

THE OTHER CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA: COSMIC HIERARCHY AND INTERIORIZED APOCALYPTICISM¹

BY

BOGDAN G. BUCUR

ABSTRACT: Clement of Alexandria's *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, *Eclogae Propheticae*, and *Adumbrationes* depict a cosmic hierarchy featuring, in descending order, the divine Face, the seven beings first created, the archangels, and the angels. This account is problematic in that it seems to incorporate a contradiction: one set of texts presents a fix cosmic hierarchy populated by different types having at its top the seven *protoclists*. A second set of texts, however, interprets this process of initiation as a continuous ascent on the cosmic ladder, marked by an ongoing cyclical transformation of humans into angels, of angels into archangels, and of archangels into *protoclists*.

This article sets forth the principles governing Clement's hierarchical cosmos, and proposes a solution to the apparent contradiction between the two accounts. In essence, Clement of Alexandria internalizes the cosmic ladder and the associated experience of ascent and transformation, offering an early example of what scholars have termed "interiorized apocalypticism."

¹ (*) An earlier version of this study was presented before the Seminar on the Jewish Roots of Eastern Christian Mysticism at Marquette University (www.mu.edu/magom), in April of 2004. I would like to thank the participants, and especially Fr. Alexander Golitzin, Dr. Andrei Orlov, and Dr. Kevin Sullivan, for their pertinent observations and critique. Many thanks also to Fr. Elijah Mueller, Rebecca Luft, and Dr. Vlad Niculescu, who read the manuscript. I owe a great debt of gratitude to Dr. Julian Hills for a wonderful semester spent reading and discussing Clement's *Eclogae Propheticae*.

The Greek text is that of the GCS critical edition (O. Stählin, L. Früchtel, U. Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus* [3 vols; 4th ed.; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1985—]). For the *Stromateis*, I am using the text available in the ANF collection, with slight modifications (indicated as such); references to the *Stromateis* indicate book, chapter, and section. The passages from the *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, *Eclogae Propheticae*, and *Adumbrationes* are my own translation.

1. "The Other Clement" and the Secret Tradition

Dwarfed and almost obscured by the "canonical" Clement of Alexandria—the Hellenist, the Christian Middle Platonist and Stoic, the heir to Philo, the precursor of Origen—there exists, as it were, "another" Clement. The voice of this "other Clement," echoing the theology and practices of the "elders"—Jewish Christian teachers of earlier generations—is dominant in the surviving fragments of the *Hypotyposes*: the *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, the *Eclogae Propheticae*, and the *Adumbrationes*.²

The "other Clement" is one of our most eminent witnesses of secret traditions ascribed to the apostles and circulating among Jewish Christian teachers during the first three centuries of the common era.³ According to Jean Daniélou, this secret tradition, imparted orally, only to advanced Christians, was "the continuation within Christianity of a Jewish esotericism that existed at the time of the Apostles" and concerned in large measure the mysteries of the heavenly worlds; more precisely, among Jewish-Christians, starting as early as the apostles themselves, the concern was to relate the mystery of Christ's death and resurrection to the mysteries of the heavenly world.⁴ In his own exploration of this topic, Gedaliahu Guy Stroumsa sug-

² On the *Hypotyposes* and their place in the Clementinian corpus, see Pierre Nautin, "La fin des *Stromates* et les *Hypotyposes* de Clément d'Alexandrie," *VigChr* 30 (1976), 268-302. For a survey of other theories pertaining to the origin and function of the *Excerpta* and the *Eclogae*, see 270-282. On the presence of Jewish and 'Jewish Christian' traditions in these works by Clement, see Jean Daniélou, 'Les traditions secrètes des Apôtres,' *Eranos Jahrbuch* 31 (1962), 199-215. Throughout this essay, the term 'Jewish Christian' will be taken in the sense described by Daniélou in his classic work *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964). As long as the narrative of an early and radical parting of the ways between 'Christianity' and 'Judaism' remains normative, despite its inability to explain a great deal of textual evidence from the first four centuries, the term 'Jewish Christianity' remains useful as a description of 'Christianity' itself. For more recent treatments of this problem, see the essays collected in A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed (eds.), *The Ways that Never Parted* (TSAJ 95; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).

³ Clement mentions such Jewish Christian teachers—"the elders"—and their oral teaching with great reverence: *Eclogae* 11; 27.1; *Adumbrationes* in 1 Jn 1:1; fragments 8, 14, and 25 (in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 6.14.5, 6.9.2, 6.13.9).

⁴ "Le contenu de cette tradition secrète concerne les secrets du monde céleste, qui était déjà dans le judaïsme l'objet d'un savoir réservé. Cette tradition secrète n'est donc à aucun degré relative à l'essence du message apostolique, qui est le Christ mort et ressuscité. Mais elle correspond à une explicitation de ce mystère dans sa relation avec le monde céleste. Les Apôtres pensaient que cette explicitation ne relevait pas de

gested that Clement of Alexandria lays out something quite similar to the “secret tradition” of contemporary Rabbinic circles (*Mishna Hagiga* 2:1): an initiation to *ma’asse bereshit* (“the things pertaining to creation”), and an initiation into the mysteries of the divine throne (*ma’asse merkavah*), on the basis of mystical exegesis of key-texts in Genesis and Ezekiel.⁵ Stroumsa’s brief note is worth exploring in greater detail.

According to Clement, “the gnostic tradition according to the canon of the truth” comprises first an account of the world’s coming into being (περὶ κοσμογονίας), beginning with “the prophetic utterances of Genesis” (ἀπὸ τῆς προφητευθείσης . . . γενέσεως), followed by an ascent to “the subject-matter of theology” (ἐπὶ τὸ θεολογικὸν εἶδος).⁶ This θεολογικὸν εἶδος is elsewhere (*Strom* 1.28.176) also described as a matter of visionary contemplation, ἐποπτεία, and explained in light of Plato and Aristotle.⁷ Yet εἶδος also happens to be the term used by the LXX version of Ezekiel 1:26 (ὁμοίωμα ὡς εἶδος ἀνθρώπου). Moreover, we know that Jews and Christians of the Greek diaspora were fond of drawing a connection between Ezekiel 1:26 and the Platonic theory of forms (e.g., εἶδος ἀνθρώπου in *Parm* 130 C).⁸ It appears quite likely, then, that “the subject-matter of theology” that Clement has in

l’enseignement commun, mais d’une initiation plus poussée, de caractère oral” (Daniélou, “Les traditions secrètes des Apôtres,” *Eranos Jahrbuch* 31 (1962), 214.

⁵ Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa, “«Paradisis»: Esoteric Traditions in Early Christianity,” in *Hidden Wisdom: Esoteric Traditions and the Roots of Christian Mysticism* (Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1996), 42-43. See also his article “Clement, Origen, and Jewish Esoteric Traditions,” in *Hidden Wisdom*, 109-131.

⁶ *Strom* 4.1.3: ἡ γοῦν κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας κανόνα γνωστικῆς παραδόσεως φυσιολογία, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐποπτεία, ἐκ τοῦ περὶ κοσμογονίας ἥρτηται λόγου, ἐνθὲνδε ἀναβαίνουσα ἐπὶ τὸ θεολογικὸν εἶδος, ὅθεν εἰκότως τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς παραδόσεως ἀπὸ τῆς προφητευθείσης ποιησόμεθα γενέσεως . . . (“The science of nature, then—or rather vision—, as contained in the gnostic tradition according to the rule of the truth, depends on the account of the world’s coming into being, ascending thence to the subject-matter of theology. Whence, then, we shall begin our account of what is handed down with that which was prophesied in Genesis . . .,” ANF modified).

⁷ Ἡ μὲν οὖν κατὰ Μωυσῆα φιλοσοφία τετραχῆ τέμνεται . . . καὶ τέταρτον ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὸ θεολογικὸν εἶδος, ἢ ἐποπτεία, ἦν φησιν ὁ Πλάτων τῶν μεγάλων ὄντως εἶναι μυστηρίων, Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ τὸ εἶδος τοῦτο μετὰ τὰ φυσικὰ καλεῖ. (“Now, the Mosaic philosophy is divided into four parts . . . and the fourth, above all, is the subject-matter of theology, the vision, according to Plato, of the truly great mysteries [cf. *Phaedr.* 250 BC; *Symp.* 210 A]; Aristotle calls this ‘meta-physics’” [ANF, modified]).

⁸ Jarl Fossum, “Colossians 1.15-18a in the Light of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism,” *New Test. Stud.* 35 (1989), 188. Cf. Alan Segal, *Paul the Convert. The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1990), 42.

mind concerns both Plato's "vision of truly great mysteries," and Ezekiel's vision of the divine chariot-throne.⁹

Within this second area of speculative concern—"the ascent to the subject-matter of theology," to use the phrase in *Strom* 4:1:3—the following pages will discuss the hierarchical cosmology that Clement inherited from earlier tradition, and the way in which he modified it to suit his own theological concerns.

2. *Clement of Alexandria's Celestial Hierarchy*

On the basis of a theological tradition inherited from Jewish Christian "elders," Clement of Alexandria furnishes a detailed description of the hierarchical structure of the universe.¹⁰

a. *The Principles of the Hierarchy*

This celestial "hierarchy"—if the anachronism is acceptable—features, in descending order, the Face, the seven beings first created, the archangels, finally the angels.¹¹ Clement's "celestial hierarchy" comprising the Logos,

⁹ The outlined similarity is, of course, not suggestive of any sort of direct borrowing. "Clement does not reflect living contacts with Jewish scholars" (Annewies van den Hoek, "The 'Catechetical' School of Early Christian Alexandria and Its Philonic Heritage," *HTR* 90 [1997], 80). However, Jewish traditions of the second Temple are influential in the shaping of both Christianity and Judaism.

¹⁰ The fact that Clement's strictly hierarchical universe goes back to earlier tradition has been demonstrated by older research: Paul Collomp, "Une source de Clément d'Alexandrie et les Homélie Pseudo—Clémentines," *Revue de philologie et littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 37 (1913), 19-46; Wilhelm Bousset, *Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom: Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenäus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915). Despite the pertinent critique of some of Bousset's conclusions (Johannes Munck, *Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandria* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933], 127-204), the thesis of a Jewish and Jewish-Christian literary source behind Clement remains solidly established (see Georg Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1956], 68, n. 3).

¹¹ The term "hierarchy" was coined centuries later by the anonymous author of the Pseudo-Areopagitic Corpus. I have taken the liberty to use it for Clement's description of the celestial realm, because the fundamental operating principles of the Clementinian and Dionysian universes are quite similar. This fact has been noted in passing by Alexander Golitzin (*Et Introibo Ad Altare Dei: The Mystagogy of Dionysius Areopagita, with Special Reference to its Predecessors in the Eastern Christian Tradition* [Analekta Vlatadon 59; Thessalonica: 1994], 265), but has not yet received adequate treatment.

the seven *protoclists*, the archangels, and the angels¹² seems to be continued by an ecclesiastical hierarchy, since Clement affirms that “the advancements (προκοπαί) pertaining to the Church here below, namely those of bishops, presbyters and deacons, are imitations (μιμήματα) of the angelic glory” (*Strom.* 6:13:107). The orienting principle (ἀρχή) of the hierarchy is the “Face of God,” a theme whose prominence in the apocalyptic literature of Second Temple Judaism was only amplified with the emergence of Christianity.¹³ More than “the radiant façade of God’s anthropomorphic extent,” more than a code-expression for “a vision of the enthroned Glory,”¹⁴ the Face of God is for Clement, as for some later Hekhalot traditions, a hypostatic “Face.”¹⁵ For Clement, “the Face of God is the Son” (*Excerpta* 10:6)—an

¹² Since God is neither an accident (συμβεβηκός), nor described by anything accidental (*Strom.* 5:12:81), he is beyond the hierarchy, and should not be counted as the first of five hierarchical levels (*pace* Collomp, “Une source,” 24, and Oeyen, *Engelpneumatologie* 20). To designate the Father, Clement repeatedly alludes to the famous Platonic “beyond ousia” (ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας, Rep 509b), which had been already appropriated by Justin (ἐπέκεινα πάσης οὐσίας, *Dial* 4:1). God is one and *beyond* the one and the monad (*Paed.* 1:8:71), and *beyond* cause (τὸ ἐπέκεινα αἴτιον, *Strom.* 7:2:2).

¹³ C.L. Seow, “Face,” in K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, P.W. van der Horst (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (Leiden; Boston: Brill; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 322-325. According to Andrei Orlov (*The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* [TSAJ, 107; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck; 2005], 153, 279), early Enochic texts, such as 1 Enoch, Jubilees, Genesis Apocryphon, or the Book of Giants, make little use of “face” imagery; however, in the context of an ongoing polemic against other Jewish traditions of divine mediatorship, later Enochic booklets—2 Enoch, 3 Enoch—produce extensive reflections on the Face. For a theological evaluation of the theme of the Face in the Pseudepigrapha, see Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*; “Exodus 33 on God’s Face: A Lesson From the Enochic Tradition,” *SBLSP* 39 (2000), 130-147; “The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*,” in C.A. Evans (ed.), *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation & Transmission Of Scripture* (London/New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2004), 59-76; April De Conick, “Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First-Century Christology in the Second Century,” in C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis, eds. *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* [JSJ 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999], 327-29.

¹⁴ Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 282: “It is evident that all four accounts, Exodus 33:18-23, Psalm 17:15, 1 Enoch 14, and 2 Enoch 39:3-6, represent a single tradition in which the divine Face serves as the *terminus technicus* for the designation of the Lord’s anthropomorphic extent.”

¹⁵ According to Nathaniel Deutsch (*Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice Regency In Late Antiquity* [Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999], 43), at least one Merkabah passage (§§ 396-397), “explicitly identifies Metatron as the hypostatic face of God,” so that “the title *sar ha-panim* . . . is better understood as ‘prince who is the face [of God].’” See also Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 124-125.

affirmation repeated elsewhere.¹⁶ To describe the continual propagation of light from the Face down to the lowest level of existence, Clement uses the adverb *προσεχῶς*, suggesting immediacy, the lack of any interval between the levels: each rank of spiritual entities is “moved” by the one above it, and will, in turn, “move” the immediately lower level. The purpose of hierarchy consists in the spiritual progress, or “advancement” (*προκοπή*) of each of the spiritual levels, or *τάξεις*.¹⁷

The first level of celestial entities contemplating the Face is constituted by the seven *πρωτοκτίστοι*, celestial beings “first created.” On the one hand, these *protoclists* are numbered with the angels and archangels, their subordinates.¹⁸ On the other hand, they are bearers of the divine Name, and, as such, they are called “gods.”¹⁹ Clement equates them with “the seven eyes

¹⁶ *Excerpta* 12:1: “But the Son is the beginning of the vision of the Father [lit.: ‘fatherly vision’], called ‘the Face (*Πρόσωπον*) of the Father.’” April DeConick (“Heavenly Temple Traditions,” 325) states that “the image of the Son as the Father’s Face may have played a significant role in Valentinian theologies.” However, the repeated occurrence of the same designation in Clement of Alexandria (*Paed* 1:57 and 1:124:4, *Strom* 7:58, as well as in Tertullian (*Adv. Prax.* 14), suggests that “Face” as a Christological title was at least as popular in the “Great Church” (to use Celsus’ designation: Origen, *Against Celsus* 5:59) as it was in Valentinian tradition.

¹⁷ According to François Sagnard, *προσεχῶς* “indique la continuité dans l’espace, sans intermédiaire. La dynamis (ou: le logos) du Père passe continuellement dans le Monogène pour l’engendrer. On peut dire aussi que le Monogène est cette dynamis du Père” (*Excerpta*, 79, n. 2; Emphasis mine); “ἡ ὑπεροχή est la différence entre deux échelons” de la *προκοπή* (Sagnard, *Extraits* 77, n. 3). Pointing to *Strom.* 7:2:10, Christian Oeyen explains: “Die verschiedenen Stufen des Fortschrittes heissen . . . *τάξεις*, das Fortschreiten von einer zur anderen *προκοπή*” (*Eine frühchristliche Engel Pneumatologie bei Klemens von Alexandrien* [Bern, 1966], 9).

¹⁸ “Hae namque primitivae virtutes ac primo creatae (rendering *πρωτόγονοι καὶ πρωτόκτιστοι δυνάμεις*), immobiles existentes secundum substantiam, cum subiectis angelis et archangelis” (*Adumbrationes in 1 Jn 2:1*). Stählin’s critical edition introduces a comma between “immobiles” and “existentes.” I prefer to revert to Zahn’s text, which has no comma. Thus, I take “immobiles existentes secundum substantiam” to mean that their substance is immovable according to substance, i.e., does not undergo change. A number of scholars (Zahn, Kretschmar, Barbel) identified these “powers” with two paracletes; on the other hand, the idea that the “powers” under discussion are the seven *protoclists* is supported by François Sagnard, the editor and translator of the *Excerpta* for Sources Chrétiennes (*Excerpta* 77, n. 2), and, more recently, by Henning Ziebritzki (*Heiliger Geist und Weltseele: das Problem der dritten Hypostase bei Origenes, Plotin und ihren Vorläufern* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994], 122, n. 148). But the most extensive argumentation has been furnished by Oeyen (*Engelpneumatologie*, 31-33).

¹⁹ “Now, in the Gospel according to Mark, when the Lord was interrogated by the high priest if He was ‘the Christ, the Son of the blessed God,’ He answered saying, ‘I

of the Lord” (Zech 3:9, 4:10; Rev 5:6), the “thrones” (Col 1:16), and the “angels ever contemplating the Face of God” (Mat 18:10).²⁰ The *protocists* are seven, but they are simultaneously characterized by unity and multiplicity: although distinct in number, Clement writes, “their liturgy is common and undivided.”²¹

The *protocists* fulfill multiple functions: in relation to Christ, they present the prayers ascending from below (*Excerpta* 27:2); on the other hand, they function as “high priests” with regard to the archangels, just as the archangels are “high priests” to the angels, and so forth (*Excerpta* 27:2). In their unceasing contemplation of the Face of God, they represent the model (προκέντημα) of perfected souls (*Excerpta* 10:6; 11:1).

Here we find a definite echo of the Jewish and Jewish-Christian traditions about the highest angelic company. The group of seven is found in Ezekiel

am; and you shall see the Son of man seated at the right hand of power (*a dextris virtutis*).⁷ But ‘powers’ indicates the holy angels. Further, when He says ‘at the right hand of God,’ he means the same ones, on account of the equality and likeness of the angelic and holy powers, which are called by the one name of God (*quae uno nominabantur nomine dei*)” (*Adumbrationes in Juda* 5:24). Clement equates here “power” in the Gospel text with “angels”; in an earlier sentence, he had equated “glory” with “angels”: “*In the presence of His glory*: he means before the angels . . .” (*Adumbrationes in Juda* 5:24).

²⁰ *Excerpta* 10; *Ecolgae* 57:1. For a synthetic presentation of the *protocists*, see A. Le Boulluec, *Commentaire*, in *Clément d’Alexandrie: Stromate V, tome 2* (SC 279; Paris: Cerf, 1981), 143.

²¹ *Excerpta* 10:3-4: οἱ δὲ Πρωτόκτιστοι, εἰ καὶ ἀριθμῶ διάφοροι καὶ ὁ καθ’ ἕκαστον περιώρισται καὶ περιγέγραπται, ἀλλ’ ἡ ὁμοιότης τῶν πραγμάτων ἐνότητα καὶ ἰσότητα καὶ ὁμοιότητα ἐνδείκνυται. Οὐ γὰρ τῷδε μὲν πλέον, τῷδε δὲ ἥττον παρέσχηται τῶν Ἐπτά, οὐδ’ ὑπολείπεται τις αὐτοῖς προκοπή· ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀπειληφῶτων τὸ τέλειον ἅμα τῇ πρώτῃ γενέσει παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ (“As for the *protocists*, even while they are distinct in number, and individually defined and circumscribed, the similarity of [their] deeds nevertheless points to [their] unity, equality and being alike. Among the seven, there has not been given more to the one and less to the other; nor is any of them lacking in advancement; [they] have received perfection from the beginning, at the first [moment of their] coming into being, from God through the Son”). I am using two different English words for ὁμοιότης (“similarity” and “being alike”), because our post-Nicene theological bias would automatically weaken the bearing of this word in Clement: the second time he uses ὁμοιότης, Clement has in mind “being like” as opposed to “being unlike,” not to “being the same as.”

Excerpta 11:4: Καὶ δύναμιν μὲν ἰδίαν ἔχει ἕκαστον τῶν πνευματικῶν καὶ ἰδίαν οἰκονομίαν· καθὼ δὲ ὁμοῦ τε ἐγένοντο καὶ τὸ ἐντελὲς ἀπειλήφασιν οἱ Πρωτόκτιστοι, κοινήν τὴν λειτουργίαν καὶ ἀμέριστον. (“And each of the spiritual beings has, on the one hand, both its proper power and its individual dispensation; but, on the other hand, given that the *protocists* have come to be and have received [their] perfection at the same time, their service is common and undivided.”)

9:2-3 (seven angelic beings, of which the seventh is more important than the other six), Tob 12:15 (seven “holy angels” who have access before the Glory, where they present the prayers of “the saints”), and 1 Enoch.²² A list of references to “angel/angels of the face” in the Pseudepigrapha is furnished by Seow, in his article on “Face,” referred to above.²³ The notion of “first created” is important to the author of *Jubilees*: the angels of the presence are said to be circumcised from their creation on the second day, thus possessing a certain perfection, and functioning as heavenly models and final destination of the people of Israel (*Jub* 2:2; 15:27). The *Prayer of Joseph* seems to imply that Israel ranks higher than the seven archangels, as chief captain and first minister before the face of God.²⁴

Among the Christian texts available to Clement, Revelation mentions seven spirits/angels before the divine throne (1:4; 3:1; 4:5; 5:6; 8:2), and the *Shepherd of Hermas* knows of a group of seven consisting of the six “first created ones” (πρῶτοι κτισθέντες) who accompany the Son of God as their seventh (Vis 3:4:1; Sim 5:5:3).

Moving on to later Jewish writings, 3 En 10:2-6 mentions that Metatron is exalted above the “eight great princes” who bear the divine Name. *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer*, composed around 750 CE, but incorporating material going back to the Pseudepigrapha, combines the number seven and the notion of “first created.”²⁵

It is quite clear that Clement’s references to *prototists* reflect ancient angelological speculations characteristic of Second Temple Judaism. However, it should be noted that Clement subjects this material to the spiritualizing interpretation and the Logos-theology inherited from Philo. The

²² 1 En 20 (*The Book of the Watchers*) features seven archangels, echoed by “the seven first snow-white ones” in 1 En 90:21 (*Dream Visions*); 1 En 40:9 (*Similitudes*) counts only four archangels.

²³ *Jub* 2:2, 18; 15:27; 31:14; T. Levi 3:5; 4:2; T. Judah 25:2 (tr. de Jonge!); 1 QH 6:13. In 2 En 19:1, a group of seven angels is placed in the sixth heaven. See also James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield: Sheffield, 2001), 87-89, 126-127; Charles Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1998), 124-151.

²⁴ See also the introductory study by J.Z. Smith in OTP 2:704, where Christ and the seven *prototists* in the *Excerpta* are offered as a parallel!

²⁵ God “has a scepter of fire in his hand, and a veil spread before him, and his eyes run to and fro throughout the whole earth, and the seven angels which were created first minister before him within the veil, and this (veil) is called Pargod” (*Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer [The Chapters of Rabbi Eliezer the Great] According to the Text of the Manuscript Belonging to Abraham Epstein of Vienna* [tr. G. Friedländer; New York: Hermon, 1965], iv:23).

protocists are both “angelic powers” and “powers of the Logos” that mark the passing of divine unity into multiplicity, and, conversely, the reassembly of cosmic multiplicity into the unity of the Godhead.²⁶

The entire hierarchy is characterized by relative corporality.²⁷ On the presupposition that anything that exists is an οὐσία, and is implicitly characterized by form, nothing is “without form,” whether angels, archangels, *protocists*, or even Christ.²⁸ However, Clement immediately notes, this type of “form” is entirely different from any earthly forms;²⁹ moreover, the corporality of the spiritual beings is characterized by progressive “subtlety,” in proportion to their position in the hierarchy.³⁰ In fact, this type of corporality is entirely relative, since the beings on any given level can be

²⁶ In *Strom.* 4:25:156, Clement presents a typical Middle Platonic cosmology, featuring an utterly transcendent God, and the Logos who, as God’s agent, founds multiplicity of creation, which eventually will be reduced to Logos. According to Lilla, “Clement found already formed in Philo the doctrine of the Logos as the totality of powers which are identical with the ideas” (Salvatore Lilla, *Clement*, 204. Eric Osborn [*The Philosophy of Clement* 41] affirms that Clement “explained the existence and nature of things by ‘powers’ just as Plato had done by ‘forms’ and the earlier Stoics had done by immanent reason or divine fire”). However, the simple equation of the “powers” with the Platonic ideas does not account for the complexity of the text. I submit that he is here attempting to fuse the Logos-speculation with an earlier and established teaching on the “powers of the spirit,” a teaching originating not in the philosophical tradition, but in Jewish or Jewish Christian speculation about angelic “powers.” It is significant in this respect that Clement immediately quotes the Book of Revelation: “the Word is called the Alpha and the Omega. . . .” (Rev 1:8; also 21:6; 22:13). What he has in mind is surely the throne-visions of Revelation, depicting Christ and the seven spirits or angels in attendance before the throne (Rev. 1:4; 8:2).

²⁷ As Collomp (“Une source,” 34; 39) has already demonstrated, here Clement seems to be reworking a source either identical or similar to what has been preserved in the Ps.-Clementine Homilies (17:7), featuring much cruder descriptions.

²⁸ *Excerpta* 10:1: ‘Ἄλλ’ οὐδὲ τὰ πνευματικά καὶ νοερά, οὐδὲ οἱ Ἀρχάγγελοι, <οὐδὲ> οἱ Πρωτόκτιστοι, οὐδὲ μὴν οὐδ’ αὐτός, ἄμορφος καὶ ἀνείδεος καὶ ἀσημάτιστος καὶ ἀσώματός ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μορφήν ἔχει ἰδίαν καὶ σῶμα ἀνὰ λόγον τῆς ὑπεροχῆς τῶν πνευματικῶν ἀπάντων· (“But neither the spiritual and intelligible beings, nor the archangels, nor the *protocists*, not even [Christ] himself, are without form, without shape, without frame, and bodiless; rather they do have both individual form and body . . .”).

²⁹ *Excerpta* 10:2-3: “Ὅλως γὰρ τὸ γενητὸν οὐκ ἀνούσιον μὲν, οὐχ ὅμοιον δὲ μορφήν καὶ σῶμα ἔχουσι τοῖς ἐν τῷδε τῷ κόσμῳ σώμασιν (“On the one hand, anything that has come to be is not without *ousia*; on the other, they [referring back to the spiritual beings] do not have a form and a body like the bodies [to be found] in this world”).

³⁰ The form, shape and body of spiritual entities is “in proportion to their degree

described at the same time as “bodiless”—from the perspective of inferior ranks—, and “bodily”—from the perspective of superior levels of being.³¹

b. *The Function of the Hierarchy*

The advancement on the cosmic ladder leads to the progressive transformation of one level into the next, an idea for which Clement offers a highly complex account.³² According to Clement’s *Eclogae Propheticae*, the believers are being instructed by the angels; their horizon is one of angelification. At the end of a millennial cycle, they are translated into the rank of angels, while their instructors become archangels, replacing their own instructors who are also promoted to a higher level. All degrees of the hierarchy move one step higher every one thousand years; humans become angels, and will function as the angelic guides and teachers of humans:

For those among humans who start being transformed into angels are instructed by the angels for a thousand years, in order to be restored to perfection. Then the instructors are translated into archangelic authority, while those who have received instruction will in turn instruct those among humans who are transformed into angels; thereupon they are, at the specified period, reestablished into the proper angelic state of the body (*Eclogae* 57:5).

This periodic “upgrading” also applies to the top level of the hierarchy. Even the *protocists*, “the first-created, at the highest level of restoration” (*Eclogae* 57:1)—are “set” higher,

so that they may no longer exercise a definite ministry, according to providence, but may abide in rest and solely in the contemplation of God alone. But those closest to them will advance to the degree that they themselves have left; and the same occurs by analogy with those on an inferior level (*Eclogae* 56:5).

among spiritual beings”; the *protocists* have form and shape “in proportion to the level of the beings below them.” I use “in proportion to” to render *ἀνά λόγον* + G, and “level” for *ὑπεροχή*.

³¹ *Excerpta* 11:3: Ὡς πρὸς τὴν σύγκρισιν τῶν τῆδε σωματίων (οἶον ἄστρον) ἀσώματα καὶ ἀνεῖδα, <ἀλλ’> ὡς πρὸς τὴν σύγκρισιν τοῦ Υἱοῦ σώματα μεμετρημένα καὶ αἰσθητά· οὕτως καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα παραβαλλόμενος. (“Thus, compared to the bodies here (such as the stars) they are bodiless and shapeless; yet, compared to the Son, they are measured and sensible bodies. Likewise is the Son in regards to the Father.”)

³² See Collomp, “Une source,” 23-24, and especially Oeyen, *Engelpneumatologie*, 8-9, 12.

3. *The Problem*

As Christian Oeyen has rightly noted, in his fundamental study dedicated to Clement's *Engelpneumatologie*, this raises numerous problems.³³ Have the *protocists* been created perfect and immutable (*Excerpta* 10:3; 11:4), or have they *acquired* perfection? (*Eclogae* 57)? How can the *protocists* be a group of no more and no less than seven, given that no limitation on the number of those "promoted" in their stead has been mentioned? If the *protocists* are "the highest level of disposition" (*Eclogae* 57:1), to what "higher" level can they be translated?³⁴

4. *Towards a Solution: "Interiorized Apocalypticism"*

To answer the questions just raised, it is necessary to determine in how far the Alexandrian master is in agreement with the Jewish and Jewish Christian traditions that he is drawing on. It is well-known that Clement shares Philo's interest in "noetic exegesis."³⁵ I submit that the result of such exegesis is the internalization of the cosmic ladder and of the associated experience of ascent and transformation.

a. *Clement on the Interior Ascent*

In *Strom* 4:25:158, Clement discusses the necessity of the seven-day purification required for the priest who has touched a corpse (Ezekiel 44:26). Since the entire text is a prophetic vision about the eschatological temple and its ministers, Clement can easily allude to an interpretation of the seven days of purification and subsequent entry into the temple as a purification

³³ Oeyen, *Engelpneumatologie*, 12.

³⁴ It should be mentioned that the vast majority of scholars are in agreement that all of these passages belong to Clement. Salvatore Lilla (*Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism* [Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1971], 176-183) instead, attributes them to a Gnostic source (179: "perhaps to Theodotus himself"), arguing that the type of *Himmelsreise* present in these passages "plunges directly into Gnosticism" (181, cf. 183). The underlying understanding of "Gnosticism" has in the meantime become untenable. But even if one were to concede the Gnostic character of *Excerpta* 10-15 and 27, the problem remains no less acute, because *Eclogae* 57 would then also be labeled as "Gnostic" (see Lilla, *Clement*, 185; 179, n. 6). In short, whether Clementinian, "Jewish-Christian," or Gnostic, these passages incorporate a contradiction.

³⁵ Osborn, "Philo and Clement: Quiet Conversion and Noetic Exegesis," in *The Studia Philonica Annual* 10 (1998), 108-124.

from *moral* corruption,³⁶ followed by the ascent through the seven heavens.³⁷ However, Clement moves beyond the traditional seven-storied cosmology:

Whether, then, the time be that which through the seven periods enumerated returns to the chiefest rest, or the seven heavens, which some reckon one above the other; or whether also the fixed sphere which borders on the intellectual world be called the eighth, the expression denotes that the Gnostic ought to rise out of the sphere of creation and of sin.³⁸

It seems that all imagistic details, such as specific intervals of space or time are emptied of the literal meaning they had had in the apocalyptic cosmology inherited from the “elders.” Whether “seven days,” or “one thousand years,” or “seven heavens,” or “archangels,” or “*protoclists*,” the details of the cosmic-ladder imagery become images of interior transformation. This is why the inconsistencies in Clement’s account about the *protoclists* are only apparent. At times, Clement refers to the data he has received from tradition. Thus, in the *Stromata*, he shows himself familiar with the idea that “the whole world of creatures . . . revolves in sevens” and that “the first-born princes of the angels (πρωτόγονοι ἀγγέλων ἄρχοντες), who have the greatest power, are seven”;³⁹ and in the *Excerpta* he presents a detailed description of the entire hierarchy. At other times, however, Clement suggests that these data ought to be further interpreted. For instance, he speaks of

. . . gnostic souls that surpass in the greatness of contemplation the mode of life of each of the holy ranks (τῆ μεγαλοπρεπείᾳ τῆς θεωρίας ὑπερβαινούσας ἐκάστης ἁγίας τάξεως τὴν πολιτείαν) . . . ever moving to higher and yet higher places [lit. “reaching places better than the better places,” ἀμείνους ἀμεινόνων τόπων τόπους], embracing the divine vision (θεωρίαν) not in mirrors or by means of mirrors. This is the vision attainable by “the pure in heart”; this is the function (ἐνέργεια) of the Gnostic, who has been perfected, to have converse with God through the great High Priest . . . The Gnostic even forms and

³⁶ Clement explicitly rejects anti-somatic ideas: “not that the body was polluted, but that sin and disobedience were incarnate, and embodied, and dead, and therefore abominable.”

³⁷ For the origin of the seven-heaven cosmology in Second Temple Judaism and Christianity, see Ioan-Petru Culianu, *Psychanodia: A Survey of the Evidence Concerning the Ascension of the Soul and its Relevance* (Leiden: Brill, 1983), and Adela Yarbro-Collins, “The Seven Heavens in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses,” in J.J. Collins, M. Fishbane (eds.), *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys* (New York: SUNY, 1995), 59-93.

³⁸ *Strom* 4:25:159, ANF.

³⁹ *Strom* 6:16:142-143.

creates himself (ναὶ μὴν ἑαυτὸν κτίζει καὶ δημιουργεῖ); and besides also, he, like to God, adorns those who hear him;⁴⁰

... Then become pure in heart, and near (κατὰ τὸ προσεχῆς) to the Lord, there awaits them restoration to everlasting contemplation; and they are called by the appellation of “gods,” being destined to sit on thrones with the other gods that have been first put in their places by the Savior;⁴¹

... “This is the generation of them that seek the Lord, that seek the Face of the God of Jacob” (Ps. 24:3-6). The prophet has, in my opinion, concisely indicated the Gnostic. David, as appears, has cursorily demonstrated the Savior to be God, by calling Him “the Face of the God of Jacob” . . .⁴²

In these passages, the “Gnostic soul” is described as possessing unmediated, perfect access to the vision of the Face, taking its stand in His immediate proximity, κατὰ τὸ προσεχῆς (cf. the repeated use of προσεχῶς in the *Excerpta* to express the immediacy, the lack of any interval between the levels of the hierarchy!). The true Gnostic has been brought “in the presence of His glory: he means before the angels, faultless in joyousness, having become angels.”⁴³ The Gnostic “has pitched his tent in *El*, that is, in God.”⁴⁴ Clement arrives at this conclusion after a creative exegesis of Ps 18:2 (“he pitched his tent in the sun”), by moving from ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ to ἐν τῷ ἡλ, on the basis of similarity of sound,⁴⁵ and from ἐν τῷ ἡλ to ἐν τῷ θεῷ on the basis of Mark 15:34 (“*Eli, Eli*, that is, *my God, my God*”).⁴⁶ Moreover, when Clement says that “the function (ἐνέργεια) of the Gnostic who has been perfected” is such that “he even forms and creates himself (ναὶ μὴν ἑαυτὸν κτίζει καὶ δημιουργεῖ)” (*Strom* 7:3:13), the verbs (κτίζει and δημιουργεῖ) are a transparent allusion to Gen

⁴⁰ *Strom* 7:3:13, ANF slightly modified.

⁴¹ *Strom* 7:10:56-57.

⁴² *Strom* 7:10:58.

⁴³ *Adumbrationes in Juda* 5:24.

⁴⁴ *Eclogae* 57.3.

⁴⁵ It appears that “aspiration had ceased in Athens already before the end of the classical period. When observed in script, it was as an old relic, not as a living item of language . . .” (Chris Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament* [WUNT 167; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004] 391). According to the rhetorician Tryphon, living in the first century BCE, aspiration was “a rule of the ancients, which the moderns set aside” (Caragounis, *Development* 391, n. 166).

⁴⁶ *Eclogae* 57:3: καὶ μή τι τὸ «ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ ἔθετο τὸ σκηνῶμα αὐτοῦ» οὕτως ἐξακούεται ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ ἔθετο, τουτέστιν ἐν τῷ ἡλ ἦγουν θεῷ, ὡς ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ «ἡλί ἡλί» ἀντὶ τοῦ «θεέ μου, θεέ μου». (“And is not he set his tabernacle in the sun to be understood as follows: he set in the “sun,” that is “in El,” or “God,” just as in the Gospel: *Eli, Eli* instead of *my God, my God*?”).

1:26, and signal the transfer of divine functions to the Gnostic.⁴⁷ One could well say that the Gnostics actually become *protoclists*, since Clement states that “they are called by the appellation of ‘gods,’ being destined to sit on thrones with the other gods that have been first put in their places by the Savior.”⁴⁸

There can be no doubt that Clement preserves something that will be eliminated in mainstream Christian theology, but retained by certain strands of Judaism: the real, ontological “angelification.” In 2 Enoch, the patriarch is not merely a visitor to the heavenly realms, but “a servant permanently installed in the office of the *sar happanim*.”⁴⁹ Similarly, *Test Levi* 4:2 is explicit about the possibility of becoming a “prince of the presence.” Hekhalot lore speaks about becoming superior, more glorious than the “eight great princes” (3 Enoch 10:2-6), becoming “little YHWH” (3 Enoch 12).⁵⁰ In Christian tradition, however, despite extensive talk about the ascetical holy man living as an “angel in the body,” and despite the depiction of an angelic life in heaven, the transformed human being appears “angelomorphic,” rather than ontologically “angelic.”⁵¹ The “real angelification” of the earlier tradition, echoed by Clement, was eventually discarded. The cause had probably something to do with the concern for the Incarnation as a “confirmation” of human existence, and with an awareness of the difficulties that Clement’s worldview raises for eschatology.⁵²

⁴⁷ Alain Le Boulluec, the editor and translator of *Strom 7* for the Sources Chrétiennes series, draws attention to the verbs (*Clément d’Alexandrie, Stromate VII*; [SC 428 Paris: Cerf, 1997] 70, footnote 2).

⁴⁸ *Strom* 7:10:56-57.

⁴⁹ Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 156.

⁵⁰ According to Deutsch (*Guardians of the Gate*, 32-34), “Metatron’s . . . transformation from a human being into an angel reflects an ontological process which may be repeated by mystics. . . .”

⁵¹ I am using the term “angelomorphic” according to the following definition: “Though it has been used in different ways by various scholars, without clear definition, we propose its use wherever there are signs that an individual or community possesses specifically angelic characteristics or status, though for whom identity cannot be reduced to that of an angel” (Crispin H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT 94; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 14-15).

⁵² In his concise but very dense treatment of Clement’s eschatology, Brian Daley notes that Clement’s dynamic conception of “a painstaking development rather than . . . eschatological crisis” is consonant with his view of the punishments after death as “a medicinal and therefore temporary measure” (*The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology* [reprint; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003], 46).

I conclude that Clement interprets the tradition about millennial cycles and the ascent on the cosmic ladder as descriptions of an interior phenomenon. He also happens to have been the one to supply the convenient shorthand for this interiorized ascent to heaven and transformation before the divine Face: *θέωσις*, “deification.”

b. *The Relevance of the Church Hierarchy*

Confirmation of this view can be found in Clement’s affirmations about the church hierarchy. I have noted earlier his conviction that “the advancements (*προκοπαί*) pertaining to the Church here below, namely those of bishops, presbyters and deacons, are imitations (*μιμήματα*) of the angelic glory.”⁵³ This would yield a model of “church hierarchy,” composed of bishops, priests, and deacons, quite similar to that advocated by Ignatius of Antioch.

However, Clement undermines this edifice, by offering the following exegesis:

Such a one is in reality a presbyter of the Church, and a true minister (deacon) of the will of God, if he do and teach what is the Lord’s; not as being ordained by men, nor regarded righteous because a presbyter, but enrolled in the presbyterate because righteous. And although here upon earth he be not honored with the chief seat, he will sit down on the four-and-twenty thrones, judging the people, as John says in the Apocalypse.⁵⁴

Quite clearly, Clement takes “bishop,” “priest,” or “deacon” not as designations of ecclesiastical office-holders—he appears, in fact, quite unhappy with those “ordained by men” and “honored with the chief seat”—, but rather as functional designations of the stages of spiritual advancement.⁵⁵ For Clement (and, later, for Origen), the function trumps the degree; or, to be more accurate, the inner quality creates the function, which is then reflected in the degree.⁵⁶

⁵³ *Strom* 6:13:107. Cf. *Strom* 7:1:3: the presbyters and deacons are “images” of the (angelic) models of superordinate and subordinate activities (*κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν μὲν βελτιωτικὴν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι σφζουσιν εἰκόνα, τὴν ὑπηρετικὴν δὲ οἱ διάκονοι*).

⁵⁴ *Strom* 6:13:106, ANF.

⁵⁵ Evidently, Clement’s assertions about Church hierarchy imply their real existence of ecclesiastical office holders in Alexandria (Jakab, *Ecclesia Alexandrina*, 183).

⁵⁶ This point is argued emphatically and supported by quotations from Origen and Cyprian of Carthage, by Roncaglia, *Histoire de l’église copte* (Beirut: Dar al-Kalima, 1971), 3:187-189, 192-194. Jakab (*Ecclesia Alexandrina*, 183) offers the same interpretation.

The “promotion” from one level of the hierarchy to the next reflects the one’s spiritual progress:

... those who, following the footsteps of the apostles, have lived in perfection of righteousness according to the Gospel . . . [are] taken up in the clouds, the apostle writes, will first minister [as deacons], then be classed in the presbyterate, by promotion in glory (for glory differs from glory) till they grow into “a perfect man.”⁵⁷

If the affirmation that the church hierarchy is an imitation of the celestial hierarchy is given full weight, it would seem logical for Clement to posit the same sort of “promotion” and transformation on the cosmic ladder—from “angels” to “archangels” to “*protocists*”—as dependent solely upon the degree of spiritual progress. Obviously, the number twenty-four in the case of the elders from Revelation is not taken any more literally than the number seven in the case of the *protocists*.

Conclusions

The “celestial hierarchy” echoed by Clement, goes back not only to Pantaenus, but to an older generation of Jewish-Christian “elders.”⁵⁸

Clement’s hierarchy has, on this point, great affinities with that of Dionysius. However, in order to uphold the perfect mirroring between the celestial and the ecclesiastical hierarchies in spite of a disappointing historical reality, they adopt divergent strategies: while Clement approaches the issue from the perspective of “function” and thus challenges the authenticity of any “degree” that does not fully mirror the “function,” Dionysius writes from the perspective of “degree” and is forced to paint a “supremely idealistic—to say the least—portrait of the Christian clergy . . .” (Golitzin, *Et Introibo*, 134). For the ongoing tension between hierarchy and personal holiness in ascetic literature (reaching back to Origen), see Golitzin, “Hierarchy Versus Anarchy? Dionysius Areopagita, Symeon the New Theologian, Nicetas Stethatos, and Their Common Roots in Ascetical Tradition,” *SVTQ* 38 (1994), 131-179.

⁵⁷ *Strom* 6:13:107, ANF.

⁵⁸ On the place of Pantaenus in the development of Alexandrian catechetical tradition, see Martiniano Pellegrino Roncaglia, “Pantène et le didascalée d’Alexandrie: du Judéo-Christianisme au Christianisme Hellénistique,” in Robert Fisher (ed.), *A Tribute to Arthur Vööbus: Studies in Early Christian Literature and Its Environment, Primarily in the Christian East* (Chicago: The Lutheran School of Theology, 1977), 211-223. Other scholars judge the evidence about Pantaenus insufficient for an assessment of his theology: Attila Jakab, *Ecclesia Alexandrina: Evolution sociale et institutionnelle du christianisme alexandrin (II^e et III^e siècles)* (Bern/Berlin/Bruxelles/Frankfurt a. M./New York/Oxford/Vienna: Peter Lang, 2004), 111, 115.

A fitting formula to describe Clement of Alexandria's treatment of the inherited apocalyptic cosmology of the elders would be "interiorized apocalyptic." This term—which, in keeping with the established definitions,⁵⁹ I would change to "interiorized apocalypticism"—has been proposed for the use of apocalyptic motifs in Byzantine monastic literature, and its definition seems perfectly applicable to Clement: "the transposition of the cosmic setting of apocalyptic literature, and in particular of the 'out of body' experience of heavenly ascent and transformation, to the inner theater of the soul."⁶⁰ Golitzin has furnished proof of this transposition as early as the fourth and early fifth century Eastern monastic literature; Stroumsa, on the other hand, argues that the shift was completed, at least in the Christian West, with Augustine of Hippo.⁶¹ I believe that we may safely affirm that Clement of Alexandria offers one of the earliest examples of "interiorized apocalypticism."

The archaic theory of the elders, postulating the celestial hierarchy as the locus of a real transformation from archangels into *protocists*, from angels into archangels, and from humans into angels, may prove illuminating for our understanding of Clement's statements about the perfected human as "living as an angel on earth, but already luminous, and resplendent like the sun," ἰσάγγελος μὲν ἐνταῦθα· φωτεινὸς δὲ ἤδη καὶ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος λάμπων (*Strom* 7:10:57). Clearly, such views are not unrelated to the later notion of the ascetical *bios angelikos*. However, if the Jewish-Christian worldview echoed by Clement constitutes the original framework of the "angelification," providing it with a very specific meaning, it would be interesting to see to what degree later ascetical literature retained these cosmological associations.

⁵⁹ Credit goes to John J. Collins (*The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* [New York: Crossroad, 1984], 2-11) for the distinction between "apocalypticism" as a worldview and "apocalypse" as a literary form. Apocalypticism is "a worldview in which supernatural revelation, the heavenly world and eschatological judgment play an essential role" (10).

⁶⁰ Golitzin, "Earthly Angels and Heavenly Men: the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Nicetas Stethatos, and the Tradition of Interiorized Apocalyptic in Eastern Christian Ascetical and Mystical Literature," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 55 (2001), 125-153.

⁶¹ "For him [Augustine], the real secrets are no longer those of God, but those of the individual, hidden in the depth of his or her heart, or soul. With him, we witness more clearly than elsewhere, perhaps, the link between the end of esotericism and the development of a new interiorization. This process of interiorization is *ipso facto* a process of demotization: there remains no place for esoteric doctrine in such an approach" (Stroumsa, *Hidden Wisdom*, 7).

The texts discussed in these pages are paradigmatic for the widespread hierarchical cosmology in the early centuries of the common era, as well as for the type of difficulties faced by the emerging Christian theology. The most acute problem was the necessity of adapting the hierarchical framework to a theology of the Trinity; more precisely, the difficulty of “fitting” the Holy Spirit in the hierarchy. In relation to Clement of Alexandria, this topic has been dealt with masterfully and in great detail by Christian Oeyen, in his *Engelpneumatologie*. A larger presentation would have to take into account the conjunction of hierarchy, prophecy, and the angelic spirit, characteristic not only of “the other Clement,” but also of other early Christian authors. I leave the demonstration of this thesis for a later and much larger undertaking.

Marquette University,
Milwaukee, WI 53233
U.S.A.