostic' philosophy of ascent toward knowledge and salvation. This remodeling has some relation to but goes well beyond the traditional 'theft of the Greeks' scenario. In his later work, the *Stromateis*, he will even become more explicit about the role of Greek philosophy.[40] There he puts philosophy on almost equal footing with the Hebrew prophets and has it function as a way of acquiring partial knowledge of God before the coming of Christ. Thus the major changes between the earlier Apologists and Clement may lie in these areas — his exploration and adaptation of philosophical concepts and his approach to mystery religions.

Clement also differs from earlier Apologists in the style and character of his writings. The *Stromateis*, for example, his major work of 'gnostic notes according to the true philosophy', appears to be a novel composition — at least, in a Christian ambiance. Eusebius calls it a 'spreading' (κατάστρωσις), not only of the divine scripture but of anything useful Clement could find in materials from the Greeks.[41] Apologetic themes that formed the basis of the discourse in the *Protreptikos*, recur in the *Stromateis* though not continuously. In the *Stromateis* they center around

[40] For the role of Greek philosophy in Clement's theology, see E.F. OSBORN, *The Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria* (Cambridge 1957); S.R.C. LILLA, *Clement of Alexandria. A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism* (Oxford 1971). The work of Einar Molland is also still very illuminating; E. MOLLAND, "Clement of Alexandria on the Origin of Greek Philosophy", in *SO* 15/16 (1936), 57-85; ID., *The Conception of the Gospel in the Alexandrian Theology* (Oslo 1938), 40-69.

[41] EUS. *Hist.eccl.* 6,13,4.

the traditional idea of the dependency of the Greeks on writings of Moses in relation to philosophy, poetry, language, or letter writing; often the examples are rather trivial. Compared to the *Protreptikos* Clement brings in a new element in the *Stromateis* by compiling elaborate chronological lists; they contain 'world history' from the beginning of times to the present and show the venerable age of the law of Moses. Although Clement's *Stromateis* have many apologetic passages, his *Protreptikos* carries through apologetic themes in a more consistent way.

Since the *Protreptikos* presents apologetic themes so extensively and coherently, the question arises of what the relationship is between the apologetic themes and the protreptic element in this work?[42] For an answer, it is necessary to look more closely at Clement's concept of *protreptic*, a word that occurs not only in its adjectival format as in the title of his writing, but also in cognate substantive and verbal forms. The choice of terminology impacts the way in which Clement aired apologetic themes to his audience. The term also says something about the way he formulated and understood his own mission. The protreptic style is not intended as a defense against accusations and attacks from the outside world as much as it is a pro-active, missionary tool of inviting, encouraging, stimulating, exciting, promising, persuading, urging, exhorting, impelling, and pushing his audience into the Christian fold. A reading of Clement makes it clear that προτρέπω can have all these meanings. It is worth noting that Clement himself provided the title *Protreptikos* to his work; in one of his later writings, in *Str.* 7,4,22,3,

[42] Modern studies have contested the idea that *protreptics* was a literary genre, as this was defined in older studies and handbooks. They showed that protreptic discourse can turn up in all kinds of literature and therefore they prefer to speak about a protreptic style; see D.E. AUNE, "Romans as a Logos Protreptikos in the Context of Ancient Religious and Philosophical Propaganda", in *Paulus und das antike Judentum*, hrsg. von M. HENGEL and U. HECKEL (Tübingen 1991), 91-124; S.R. SLINGS, "Protreptic in Ancient Theories of Philosophical Literature", in *Greek Literary Theory After Aristotle. A Collection of papers in Honour of D.M. Schenkeveld*, ed. by J.G.J. ABBENES, S.R. SLINGS, and I. SLUITER (Amsterdam 1995), 173-192; D.M. SWANCUTT, *Pax Christi*, see above n.19.

he explicitly referred to this title. He also used the protreptic terminology throughout his oeuvre, and not just in his *Protreptikos*. Statistics show that the words προτρέπω, προτρεπτικός, and cognates, occur 58 times in total (*Protreptikos* 19, *Pedagogue* 16, *Stromateis* 18, other 5), compared to only 14 occurences of ἀπολογέομαι or ἀπολογία.[43] It seems clear that Clement found the protreptic element congenial to his way of communicating, and that this orientation provides his discourse with a less defensive and more assertive quality.

The characterization of protreptic writing presents problems similar to those encountered in the definition of apologetics. The term *protreptic* is even more debated in discussions of ancient philosophical literature; it can been connected to a whole range of writings, whether explicitly through their titles or implicitly through their contents.[44] Aristotle's *Protreptikos* was among the most well-known and influential examples of exhortations to philosophy, but the work has been lost except for a papyrus fragment and some ancient quotations and adaptations, as in Iamblichus' book of the same title.[45] Plato's *Euthydemus* contained protreptic dialogues, as did (Ps.)Plato's *Clitophon*. Galen, almost a contemporary of Clement, wrote a *Protreptikos* to the art of medicine, part of which has been preserved.[46] From

[43] Clement uses the word ἀπολογία mostly in a neutral way in the sense of 'justification' or 'excuse'. The verb ἀπολογέομαι can appear in the sense of a legal defense in court, in conjunction with biblical texts, such as *Lc.* 12,11. On three occasions he uses ἀπολογέομαι or ἀπολογία in the sense of putting up a defense against accusations of the Greeks (*str.* 2,1,2,1; 7,15,89,1; 7,15,90,3). As indicated above, Clement frequently argues against the Greeks in the *Stromateis* but without using these terms (f.e. 2,1,1,1; 7,1,1,1).

[44] SLINGS, "Protreptic in Ancient Theories", 173.

[45] D.S. HUTCHINSON and M. RANSOME JOHNSON, *Aristotle's Protreptic Arguments to Philosophy*; a new English translation of the witnesses to *ΠΡΟΤΡΕΠΤΙΚΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΟΥΣ*, 2003, retrieved from: www.chass.utoronto.ca/~phl102y/Protrepticus.pdf.

[46] Its title reads in Greek: *ΠΡΟΤΡΕΠΤΙΚΟΣ ΛΟΓΟΣ ΕΠΙ ΤΑΣ ΤΕΧΝΑΣ*, and in Latin: *Adhortatio ad artes addiscendas*; E. WENKEBACH, *Galens Protreptikosfragment*, Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und Medizin 4,3 (1935), 90-120.

these examples it can be seen that the protreptic style of argumentation can be applied to a variety of literary forms, such as dialogues, discourses, and letters, which makes it difficult to define protrepsis as a genre.

Equally debated is the function of this kind of writing. In his great study on education in Antiquity, Henri-Irénée Marrou pointed out that in Hellenistic times a competitive environment existed between parallel forms of higher education, whether this was in rhetoric, philosophy, medicine, or law. The heads of schools may have offered lectures as a kind of recruiting tool to publicize their teachings and themselves. In these speeches they formulated their viewpoints and 'exhorted' potential students to join their constituency.[47] In this view protrepsis belongs to philosophical 'conversion' literature.[48] It is worth mentioning that not only scholars in ancient philosophy but also New Testament scholars have joined the debate and done extensive background study on the subject.[49] Their primary focus of interest was the apostle Paul, who made use of protreptic speech in his letters. In her dissertation Diana Swancutt tried to modify some of the scholarly positions by stressing the function of protrepsis as cultural critique. She views it less as an attempt to convert people than a need of particular groups to define themselves in relationship to others who challenge their identity.[50] The Dutch scholar S. R. Slings also tried to correct earlier views on theories about protreptic discourse. His insightful but complex article sheds new light on passages of Epictetus, Posidonius, Philo of Larissa, Clement, and others presenting analysis of protreptic discourse. He noted that 'protreptic' never stands alone; it

[47] *Clément d'Alexandrie. Le Pédagogue*, Livre I, éd. par H.-I. MARROU et M. HARL (Paris 1960), 12; H.-I. MARROU, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité* (Paris 1956), 205-206.

[48] See *Moral Exhortation. A Greco-Roman Sourcebook*, compiled by A. MALHERBE (Philadelphia 1986); S.K. STOWERS, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Chico, CA, 1981); ID., *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia 1986).

[49] AUNE, "Romans as a Logos Protreptikos"; SWANCUTT, *Pax Christi.*

[50] SWANCUTT, *Pax Christi,* 191.

always functions as protreptic to something else.[51] He also concluded that protrepsis always appears in well-organized divisions and in an ethical context.[52]

Clement formulates his own vision of protreptic discourse and its function in one particularly dense passage. The text is not in the *Protreptikos* itself but at the beginning of the *Pedagogue*, in a passage that forms a kind of transition between the two works. Apparently the author is presenting a theoretical framework in which the various aspects of the logos are intertwined with various aspects of human life and behavior — in short with human ethics. Analyzing this passage will help to form a clearer idea of some key terms in his system. It also may clarify how Clement's terminology relates to other philosophical writing of this kind. As in so many ancient authors, Clement begins his *Pedagogue* with a rhetorical fanfare:

> "What the Pedagogue promises[53]
>
> 1, 1 We have put together, o you children, a groundwork of truth, an unshakable foundation of knowledge of the holy temple of

[51] SLINGS, "Protreptic in Ancient Theories", 181.

[52] SLINGS, "Protreptic in Ancient Theories", 191.

[53] Τί ἐπαγγέλλεται ὁ παιδαγωγός.

1,1 Συγκεκρότηται κρηπὶς ἀληθείας, ὦ παῖδες ὑμεῖς, ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς, ἁγίου νεὼ μεγάλου θεοῦ θεμέλιος γνώσεως ἀρραγής, **προτροπὴ** καλή, δι' ὑπακοῆς εὐλόγου ζωῆς ἀιδίου ὄρεξις, νοερῷ καταβληθεῖσα χωρίῳ.

Τριῶν γέ τοι τούτων περὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὄντων, ἠθῶν, πράξεων, παθῶν, ὁ **προτρεπτικὸς** εἵληχεν τὰ ἤθη αὐτοῦ, θεοσεβείας καθηγεμών, ὁ τροπιδίου δίκην ὑποκείμενος λόγος εἰς οἰκοδομὴν πίστεως, ἐφ' ᾧ μάλα γανύμενοι καὶ τὰς παλαιὰς ἀπομνύμενοι δόξας πρὸς σωτηρίαν νεάζομεν, ψαλλούσῃ συνάδοντες προφητείᾳ "ὡς ἀγαθὸς τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ὁ θεός, τοῖς εὐθέσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ", 2 πράξεών τε ἁπασῶν λόγος ἐπιστατεῖ ὁ ὑποθετικός, τὰ δὲ πάθη ὁ παραμυθητικὸς ἰᾶται, εἰς ὢν πᾶς ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος λόγος, τῆς συντρόφου καὶ κοσμικῆς συνηθείας ἐξαρπάζων τὸν ἄνθρωπον, εἰς δὲ τὴν μονότροπον τῆς εἰς τὸν θεὸν πίστεως σωτηρίαν παιδαγωγῶν. 3 Ὁ γοῦν οὐράνιος ἡγεμών, ὁ λόγος, ὁπηνίκα μὲν ἐπὶ σωτηρίαν παρεκάλει, **προτρεπτικὸς** ὄνομα αὐτῷ ἦν — ἰδίως οὗτος ὁ παρορμητικὸς ἐκ μέρους τὸ πᾶν προσαγορευόμενος λόγος· **προτρεπτικὴ** γὰρ ἡ πᾶσα θεοσέβεια, ζωῆς τῆς νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ὄρεξιν ἐγγεννῶσα τῷ συγγενεῖ λογισμῷ· 4 — νυνὶ δὲ θεραπευτικός τε ὢν καὶ ὑποθετικὸς ἅμα ἄμφω, ἑπόμενος αὐτὸς αὑτῷ, παραινεῖ τὸν **προτετραμμένον**, κεφάλαιον τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν παθῶν ὑπισχνούμενος τὴν ἴασιν. Κεκλήσθω δ' ἡμῖν ἐνὶ προσφυῶς οὗτος ὀνόματι παιδαγωγός, προακτικός, οὐ μεθοδικὸς ὢν ὁ παιδαγωγός, ἢ καὶ τὸ τέλος αὐτοῦ βελτιῶσαι τὴν ψυχήν ἐστιν, οὐ διδάξαι, σώφρονός τε, οὐκ ἐπιστημονικοῦ καθηγήσασθαι βίου.

the great God, a beautiful exhortation, a longing for eternal life through obedience in accordance with the logos, laid down in the field of the mind.

Since the following three things are integral to human beings — their ways of life, their actions, and their passions — the protreptic logos (Λ. προτρεπτικός) took possession of their ways of life, guiding in the worship of God, lying as a keel of a ship under the edifice of faith. Because of him we rejoice exceedingly, renounce old beliefs solemnly, and grow young again on the way to salvation; we chime in with the chant of the prophecy 'how good God is to Israel, to the righteous of heart'. 2 The counseling logos (Λ. ὑποθετικός) presides over all actions, and the encouraging logos (Λ. παραμυθητικός) heals the passions, but this is one and the same logos, who rescues humans from their natural and worldly customs, guiding them as a pedagogue toward the unique salvation of faith in God. 3 The heavenly guide then, the logos, received the name 'protreptic' (προτρεπτικός), when he invited us (παρεκάλει) to salvation — this name is specifically given to the logos who urges on (Λ. πὰρορμητικός), the whole taking its name from a part.[54] For piety as a whole is protreptic (προτρεπτικός), since it engenders in the natural ability to reason a desire for life now and in the future. 4 — but now being inclined both to heal (θεραπευτικός) and instruct (ὑποθετικός) at the same time, following his own steps, he gives precepts to the

2,1 Καίτοι καὶ διδασκαλικὸς ὁ αὐτός ἐστι λόγος, ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν· ὃ μὲν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς δογματικοῖς δηλωτικὸς καὶ ἀποκαλυπτικός, ὁ διδασκαλικός, πρακτικὸς δὲ ὢν ὁ παιδαγωγὸς πρότερον μὲν εἰς διάθεσιν ἠθοποιίας **προὐτρέψατο**, ἤδη δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν τῶν δεόντων ἐνέργειαν παρακαλεῖ, τὰς ὑποθήκας τὰς ἀκηράτους παρεγγυῶν καὶ τῶν πεπλανημένων πρότερον τοῖς ὕστερον ἐπιδεικνὺς τὰς εἰκόνας. 2 Ἄμφω δὲ ὠφελιμώτατα, τὸ μὲν εἰς ὑπακοήν, τὸ παραινετικὸν εἶδος, τὸ δὲ ἐν εἰκόνος μέρει παραλαμβανόμενον διττὸν καὶ αὐτὸ παραπλησίως τῇ προτέρᾳ συζυγίᾳ, τὸ μὲν αὐτοῦ ἵνα μιμώμεθα αἱρούμενοι τὸ ἀγαθόν, τὸ δὲ ὅπως ἐκτρεπώμεθα παραιτούμενοι τὸ φαῦλον τῆς εἰκόνος.

3,1 Ἴασις οὖν τῶν παθῶν ἐνθένδε ἔπεται, κατὰ τὰς παραμυθίας τῶν εἰκόνων ἐπιρρωννύντος τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ ὥσπερ ἠπίοις φαρμάκοις ταῖς ὑποθήκαις ταῖς φιλανθρώποις εἰς τὴν παντελῆ τῆς ἀληθείας γνῶσιν τοὺς κάμνοντας διαιτωμένου. Ἴσον δ' οὐκ ἔστιν ὑγίεια καὶ γνῶσις, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν μαθήσει, ἡ δὲ ἰάσει περιγίνεται.

... 3, 2 ... Σπεύδων δὲ ἄρα τελειῶσαι σωτηρίῳ ἡμᾶς βαθμῷ, καταλλήλῳ εἰς παίδευσιν ἐνεργῇ τῇ καλῇ συγχρῆται οἰκονομίᾳ ὁ πάντα φιλάνθρωπος λόγος, **προτρέπων** ἄνωθεν, ἔπειτα παιδαγωγῶν, ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐκδιδάσκων.

[54] Synechdoche.

> one who has been persuaded (προτετραμμένον); in sum, he promises to heal our passions. Let us call him by one name that suits him well: namely, pedagogue. The pedagogue occupies himself with upbringing, not with pursuit of knowledge. His aim is to improve the soul, not to teach it and to introduce the soul to a virtuous, not to an intellectual life.
> 2,1 Although the same logos is didactic (Λ. διδασκαλικός), it is not so now; for the didactic word is explanatory and revealing in matters of doctrine, but the pedagogue, being effective, first urged us (προὐτρέψατο) toward a disposition for character building (ἠθοποιία), but now he also persuades us (παρακαλεῖ) to perform our duties, giving pure instructions (ὑποθήκας) and showing examples of those who erred earlier to those who come later. 2 Both approaches are most beneficial; the one that leads to obedience is paraenetic (παραινετικόν) in style; the other that takes the form of an example, is double and itself corresponds to the previous duality: on the one hand, that we imitate and choose the good part of the example and, on the other, that we turn away (ἐκτρεπώμεθα) and reject (παραιτούμενοι) the bad part.
> 3,1 From this now follows healing of the passions, as the pedagogue strengthens our souls with encouraging (παραμυθίας) examples and guides the sick with his loving precepts (ὑποθήκαις), as if 'with gentle medicines', to the perfect knowledge of the truth. Health and knowledge are not equivalent, but the latter is a consequence of learning, the former of healing.

After a passage about the physical and moral process of healing as a way to receive the logos, Clement ends the section with:

> ... 3,2 ... Eager then to lead us to perfection through gradual steps of salvation, the logos, who in all respects loves humans (Λ. φιλάνθρωπος), makes use of a beautiful arrangement that corresponds with an effective system of education: he first urges us (προτρέπων), then guides us as a pedagogue (παιδαγωγῶν), and finally teaches us (ἐκδιδάσκων)".

Clement presents an anthropological scheme that consists of morals, actions, and passions (ἤθη, πράξεις, πάθη). This triple division impinges on the multiple representations of the logos, which is itself a polyvalent term: the spoken word, discourse, reason, divine word, second person of the trinity, the savior,

Christ.[55] To add to the complexity, Clement's division in three reflects both the activities of the divine logos and the literary forms of Clement's philosophical discourse. He expounds a grand scheme in which the logos urges the believers (προτρέπω), guides them as a pedagogue (παιδαγωγέω), and teaches them (ἐκδιδάσκω). The terminology of this scheme is repeated in the titles of two of his surviving works, the *Protreptikos* and the *Paidagogos*. It might be noted that the former reflects a venerable tradition of works by that name, the latter appears to be a novelty. Clement may have invented the title *Paidagogos* to match his *Protreptikos* and to make both of them parallel to his grand scheme. To be fully consistent with this scheme he should have written a third work perhaps entitled the *Didaskalos, (Logos) Didaskalikos,* or *Didaskalia*. Clement also mentioned that a work in the εἶδος διδασκαλικόν belonged to the spiritual realm and was aimed at contemplation.[56] On various occasions in the *Stromateis* allusions to a *didaskalos* resurface, but whether he actually ever wrote such a work has been hotly debated for many decades. Marrou calls it the *questio vexata* of the Clementine trilogy. It remains intriguing, indeed, whether the third part would have resembled a work like the *Stromateis* or part thereof; scholars also have suggested an altogether different writing. Intriguing as this may be, this vexed question does not have to concern us here any further.

The introduction to the *Paidagogos* translated above presents the logos in its various functions.[57] As the first stage on the way to salvation, the logos προτρεπτικός invites people to conversion. According to Clement's scheme, the 'exhorting' logos is directed toward the human way of life and to morality.

[55] Marrou termed this multiplicity in meaning "l'amphibologie féconde entretenue par Clément"; MARROU and HARL, *Clément d'Alexandrie. Le Pédagogue*, Livre I, 46.

[56] *Paed.* 1,3,8,3; see A. MÉHAT, *Étude sur les 'Stromates' de Clément d'Alexandrie*, Patristica Sorbonensia 7 (Paris1966), 89-95.

[57] For a discussion of the functions of the logos in this passage, see also CASEY, "Clement of Alexandria" (above n.21), 60-63.

Character building is part of it; a ἠθοποιία, the 'forming' or 'moulding' of character, was an well-known concept in protreptic discourse, a common fixture in philosophical debates on ethical theory and practice. In the following stage, the logos ὑποθετικός calls to action through counsel and advice; further down Clement calls this notion παραινετικός, which is on par with ὑποθετικός. In the same stage the logos παραμυθητικός, which encourages and consoles, plays its role; it is equivalent to the logos θεραπευτικός, which heals moral deficiencies, such as the πάθη: that is, sensations, emotions and passions. The wording is clearly inspired by the technical terminology of the Stoics, who divided their ethical systems in similar ways.[58] There are other epithets of Stoic origin in this passage as well. The logos παρορμητικός appears to be a synonym in Clement for προτρεπτικός and belongs to the initial phase. Then there is the logos διδασκαλικός, on which Clement touches in passing; he has no use for it at this point, since he is not going to speak about the didactic function of the logos now but about its pedagogical role.[59] The logos διδασκαλικός represents the third stage of the ascent, but, as noted, Clement does not elaborate on it here. Another favorite occurs toward the end of the passage: the logos φιλάνθρωπος, which appears to be an over-all function not bound to any phase.[60] In spite of the multiplicity of functions, Clement wants to preserve the unity of the logos.

One of the roles of the pedagogue-logos is as a doctor or healer. This medical reference is another fixture in discourses on virtues and the virtuous life. It has a long tradition, examples of which can be found in the thought of many authors, among

[58] See, for example, a letter of Seneca referring to Posidonius, in which the same categories appear: *praeceptio* (παραινετική), *suasio* (ὑποθετικός), *consolatio* (παραμυθητικός) and *exhortatio* (προτρεπτικός or παρορμητικός); SEN. *epist.* 95,65; also *epist.* 89 and 94; MÉHAT, *Étude,* 83.

[59] Repeated in *paed.* 1,3,8,3· ὃ δὴ ὑπερκείσθω τὰ νῦν. See also SLINGS, "Protreptic in Ancient Theories", 190.

[60] See also *paed.* 1,7,55,2; 58,2; 1,8,63,1.

them Epictetus and Philo of Larissa.[61] Speaking about the process of healing the ills of the soul, Clement remarks that the pedagogue guides the sufferers with loving precepts, and — with a nod to Homer — 'with gentle medicines'.[62] Clement defines the distinction between health and knowledge; the health of the soul comes as the result of healing, and knowledge comes as a result of learning. This may be another allusion to the idea that the cure of the soul is still part of the phase of pedagogical training, while knowledge belongs to a higher stage, in which the soul is supposed to have been cleansed from all such stains and infirmities. The theme of Christ as the healer of the soul is well-known throughout Christianity, and Clement will return to it on various occasions.[63]

Another staple of protreptic discourse is the contrast between positive and negative elements. In the passage above the distinction was between 'choosing the good part' and 'rejecting the bad part'. A few chapters later Clement repeats this message, having the Pedagogue prescribe what should be done and forbid the opposite.[64] The antithesis between good and bad goes hand in hand with two contrasting incentives; namely, persuasion and dissuasion. Thus the verb προτρέπω has as its counterpart — often in close proximity — ἀποτρέπω. Clement and other philosophers use both verbs as technical terms in their discussions of the theory and practice of morality.[65] In the passage above, Clement alludes in a cryptic way to examples of what to do and what not to do. He did not offer any examples, so it is necessary to grope around for

[61] For examples, see SLINGS, "Protreptic in Ancient Theories", 179; MÉHAT, *Étude,* 85.

[62] HOM. *Il.* 4,218.

[63] Current theories about the historical Jesus, have given renewed attention to the model of Jesus as a healer, see S. DAVIES, *Jesus the Healer: Possession, Trance, and the Origins of Christianity* (London 1995).

[64] *Paed.* 1,3,8,3.

[65] *Protr.* 1,4; 8,77,1; *paed.* 1,10,89,2; *str.* 1,17,83,5.

clues as to what he had in mind. In other parts of his work he seems to develop this line of thought more fully. He frequently brings up biblical passages that were exemplary of divine punishment, such as the story of Sodom and Gomorrah in the book of *Genesis*;[66] or the 25.000 people who were exterminated for fornicating in the book of *Numbers*.[67] Clement explicitly interprets these stories as menacing examples that warn and correct us. They instruct people what to do and what to avoid along the same lines that Paul does in his *Letter to the Corinthians*.[68]

Comparisons between the moral systems of Clement and other philosophers reveal much terminology in common. André Méhat has assembled parallels from Philo of Larissa, Eudorus of Alexandria, Posidonius, Seneca, and Albinus.[69] In a detailed analysis, however, Méhat has shown that the common terms and concepts play different roles in the various systems. Clement has an added peculiarity in that he compresses the terminology by turning several of the concepts into synonyms.[70]

Clement clearly wants to built up an ethical system in which accepted philosophical language serves his over-all view of ascending stages of religious experience. In his view, moral underpinnings are an essential basis for a cognitive upper part. While he leans heavily on Platonic language for his grand perception of the ascent to knowledge and salvation, he looks primarily towards the Stoa for the categories of morality. This

[66] *Gen.* 19; CLEM. *protr.* 10,103,4; *paed.* 1,8,69,3; 2,10,89,3; 2,4,43-44.

[67] *Num.* 25,9; CLEM. *paed.* 1,10,90. MÉHAT, *Étude,* 313-314.

[68] As, for example, in *1 Cor.* 10.

[69] More recent studies such as of the Dutch scholar S.R. Slings, tend to confirm A. Méhat's observations. In addition to the philosophers listed above, Slings included authors, such as Cicero and Epictetus; SLINGS, "Protreptic in Ancient Theories", 173-175; 182-183; Philo of Larissa (159/8–84/3 BCE, Platonist); Eudorus of Alexandria (fl. *c.* 25 BC, Platonist with Stoic and Pythagorean influences); Posidonius (Stoic, *c.* 135- *c.* 51 BCE); Seneca (Stoic, 4 BCE/1CE- 65 CE); Albinus/Alcinoos (Platonist, 2nd c. CE); Cicero (Academic Skeptic; Stoic, 106-43 BCE); Epictetus (Stoic, mid-1st to 2nd c. CE).

[70] MÉHAT, *Étude*, 87-89.

should not come as a surprise, since it is known that Platonism in this period incorporates Stoic doctrine and terminology as well as elements of Aristotelian logic and Pythagorean ideas.

Where does this bring us? Earlier the question arose about the relationship between apologetics and protreptics in Clement's discourse. It seems to me that the two are not strictly parallel in his usage; 'apologetic' seems to refer to themes and subject matter while 'protreptic' is more connected with a style, a manner of address and a mode of discourse with a strong ethical component.[71]

While 'apologetic' has its origin in the rhetorical device of a defense, the concept takes on a different role in Clement. He continues to touch on all the themes of an apology, but they are transferred into a new stylistic or rhetorical framework. At the risk of oversimplification, it could be said that the message is apologetic but the package is largely protreptic. The message takes on a more assertive, a more confident tone.

Apologetic themes are not confined to only one work in Clement. They form the backbone of the *Protreptikos*, but they are scattered over other writings as well, most notably the *Stromateis*. Time and again Clement will revisit questions of Greek superstition and idolatry; he will reiterate that Greek philosophers, Plato κατ' ἐξοχήν, were disciples of Moses and dependent on the 'barbarian' scriptures. Although Clement lessened the pejorative connotations of some of these non-biblical traditions — for example, that of philosophy — these apologetic arguments stand by and large in the tradition of a Justin or Tertullian.

Clement uses the protreptic style throughout all his writings. As shown above, the most dense passage on 'protreptic' and its

[71] Protreptic speech is closely related to other forms of discourse, such as the *diatribe* and *paraenesis*, see G.E. STERLING, "Hellenistic Philosophy and the New Testament", in *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*, ed. by S. PORTER, New Testament Tool and Studies 25 (Leiden 1997), 313-358; A.J. MALHERBE, "Hellenistic Moralists and the New Testament", in *ANRW* II 26,1 (1992), 267-333; S.K. STOWERS, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (above n.48).

theoretical trappings occurs in the *Pedagogue*. In that passage Clement attempts to express Christian faith through Greek philosophical categories, presumably to make it more acceptable to a pagan elite. This is, in my view, still the main function of protrepsis for Clement. Protreptic presentation could moreover make his arguments function in a new and more positive way. He urged his auditors not only to reject the wrong choices, but also to make the right ones. He exhorted them to avoid the worship of idols, which would lead to the worship of the true God, toward salvation, and toward eternal life. In the *Pedagogue* Clement stated that the whole worship of God or piety was hortatory in its own right. This exhortation intended to guide people onto the right track went far beyond the areas involved in traditional apologetic themes. There were numerous realms in which people could stray in their lives and behavior — they ate, drank, dressed themselves, had children, and needed direction and correction in multiple ways. For Clement, the protreptic style and way of expression had a vast range of applications.

To summarize, Clement built on existing Christian apologetic traditions but took them into different directions by integrating new aspects of Hellenic culture in his approach. He employed philosophical and rhetorical schemes as modes of expression but by doing so transformed both the schemes and the traditional apologetic subject matter. The use of the protreptic style — that is, the format of exhortation — was just one element in this strategy. A precise definition of the apologetic element in Clement's work is harder to formulate than his overall strategy. In a narrow sense it consists of traditional ideas of the dependency of the Greeks and the rejection of Greek religious customs. In a broad sense apologetic themes and discourse permeate everything that Clement wants to include in his vision of the 'true philosophy'. Every aspect of that philosophy is, in his words,

> "to show the Greeks that only the 'Gnostic' is truly pious; so that philosophers on learning what kind of person the true Christian is, may condemn their own ignorance in rashly and accidentally

> persecuting the Name; without reason they call those who know the true God 'atheists'".[72]

By this appropriation of Hellenic culture, Clement sets in motion a powerful process, which will continue throughout early Christianity. This approach will prove fruitful for later speculative theology well into Byzantine times.

[72] *Str.* 7,1,1,1: Ἤδη δὲ καιρὸς ἡμᾶς παραστῆσαι τοῖς Ἕλλησι μόνον ὄντως εἶναι θεοσεβῆ τὸν γνωστικόν, ὡς ἀναμαθόντας τοὺς φιλοσόφους οἷός τίς ἐστιν ὁ τῷ ὄντι Χριστιανὸς τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἀμαθίας καταγνῶναι, εἰκῇ μὲν καὶ ὡς ἔτυχεν διώκοντας τοὔνομα, μάτην δὲ ἀθέους ἀποκαλοῦντας <τοὺσ> τὸν τῷ ὄντι θεὸν ἐγνωκότας. See also *str.* 6,1,1,1; 7,9,54,3.

DISCUSSION

L. Perrone: E' possibile accertare una 'genealogia' di Clemente nell'ambito della letteratura apologetica? O meglio ancora, è giusta l'impressione che con Clemente si sia prodotta una svolta sostanziale rispetto agli apologisti precedenti, nel senso che egli ha dato della 'filosofia' il riconoscimento più alto ed esplicito, fino ad intenderla quasi come una *praeparatio evangelica*? Dalla relazione la specificità di Clemente sembra emergere non solo sul piano del rapporto con la tradizione filosofica, ma anche per l'attenzione particolare con cui guarda alla tradizione letteraria greca e alla religione dei misteri. Se è vera — come credo, almeno in parte — la tesi esposta da Fredouille, secondo cui la letteratura apologetica si adatta, innovandosi, alle diverse situazioni, che cosa dobbiamo pensare del contesto storico-culturale in cui Clemente ha elaborato il suo discorso apologetico?

Quanto al tentativo di distinguere fra protrettica e apologetica, credo si possa dire che anche il discorso protrettico implica — come avviene tendenzialmente nelle opere apologetiche — una dialettica in due tempi: in negativo, come abbandono di determinate opinioni e comportamenti; in positivo, come assunzione di nuove opinioni e comportamenti. Mi viene in mente, come analogia più ravvicinata tra gli scritti di Origene, lo scritto *Sulla preghiera*, dove i due momenti sono ben chiariti nei loro contenuti rispettivi. Non so se alla luce di questa considerazione si possa o meno sottolineare la differenza tra apologia e protrepsis (in qualche misura, mi sembra, anche il 'discorso protrettico' *Sulla preghiera* è per Origene un'opera 'apologetica', poiché egli combatte la visuale che ne nega l'utilità).

A. van den Hoek: In my paper I have tried to sketch the position with which Clement entered the debate, which is different

from earlier second-century authors even from someone like Justin. It appears that the non-Christian ambiance against which some of Clement's argument was directed represents in part Clement's own cultural identity and background. He knows the language and the habits from within and clearly wants to voice his message in this language. It is hard to say to whom Clement's arguments may have appealed, but it is clear that he makes a positive attempt to attract people who were able to understand the cultured language with its complex literary mannerisms: there may have been people who enjoyed listening to or reading some of the familiar quotations from the classical poets, an audience that was also appreciative of new interpretations. The position from which Clement enters this discussion is not of someone who has to defend his beliefs from an inferior position, but from someone who competes in an equal way. For this reason the view of Marrou is very attractive who postulates an environment in which heads of schools offered lectures as a kind of recruiting tool to publicize their teachings and attract a potential audience. If one wants to characterize Clement's role in an apologetic tradition, it is the affirmative and confident character of his stance that is most striking.

Thank you for underlining the two-part aspect of protreptic discourse in somewhat different terms than I had used. I also appreciate your reference to Origen's treatise *On Prayer* in which you distinguish apologetic and protreptic tendencies similar to what we saw in Clement's work. It is possible that some connection may have existed between Origen's treatise (*or.* 5,1; 29,15; 31,4; 32) and parts of the *Stromateis*, see my list in "Origen and the Intellectual Heritage of Alexandria. Continuity or Disjunction?", in *Origeniana Quinta*, ed. by R.J. Daly (Leuven 1992), 40-50.

A. Birley: How surely can we really date Clement? Eusebius probably only knew that he outlived Commodus. Can we infer that he actually gave regular lectures, e.g. in a house of a rich patron (ancient equivalent of Baron von Hardt); on lines of what is described in Origen's case (Eus. *hist.eccl.* 6,2,13ff.)?

A. van den Hoek: For the questions of dating, I would like to refer to the works of Méhat and Nautin.[73] Méhat (p.54) places his birth (perhaps in Athens) around 140?, the conversion to Christianity around 165?; his *Protreptikos* around 190?, *Pedagogue* 195?; the first book of the *Stromateis* between 193 and 211 (perhaps 197?), *Stromateis* 2-5 between 199-201?; departure from Alexandria perhaps in 202/203. His death is dated after 215 and before 221. The traditional idea based on a correspondence between Origen and Alexander of Jerusalem as preserved in Eusebius was that Clement spent his later years in Caesarea in Cappadocia, but Nautin has advanced the hypothesis that this may have been Jerusalem.

It is likely that Clement taught various levels of instruction, perhaps not in an overtly institutional setting but somehow connected with a church or a house-church community. From his writing, however, we have no clear information how this might have functioned.

A. Wlosok: Wie beurteilen Sie die von B. Pouderon (*D'Athènes à Alexandrie. Études sur Athénagore et les origines de la philosophie chrétienne* [Québec 1997]) aufgestellte Hypothese (gestützt auf Philipp von Side), dass Athenagoras Schulhaupt einer christlichen Philosophenschule in Athen gewesen sei und diese nach Alexandrien gebracht bzw. verlagert habe? (Vgl. dazu Fiedrowicz, S.44f.)

Sie haben das Verhältnis von Apologetik und Protreptik bei Clemens mit den Kategorien Inhalt (*content, themes, subject matter*) und Form (*protreptic style, way of expression, presentation*) zu bestimmen versucht und mit dem Bild einer apologetischen *message* in 'protreptischer Verpackung' illustriert (S.91f.). Ist damit die Funktion der Protreptik innerhalb der Apologetik (im allgemeinen und im vorliegenden Fall) wirklich schon zutreffend erfaßt? Die apologetische

[73] A. MÉHAT, *Étude sur les 'Stromates' de Clément d'Alexandrie* (Paris 1966); P. NAUTIN, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des IIe et IIIe siècles* (Paris 1961).

Aufgabe als solche ist ja doch eine komplexe und umfaßt eine Vielfalt von ineinandergreifenden und zusammenwirkenden Funktionen, zu welchen von Anfang an auch die protreptische (also die werbende, auf Bekehrung zielende und insofern missionarische) gehört. Clemens hat nun gerade die protreptische Zielsetzung in den Vordergrund gestellt und ihr die defensive und zugleich polemische untergeordnet. Diese wird dadurch ja wohl kaum zur 'Verpackung'. Aber müssen wir der apologetischen Protreptik nicht auch eine eigene *message* zugestehen?

A. van den Hoek: If Clement was a native of Athens, he represents the connection with Athens himself. The new reconstruction around Athenagoras is very intriguing and certainly worth studying but at the same time very problematic.

For the relationship between apologetic and protreptic discourse, you certainly touch on a point with which I have been struggling as well. Let me return to the concept of early Christian apologetic writing and Apologists in general. These categories are in my view modern categories. They may have been coined particularly for those Christian authors who, according to Eusebius, left behind a defense of their faith. In this way the term 'apology' is used in a narrow sense, and it is clear that in this sense Clement does not qualify to be called an Apologist. It is not without interest to look at the way in which Clement himself employs the terms ἀπολογία and ἀπολογέομαι. His usage indicates that these terms do not play a prominent role in his writing, at least not in the sense that we are interested in. On the other hand, προτρέπω, protreptic discourse and also the title *Protreptikos* are well-established concepts in ancient rhetorical traditions. Clement uses these words very frequently, and it seems clear that he reflects on this terminology deliberately.

In answer to your question: part of the problem of defining the relationships between the 'apologetic' and 'protreptic' elements, stems from the confusing mixture of modern and ancient concepts. I have tried to demonstrate that in Clement's case the

protreptic elements were most important and that the apologetic elements have to be taken in a very broad sense. When trying to relate the two concepts in a kind of shorthand, I gave a simplified picture to express the idea that compared to the earlier writers Clement's message takes on a more assertive and confident tone. You are right in pointing out that the distinction between content and form does not solve the question and is ultimately not satisfactory. The basic problem for me is that 'apologetic' is modern and 'protreptic' is ancient, and that we probably should not use these terms in such close proximity. I was, however, 'commissioned' to speak about these two aspects and tried to find out what they might mean for the reader of Clement.

Chr. Riedweg: It seems important to look more precisely at the background of ancient rhetorical theory, taught everywhere in the Roman Empire, and to clearly distinguish between apology in the narrow, technical sense and apologetic literature as a (modern?) label for a literary genre. The *Protreptikos*, to be sure, is not an apology in the narrow sense, but belongs to the genre of the *symbouleutikos logos*. The use of this genre may well reflect a growing self-confidence on the part of the Christian community in Alexandria. In taking up a genre so strongly associated with philosophy and with attempts at converting to e.g. the Peripatos, Clement seems to engage in a competition with other schools of thinking.

A. van den Hoek: Thank you for pointing this out. The use of technical terminology is certainly very striking in the case of Clement's prologue to the *Pedagogue*. It is hard to define exactly where and how Clement's protreptic discourse fits into the history of ancient rhetoric, since he uses his skills in an innovative way not seen before in a Christian context. In addition, rhetorical theory was not a static entity but developed over time; as I understand from specialists in this field, it reached a high level of sophistication in the second and third centuries, so around

Clement's time. My feeling is that Clement's prose is closer to *epideictic* than *deliberative* speech, since the latter is perhaps more geared toward judicial and political matters.

I agree that there are indications that as a teacher he had to compete with others for his clientele, not only with other philosophers on the outside but with other Christian teachers as well.

J.-C. Fredouille: Une remarque très générale. En dépit des différences de personnalité et de caractère entre Clément d'Alexandrie et Tertullien, il y a des convergences d'idées entre eux, comme on en constate entre Eusèbe de Césarée et Lactance. Dans un cas comme dans l'autre, les auteurs n'échappent pas à leur temps.

À propos de votre note 58: ces termes, qui trahissent le goût des stoïciens pour les divisions et les classifications, demeurent, sinon synonymes, du moins fort proches, en tout cas indissociables: on tente de persuader celui que l'on console, en même temps qu'on l'exhorte, etc. Dans cette énumération manquent les *exempla*. Dans les *Lettres*, en effet, si je me souviens bien, Sénèque demande s'il est possible d'exhorter en recourant seulement aux préceptes (*modo philosophico*), ou seulement en recourant aux exemples (*modo rhetorico*), ou s'il n'est pas préférable de joindre les exemples aux préceptes.

A. van den Hoek: It has often struck me that there are common thematic features and, particularly, commonalities in the use of biblical texts between Tertullian and Clement. I cannot explain this other than to say that certain themes and texts may have been 'in the air' or perhaps that they were used as scriptural clusters in communal practice. The same is true for the connection with Irenaeus, but there it can be shown that both Tertullian and Clement had some knowledge of the works of Irenaeus.

You are right in observing that Clement does not offer any *exempla* in his theoretical exposition at the beginning of the

Pedagogue. He only alludes to examples in a very oblique way. When he introduces examples elsewhere in his work, these are often biblical and exemplify disasters of apocalyptic proportions, such as the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

M. Alexandre: À propos du prologue du *Pédagogue* de Clément. Bien que le finale en 1,3,2 distingue clairement les trois étapes — protreptique/pédadogique/didascalique — le texte précédant ce finale est bien plus sinueux et difficile à interpréter (par exemple παραμυθητικός, ὑποθετικός en 1,1,2 et 3; cf. 1,2,1; 1,3,1, ne devraient-il pas être traduits de façon unifiée? ὑποθετικός devrait être mis en relation avec les ὑποθῆκαι, préceptes de *Paed.* livres 2 et 3?). Le coeur du texte concerne le niveau du *Pédagogue* avec des retours sur le niveau du *Protreptique* en 1,1,3. Pour ce qui est du premier niveau, il est lié aux ἤθη (*ways of life*) et le nom ἠθοποιία (1,2,1) est à rapprocher de θεοσέβεια en 1,1,1: il s'agit moins d'appel à l'éthique que d'appel à la piété, à la foi (des réminiscences pauliniennes peut-être avec κρηπίς ἀληθείας).

Peut-on distinguer les éléments apologétiques du *Protreptique* de ceux qu'on trouve dans les *Stromates* 1, 2 et 5 — antiquité de Moïse et chronologies, thèse des emprunts, statut de la philosophie (cf. Philon)? Quels apologistes antérieurs a lu Clément? Il connaît l'apologétique judéo-hellénistique, par ex. Aristobule, les fragments d'historiens, les forgeries poétiques. Qu'en est-il pour les apologistes chrétiens?

A. van den Hoek: I thank you for your remarks, which as always are very precise. I agree with you that the ἠθοποιία for Clement ultimately refers to the θεοσέβεια. In the introduction to the *Pedagogue*, however, Clement is still engaged in a rather theoretical discourse and displays many reminiscences of technical philosophical language, as for example shown by the term ὑποθετικός, which I translated in first instance as 'counseling'. One can also translate it more emphatically as 'prescriptive' or 'instructive' in the sense of 'giving instructions'. Of course the word ὑποθήκη itself has a range of meanings, reaching from

'suggestion', 'counsel', 'advice', to 'warning', or 'instruction'. In my translation I tried to reflect the multiplicity of meanings in Greek. In his article on ancient philosophical theories, Slings provided materials that show how Clement's terminology functioned in comparison with other philosophical works. He shows that Clement compresses the vocabulary, by using words in a synonymous way; for example, παραινετικός and ὑποθετικός are almost equivalent in Clement's usage, while the terms were distinguished in earlier writers. He equally uses παραμυθητικός as synonym of θεραπευτικός.

As for the relationships between the apologetic elements in the *Protreptikos* compared to the (later) *Stromateis*: it is indeed striking that certain themes do not appear in one or the other. As you noticed the chronologies only occur in the *Stromateis*. The difference may partly be explained by the different outlook of the two works and perhaps also by different audiences for them. With regard to earlier Christian Apologists: I think that Clement quoted only Tatian.

J.J. Herrmann: I wonder whether it is likely that Clement operated in a church setting? He clearly had access to an excellent library (or libraries), and such resources were available at Alexandria in the famous library. The evidence of archaeology for libraries in church buildings in later times is scanty and suggests that their contents were not necessarily very intellectual; one can think of the sixth century church at Petra, where the library attached to the apse seems to have contained primarily legal and financial documents.

A. van den Hoek: Because of his many quotations from earlier Jewish and Christian sources and also the character of these quotations, I have argued elsewhere that Clement likely was associated with a library that was Christian.[74] If there were house

[74] "How Alexandrian was Clement of Alexandria? Reflections on Clement and his Alexandrian Background", in *The Heythrop Journal* 31/2 (1990), 179-194.

communities in which people gathered, one can postulate that there were also libraries or depositories of books. Zuntz has argued that toward the end of the second century already a very good text existed in Alexandria of the Pauline corpus, far superior to most other biblical texts available in the second century. His conclusion was that the Christian community must have possessed a scriptorium that set the standard for an Alexandrian type of biblical text.[75] The step from a Christian scriptorium to a library is small. But of course, this is all hypothetical; there are just a few indications from various sides, and the question of how private these operations were and how they actually functioned, remains totally unknown.

[75] G. ZUNTZ, *The Text of the Epistles. A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum* (London 1953), 273.