This is an engaging monograph. One may not always agree with the Author, and there are quite a few misprints,\(^1\) but it is undeniable that plenty of interesting and inspiring elements are contained in this book. Ashwin-Siejkowski (A.) maintains that Clement was above all a Biblical exegete, although most of his exegetical production is lost. In this respect, I think a comparison with Origen – whose relationship with Clement is controversial – is illuminating. Origen was «the greatest exegete the church has ever had» (M. Simonetti), but his bold theological and philosophical speculations were always grounded in the Bible. What Origen did was in fact exegetical theology and philosophy. Clement’s exegetical work, like that of Origen, is at the same time exegetical and theological/philosophical. A part of it is preserved by Photius, who in *Bibl. Cod.* 159 provides an abridgement of Clement’s lost *Hypotyposeis*, the focus of the book under review. Besides scarce fragments and a partial Latin translation, one must rely on Photius for the *Hypotyposeis*. But Photius, who regarded iconoclasm as the arch-heresy and Christian Platonism as a source of heresies, and who rather had a penchant for the Aristotelian line, requires a critical reading, also because he wrote so long after Clement and from the perspective of his own theological concerns. A. is aware of this and is careful in his evaluation of Photius’ words. I also agree with him that the conflict between Alexandrian allegorical exegesis of the Bible and Antiochian literal exegesis should not be exaggerated (13).\(^2\) Photius does not

---

\(^1\) E.g., Ἰησοῦς without accent (p. 12); πουρής with an acute accent instead of a grave, being followed by καί; ἐκκαί for τὸ followed by παράδειγμα on 37; ἔγεν for ἔγενεν (97); οἱ for οἱ (98); ἀπάθης with an acute accent on its second alpha (100); μετεμψυχώσεις for μετεμψυχώσεισ (113); Ἄρα προὶς for Προὶς προὶς (123 n. 29, thrice); ἄνθρωπος with a subscript iota (138); «development» for ‘development’ (33); «Heraclites» for ‘Heraclitus’ (135), «the Ideas were pre-existence for ‘pre-existent’; «which is not surprising» for ‘which is not surprising’ (33); «Pantaneus» for ‘Pantaenus’ (112; 161); «Saviour who originating» for ‘originated’ (ibid.); «that the Clement believed» for ‘that Clement believed’ (116); ‘Origin’ for ‘Origen’ (118; 160); «his main concern is to emphasise’ for ‘emphasis’ (121); «Basilides and seine Schule» for ‘B. und seine Schule’ (ibid. n. 21); «in the presence life» for ‘present’ and «neither if it became angelic or evil» for ‘not even if...’ (114); «description» for ‘description’ (135); «Andrew Louth’s a very helpful summary» for ‘A. L.’s very helpful summary’ (145 n. 2); crux interpretatorum for crux interpretum (148); «during in earlier chapters» for either ‘during’ or ‘in’ (ibid.); «it most surprising’ for ‘it is most surprising’ (151), etc.

criticise Clement’s other works, such as the *Stromateis*, but he deems his *Hypotyposeis* full of ‘myths’ and ‘blasphemy’, like pagan works. A. groups Photius’s accusations into metaphysical, Logos-related, and anthropological.

Let me begin with the anthropological charges, which are the (relatively) easiest to explain away. The first is that of upholding the doctrine of metensomatosis, an accusation that was hurled against Origen as well, on no grounds, and is related to that of believing in a series of worlds (see below). A. does not remark on this link; he simply assumes that Photius levelled this charge against Clement because the reincarnation issue was of concern in his own day, and provides a survey of metensomatosis doctrines in Middle Platonism, Neopythagoreanism, Gnosticism and Hermeticism. Clement overtly criticised metensomatosis, as Origen – I add – did even more definitely. I suspect that Photius accused Clement of believing in metensomatosis because of his misunderstanding concerning the doctrine of the succession of aeons (see below): he thought that Clement posited a series of worlds in which transmigrations of souls would take place. This is all the more probable in that the same accusation of upholding metensomatosis was levelled against Origen due to his theory of a succession of aeons prior to the final restoration. The same connection between the notion of a series of aeons and the theory of metensomatosis seems to me to underlie the charge against Clement.

A second charge related to anthropology is that of imagining the creation of Eve from Adam «in a shameful and impious way». What Photius meant is unclear. A. sensibly hypothesises that this accusation is connected with the ‘Valentinian’ idea of Adam’s androgyny, reported in Clement’s *Excerpta ex Theodoto*. Photius may have mistaken this as Clement’s own view – indeed, this would not be the only case. Though, a view of the first ἄνθρωπος as gender inclusive seems to me to have been widespread outside Valentinianism, e.g. in Philo and his first ἄνθρωπος as neither man nor woman, or in Bardaisan – moreover a contemporary of Clement – and his concept of the cosmic Adam and cosmic Christ, subsuming both halves of humanity and transcending gender differences.¹ An influence from Plato’s myth of the androgynous on these conceptions cannot be ruled out. Clement reflected on Jesus’s claim that in the next world there will be no marriage, interpreting it as a prophecy of the disappearance of gender distinctions, which not even in this world are admitted for the soul. Clement insists that souls are neither male nor female; this is also why women can attain ‘gnostic’ perfection according to him. Gender distinction is purely instrumental to the perpetuation of human race: only women bear babies, and not all women, e.g. not the consecrated. A. remarks that «Clement is inclined to recognise female characteristics in God, but God’s ‘motherhood’ is related to his way of dealing with his creature and is not an expression of God’s own ‘female’ nature» (143). Clement, however, ascribes a female nature to God precisely in the Father’s gen-

---

eration of the Son; this belongs much more to intra-divine ‘theology’ than to ‘economy’. The third anthropological charge is that of teaching that angels mated with women and begot an offspring (cf. Gen 6:1–4). A. rightly shows that this reflects a common belief in Clement’s time; I only add the documentation ad-
duced by Dal Basil Martin.

The first charge of those concerning Logos theology bears on the alleged doc-
trine of two Logoi of the Father. I suspect, however, that the passage quoted by
Photius is in fact Clement’s report of the ideas of some Gnostics, such as are
often found in his Excerpta ex Theodoto. That Clement postulated only one
Logos is held by Hanny F. Hägg, Mark J. Edwards and me, amongst others. A.
agrees; yet, he does not think that Photius misunderstood a ‘Gnostic’ passage for
one by Clement, but that he misunderstood Clement. Nevertheless, the corre-
spondences between that passage and Gnostic thought are such as to make me
suppose that Clement was citing a ‘Gnostic’ concept, easily mistook by Photius
for Clement’s own.

The second accusation related to Logos theology is that of
deeing the Son of God a creature (κτίσμα). As A. correctly notes, also provid-
ing an excursus on Philo’s doctrine of the Logos, Clement repeatedly uses κτίσμα
in reference to the Son, but this does not mean that he deemed the Son a creature
as opposed to divine: the use of κτίσμα as a denial of the Son’s divinity is post-
Arian. Clement uses πρωτοτόκος and πρωτόκτιστος as synonyms. I observe that
the same accusation of subordinationism and even denial of the divinity of
the Son was levelled against Origen as an alleged precursor of Arianism, but on no
grounds. Photius, long after Nicaea, attached to κτίσμα the ‘Arian’ connotations
that it had not in Clement’s day. A. surmises that Clement avoided calling the
Son ουμοούσιος with the Father because the ‘Gnostics’ used ουμοούσιος. Origen,
though, who knew its Gnostic use, did not refrain from adopting it, which was
employed not only by ‘Gnostics’ in his time.

The third Logos-related charge is that of a docetic conception of Christ’s in-
carnation. A. examines all of Clement’s passages on the body of Christ: some are

---

1 Clement ascribes the characteristic of being θηλυ to the Father in Quis dives 37: ‘The
unspeakable part of God is Father and the part that has sympathy with us is [or has become:
γέγονε] Mother. By loving, the Father became female [θηλυκενθη] and a great proof of this
is the one whom he bore from himself’, the Son. In the Paedagogus the Father is called
τροφευς (I 41.2 and elsewhere) and the Logos ‘the care-soothing breast of the Father’ (I
43.4); the Logos has nipples at which the infants are suckled (Paed. 1 hymn 42–50) and
the Father has ‘fatherly breasts that supply milk’ to the children (Paed. I 46.1; I 43.3). This
attribution of female breasts (μαστοί) to God and Christ-Logos is already found in Rev
1:15–16, where the glorious Christ is said to have μαστοί, whereas the angels have στήθη,
and in the Bible, Philo and Josephus μαστοί never describes male breasts, but it is only
applied to women. This representation probably aims at depicting the glorified Lord –
high priest as subsuming all of humanity and not just a half.


3 This is also the impression of F. Jourdan, ‘Le Logos de Clément soumis à la question’

4 See I. Ramelli, ‘Origen, Greek Philosophy, and the Birth of the Trinitarian Meaning of
Hypostasis’, forthcoming in HTR.

5 Argument in my ‘Origen’s Anti-Subordinationism and its Heritage in the Nicene and
even anti-docetic, whereas docetism is rightly pointed out by A. in ‘Gnostic’ texts from Nag Hammadi. A. does not explain the conflict between this evidence and Photius’s accusation, but I think that the charge of incarnational docetism was suggested to Photius by the above-mentioned passage in which Clement probably reported a ‘Gnostic’ doctrine of the two Logoi based on a docetic idea of the incarnation (the incarnation of the Logos is the presence of reason in each human). Photius mistook that passage for an expression of Clement’s own view; this is why he thought Clement had a docetic notion of Christ’s incarnation.

The first among the metaphysical charges is that of upholding the eternity of matter and Ideas. A. draws a fine picture of the notions of matter and Ideas in Middle Platonism and Philo; he rightly remarks that the *Timaeus* was a point of reference for these. I add that it was so for a Christian Middle Platonist as well, Bardaisan.¹ With Annewies van den Hoen, A. correctly traces Clement’s notion of double (intelligible and sense-perceptible) creation back to Philo. Clement, indeed, declares his indebtedness to Judaism’s ‘barbarian philosophy’ on this score. A. rightly deduces that Clement thought both Ideas and matter to have preexisted this sense-perceptible world. Yet, this does not entail, I note, their coeternity with God, just as it does not in Bardaisan, who also presupposed the preexistence of matter and Ideas to this sense-perceptible world, but deemed them creatures of God and not coeternal with God. A., following Panayiotis Tzamalikos, remarks that Origen maintained a doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo* (36); I certainly agree and have considerable arguments to support this.²

The second ‘metaphysical’ accusation concerns the postulation of more worlds prior to Adam. Photius uses κόσμοι and A. accepts this. I suspect Clement might have used άιόνες and Photius misunderstood it as a synonym of κόσμοι. Clement probably drew on the Bible, which often uses άιόν as a synonym of ‘olam or a long period, generation, or aeon. It is significant that the *Hypotyposis*, an exegetical work, relied precisely on the Bible. This surmise of mine is confirmed by Origen’s theory of the άιόνες, which also was misunderstood and yet was grounded in Scripture. After all άιόνες, Clement and Origen posited the final apokatastasis.³ I agree with A.’s translation of the Biblical phrase το άιόνον not as ‘eternal fire’ but as «fire of the world» (45); more exactly, I would say, ‘of the other world’ or ‘the world to come’. As I have suggested, Photius condemned Clement’s doctrine of the άιόνες because he connected it with the ‘pagan’ theory of metensomatosis. Interestingly, this is also the reason why Origen’s doctrine of

¹ See I. Ramelli, Bardaisan of Edessa: A Reassessment of the Evidence and a New Interpretation, also in the Light of Origen and the Original Fragments from *De India*, Piscataway 2009.
the αἰῶνες was deemed suspect. A.'s overall conclusion, in any case, is decidedly sound: Photius's accusations of blasphemy and heresy are untenable.
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Der Editionsband gliedert sich in zwei Hauptteile: Im ersten Teil werden ein theologischer und 13 literarische Texte herausgegeben, die aus dem kaiserzeitlichen Oxyrhynchites stammen, im zweiten und umfangreicheren Teil Urkunden aus römischer und spätantiker bzw. byzantinischer Zeit präsentiert. Die in jedem einzelnen Fall vorbildlich edierten und mit großem Sachverstand kommentierten Schriftstücke werden in der für die Reihe gewohnten hohen Qualität gedruckt und in vielen Fällen von einer farblichen Abbildung der Papyri am Ende des Bandes begleitet.
