Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui

THE *PROTREPTICUS*

OF

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA:

A COMMENTARY

τὸ γὰρ ψεῦδος οὐ ψιλῇ τῇ παραθέσει τἀληθοῦς διασκεδάννυται,
τῇ δὲ χρήσει τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκβιαζόμενον φυγαδεύεται.

La falsedad no se dispersa por la simple comparación con la verdad,
sino que la práctica de la verdad la fuerza a huir.

Protréptico 8.77.3

PREFACIO

Una tesis doctoral debe tratar de contribuir al avance del conocimiento humano en su disciplina, y la pretensión de que este comentario al *Protréptico* tenga la máxima utilidad posible me obliga a escribirla en inglés porque es la única lengua que hoy casi todos los interesados pueden leer. Pero no deja de ser extraño que en la casa de Nebrija se deje de lado la lengua castellana. La deuda que contraigo ahora con el español sólo se paliará si en el futuro puedo, en compensación, "dar a los hombres de mi lengua obras en que mejor puedan emplear su ocio". Empiezo ahora a saldarla, empleándola para estos agradecimientos, breves en extensión pero no en sinceridad.

Mi gratitud va, en primer lugar, al Cardenal Don Gil Álvarez de Albornoz, fundador del Real Colegio de España, a cuya generosidad y previsión debo dos años provechosos y felices en Bolonia. Al Rector, José Guillermo García-Valdecasas, que administra la herencia de Albornoz con ejemplar dedicación, eficacia y amor a la casa. A todas las personas que trabajan en el Colegio y hacen que cumpla con creces los objetivos para los que se fundó. Y a mis compañeros bolonios durante estos dos años. Ha sido un honor muy grato disfrutar con todos ellos de la herencia albornociana.

En Bolonia debo agradecer también al Profesor Lorenzo Perrone su guía experta y paciente por los senderos de la tradición alejandrina antigua y los de la patrística moderna. En Madrid, a los profesores Alberto Bernabé y Antonio Piñero, que mantuvieron desde la distancia su disponibilidad y colaboración académica y personal en todo momento. Y también el Ministerio de Educación de España que me concedió una beca postdoctoral para investigar en Bolonia.

Sin la ayuda de todos los aquí mencionados, y de algunos más, no habría sido posible realizar el comentario. No son responsables de ninguno de los errores que pueden encontrarse. Pero sí han contribuido, cada uno a su modo, a enseñarme que "la práctica de la verdad ahuyenta la falsedad".

Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui

Bolonia, 6 de Febrero de 2008

CONTENTS

Introduction

1. Clement: his life, work and environment

Clement's life seems to push him to lead the fusion of Greek and Christian cultural traditions: he travelled and knew different places and teachers as only a well-to do educated Roman citizen could do, he settled in the favorable environment of Alexandria to teach peacefully and write his work, and at the end of his life perhaps he experienced that the life of a Christian was not so pleasant as he might have thought.

Apart from a few self-references in Clement's own work, most of the scarce information that we can gather about his life comes from the works of Eusebius of Caesarea, who wrote around one hundred years after Clement had died[1]. Eusebius' statements, therefore, must not be taken at face value. Most of them seem coherent with what we would expect, but some are likely to result from his own idealization of the first great master of the Alexandrian school.

Titus Flavius Clemens was born around 150-160 AD in Athens[2]. Eusebius (*PE* 2.2.64) says that he was born in a Pagan family, and that in his youth, after having been initiated into Greek mysteries, he converted to Christianity. Since the piece of news about initiation in the mysteries is clearly false[3] there is some reason to doubt also his being Pagan[4] and then converting, though it has traditionally been accepted on Eusebius' word. His broad knowledge of Greek authors would be coherent with a Pagan background, but an educated Christian environment would also know well Plato and Homer. Against Eusebius, it can be argued that when Clement preaches conversion, he never makes the slightest autobigraphical reference, and that an upper-middle-class Athenian would be very likely to be initiated in his youth, which was most probably not the case. The *Protrepticus* is likely to be, therefore, an exhortation to a religious conversion that he has never experienced himself. Perhaps Clement's love for

---

[1] Eusebius' passages and the few other references to Clement's life are collected by O. Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, Leipzig 1905, vol. I. IX-XVI.

[2] Epiphanius (*Haer.* 32.6) says that some call him Alexandrian, but it clearly refers to his place of work, not of birth. On his Roman name (coincident with a consul put to death under Domitian for being a Christian), cf. R. Feulner, *Clemens von Alexandrien*, Frankfurt am Main, 2006, 24.

[3] Cf. commentary to *Protr.* 2.12. A. Le Boulluec in his work on the origins of Alexandrian school (cf. n.5) does not exclude the possibility that Eusebius' is inventing a Pagan origin (n. 29).

[4] I will use the admittedly anachronic term "Pagan" for the sake of convenience, to avoid the exceses of extreme rigour like "attached to non-Christian and non-Jewish religious cults". Other possibilities like "Greek" or "Hellenes" (Clement's own term) would bring more confusion than clarity. The term "Pagan", however, should be devoid of any apologetic implication. I follow thus the usage of P. Athanassiadi-M. Frede, *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, Oxford 1999, 8f.

Hellenism comes precisely from his not having to fight back against his own Greek past.

Clement speaks in a famous passage of the *Stromata* (1.11.1-2) about his Christian masters, in geographical-chronological order: "one of them, an Ionian, lived in Greece; two others, from Coele-Syria and Egypt respectively, were in Magna Graecia; others were in the East, one from Assyria, another a Hebrew from Palestine. I found the last of them where he was hiding in Egypt. Here I came to rest. He was a real Sicilian bee who drew from the flowers of the apostolic and prophetic meadow and who engendered a purity of knowledge in the soul of his hearers". This passage describes his mobility throughout the Eastern Mediterranean until he settled in Alexandria, and the variety of his teachers. There have been attempts to identify the Ionian teacher with Athenagoras and the Syrian with Tatian. These attempts remain, however, mere speculation[5]. But the last teacher is well known: the Sicilian Pantenus, whom the tradition establishes as the first leader of the so-called Alexandrian catechetical school, and whose successor would have been Clement himself[6].

Yet words like "school" an "succession" must be handled with precaution. There is much discussion about the nature of these Christian schools in the 2nd-3rd centuries, and specially about the *didaskaleion* of Alexandria, where it is easy to project (even for 4th century sources like Eusebius) the much more sophisticated model of later centuries. Far from the traditional view of an ecclesiastical school controlled by the bishop, with a firm succession of leaders as in philosophical *haireseis*, they should be rather seen as private gatherings of students who wanted to obtain advanced knowledge of theology, and studied. Their relation with the official Church is loose and imprecise, while it presents affinities to the tradition of Jewish Rabbis who instructed on how to lead religious life[7]. Clement himself seems, by some ambiguous allusions throughout his

---

[5] Cf. R. B. Tollinton *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Liberalism*, London, 1914, 12-16; on relations of Clement with previous apologetic literature, cf. *infra* intr. §7.

[6] Eus. *HE* 6.6; Hieron. *Vir. Ill.* 38 (*PL* 23.686). On Pantaenus, cf. the survey of the sources and inerpretations in the inital part of A. Le Boulluec, "Aux origines, encore, de l'"école" d'Alexandrie", *Adamantius* 5 (1999), 7-36 (= *Alexandrie Antique et Chrétienne*, Paris 2006, 29-62; the page number quoted refers to this reedition).

[7] G. Bardy, "Aux origines de l'École d'Alexandrie", *Rech Sc rel* 27 (1937), 65-90, was the first to question the nature of the official school described by Eusebius. The absene of a supreme episcopal power and a fix rule of succession are now accepted by all as features of the Alexandrian didaskaleion (cf. Le Boulluec, *op. cit.* 42f). Cf. the studies of R. Van der Broek, "The Christian 'School' of Alexandria in the Second and Third Centuries", in J.W. Drijvers – A.A. McDonald, *Centres of Learning : Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*, Leiden-New York-Köln, 1995, 39-47; and A. Van der Hoek, "The Catechetical School of Early Christian Alexandria and its Philonic Heritage", *HThR* 90.1 (1997), 59-87. E. Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria*, Cambridge, 2005, 19-24 synthesizes the results of both

work, to have been ordained priest and as such would have had some kind of pastoral responsibility over his "flock" which overlapped with his teaching role[8]. But these are deep and dark waters. Yet one thing is clear: the school had easy access to a great number of books of Christian and Jewish provenance. Much of the Christian literature of the first two centuries and the works of Philo and other Jewish Hellenistic authors must have been handy in the *scriptorium* in which the Alexandrian school developed its work[9]. Also, the vicinity of the great Alexandrian library allowed easy access to Greek authors, many of whom were probably incorporated to the Christian *scriptorium*.

The physical vicinity of Greek, Christian and Jewish authors in Alexandrian libraries mirrors adequately the lively multicultural atmosphere in which Clement lived and worked. The Christian community in the city was increasing in size and activity, though it was yet far from being comparable to those of Rome or Antiochia, as it would be in the following centuries. Along with an ill-defined orthodoxy, a large number of so-called "heterodox" and more or less heretic currents, most of them labeled modernly as Gnostic, inevitably developed in Alexandrian soil[10]. Besides, Hellenistic Judaism had reached its intellectual climax with Philo of Alexandria in the 1st cent. AD. Christians appropiated many of the Jewish-Hellenistic ideas and attitudes while at the same time they struggled to distinguish themselves from Jews. Judaism steps out from the Hellenizing trend in the 2nd century and begins to focus in the development of its own Talmudic tradition, thus broadening the separation with Christianity[11]. It is not surprising that, in this struggle for self-definition, cultural contact was extremely intense. Finally, in the second half of the 2nd century Alexandria was the most renowned centre of Greek philosophy and science, at least in the same level than Athens. The

---

papers, while he rightly disagrees with the portrait made by D. Dawson, *Allegorical Reading and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*, Berkeley 1992 of a school consciously tracing a middle way between orthodoxy and Valentinian Gnosticism.

[8] Le Boulluec, *op. cit*. 41-43 alleges *Strom*. 6.106-107, 7.3 and *Paed*. 3.12.101.3 and 1.6.37.3 as proofs that he was priest when he wrote these passage. Besides, the letter of Alexander of Jerusalem (cf. n. 18 *infra*) which speaks of him as *presbyteros* seems to imply that he had this title before he went to Jerusalem.

[9] Le Boulluec *op. cit*, 43 defines the *scriptorium* in these words: "un centre de copie des textes bibliques, une bibliothèque chrétienne, liés à une Église dont l'organisation s'affermit, tels sont les instruments institutionnels dont l'existence et rende plausible par l'activité de Clément". Of course the model of a much more perfect scriptorium like that of 3rd cent. Caesarea should not be projected to the more modest context of 2nd cent. Alexandria.

[10] Since the *Protrepticus* deals only with Paganism, and not with Jews or other Christian tendencies, this is not the place to deal with the inadequacy of all these labels which were fixed only much later and which heavily distort the fluid reality of that age. Cf. K. L. King, *What is Gnosticism?*, Cambridge Mass 2003; and A. Le Boulluec, *La notion d'hérésie dans la litterature grecque IIe-IIIe siècles* Paris, 1985.

[11] Cf. E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, new ed. revised by G. Vermes – F. Millar (eds.), Edinburgh, 1973-1987.

philological and literary tradition that had flourished under the Ptolemies had decayed, but it still determined a high cultural level of the Greek upper class (to whom Clement addressed his works). Yet it is the geographical and chronological coincidence with the rise of neo-Platonism around the figure of Ammonios Saccas the fundamental key to explain the philosophical and literary coincidences between Jewish and Christian Alexandrian authors and the early neo-Platonists[12]. The confluence of the diverse tendencies of Christianity, Judaism and Paganism, in addition to the easy reception that Oriental currents enjoyed in Alexandria, made the city the perfect place in which religious speculation could flourish and expand in different directions. *Mutatis mutandis*, Imperial Alexandria has often been compared to 20th century New York City[13].

In this environment Clement composed his writings, in which the influence of his background is largely perceivable. Apart from some minor works dealing with specific topics (*Quis dives salvetur*, on the salvation of the rich; *Eclogae propheticae*, which seem part of an exegetical larger work; and the *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, which examines the work of this disciple of the Gnostic Valentinus) and others which have apparently been lost[14], the main works are three: the *Protrepticus*, in which he exhorts the Greeks to convert to Christianity; the *Paedagogus*, in which he instructs Christians on how to behave; and the *Stromata*[15], much longer and complex than the other two, where he dwells on philosophical and doctrinal matters to instruct the true Gnostic on what to believe and how to act.

The relation of his three main works with one another has been matter of incessant discussion. In the *Paedagogus* (1.1-3) he describes a threefold action of the divine Logos which has been usually taken as a working program (since *logos* can also

---

[12] R. E. Witt, "The Hellenism of Clement of Alexandria", *CQ* 25 (1931), 195. Cf. n. 76 *infra*.

[13] Cf. P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* I-III, Oxford, 1972, for a complete portrait of Hellenistic Alexandria, which is largely valid for the following two centuries. On the Christian community in the city, see A. Jakab, *Ecclesia Alexandrina*, Bern 2001, and G. Stroumsa, "Alexandria and the Myth of Multiculturalism", in L. Perrone (ed.), *Origeniana Octava I,* 23-30 (among other papers in the first part of that volume).

[14] The most important lost work must have been the *Hypotyposeis*, a sort of commentary to selected Biblical texts, from which only brief fragments are preserved, and which seems to have survived to the 18th century (C. Duckworth - E. Osborne, "Clement of Alexandria's *Hypotyposeis*: A French Eighteenth Century Sighting", *JThSt* 36 (1985), 67-83); perhaps the Ecolgae Propheticae were part of it (P. Nautin, "La fin des Stromates et les Hypotyposeis de Clément d'Aléxandrie", *VChr* 30 (1976), 169-302, esp. 296-298); other works mentioned by Eusebius are *On the Passover, On Fasting, Against Judaisers, On Providence, To the newly Baptised*; others works mentioned by Clement himself, like *On Principles*, were never probably more than a project. M. Smith, *Clement of Alexandria and the Secret Gospel of Mark*, Cambridge Mass, 1972, claimed to have discovered a letter of Clement mentioning an unknown Gospel of Mark, but the truth of his account is much suspected (cf. S. C. Carlson, *The Gospel Hoax*, Waco 2005).

[15] I choose this name consacrated by tradition instead of the equally valid *Stromateis*.

be interpreted as "discourse"): the *protreptikos logos* invites men to salvation; the *logos paidagogos* advices and heals them of their passions; and the *logos didaskalikos* instructs them about the contents of Christian faith, introducing them to the true and complete knowledge of God. There is no question about the two first works, *Protrepticus* and *Paedagogus*, which follow strictly this tripartite division. The problem is whether the *Stromata* can be equated with the *logos didaskalikos* that is announced, since neither the title nor the miscellaneous contents of Clement's third main work wholly coincide with those that he envisaged when writing the *Paedagogus*. A number of hypothesis has been put over for more than a century, and scholars have not yet reached an agreement[16].

The last part of the *Stromata* was written in Jerusalem, where Clement could not have access to so many books as in Alexandria. His years in the city seem to have passed in an austere but peaceful atmosphere, the same lifestyle held by most of his audience, from what we can gather from his work[17]. However, the threat of prosecution must have loomed large over Christians. It is quite probable that his departure from Alexandria around 202 or 206 was due to a wave of violence against the Christians. Clement arrived to Jerusalem, where he worked as *presbyteros*[18], and he died there between 215 and 221. He left behind an extremely important work[19], which led the way to Hellenization of Christianity. The first stage of this accomplishment, the *Protrepticus*, fulfilled this Hellenization in the literary and rhetorical level.

---

[16] The discussion includes many of the relevant authors who have undertaken deep study of Clement. The whole bibliography is commented in the two latest monographs on Clement, R. E. Osborne, *Clement of Alexandria*, Cambridge 2005, 5-15, and R. Feulner, *Clemens von Alexandrien*, München, 2006, 38-47. The former believes that the *Stromata* is the *Didaskalikos*, while the latter thinks that Clement changed his mind and wrote the *Stromata* instead of his promised work.

[17] A. Van der Hoek, "How Alexandrian was Clement of Alexandria? Reflections on Clement and his Alexandrian Background" *Heythrop Journal* 31 (1990): 179-194, and also A. Deiber, *Clément d'Alexandrie et l'Egypte*, Cairo 1904. Most of actual news about Alexandria come from the *Paedagogus*. Since the *Protrepticus* has mostly bookish sources (cf. *infra* intr. §8) and does not descend to details of daily life, there are very few references to actual Alexandrian life (cf. 10.100.4).

[18] A letter by Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem (Eus. *HE* 6.11.5) mentions him. Cf. P. Nautin, *Lettres des écrivains chrétiens des IIe et IIIe siècles*, Paris 1961.

[19] In this introduction and in the commentary I will restrict myself o the bibliography directly relevant for the *Protrepticus*. Most studies on Clement focus on the *Stromata* because of its greater theological interest. Cf. a review of the bibliography in E. Osborn, "Clement of Alexandria: A Review of Research, 1958-1982" *Sec Cent*, 3 (1983), 219-244; "One Hundred years of Books on Clement", *Vig Christ* 60 (2006), 367-388; M. Rizzi, "Cinquant'anni di studi italiani su Clemente Alessandrino", *Adamantius*, 4 (1998), 15-24. Cf. also n. 118 *infra*.

2. Composition of the *Protrepticus*

The *Protrepticus* is divided in twelve chapters which follow the canonical order that rhetorical handbooks impose to a suasorial discourse[20]: *exordium* (I), *refutatio* (II-V), *argumentatio* (VI-XI), *peroratio* (XII). For the sake of clarity, let us summarize briefly the contents of each chapter (a general vision will be given in the next point) :

Chapter I introduces Christianity as the true religion which will replace Greek superstitions. This replacement takes the form of a musical metaphor, a New Song will replace the old one. Its tone is exalted and full of rhetorical devices. The aim is to set the audience in a mood prone to receive the rational arguments which will follow.

Chapter II initiates the *refutatio*, under the image of a trial to Greek religion: oracles, mysteries and gods are presented under the most unfavourable light, mocked and condemned.

Chapter III identifies Greek gods with daemons subject to passions.

Chapter IV culminates the critique of Paganism with a lengthy attack on the cult of statues and images.

Chapter V brings in Greek philosophers and condemns their divinization of elements; this subject connects the preceding section with the following part.

Chapter VI starts the *argumentatio*, which makes the case for Christianity, precisely with the intuitions of the truth which can be found in some Greek philosophers, especially Plato.

Chapter VII does the same with Greek poets, offering some fragments in which they seem to announce the Christian God.

Chapter VIII shows, after philosophers and poets, the Biblical prophecies, with less literary value but a deeper and more direct knowledge of the truth.

Chapter IX starts the theological elaboration of the Logos: it describes through different images the love of God for mankind. The notion of God as true faher of men is particularly developed.

Chapter X, very long in comparison with the preceding ones, culminates the *argumentatio* with the offer of true reason to save the Greeks from the slavery and corruption in which they are kept by tradition (*synetheia*). Against superstition (*deisidaimonia*) God offers religion (*theosebeia*).

---

[20] Cf. in general G. Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, Princeton, 1994. On the Christian appropiation of rhetoric, cf. A. Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*, Berkeley 1991. On the protreptic genre as a type of deliberative discourse, cf. n. 29.

Chapter XI describes the benefits of the Logos for men with some metaphors, like the light imagery, which announce a transition to the tone of the *peroratio*.

Chapter XII is the culmination of the *peroratio*, with a powerful exhortation to convert and take part in the mysteries of the Logos.

The *peroratio*, like the *exordium*, appeals to the emotional rather than to the rational mind, to awake again enthusiasm in the audience after the more dense and complex argumentative chapters. This causes inevitably a similarity of tone and images of the last and the first chapter which has a clear effect of *Ringkomposition*. But this anular composition is also achieved through the progressive recuperation of earlier themes to go back to them and close the "open folders". For example, in chapter II Orpheus is the hierophant of Greek mysteries, and then, in chapter VII, he is the firt to convert. The axis is situated between chapters V and VI. The first one criticizes philosophers, the second one points at their intuitions of the truth. Correspondingly, the spotting of the monotheistic intuitions of poets will match the criticism of their polytheism in chapter IV. This progressive closing of the internal rings not only allows the reader to have the feeling that the work is approaching its spectacular end. It also gives internal unity to the entire discourse, so that the ordained succession of chapters ends up being a consistent whole.

3. Contents of the *Protrepticus*

The *Protrepticus* follows strictly the program traced by Clement in his threefold division of the action of the Logos. This work has practically no concrete ethical or theological contents, which are left for the *Paedagogus* and the *Stromata*. Instead, Clement invites the Greeks to convert to Christianity, adapting the traditional genre of the exhortation to philosophy to his new religious message. His arguing for Christianity introduces some theological and ethical notions (cf. *infra*, §11) but he does not explain them nor expands them systematically. The purpose is to inflame with enthusiasm the audience so that they will decide to convert. Detailed explanations of ethics or theology would be out of place, since they belong to a posterior stage. Literature and rhetoric are here much more important than doctrine. The main themes are three: presentation of Christianity, refutation of Paganism, and exhortation to choose the former. The three will be briefly introduced in this order.

Presentation of Christianity

Clement keeps in mind that Christianity is being presented to a Greek audience, and he tries to shape it in Greek moulds to make it understandable and attractive to the Pagans. He does it in a threefold way: he keeps the message simple and familiar; he presents it through metaphors; and he builds bridges with the Greek tradition.

First of all, he announces God of the Bible in the way that will be closer to the understanding of an audience who does not know him. Therefore, he selects for this presentation some aspects and hides other ones: for example, departing from the Gospel of John, he chooses to concentrate on the Logos as the formulation of the divinity of Christ which is most akin to Greek philosophical categories. But the all-too-human name of Jesus, which has very little appeal for the Greeks, is mentioned very few times and with a careful preparation in each occasion[21].

Secondly, he defines the Logos through different metaphors, using Greek myths and images: the Logos is a song better than that of Orpheus (Chapter I); the mysteries of the Logos are the true mysteries (Chapter XII); the Logos brings daylight which defeats the obscurity of the night (chapter XI). These metaphors introduce theological notions: e. g. in the musical metaphor *pneuma* is the wind which makes the instrument sound, and *nomos* is the melody of the song. Thus the concepts of Spirit and Law are introduced and then can be illustrated with Biblical quotations. These kind of metaphors abound, and they are recovered and redeployed many times throughout the whole work. The confrontation with Paganism forces a dualistic structure of these metaphors: the theatrical competition, the opposition of light vs. darkness, the true mysteries against the false ones, the legitimate children vs. the illegitimate ones, etc.

Such metaphors carry on to the extreme the first principle of selecting some dimensions and hiding others. They become conceptual metaphors, in the terms of cognitive linguistics, through which Christianity is conceptualized[22]. Even literary metaphors (like that of an opposition between mountains, Cytheron vs. Sion) are built over these conceptual images which shape the idea of religion[23]. In effect, these images were very successful in posterity, and were expanded by the Church Fathers: when Clement creates these metaphors, in fact, he is not presenting an artificial portrait of

---

[21] Cf. commentary to 12.120 and 12.122. Celsus based a great part of his criticism to Christianity on the historicity of the man Jesus.

[22] This is the main postulate of cognitive linguistics, whose foundational work is G. Lakoff - M. Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, Berkeley, 1980.

[23] G. Lakoff –M. Turner, *More than Cool Reason: A Guide to Poetic Metaphor*, Berkeley, 1989.

Christianity, as if he was "disguising it", but shaping it in new Greek forms which will become permanent after him. That is the reason why the literary form of the *Protrepticus* is inseparable from its religious contents.

Yet Clement, though innovator and creator in many aspects, is also heir of a long tradition before him. The third way of making Christianity acceptable to the Greek mind is less original and follows the apologetic tradition: Clement argues that the God of the Bible had been prophesized by some Greek poets (like Orpheus and the Sibyll) and philosophers (like Plato). These type of arguments, though they may seem risible and weak, revealed a mood prone to find agreements and coincidences with Greek culture, instead of rejecting the whole of it. Against the anti-Hellenic line of other apologists like Tatian or Tertullian, Clement tries to build bridges with Greek tradition to link it to Christianity. This effort balances the critique of Paganism which is the other pillar of the *Protrepticus*.

Critique of Paganism

The critique of Paganism follows, on the one hand, the trends of precedent Christian apologetics. Like Athenagoras, Tatian or the author of the *Cohortatio ad Graecos* attributed to Justin, with whom he shares many sources, Clement attacks Greek gods, myths and cults and describes them as immoral, ridiculous and false (cf. 2.18: "the mysteries are, in a word, murders and tombs). His descriptions of Greek myths and cults are a source of great value for our knowledge of Greek religion, since many of his informations are not attested elsewhere. He draws largely from bookish mythographical sources, and chapters II, III and IV have a catalogic form which comes from plain transcribing of the notes he has taken from these sources, to which he adds some personal mockery and ironical comments.

On the other hand, Clement accomplishes a much more original task than merely showing the scandalous and ridiculous aspects of Greek religion. He is the first Christian author who shapes Paganism into a coherent whole out of a multiplicity of cults and myths. To Christianity, presented in Greek moulds, he opposes one single entity, the entire world of Greek myths and cults, which he dismisses as "superstition" (*deisidaimonia*) or "magic" (*goeteia*). This unification takes the mysteries as main representatives of Greek religion; Dionysus, Demeter and Zeus as its main gods; and Orpheus as its main prophet. This fusion of different religious elements into one single system leads to some misrepresentations of the reality of cults (e. gr. the identification

between Dionysiac mysteries and maenadism in 2.12.2) or to manipulation of previous traditions: e. gr. when in 1.3 he makes of Greek mysteries the contents of Orpheus' magical song, he identifies the myth of the enchanting singer with the content of the mysteries which Orpheus was credited to have founded; but, though both aspects are undoubtedly related in a deeper level (and Clement profits from such basic connexion) they myth of Orpheus had been consistently kept separated in previous Greek tradition from his mysteries, and there is not a single text which fuses them. However, it must be said that, when systematizing Paganism, Clement continues the tendency of his Hellenistic bookish sources, which were already giving some coherence and conceptualizing Greek religion when they presented in a systematic way their myths, cults and gods.

This shaping of two opposed fields leads inevitably to some symmetry in their construction, even if the moral hierarchy between the good pole and the evil one is always clear. Not only in metaphors like light vs. darkness, but also in the conceptual notion which shape Paganism and Christianity in opposition to each other. Thus, the opposition between religion (*theosebeia*) and superstition (*deisidaimonia*) brings with it other binary oppositions like the legitimate children of God against the bastard children of the idols (2.23.2); the Scripture against the writings of Greek theologians. Thus not only Christianity is dressed up with some Pagan categories (e. g. mystery terminology), but also Paganism is reshaped as a counter-Christianity[24].

Conversion

Between these two opposed entities, Christianity and Paganism, man is forced to choose. Though symetrically shaped, they are by no means equivalent: the whole work is structured in oppositions like religion / superstition, true / false. The *Protrepticus* aims to show that election between those poles should be obvious. Yet it has to be taken by each individual. The insistence on election and free will impregnates the whole work (e. g. the last paragraph in 12.123.2). That is exactly what is to be expected from a deliberative discourse, and in this sense Clement follows strictly the rules of the protreptic genre (cf. §4). His argument will show that the right decision will be, of

---

[24] This process is natural to apologetic literature, ending up in Augustin's *Civitas Dei* vs. *Civitas impiorum*. Cf. Orig. *CC* 1.16-18: "comparing (Pagan) books with (Christian) books... their stories to our stories, their ethical discourse to our laws and commandments" (βίβλους βίβλοις... ἱστορίας ἱστορίαις καὶ ἠθικοὺς λόγους νόμοις καὶ προστάγμασι παρατιθείς). Cf. D. B. Martin, *Inventing Superstition from the Hippocratics to the Christians*, Cambridge Mass. 2004.

course, to convert from Christianity to Paganism: this work is fundamental in the shaping of a new notion which enters the spiritual panorama of Antiquity, i. e. conversion[25].

Clement conceptualizes conversion over two basic images. The first one, which comes from the philosophical tradition, is that of turning round, as the verb ἐπιστρέφειν indicates, and its latin translation *con-vertere*. The literary images of metamorphosis of animals into men in Chapter I design an inner transformation conceived over this paradigm[26]. The exhortations to stop looking down into darkness and watch up to light are easily understandable as developments of this basic image.

The second conceptual metaphor is a Christian novelty, in which conversion is presented as a spacial movement from a point A to a point B. It does not only imply a turning round, but a physical deplacement. That is the basis of the verb μετανοέω, where the prefix implies a change of place: "Let us convert (μετανοήσωμεν) and pass (μεταστῶμεν) from (ἐξ) ignorance to (εἰς) knowledge, from insensibility to sensibility, from incontinence to continence, from injustice to justice, from atheism to God" (*Protr.* 10.93.1). It is easily expressed through literary metaphors like the journey from Helicon and Citheron to Sion, proposed at the very beginning of the work (1.2.3). This notion of conversion does not belong to the philosophical tradition. Religious conversion is a Christian conception[27], which is skilfully integrated by Clement in the protreptic genre.

---

[25] The classic study on ancient conversion is A. D. Nock, *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo*, Oxford, 1933. The only serious attempt to refute Nock's central ideas is that of R. MacMullen, "Two types of Conversion to Early Christianity", *Vig. Christ.* 37 (1983), 174-92; *Christianizing the Roman Empire*, New Haven, *YUP*, 1984; "Conversion: A Historian's View", *Sec. Cent.* 5 (1985/6), 67-81 (followed by responses in the same number by W. Babcock (pp. 82-89) and M. Jordan (pp. 90-96). McMullen defends that conversion to Christianity made little difference to the people of the Roman Empire from a purely historical point of view. Only a select minority would follow the elevate patterns of a philosophical conversion, while the great majority would just convert superficially. Yet for Nock it is not a matter of the psychological depth of every conversion, but of how the extension of the idea affects religion. And it is doubtlessly the elevate conversion which finally moulds the discourse, as is proved by the conversion to Islam of previously Christian territories. Accepting Nock's guidelines, another important study about aspects of proselytism among Jews, Pagans and Christians is that of M. Goodman, *Mission and Conversion. Proselityzing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 1994; See also Z. A. Crook, *Reconceptualizing Conversion: patronage, loyalty and conversion in the religions of the ancient Mediterranean*, Berlin-New York, 2004. On the continuity of the phenomenon until modern times, cf. now J. Bremmer, W.J. van Bekkum, A.L. Molendijk (eds.): *Cultures of Conversions*, 2 vols., Leuven, 2006.

[26] Plat. *Resp.* 518d, Cic. *ND* 1.77. Cf. P. Aubin, *Le problème de la conversion: Étude sur un terme commun à l'hellenisme et au christianisme des trois premiers siècles*, Paris, 1963.

[27] The scheme of the change of place may come, among other reasons, from the fact ancient religion demands adhesion to a cult, which needs physical presence, and is usually located in a specific sanctuary. Thus Clement's image of Helicon and Sion is suitable because it generalizes a fact imbedded in the mind of every ancient: to revere a god one had to practice a cult in a specific cult-place. Crook, *op. cit.*, shows that late Hellenistic cults were conceived in terms of patronage. To revere a god meant to serve him in exchange of his protection and graces, in the same way than a poor man served a powerful lord.

4. The protreptic discourse

The clearest adaptation of Christianity to Greek forms is the type of work which Clement chooses to write. The title *Protrepticus* immediately refers to a traditional prose composition which exhorts to take up the way of some discipline, usually philosophy. The protreptic is a kind of deliberative discourse (συμβουλευτικός λόγος) which aims to convince, to persuade and dissuade, and its specific features turn it into a recognizable subgenre, with particular style and type of argumentation[28]. Some dialogues of Plato have the typical features of the protreptic discourse[29]. But it was the young Aristotle, still in the Academy under the influence of Plato, who wrote the first work of that name which became the model for future works. In his *Protrepticus*, written against Isocrates' attacks against the Academy, he argues why to make philosophy (τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν) is both necessary and good for the happiness of man[30]. His exhortation, preserved among his exoteric works and well-known in Antiquity (though, paradoxically, it was not preserved with the esoteric *Corpus Aristotelicum* and, therefore, only some fragments have arrived to us), was very successful and had many imitations. Cicero in his *Hortensius* and Iamblichus in his *Protrepticus* explicitly take Aristotle as a model. Also, many polemical diatribes, discourses and ficticious letters were influenced by it: Heraclides and Plutarch write against Epicureans, Themistius or Galen have exhortative dicourses, and Epicurus himself has an exhortative *Letter to Menoeceus*. All these works share many formal features with the philosophical *Protrepticus* of Aristotle and Iamblichus. Clement, like Plutarch or other contemporary authors, does not follow slavishly Aristotle's model, but adapts it to his particular needs.

Compatibility between two or more cults was possible, just as one could be loyal to different patrons. But there could always be a specially jealous God who demanded exclusive service. To abandon other cults to serve only one, within the conceptual framework of patronage relations, could not be thought but in spacial terms.

[28] Though it was traditionally defined as a "literary genre", the variety of forms it may take have made scholars prefer other more flexible labels to define it such as "protreptic style", argumentation, or discourse (e. g. Van der Hoek, "Apologetic and Protreptic Discourse in Clement of Alexandria", en *L'apologétique chrétienne gréco-latine à l'époque prénicenienne*, Entr. Hardt 51, 2005, Vandoeuvres-Genève, 69-102). Cf. S. R. Slings, "Protreptic in Ancient Theories of Philosophical Literature," in J. G. J. Abbenes, S. R. Slings, and I. Sluiter (eds.), *Greek Literary Theory After Aristotle.*, ed. by (Amsterdam 1995),173-192; and S. van der Meeren "Le Protréptique en philosophie: essaie de definition d'un genre", *Rev. Ét. Gr.* 115 (2002 / 2), pp. 591-621, with full bibliography on the literary discussions.

[29] A. J. Festugière, *Trois protréptiques de Platon: Euthydème, Phédon, Epinomis*, Paris, 1973.

[30] On Aristoteles' *Protrepticus* the work of reference is I. Düring, *Aristotle's Protrepticus. An Attempt at a Reconstruction*, Göteborg 1961. Some authors are, however, sceptic about Düring's reconstruction, largely based on Iamblichus (e. g. O. Gigon, *Aristoteles III*, Berlin 1987). G. Schneewiss, *Aristoteles. Protreptikos*, Darmstadt 2005 offers now an alternative reconstruction.

Clement inserts in the tradition of protreptic discourse the old themes of earlier Christian apologists. His work is in many was the culmination of 2nd century apologetics, which had some precedents in earlier Greek tradition but had coined fundamentally a set of themes which served to defend Christianity and attack Paganism[31] (cf. §7 *infra*). By abandoning the defensive frame and adopting the scheme of persuasion / dissuasion, Clement takes the apologetic themes in the illustrious Greek tradition of the philosophical protreptic discourse. The protreptic type of argumentation can be traced back, to be sure, to the Pauline epistles[32], but the clear difference of Clement's *Protrepticus* with all earlier Christian literature is his will to link his work directly with the philosophical tradition. The title of his work[33], or the strict separation in two parts of protreptic and parainesis, are clear proofs of this will. It all collaborates to the substitution of philosophy by Christianity as the subject of exhortation[34].

However, this link with the Greek literary tradition can be traced not only in formal features, but, what is much more important, in the inner deep structure of the work. No matter how the forms and contexts may vary, the protreptic discourse has some specific features which come from its goals of persuading and dissuading. They are present both in the classical philosophical works with the title *Protrepticus*, and in Clement's exhortation to conversion, much different though it is in style and contents. Three central elements of Clement's work can be found also in the fragments of Aristotle's *Protrepticus* (many of which were taken over by Iamblichus in his own). We can go briefly through them, leaving their detailed explanation for the commentary.

Two opposed fields: Aristotle says: "For man, without perception and mind is similar to a plant; only without brain, he becomes like an animal, but free from irrationality, yet staying in his mind he becomes similar to God"[35]. In the protreptic genre, man is given the choice to choose between being less or more than a man. A *tertium genus* or a neutral field is not possible. Clement also calls the man who does not

---

[31] Cf. §7 on apologetic themes. For the link of apology with Greek literary tradition, cf. M. Frédouille, "De l'Apologie de Socrate aux Apologies de Justin" in J. Granarolo (ed.), *Hommage a R. Braun*, Nizza 1990, 1-22; W. Kinzig, "Der Sitz im Leben der Apologie in der alten Kirche", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 100 (1998), 291-317.

[32] D. E. Aune, "Romans as a *Logos Protreptikos* in the Context of Ancient Religious and Philosophical Propaganda," in M. Hengel – U. Heckel (eds.) *Paulus und das antike Judentum*, Tübingen 1991, 91-124. Cf. also the dissertation (forthcoming as a book) of D. Swancutt cited in n...

[33] The demonstration by A. von Stockhausen (*op. cit.* in. n. 51; cf. commentary to the title) that the original title of the work was just Προτρεπτικός and that πρὸς Ἕλληνας was added at a later stage confirms that its form was fully inserted in the Greek tradition and that it did not belong to a specific "subgenre".

[34] Cf. G. Lazzati, *L'Aristotele perduto e gli crittori cristiani*, Milano, 1938, 74-76.

[35] Arist. *Protr.* Fr. 28 During (= Iambl. *Protr.* 35.18 Pistelli)

know the Logos a slave of passion doomed to condemnation (and in 14.1-3 he compares him to plants or animals), while to the Christian he promises the same asimilation to God (ὁμοίωσις Θεῷ, cf. 12.122.4). The deep structure of the protreptic genre demands the construction of two opposed extreme poles. In addition, the basic images (god / animal, free /slave) which describe the good and the evil side are similar[36]. A look at the conclusion of both works is illustrative enough of the structural similarity which makes unavoidable lexical affinities, even though the rhetorical style is very different: Aristotle ends his *Protrepticus* saying: "either one has to practice philosophy or go away from here, saying goodbye to life, since all the rest seems to be futile and insignificant"; and Clement: "you must choose the most useful thing, judgement or grace, and I do not think worth doubting which is best. It is not possible to compare life with condemnation!"[37].

Decision: Between both opposed sides man is forced to choose. Just as there is no possible neutral field, the possibilty of a *non liquet* does not exist. Not to turn to philosophy (or to Christianity in Clement's adaptation) means to refuse it and choose slavery and ignorance. The protreptic genre implies a *homo optans*. At the same time, thrugh different images the decision for the superior side is shown to be obvious and beneficial: "To think sensibly and to contemplate are the function of the soul and the most eligible (αἱρετότατον) of all things for men, just as I think that seeing is for the eyes; anybody would choose (ἕλοιτο) to be able of seeing, even if nothing else apart from sight itself should be gained"... "sensibility is opposed to insensibility, and of both opposites, one must be avoided and one must be chosen (αἱρετόν)[38].

Ethical dimension: Aristotle claims that all theory should lead directly or indirectly to good praxis: "the most important of all things, we do not live a good life through knowing things about the beings, but through doing good things: for this is the real happiness. So philosophy, if it is useful, should consist in an action of good things or be useful for this kind of actions"[39]. Like the philosopher, Clement does not forget the ethical aspect of conversion. In chapters X and XI he will insist that following the Logos requires a practical dimension of leading a good life. However, neither the philosphical protreptic discourse nor its Christian counterpart engage in a detailed

---

[36] Cf. commentary to Chapter I and specially to 1.7.5 for an inherited image from Aristotle's *Protrepticus*.

[37] Arist. *Protr*. Fr. 110 Düring and 12.123.2

[38] Arist. *Protr*. Fr. 70 Düring Fr. 98 Düring (*in fine*). Cf. the homo optans portrayed by Clement, e.g. in 10.95.2, 12.123.2.

[39] Arist. *Protr*. fr. 52 Düring (= Iambl. *Comm. Math.* 79.15-80.1 F.)

description of what this ethical behaviour should imply. This is left for the *parainesis*, which always comes later, after the enthusiasm has been awoken by the exhortation[40]. Iamblichus makes it the second part of his *Protrepticus*, which describes the life of a philosopher along neo-Pythagorean guidelines. Clement leaves the parainetic continuation for the *Paedagogus*.

Therefore, though the themes of Clement's work are different from Aristotle's, the deep structure of his work comes straightly from the tradition of exhortations to philosophy. As the coincidence of the title *Protrepticus* showed at first glance to the public, Clement was consciously adhering to that prestigious tradition, which aimed to transfer Christianity all the authority that philosophy had in the ancient world.

5. Style

Much less considered by theologians than the rest of Clementine works, the *Protrepticus* has been praised above all by its style. The exalted tone of the initial and last chapters, the subtlety and variety of the literary allusions and the originality of its images have largely compensated the sensation of monotony which the apologetic lists of *exempla* inevitably causes in the modern reader. Therefore it is considered one of the finest literary achievements of Early Christianity.

The style chosen by Clement is, like the literary genre, an external sign of attachment to Greek culture. A mixture of Asianism in ornamentation and Atticism in grammar and syntax was the typical style of 2nd century prose, dominated by the Second Sophistic, and to this kind of "artistic prose" Clement adheres without any kind of doubts. There are, as would be expected, some traces of the *koiné* in the lexical, morphological, and syntactic levels, as well as a perceivable influence of the Scriptural style[41]. But the natural style of Clement stems in the greatest part from the rhetorical schools, and in the *Protrepticus* that link is obviously emphasized. Since philosophy cultivated the diatribe and the exhortation, nothing could be more natural than writing like the philosophers he was claiming to imitate and surpass. The attention paid to rhythm, *colla*, alliteration, parallelisms, etc., reveals the care he took in the formal

---

[40] Cf. Van der Meeren, *op. cit.* defending the traditional dicotomy, which has been, however, contested by D. M. Swuancutt, "Parainesis in light of Protrepsis: Troubling a typical dicotomy", in J. Starr-T. Engberg-Pedersen, *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*, Berlin-New York, 2004, 113-156

[41] To this conclusion arrive both J. Scham, *Der optativgebrauch bei Clemens Alexandrinus in seiner sprach- und stilgeschichtlichen Bedeutung*, Paderborn 1913, and H. Mossbacher, *Präpositionen und Präpositionsadverbien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Infinitivkonstruktionen bei Clemens von Alexandrien*, Erlangen, 1931, from their respective studies of Clement's use of the optative (and, in passing, of the dual) and of the prepositions. On the influence of the Bible upon the style, cf. intr. §10.

composition of the *Protrepticus* to gain the respect of a cultivated class which generally despised Christian literature for its primitive and barbarious style. Yet in the analysis of his work the style cannot be reduced to pointing out the ornamental elements. Not only does the style often collaborate in the blending of Biblical and Greek tradition and in the presentation of Christianity in Greek forms, but it also determines the ideas expressed by Clement and, in a way, shapes the form of Hellenized Christianity. In all these levels, from the purely phonetic games to the deepest layers in which form is inseparable from content, the style of the *Protrepticus* was exhaustively studied in 1967 by H. Steneker[42]: he undertakes this task in a threefold structure: the formal aspects of style (phonic effects and word-plays, clauses, rhythm), of the style as an instrument of exhortation to conversion, and, in the third part, the metaphor of mysteries. His work remains a fundamental reference. In this introduction only the most salient formal features will be mentioned, from the most superficial to the deepest ones, leaving the particular details for the commentary.

The prose of the *Protrepticus* follows, even exageratedly, the usage of the Second Sophistic: it is based on an equilibrium purposeflly disequilibrated in specific points[43]. The main factors of these two principles are phonetic and syntactic constructions. The love for phonetic effects determinates in many occasions the choice of words[44]. Yet many of the phonetic resources used by Clement cannot be said to be purely ornamental. Thus, the rhythm and repetitions of the opening chapter and of other

---

[42] H. Steneker, *Peithous demiourgia: observations sur la fonction du style dans le protreptique de Clément d'Alexandrie*, Nijmegen, 1967, integrated all the previous analyses of the style of the *Protrepticus* in classical works like those of E. Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, Leipzig 1898, or H.I. Marrou, *Historie de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, Paris 1948. I have not been able to see the yet unpublished work of 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).

[43] Steneker, *op cit.* 64 is worth quoting as summary of all his previous research: "Le style est régi par deux principes paradoxaux: équilibre et déséquilibre. L'équilibre est la base, mais le déséquilibre introduit les variantes désirées. La responsion métrique des *kommata* se termine par une clausule qui comporte un mètre différent; pourtant, nonobstant leur grande varieté, on constate que, dans les clausules, le crétique final est la règle générale. Il y a parallélisme dans l'ordre des mots, mais les chiasmes rompent opportunément la trop grande rigidité qui en resulterat. Il ya beaucoup de répétitions emphatiques, mais soudain le style devient concis et les expressions variées. Tout témoigne d'une recherche de style et d'un souci de la forme qui nous paraissent exagerés, mais qui, présumons-nous, en attirant l'attention du public, au goût duquel ils s'accordaient, n'ont pas manqué leur but".

[44] Steneker, *op cit.* 11-26, researches thoroughly all the cases. In the commentary only the more complex cases or those with some relevance for the meaning of the text will be spotted, for the purely phonetic correspondences are self-evident. As Steneker himself acknowledges (p.25): "On peut se démander où se situe la frontière entre le hasard et le jeu phonique voulu... impossible d'établir la frontière qui, en utre, n'existe pas réellement: on s'imagine aisément que Clément ait souvent dû être frappé lui-même par une image sonore fortuite et que, consciemment, il l'ait perfectionnée". In any case, the phonetic effects in this work are much more frequent than in the other Clementine works.

passages contribute to give it a hymnic-dythirambic tone which is very appropiate for transmitting enthusiasm to the audience[45]. The repetition of lexical roots in different forms and even of the same word (*polyptoton*) are used often to emphasize exhortations to convert or attacks to Paganism. Synonyms and explanations which repeat the same message with different words aim to the same objective. Etymology (true or false)[46] is used with particular frequence to draw home his point of the innoble origin of Greek gods and cults. On the other hand, some etymological word-plays, ridiculous as they may seem (like e. gr. the linking of Eve with the Bacchic cry *evai* in 2.12.2) contribute to associate Biblical and Greek tradition and thus to make the Logos appear as new but not alien to the purported Pagan audience.

A similar function has the profit taken from the ambiguity of words which have different senses in both traditions: Nomos, Logos or *pneuma*, in Chapter I, are expressive enough of how Biblical concepts can be introduced to the Greeks as if they were notions familiar to their philosophical tradition. The divine Logos presented to the Greeks, for example, is also the *protreptikos logos* which precedes the *paidagogos logos* in a purely literary sense which is blended with the theological concept. Inversely, some attacks on Greek religion profit from the negative sense that some traditional Greek words (like δράκων "snake" or δαίμονες) have in Biblical tradition. These words are taken from their original context into a different one in which they acquire a Christianized sense. They may appear in paraphrase or in direct quotations.

Most quotations serve as evidence to support an argument (e. g. human features of the gods) or as purely ornamental. But other times a passage from a classical author is completely inserted in the discourse almost as part of it. In the critiques of Greek religion, for instance, Clement makes Heraclitus' words his own, so much that it is difficult at times to know exactly who is speaking (2.22.3). The whole work sounds with echoes of Platonic *Phaedrus* and the last chapter makes explicit references to the *Odyssey* and to Euripides' *Bacchai*. It seems as if, just as in the *refutatio* of Greek mysteries Clement followed Orpheus' script to denounce them, also in the *argumentatio* which makes the case for Christianity he followed to a certain extent rather than the guidelines offered by the Bible, those of the Classical authors he most admires. This expanded and free quotations, which end up being imitations of an author's tone, are

---

[45] Cf. p.e. 67.2, 113.4-5, 110.3, analysed by Steneker, *op cit*. 49-51.
[46] Steneker, *op. cit*., 18-19. Cf. also U. Treu, "Etymologie und Allegorie bei Klemens von Alexandrien", *Studia patristica* 4 (*TU* 79), 1961, 191-211.

coherent with the intention of the *Protrepticus*. If Sion is going to replace Helicon and Citheron, and the New Song will substitute the old one, nothing is more logical that the new prophet takes over the tone of those whom he wants to replace. The Greeks would not accept a religious tradition esthetically inferior to their own.

Steneker rightly devotes a section to "the style as means of exhortation"[47]. The addressing to the readers as if they were audience of a discourse was partly demanded by the protreptic genre, but it nevertheless leaves a deep trace in the form of the work. Vocatives and apostrophes to his readers (designed with general terms like "men" or "Greeks" which allow a critical, sometimes even insulting, tone) are abundant: they come partly from the Biblical tradition and from the revelatory style of Greek religious and philosophical texts[48]. Verbs in optative and imperative (many of them in the third person) and rhetorical questions (both to gods, poets or philosophers, or to the audience) appear also in a high proportion coherent with the purpose of the discourse.

Finally, the most effective of all stylistic resources is metaphor: metaphors seldom have a purely ornamental purpose, since they go further than a mere simile[49]. Not only does it make the concept clearer through another image, like comparisons do. It also constructs the concept in the terms of the image, so that some aspects are underlined, others are hidden, and others can even be modified depending on the image one chooses. Clearly not all metaphors have the same effect. Clement presents the attack on Greek cults like a trial against Paganism, using as a rhetorical weapon a judicial metaphor ubiquitous along the whole work: it allows him to interrogate and accuse Greek gods, philosophers and poets, calling them as witnesses to their own accusation. But he also presents the Logos through a variety of metaphors: some are short images which are not developed (like the Logos as a triumphant actor or athlete in Chaper I); three of them are much more extended: the Logos is presented as a song (Chapter I), as daylight (Chapter XI), or as the true mysteries (Chapter XII). The first two may be popular as rhetoric or poetic presentations of the Logos, yet they do not have enough depth to become permanent representations of it; but the mysteries were, on the one hand, akin in many ritual aspects to Christian experience, and on the other hand, mystery terminology had been developed by philosophy as an appropiate way to

---

[47] Steneker, *op. cit.* 118-140.

[48] Steneker, *op. cit*. 121 points out that the singular σύ is always used in a positive sense (10.2, 50.4), while the plural is apotreptic (negative): 44.4, 106.1. This is in complete agreement with the Greek revelatory tradition (cf. commentary to 1.2.2, 4.45.5, 11.115.3).

[49] J. M. Tsermoulas, *Die Bildersprache des Klemens von Alexandrien,* Kairo 1934, lists all of them. Cf. Steneker, *op. cit.* 133-140 (and 141-174 exclusively on the mysteries).

express philosophical knowledge. Therefore Clement, being the first Christian author who dared to present the Logos using the image of mysteries, started a way of describing and perceiving Christianity that would become intrinsecal to the tradition of the Church.

Clement used the stylistic resources of the protreptic tradition, of the diatribe, and of the rhetorical trends imposed by the Second Sophistic. His choice of style not only reveals the purposes and tastes of the author, but also those of his audience.

6. Audience

Pagans or Christians?

Exhortation to conversion is rhetorically addressed to Pagans, and the ideal reader of the *Protrepticus* would no doubt be a Pagan who seeks truth and is struck by the revelation of the Christian Logos. The problem lies, however, as in the rest of apologetic literature, in the fact that this ideal reader would be very hard, if not impossible, to find. To read an a apologetic work one should concede some authority to Christian authors, and that presupposes at least some affinity to Christian circles[50]. Also, beside the quotations of Homer or Plato there are still more references to the Bible, which obviously have in mind a reader able to recognize most of them.

Yet the contents of a work like the *Protrepticus* only has sense in confrontation with Paganism. A likely middle-point may be sought in the instruction of Christians to confront Paganism, both in their external and in their internal lives. Not only would this work give Christians resources to preach conversion in their private circles; the *Protrepticus*, devised as the first stage in Christian instruction, could also also intend to exhort the new Christian, or more likely, the newly converted but not yet baptized whose faith needed to be reassured[51], to abandon definitely the cults and beliefs that he might have held before his conversion. Syncretism between Greek, Oriental, Egyptian, Jewish and Christian religions was very extended, not the least in Egypt as is shown by the papyri, and the insistence on defining sharp boundaries between religion and

---

[50] Too radical seems the proposal (reported by A. van der Hoek, *op. cit.* (n. 28), n. 19, of D. M. Swancutt, *Pax Christi: Romans As Protrepsis To Live As Kings* (Dissertation PhD, Duke University, 2001), UMI Microform 3041314, Ann Arbor (Michigan), which following on her thesis on the *Epistle of Romans*, thinks that the *Protrepticus* has little to do with conversion and was aimed to strenghten the self-security of the Christian community. It is clear, however, that this was a collateral effect of the *Protrepticus* (cf. *supra*, §3 on the presentation of Christianity).

[51] As it has been recently suggested by A. von Stockhausen, "Ein "neues Lied"? Der *Protreptikos* des Klemens von Alexandrien", in Ch. Schubert, A. von Stockhausen (eds.), *Ad veram religionem reformare. Frühchristliche Apologetik zwischen Anspruch und Wirklichkeit*, Erlangen 2006, 75-96, esp. 89-92.

superstition may be determined by the conscience of this danger. Other Christian apologetic works tried hard to draw the limits with Judaism and different heresies[52]. In the *Stromata*, Clement himself does engage with many Gnostic trends. In the *Protrepticus*, however, his only rival is traditional Greek religion.

Anti-Christian polemic literature

This leads us to another possible type of audience addressed in this work, i. e., anti-Christian polemics. Celsus had written his *True Account* in ca 170-180 AD, and it is not improbable that Clement knew it –or other similar works– and thought partly of his *Protrepticus* a an answer[53]. Celsus, as later Porphyry or Julian, raised traditional Greek religion as the true source of spiritual knowledge; mysteries and theological literature, like Orpheus or Apollinean oracles, were vindicated as their revelation; myths were saved through allegory. Instead, Christianity was attacked as a dangerous novelty without philosophical depth. Clement, instead, presents the Christian Logos as the culmination of philosophy; attacks the literality of Greek myths and obviates the possibility of their allegory; takes Orpheus, the oracles and the mysteries (Chapters I and II) as the main targets of his refutation; mocks Greek tradition and condemns custom (Chapters II and X); and vindicates the novelty of Christianity (Chapter I), making it a proud title of victory against the old and aged myths. Whether it was Celsus whom he had in mind or other similar critics, to be confronted in written or oral discussions, the terms of the polemics are the same that we find in anti-Christian apologetics.

7. The *Protrepticus* in apologetic tradition

Clement of Alexandria may be considered the last of the Greek Apologists and the first of the Church Fathers. Part of his work continues the lines of his predecessors and part of it, notably the *Stromata*, inaugurates new theological lines which will be developed by the Christian authors of the following centuries. Still, the *Protrepticus*,

---

[52] On this struggle for self-definition, cf. D. K. Buell, *Why This New Race? Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity*, New York, 2005.

[53] It is obviously exaggerated the hypothesis of J. M. Vermander, "De quelques répliques à Celse dans le *Protréptique* de Clément d'Alexandrie", *Rev. Ét. Aug.* 23 (1977), 3-17, which sees the whole work as a thorough refutation of Celsus. He points to many conceptual parallels, but non of them has the verbal and formal similarity which would assure that it is a direct response to Celsus. That is why it is preferable to insert the topics of the discussion in the atmosphere of Christian and anti-Christian apologetics than restricting them to two single works. Vermander, on the other hand, tends to see a response to Celsus in practically any Christian work of the 2nd nd 3rd centuries (Theophilus, Hippolytus, Minucius Felix, Tertullian, Pseudo-Justin), with the same arbitrarity as in his ideas about Clement.

addressed as it is to the Heathen, is above all an apologetical work, whose relation with the precedent Christian apologetic literature is self-evident[54].

Many of the arguments and examples alleged by Clement in his refutation of Paganism and in defense of Christianity are also found in the Greek apologists, above all Athenagoras, Tatian, Theophilus, and the author of the so-called *Cohortatio ad Graecos* falsely attributed to Justin[55]. Rather than a direct influence of these authors – though it cannot be excluded that Clement knew many of their works, and in fact he expressly refers to Tatian–, these parallels probably come from the common sources of *exempla* to be used against Paganism. The use of the same material inevitably produces common arguments, topics, and expressions, some of which go back to Jewish apologetics in the 2nd cent. BC. This continuity with previous tradition is even more clear in the *Stromata*, in which books I or V treat at length subjects like the "stolen wisdom" which would have Greek philosophers taking their knowledge from Biblical revelation. Yet the *Protrepticus*, partly due to its formal genre which requires brevity and persuasive enthusiasm rather than lengthy demonstrations, adds some important modifications to the use of this material. For example, in *Stromata* V he uses the Pagan and Biblical *exempla* of an apologetic anthology which tried to prove the plagiarism of Greek philosophers and poets from the Bible. In the *Protrepticus* he uses the same material, but redistributes it in chapters VI (the intuitions of the philosophers), VII (those of the poets) and VIII (the direct prophecies of the Bible), in an orderly succession of preparations to the presentation of the Logos. The theme of plagiarism is let down for the benefit of the exhortative purposes of the *Protrepticus*.

A first clear particularity which distinguishes the work of Clement from that of Athenagoras and Tatian (and which is more akin to Justin or to the *Cohortatio*) is a much more clear presence of the Jewish Alexandrian tradition. It is well known that Philo is ubiquitous in the *Stromata*, but he is also frequently used in the *Protrepticus*, as the many parallels appearing in the commentary will show[56]. Also, the sources for the

---

[54] In general on Christian apologetics in the 2nd century cf. B. Pouderon, *Les apologistes chrétiens,* Paris 2005; M. Fiedrowicz, *Apologie im frühen Christentum*, Paderborn 2001; M. J. Edwards, M. Goodman, and S. Price (eds.), *Apologetics in the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1999; B. Pouderon – J. Doré (eds.), *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, Paris, 1998; and the *Entretiens Hardt* of 2005. Cf. also the two articles cited in n. 31, and van der Hoek (*op. cit.* n. 28) for the relation of apology as a genre with the protreptic discourse.

[55] Ch. Riedweg in his commentary of 1994 has shown that this work was with all probability the *Ad Graecos de vera religione* of Marcellus of Ancyra. But the scholarly tradition it too strong to change a such well-known label, so for the sake of clarity I will refer to it as Ps-Justin's *Cohortatio*.

[56] A. Van der Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and his Use of Philo in the Stromateis*, 1986. J. C. M. van Winden, "Quotations from Philo in Clement of Alexandria's *Protrepticus*", *Vig Christ* 32 (1978), 208-

quotations of Greek philosophers and poets which somehow prophesized the Biblical truth are clearly Jewish-Alexandrian. It is not strange that the line which springs from Alexandrian Judaism and to which Clement adheres has a much more philo-Hellenic attitude than the aggressive line against Paganism to which Athenagoras or Tatian (or Tertullian in the Latin side) belong. The main goal of Hellenistic Jewish literature was to find a place for Judaism in the cultural Greek world, and the adaptation of the Biblical theology to Greek categories and the finding of more or less clear links between the Bible and Greek poetry and philosophy played a central role in this process of acculturation. Only from the 2nd cent. onwards would gain predominant weight within Judaism the anti-Hellenic current[57]. Among the Christians, some chose to deny any relation between Athens and Jerusalem, in the famous words of Tertullian (*Praesc. haer.* 7.9). Others would try to build as many bridges as possible between both. Clement belonged to the latter group, and he played a central role in the intellectual victory of the Hellenizing tendencies within Christian tradition.

The circumstances in which apologetics was written would also influence the tone of each author. Justin, Athenagoras, Theophilus or Tatian would write to defend Christianity against the prejudices and accusations that it suffered as a yet small and little-known sect. Their tone is defensive, and the attacks against Paganism intend to reshift the balance of arguments rather than to cause any abandons of Greek religion by their readers. Half a century later in Alexandria, Clement writes in a situation in which the Christian community is large and composed of educated people, and his tone is quite different. The attacks on Paganism have a much more specific function, to provoke direct conversion to Christianity, which in its turn is presented as the triumphant and truthful replacement of old myths and cults. To use Clement's own judicial metaphor (cf. 2.12.1), it is not Christianity that must defend itself in a trial, but it is rather Paganism that is under accusation. The balance will turn further against Paganism in the following centuries, when the apologetic works of Eusebius, Lactancius, Arnobius, Firmicus Maternus, Augustine, Cyrill or Theodoretus will be much more aggresive and less cautious than Clement (from whom they draw much inspiration, cf. § 12), in their attacks against agonizing Paganism.

213: "Clement had Philo's writings, so to speak, at his desk when he was writing his *Protrepticus*" (208). In general, cf. D. T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, Minneapolis, 1993.

[57] Cf. e. g. E. S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London, 1998.

In his presentation of Christianity, even if most of it is covered by metaphorical and literary rhetoric, Clement also gives quite more space to theology than Athenagoras, Tatian or Theophilus[58]. It can easily be felt that the ethical teacher of the *Paedagogus* and the theologian of the *Stromata* is also the rhetorician of the *Protrepticus*. The word-plays with which he introduces the notions of Logos, *nomos* or *pneuma* have no parallels in precedent authors. Among the apologists of the 2nd century, only Justin has a similar interest and deep insight in theological matters. In a purely rhetorical and propagandistic work as the *Protrepticus* is, this interest is remarkably perceivable. Along the whole work there are some hints of the theological concepts which he will deploy in later writings, but it is in chapters IX, X and XI, the *argumentatio*, where his exhortation turns into a theory of the Logos. Even though this presentation does not reach a deep systematic form (cf. §11) the images and metaphors he uses have an inner consistence which announces the theologian writing as rhetorician.

Finally, it must be said that contrary to most of the previous apologetic works, some of the rhetorical devices used by Clement did contribute to the permanent development of the self-representation and perception of Christianity. Thus he carried the apologetic *topoi* to perfection as quasi-theological concepts and opened the way for a new task of theological speculation which he would himself start in his following works. This is due also to the change of circumstances that allowed a positive presentation instead of a purely defensive one. For example the construction of Christianity as the true mystery, which replaces the Greek mystery cults, specially those of Eleusis, had a tremendous success which led the way to the permanent use of mystery terminology and categories in the conceptual shaping of Christianity from the 3rd century onwards. If Plato had adapted mystery language to philosophy, Philo did it with the philosophical interpretation of the Bible and Clement with Christian doctrine and ritual[59]. This was mainly accomplished by the *Protrepticus*, which had no little echo in later Christian literature (§12). Clement managed to profit from the heritage of the precedent apologetic tradition to create new trends which would succeed in the following centuries[60].

---

[58] The theology of the apologists was heavily determined by the *ad hoc* character of their works. Cf. M. Rizzi, "Gli apologisti greci. Teologia in funzione polemica e propositiva" in E. Dal Covolo *Storia della teologia*, Roma-Bologna 1995, pp. 45-62.

[59] Ch. Riedweg, *Mysterienterminologie bei Plato, Philo und Klemens von Alexandrien*, München 1987.

[60] J. Bernard, *Die apologetische Methode bei Klemens von Alexandrien: Apologetik als Entfaltung der Theologie*, Leipzig, 1968.

8. Sources

Bookish sources

One of the main differences of Clement's work with both the Greek exhortations to philosophy and earlier Christian apologists are the sources used by the Alexandrian to compose his book. Clement's *Protrepticus* is much more varied in this aspect than his predecessors, which makes the research of his sources particularly interesting. In Alexandria he had access to material from both Jewish-Christian apologetics and Pagan erudition, which make his work a precious source of informations about ancient literature, philosophy and religion which in many cases are incompletely (or not at all) attested elsewhere. At the same time, the study of his sources illuminates how he uses this variety of sources to combine quotations and allusions from different traditions to create a new cultural product, i. e. Hellenized Christianity.

A previous warning is convenient. The *Quellensforschung* aims to locate the material whose origin can be traced back to a work or an author, as it is done when it is possible in the commentary to each passage. But this does not necessarily mean that Clement had always in mind the work he was quoting or in which he was taking inspiration. As we shall see, this is the case in many times. But Pagan authors like Homer or Plato, and on the other hand, the Bible or Philo, were probably part of the oral culture which always surrounded Clement (let us remember that Pantaenus' teaching seems to have been purely oral)[61], and they had been read by Clement so many times, that their influence goes far beyond mere quoting. This is the reason why his philosophical and Biblical background are given separate treatment. I will list here the types of sources that can be spotted in the *Protrepticus*, independently of how deep their influence in Clement was. The Pagan anti-Christian literature which Clement may have read has been previously dealt with.

All the cataloguic lists which fill the *refutatio* of Paganism and the *argumentatio* (i. e. chapters II-VIII) in favour of Christianity come from bookish sources, with some possible isolated instances which may be inserted out of a reminiscence. From the books he reads in the Christian *scriptorium* and the Alexandrian libraries, Clement excerpts in notes the examples that he considers useful to make his case[62]. Some of

---

[61] Cf. Le Boulluec, *op. cit* (n. 5), 32f.
[62] A. van den Hoek, "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria: A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods" *Vig Christ* 50.3 (1996), 223-243. The gigantic *Quellensforschung* of J. Gabrielsson, *Über die Quellen des Clemens Alexandrinus*, Uppsala, 1906-09, which postulates Favorinus as main

these bookish sources are clearly identifiable because there are coincidences with other authors, and other times he reveals them himself. Yet most of them are anonymous and not known from other testimonies. The main types of bookish sources are the following:

Apologetic sources to refute Paganism: many of the citations of Greek poets which show the immorality of Greek gods are found in other Christian apologists. Some of them come from anthologies which circulated in apologetic circles, others may be already topical instances which any Christian polemist would know. Chapters II-IV and some parts of chapter X show this kind of topical poetic citations[63]. To this group can be added the anthologies of philosophical texts which serve to show the theological errors of the philosophers (chapter V).

Apologetic sources to support Christianity: most of the instances Clement allegues of a poet or philosopher who has said some of the Christian truths are found also in other apologists. Since this approach to Greek culture was initiated and developed by Hellenistic Judaism, it is probable that the anthologies shared by Christian apologists (Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, the *Cohortatio* and Clement) spring ultimately from Jewish apologetics. They fill above all chapters VI, VII and VIII. In these first two kinds of sources the direct consultation of other apologetic treatises instead of anthologies cannot be excluded, but it cannot be clearly demonstrated either. Of all the other apologists, only Tatian is cited once in the *Stromata* (1.21.1).

Pagan erudite sources: Like the Jewish before him, in Alexandria Clement had access to excellent libraries where he could get hold of many treatises on religious and literary matters: erudite works on Greek myths and cults and literary texts which approached these subjects from a purely scientific curiosity. Yet these works were often tainted by some perspective on religion (like Euhemerism or Stoicism, for instance) and Clement often profitted from the historical or more or less allegorical explanations of myth (which were not elaborated against myth, bur rather to save its truth[64]) to attack their falsehood. In this way he gave an apologetic use to works who never intended it. And at the same time, he transmitted in this way many informations on Greek religion and literature which would otherwise have been lost. Chapters II, III and IV are

---

source of both the *Protrepticus* and the *Stromata*, is generally dismissed today as lacking enough solid basis. W. Bousset *Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom: Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenäus*, Göttingen, 1915, is still valuable in its approach, though many of its speculative conclusions have been refuted.

[63] N. Zeegers-Van der Vorst, *Les citations paiennes dans les apologistes grecs du II siècle*, Louvain 1972.

[64] P. Veyne, *Les grecs ont-ils cru à leus mythes?*, Paris 1983. L. Brisson, *How Philosophers Saved Myths: Allegorical Interpretation and classical Mythology*, Chicago-London 2004.

abundant in this type of sources. They present many parallels with other roughly contemporary erudite Pagan authors with which they obviously share some sources, like Pausanias, Philostratus, Plutarch, Aelian and Athenaeus.

Pagan philosophical sources: since Clement had an ample culture and easy access to books, some of his philosophical quotations may not come from bookish anthologies, but from general knowledge or direct consultation. Plato is of course the favourite pre-Christian Greek, like for most of the Church Fathers. Clement knew him well and the quotations and references to Plato are constant along his whole work. The *Phaidrus* seems to be specially on the back of Clement's mind when writing the *Protrepticus*[65]. But also Heraclitus should be mentioned here. His critique of Greek traditional religion, which aimed probably to depurate it from misunderstanding and superficiality, was used by Clement to attack the whole of it. Clement probably knew Heraclitus' book directly, and he is, therefore, a precious unique transmittor of many of his fragments[66]. The majority of the other philosophers mentioned probably come from intermediate sources which excerpt some fragments with different interests.

Pagan poetic sources: apart from the quotations springing from apologetic sources, or from erudite Pagan works, there are many other lines from Greek poets whose function is not to support any arguments, but just ornate or to create metaphors in an original and personal way. Homer is the most frequently quoted poet, and often by heart, as some imprecisions in the quoted lines seem to indicate[67]. The references to Euripides' *Bacchai* in chapter XII must come also from Clement's literary culture. Euripides is his favourite poet, the one in whom he sees more affinities with Christian theology, and though he condemns theatre as a whole, following an apologetic *topos*, he aknowledges the intuitions of the Greek poet[68].

Direct experience

The *Quellensforschung* may search for the bookish sources of particular sections. But another important root of the *Protrepticus* may lie not in the notes taken from reading but from direct contact of Clement with the religious and philosophical

---

[65] G. W. Butterworth, "Clement of Alexandria's *Protrepticus* and the *Phaedrus* of Plato", *CQ* 10 (1916), 198-205.

[66] Cf. H. Wiese, *Heraklit bei Klemens von Alexandrien*, Kiel 1963; P. Valentin, "Héraclite et Clément d´Alexandrie", *Rech Sc Rel* 46 (1958), 27-59.

[67] Cf. now M. Fédou, "La référence à. Homère chez Clément d'Alexandrie et Origène", in L . Perrone (ed.) *Origeniana Octava*, 377-383.

[68] Steneker, *op. cit*, 83ff; Zeegers-van der Vorst, *op. cit*. 36ff, 100ff, 308ff.

atmosphere of his time. These un-bookish sources, since they are more difuse, are more difficult to spot. Yet three of them can be clearly shown as an example (other less meaningful cases will be mentioned in the commentary):

Iconography: the iconographical identification between Orpheus and Christ was popular from the 2nd cent. AD onwards in Christian art (frescoes in catacombs and reliefs in sarcophages). It derived probably from the Jewish presentation of David as Orpheus, as shown in mosaics and frescoes in some sinagogues of the Middle East[69]. The fact that Clement decides to start the *Protrepticus* with an explicit presentation of Christ as the true Orpheus (cf. chapter I) can hardly be thought to be casual. He is giving a literary form to an identification which was becoming increasingly popular in Christian circles, and which his work contributed to expand.

Liturgy: Some expressions may derive not from literary poetry but from Christian liturgy. Perhaps the mentions to the power of the New Song of the Logos, to music and poetry in Chapter I may echo Christian music and singing[70]. Baptism, which is the objective point which his audience should reach to culminate conversion, is clearly hinted at in some passages[71]. Some of the images seem to be partly developed from liturgical formulas: the presentation of Logos as light is built on the central phrase χαῖρε φῶς, probably a liturgical acclamation of the Early Church (11.114.1); the eulogy of God's fatherhood culminates in the probably ritual utterance Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ (9.88.3). This kind of occasional ritual echoes in Clement's prose must be distinguished from the mystery metaphors, which are more related to literary tradition.

Mystery terminology: the presentation of Christianity as the true mysteries of the Logos has raised the question of whether the terminology of initiation (specially in Chapter XII) reflects some ritual correspondence. Of course many elements may be shared by Christian rites and those of other contemporary cults. Yet the mystery terminology in the *Protrepticus* does not come from that similarity but from the extremeply popular metaphor of knowledge as an initiatic process. Plato introduced the metaphor into philosophy and Philo applied it to Biblical theology. In Clement's time it

---

[69] Cf. the classic study of H. Stern, "Orphée dans l'art paléochrétien", *Cahiers Archéologiques* 23 (1974), 1-16; a good status quaestionis in J. M. Roessli, « Orphée aux catacombes », *Archivum Bobiense* 25, 79-133 ; and some new thoughts in Ch. Markschies « Odysseus und Orpheus christlich gelesen » in R von Haehling (ed.), *Griechische Mythologie und frühes Christentum*, Darmstadt 2005.

[70] These possibilities, which cannot reach beyond the speculative level, are explored by A. Skeris, *ΧΡΩΜΑ ΘΕΟΥ: On the origin and theological interpretation of the musical imagery used by the ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries, with special reference to the image of Orpheus*, Altötting, 1976.

[71] 9.82.4, 10.94.1-3, 10.99.3, 11.116.4, 12.120.1-2 ("initiation")

had already become the basic framework of rhetoric and philosophy to express progressive learning of the truth. Clement used that framework with such sucess that mystery terminology began to be applied freely to label Christian experience. In Origen this is already clearly perceptible. Thus Clement contributed to a new ritual use of mystery terminology which he had taken from the philosophical *koiné* of his time[72].

The fact that the traces of direct experience are limited to a few passages in comparison with the great presence of bookish sources could make a modern reader think that Clement's work is an erudite dissertation made in and for a library, without any real contact with his contemporary world. The *Paedagogus* and *Stromata*, which engage with practical and theoretical problems of the time, would refute by themselves this charge to Clement. But also the *Protrepticus* is far from being a literary exercise. Bookishness was a central element of religiosity in Late Antiquity. If Clement attacks the myth of Orpheus, the Homeric pantheon and the Eleusinian mysteries, it is because contemporary Pagans had their eyes turned towards Clasical times in search for religious illumination[73]. Not long before Clement, Celsus claimed that Greek religious tradition was earlier and nobler than the Jewish and Christian one. Clement fought against the gods and authors of classical times because they were more and more alife in the contemporary Greek world. Against them he had to raise something better both in form and in content.

9. Philosophical background

Clement is, with Justin before him and Origen after him, the Christian Father whose view of Greek philosophy is more positive[74]. This admiration for the intellectual accomplishments of Greek philosophers is patent in the *Protrepticus* in a twofold way. On the one hand, in chapter VI he will concede that they have had some intuitions of the truth. He attempts to reconcile this aknowledgement of the presence of truth in Greek philosophy with the unity of the Revelation through two alternative explanations: they (i.e. Plato) had contact (through Moses in Egypt) with the Biblical Revelation; or they were illuminated independently by some sparks of the truth[75]. Both explanations belong to the topics of apologetic tradition, and they have little intellectual weight for modern

---

[72] Cf. Riedweg, *op. cit.*, esp. 154ff.

[73] M. Herrero, *Tradición órfica y cristianismo antiguo*, Madrid 2007, cap. II; Steneker, *Peithous*, 92.

[74] Cf. H. Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition: Studies in Justin, Clement and Origen*, Oxford, 1966.

[75] Cf. commentary to 6.68.2.3, 6.70.1-2.

minds. But it has to be taken into account that they were attempts to build bridges with the Greek world to integrate in Christian tradition all that could be saved from the classical culture.

On the other hand, not only does he use philosophy to support his argument, but his way of thinking is much influenced by it. Clement's thought has been studied in connection with all the philosophical currents of his time, with which he shares many sources and postulates. The abundant scholarship on the subject has focused mainly on the *Stromata*, where he deploys all his knowledge, and his Jewish-Hellenistic inheritance, his debt to philosophy, and his proximity to some Gnostic currents, are better studied[76]. But in the *Protrepticus* the roots of his thought are already perceivable, even if they can be spotted more through literary coincidences than through conceptual parallels. Let us examine the main trends which influence his thought in ascending order of importance.

Firstly, there are some Greek attitudes regarding religion which stem from philosophical currents and which are inherited by Christians in their critique of Paganism. Though they they leave few traces in the positive argumentation of Clement's thought, they loom large over chapters II-IV and X: the Heraclitean critique of Greek ritual, and the Euhemeristic and skeptic interpretations of Greek myth are incorporated by Clement to Christian offensive against Paganism[77].

There is a clear influence of Stoicism in his approach to internal conversion (*epistrophe*) and its necessary consequence of living rightly (εὖ ζῆν, cf. 1.7.2), a subject much developed by Stoic philosophers which probably had become inherent to the genre of philosophical exhortation. Stoic influence will be much more evident in the *Paedagogus* where the ethical subjects which worried both Stoics and Christians are fully treated. Another clear trace of Stoicism in the *Protrepticus* is found in Clement's

---

[76] In chronological order, the most important studies on Clement's relation with Greek philosophy are: C. Merk, *Clemens Alexandrinus in seiner Abhängigkeit von der griechischen Philosophie*, Leipzig, 1879; H. De Faye, *Clément d'Alexandrie. Étude sur les rapports du christianisme et de la philosophie grecque au IIe siècle*, Paris, 1898; J. Meifort, *Der Platonismus bei Clemens Alexandrinus*, Tübingen 1928; M. Pohlenz, *Klemens von Alexandreia und sein hellenistisches Christentum*, Göttingen, 1943; Walther Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus*, Berlin, 1952; S. R. C. Lilla., *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*, Oxford, 1971; D. Wyrwa, *Die Christliche Platoneignung in den Stromateis des Clemens von Alexandrien*, Berlin, 1984; U. Schneider, *Theologie als christliche Philosophie*, Berlin-New York, 1999. In general, cf. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, Cambridge Mass., 1956

[77] Cf. 2.22.2 for Heraclitus, 2.24.2-4 for Euhemeros and Diagoras. Cf. F. Zucker, "Euhemeros und seine ῾Ιερὰ ἀναγραφή bei den christlichen Schriftstellern" *Philologus* 64 (1905), 465-472.

doxographic approach to earlier philosophy: the history of ideas sketched in Chapter V is an clear fruit of Poseidonian transmission[78].

Gnosticism, which S. R. C. Lilla sees as a main dimension of Clement's thought in the *Stromata*, is difficult to spot in the *Protrepticus*, where doctrinal debates are absolutely absent. However, there is a Gnostic ring in the insistence on the Fall of Man and the saviour role of the Logos, which returns him back to his heavenly origins. Though these ideas are rooted in vulgarized Platonism, the text is close to Gnosticism in the tone of some expressions[79].

Middle-Platonism is the most important intellectual stream which floods in Clement's work. Much of it comes through Philo, but it is also important the direct influences of Pagan authors he may have read like Plutarch. Let us remember what was said above on the rise of Platonism in Alexandria around Clement's time. However, apart from the general theme of the fallen soul in search for the unity with God, it is difficult to spot in this work specific philosophical correspondences. The rhetorical nature of the *Protrepticus* makes that these coincidences are mostly evident in literary parallels which will be spotted in each passage. But a particular case within the middle-Platonic stream is that of Philo, whose influence is enormous in the whole of Clement's work, and also in the *Protrepticus*. His allegories of Biblical passages and his use of mystery terminology to express the close knowledge of God are taken over by Clement in this work, many times with literal correspondences[80].

Precisely because of this literary nature, the influence of Plato himself is superior to any other Greek philosopher, only comparable to Homer on the side of the poets. The *Timaeus*, the *Theetetus*, the *Republic*, the *Phaedo* and some *Letters* are quoted and alluded extensively, but it is above all the *Phaedrus* which penetrates the work so intensely that one cannot but agree with G. W. Butterworth: "Clement knew the *Phaedrus* intimately. There is not a single direct quotation such as would be obtained from a book of extracts, but a continuous series of casual allusions to words, phrases and topics; just the thing, in fact, which we might find in a modern English writer with respect to the Bible or Shakespeare. It betrays a familiarity born from affection... He

---

[78] Witt, *op. cit*. 202-204 for *epistrophe*. Cf. commentary to 5.65ff.

[79] Cf. Lilla, *op. cit*. J. Hering, *Étude sur la doctrine de la chute et de la préexistence des âmes chez Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1923. Cf. e. g. 1.5.1

[80] Cf. e. g. 2.22.3. On the importance of Philo in Clement's thought, cf. A. van der Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and his Use of Philo in the Stromateis*, Leiden, 1988.

uses the language of Plato as unconsciously as he uses that of the Scriptures; and it need hardly be said that when he writes under these two influences he is at his very best"[81].

Thus the *Protrepticus* is the first step in the integration of Platonism in Christianity which would be fully exploited by Clement in the *Stromata* and after him by Origen and the Cappadocian Fathers. With this work a path was started that Christianity is still walking today.

10. Biblical background

Notwithstanding his love of Greek culture, no Greek author, including Homer or Plato, are comparable in presence and importance to the Bible in all Clementine works. Clement is one of the Church Fathers who most often quotes the Scripture[82], which may be partly due to his love for quotation in general and for his attention to Jewish Alexandrian literature. In any case, the general importance of the Bible as main source of Clement's thought is also true in the *Protrepticus*, and therefore, the results of the research on the Biblical presence in Clement can be generally applied to his first work.

There are many studies on Clement's use of the Bible, which obviously draw from his entire work[83]. They all agree that the exegesis of the Bible is the main fundament of Clement's theology[84]. The authority Clement gives to the Scripture is absolute, and the Revelation may be subject to allegory or interpretation, and combined with findings from Greek philosophy, but it is never matter of discussion. It is particularly noticeable that he gives the same weight as revealed text to the Old Testament, which was subject contemporaneously to heavy criticism by philo-Hellenizing currents (and radically rejected by Marcion and his followers) who would exclude it from the Revelation. This respect for the whole Bible can be also perceived in the *Protrepticus*: after the intuitions of Greek philosophers and poets, the word is given in chapter VIII, in ascendent order, to the Old Testament prophets, who need not speaking in riddles to announce the truth, but say it directly, for God speaks through them himself. Chapters IX and X where the Logos is finally presented, quotations of the

---

[81] Butterworth, *op. cit.* 205.

[82] Cf. the statistics made up by W. Krause and offered by Steneker, *op. cit.* 94.

[83] Among the most relevant ones, apart from those cited here, cf. O. Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus und die Septuaginta*, Nüremberg 1901; H. Kutter, *Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament*, Giessen 1897; M. Mees, *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien*, Bari 1970.

[84] C. Mondésert: *Clément d'Alexandrie: Introduction à l'étude de sa pensée religieuse à partir de l'Écriture*, Paris, 1944.

New Testament are extremely abundant[85]. In the rest of the chapters, even in those most concerned with Greek religion, there is a constant presence of Biblical sentences, as if to remind the reader of the direction of the argumentation. It can be easily perceived in the commentary.

Clement's Biblical quotations have been thoroughly researched as very useful material for Biblical textual criticism and the history of the canon[86]. But these matters go far beyond the scope of this study, which is just concerned with their use in the *Protrepticus*. The particular interest of the use of the Bible in this work comes from the fact that, being addresed (at least formally) to Pagans, the Scriptures are being presented to a public which is not familiar with them and which does not, in principle, consider them sacred and revealed texts. Yet the very frequency of the use of the Bible from the beginning shows, as it has been already said above, that the audience intended for the *Protrepticus* was not entirely and purely Pagan.

On the theoretical level, the only question Clement addresses in this work (which like other theoretical problems will be developed much more extensively in the *Stromata*) is the relationship of Biblical revelation with the intuitions of Greek philosophy. We have already seen how he explains the latter, either through dependence or through divine illumination. Often he combines Biblical quotations with others from Pagan texts to fuse Greek and Jewish-Christian tradition and show that they could be allied rather than confronted in the literary and philosophical level. But in any case, he emphasizes the superiority of Scripture as fundamental and most complete source of the Revelation. The primacy of the Bible is based by the fact that God himself speaks in it. Clement begins his chapter IX with a sentence that leaves no doubt: "I could adduce ten thousand scriptures of which "no one tittle shall pass away" without being fulfilled. For the mouth of the Lord, the Holy Spirit, had spoken these things"[87]. This direct link of the Bible to God allows to quote it without any need for justification.

Thus Biblical quotations become integrated in Clement's *Protrepticus* as part of the protreptic discourse[88]. They are not an ornament or an example, but become his own

---

[85] This terminology is clearly anachronical for the 2nd cent. AD. However, a commentary is in a large part a summary of earlier bibliography, whose traditional terminology has to be kept, and it is not, therefore, the best place to innovate. Rigour must in this case cede to clarity.

[86] J. A. Brooks, "Clement of Alexandria as a Witness to the Development of the New Testament Canon", *Sec Cent* 9.1 (1992), 41-55, with all previous bibliography on the subject.

[87] 9.82.1. Cf. also 9.87.2. Mondésert, *op. cit*. 86ff also quotes this passage as paradigmatic.

[88] Cf. M. Rizzi, "Il fondamento epistemologico della mistica in Clemente Alessandrino", in L.F.Pizzolato - M. Rizzi (eds.), *Origene maestro di vita spirituale*., Milano 2001, 91-122, who analyses the use of the Bible in apologetic discourse in the *Stromata*.

words (which only happened at very specific points with some Greek poets and philosophers). At some stages, like in chapter IX the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Scriptural quotations are the theme and pattern of the discourse, which takes the form of an exegetical paraphrasis. The sources and style of these quotations merit a separate paragraph, though the commentary will dwell on the details of particular passages.

When quoting the Old Testament, Clement makes a difference in the degree of authority he gives to each book: thus the Psalms are the only poetic books, and they are always quoted to support some point, but not as the fundament of it, while the scarce quotations of the Pentateuch and the frequent appeal to the prophets (above all Isaiah) may base the argument on these passages. The New Testament quotations are also given the latter treatment, as it could be expected. As for the Gospels, Matthew is almost always preferred; there are some hints of Luke, but always in passages in which he concords with Matthew; Mark is absent and John is quoted somewhat vaguely, except in the prologue, of which good use is made. This distribution corresponds to that of 2nd century writers[89]. The Pauline epistles are by large the most quoted Biblical texts, while of the other letters and of Acts there is little presence. Some *agrapha* and texts not included in the later canon can be detected also in the *Protrepticus*, since Clement's body of revealed texts was admittedly larger than that of later authors and some of his contemporaries[90].

There is a general agreement that Clement quotes often by heart, which gives place to some misquotations, conflation of paragraphs, and unconscious correction. Yet some other times, above all with the rarer passages, he may be consulting some written source. Perhaps the Bible itself, but most often, some other written source which is using a Biblical passage. Philonic interpretations are an obvious example, as well as the row of prophetic quotations in Chapter VIII, which is taken from an apologetic source[91].

The main problem for Clement when quoting the Bible must have come from its style, which did not resemble at all the purity of neo-Attic Greek that the Second Sophistic proclaimed as the model and which Clement himself cultivated. Representative of this problem is 8.77.1, where Clement, following the apologetic *topos*, praises the simplicity of Scriptural style in a highly sophisiticated tone. A certain

---

[89] Steneker, *op. cit.*, 104, who refers to E. Massaux, *Influence de l'Évangile de Saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant Saint Irenée*, Louvain 1950.
[90] Brooks, *op. cit.* 54-55.
[91] Cf. e. g. 2.25.1, where the exegesis of Dt. 23.1-2 depends on Philo. For the anthological source of the quotations of chapter VIII, cf. introduction to this chapter.

scholarly controversy arose around this problem, which was solved by H. Steneker, who devoted a part of his study to research whether Clement corrected the style in his Biblical quotations[92]. He reached the conclusion that his corrections are moderate and limited to some minor points to make the text fit for the context, but that there is no real depuration, which must be due to his respect for the sacrality of the Biblical text. In fact, there is more variation in his quotations of the Gospel and the Pauline Epistles than in those of Old Testament prophets. The reason of this difference is threefold: he quotes the New Testament more by heart, which allows unconscious correction; the style of Matthew and Paul is much closer to his own, which allows an easier adaptation, than the text of the LXX, whose "exotism" is impoossible to adapt to neo-Attic standards without a much more violent correction; and finally, he integrates much more the Gospel and the Epistles in his prose discourse than the Old Testament, whose text he quotes much more as way of exemplum or basis for exegesis. An interesting aspect also observed by Steneker is that Clement even imitates in some places the Biblical style: it turns out to be when he is giving the word to the Logos, who is addressing directly the readers of the *Protrepticus*. This influence is half-way between a purposeful literary device and the unconscious imitation of the Biblical style when he is writing a passage directly inspired in the Bible[93].

Thus Clement's use of the Bible in the *Protrepticus* becomes paradigmatic of his ability to mediate between the two poles of Athens and Jerusalem (or Cytheron and Sion), which were often opposed and even contradictory. Yet Clement managed to solve, or at least soften, many of these contradictions in the literary level in the *Protrepticus*, as he did in the ideological level in his later works.

11. Theology and anthropology

The contents of Clement's *Protrepticus* have been examined above. They are mainly development of apologetical themes, like the contraposition of Paganism and Christianity and the relations of the Bible with Greek philosophy. In the presentation of these problems the traces of some philosophical currents and of his attachment to the Scripture are perceivable. But these traces do not go beyond the level of images and allusions, since this work is not devoted to speculation, but to propaganda. There is little

---

[92] Steneker, *op. cit*., 93-118, esp. 101, 115f., who finds the right middle way among the extreme positions of Mondésert, op. cit., 71, "Clément a un style tout scripturaire", and E. Norden, op. cit., 520, who held that Clement was ashamed of the style of the LXX and tried to hide it as much as possible.

[93] Steneker, *op. cit.* 110-114: some clear cases are 27.2, 94.2, 99.3, 103.3, 106.4-5, 114.2, 120.2-5.

presence of theoretical questions in the *Protrepticus*. In the program for the development of Christian faith, which he follows in his works, the complications of theology come only after conversion and the leading of an ethically adequate life. therefore, only in the *Stromata* will he develop his theological ideas. For the same reason all his teachings on the life a Christian should lead are absent from the *Protrepticus* and concentrated on the *Paedagogus*. Granted, many of these ethical and theological notions can be found *in nuce* in the *Protrepticus*, where many expressions and interpretations have parallels in later works which develop them extensively. For this reason the *Protrepticus* is usually mentioned by scholarship on Clement's thought in footnotes which allude to precedents of passages in later works. It is also very popular as a powerful illustration, with an image or a metaphor, of a notion which is explained at length in the *Stromata*[94]. But its introductory character deprives it of much theological depth. To my knowledge only M. Galloni has specifically studied the ideological content of the *Protrepticus* as a whole, without subordinating it to the *Paedagogus* and the *Stromata*[95]. A brief summary of his book is due in this place.

The first part of the work on "culture" deal with maters which have been already mentioned here: the construction of a new cultural discourse in which Christianity can assume its place, that is, the abandonment of custom and ignorance and the assumption of the true reason and the true beauty, i. e. the Logos, through *theosebeia*[96].

The second part on "Evangelization" begins with the statement that for Clement God is fundamentally unknowable and therefore a Revelation is needed. This revelation comes in the Logos, i. e. Christ[97]. His divine nature is contantly emphasized, while references to his human nature are scarce and more allusive, though there are some clear instances like 11.111.2. This is a rhetorical consequence of his speaking in Greek categories. He will resurrect men and grant them salvation. Though the Logos is the centre of the work, specially of its beginning and the end, the Father is given due importance, above all in the central chapters dealing with philosophy. The Logos "reconciles disobedient children with the Father" (1.6.1), and therefore God's fatherhood is developed, specially in chapter IX, as opposed to other false paternities and dominances. Men are therefore called to "receive the Father" (12.119.2-3). The

---

[94] E. g. the quotations of Mondésert, *op. cit.* pp. 200-205.

[95] M. Galloni, *Cultura, evangelizzazione e fede nel Protrettico di Clemente Alessandrino*, Roma 1986.

[96] Galloni, *op. cit.*, 33-49.

[97] P. B. Pade, Λόγος Θεός: *Untersuchungen zur Logos-Christologie des Titus Flavius Clemens von Alexandrien*, Roma 1939.

Holy Spirit is mentioned much less frequently[98], mainly in chapters VIII and IX in reference to the Biblical prophecies, inspired by the Spirit, "mouth of God" (9.82.1). Finally, Galloni sees three veiled affirmations of the Trinity[99].

The last part, "Faith", begins with a recollection of Clement's insistence in the freedom to choose between salvation and condemnation. Salvation has only one requisite, believing: there are some passages in chapters VIII-X which theorize Faith and link it to salvation almost as synonyms. Its concrete realization is baptism, which is probably the real goal for Clement's readers. Thus they will be images of God and even attain assimilation to God[100].

Galloni' work, though he does not hide his enthusiasm for Clement and is too worried to prove his orthodoxy at all costs[101], does not distort heavily its contents, and has the great advantage of explaining the *Protrepticus* from the work itself, without turning to other Clementine works to develop its ideas. He is interested in some subjects which were not central for Clement in this work, like the Trinity or the Church. But on the whole he gives an adequate portrait of the theological and anthropological basis which underlies the *Protrepticus*. It is in fact very simple and can be articulated around two poles: God who offers salvation, and mankind who is exhorted to accept it: to be really human, humans must respond to God's call by converting to the true faith and leading a good life. This relation between God and man is described through many metaphors, but in my opinion the most constant one is that which describes it in generative terms: God is the Father and men his children. His love for them (sometimes threatening and corrective, but always well-meant), their natural tendency towards Him, and the illegitimacy or bastardy of other options which keep men away from their true Father, are all justified by this mental scheme which is sustained in many Biblical and some Platonic quotations and which will be fully developed in the *Stromata*[102].

Many other interesting notions, like for instance the unity of all mankind, hang around these two fundamental ideas, which can be seen in the commentary to particular passages of chapters VIII-XII. It would be useless to look further for a deeper

---

[98] Galloni, *op. cit.*, 107, counts eight mentions of the Holy Spirit (1.5.3, 8.78.2, 9.82.1, 9.84.4, 9.85.3, 11.112.3, 12.118.3, 12.118.4.

[99] Galloni *op. cit.*, 113-116: 1.5.3, 9.88.2, 12.118.4.

[100] Galloni *op. cit.*, 131-141. For baptism, cf. references in n. 71 *supra*.

[101] "ortodossia veramente cristallina" (p. 180). Photius' attacks on Clement did not come in any case from the *Protrepticus*. Galloni end up his work asking for a rehabilitation of Clement as a saint (146f.).

[102] Cf. all the quotation of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* in Chapter IX. On Clement's love for generative images, cf. D. K. Buell, *Making Christians: Clement of Alexandria and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy,* Princeton, 1999.

systematic theology in the work, for it is not Clement's interest to dwell in any theological depths. Rhetoric commands, and the goal is to persuade rather than to instruct. The main explanations, for instance, dwell on the Logos. But the Logos is given an inmensely varied number of epithets which serve to qualify it: philosophical terms[103]; Greek religious terms[104]; Biblical religious terms[105]; and above all, metaphorical literary terms of many different kinds[106]. Yet none of them is developed with priority in detriment of others, because they do not intend to build a permanent theological theory on the Logos, but to persuade the audience to convert to it. In his following works, taking this conversion for granted, Clement will explain (never in a wholly systematic way) his anthropological and theological ideas. The *Protrepticus* does not belong to the field of theology, but to that of apologetics. And as an apologetic work it reached no little success in posterity.

12. Transmission and reception

The most immediate influence of the Protrepticus is on Clement himself. This was his first work, and no doubt the process of composition and the reactions he had from his public would inflence him on composing his later works. The commentary shows frequently correspondences with the *Paedagogus* and the *Stromata*, which show that in later works he developed themes which are left in an embrionary state in the *Protrepticus*. At the same time, this has made that the *Protrepticus* occupies always a subordinate place dependent of the other Clementine works, specially of the *Paedagogus*, with which it has often been paired as a twin work[107]. Thus the story of the reception of the *Protrepticus* is largely that of the reception of Clement himself. Let us try, however, to sketch here the transmission and influence in posterity of the work we are dealing with.

---

[103] truth (6.2), harmony (5.2, 120.4), wisdom (5.4), *arché* () 6.5), image (98.4), *dynamis* (120.4), demiurge (120.2)

[104] saviour (110.3), life-source (110.3), purifier (110.1)

[105] Christ (7.1), Jesus (120.2), ἀρχιερεύς (120.2), first-born (82.6).

[106] ἀγονιστής (2.3, 110.3), song (5.1), doctor (8.2), pilot (100.4), general (100.4), shepherd (116.1), georgos (114.4). Steneker, 137, suggests that he may have inherited many of these terms from Philo's use of them, who in his turn would have taken them from the sovereign-cult (cf. P. Beskow, *Rex Gloriae, The Kingship of Christ in the Early Church*, Stockholm, 1962).

[107] In Photius' catalogue (cod. 109-111) the *Protrepticus* is mentioned after the "three books of the *Paedagogus*" as "other work preceding it and anexed to it (προηγούμενον καὶ συντταττόμενον λόγον ἕτερον)". Cf. Von Stockhausen, *op. cit.* 90-92 says that one continues the catechetic program of the other, but the same could be said about the *Stromata*. The reasons for this pairing of both works may be: the similar size of both works in comparison to the magnitude of the *Stromata* and the briefer *opuscula*; and the traditional continuity between protreptic and parainesis, commented above.

The *Protrepticus* does not seem to have been widely known in the century which followed its composition. Clement's successor in the leadership of Alexandrian tradition, Origen, does not make any reference to it in all his work and there is no proof that he even knew it. It was Eusebius, 150 years later, who multiplied its effect. He knew well Clement's work and specially admired his *Protrepticus* as a way to interact with Greek culture. In the *Laudes Constantini* he turned Clement's metaphor of Christ as Orpheus into an ornamental image, thus confirming that it would have not only an inconographic development in the following centuries, but also a literary tradition[108]. Moreover, he transmitted large excerpts of the work by quoting them in his *Praeparatio Evangelica*[109]. Eusebius seems to have opened the way for a rediscoverment of Clement in the Greek apologetic literature of the 4th and 5th century. On the one hand, some of the powerful Clementine metaphors, notably that of the mysteries, were used and expanded to present Christianity[110]. On the other hand, these authors had an even more aggresive attitude than Clement against Paganism, and profitted from his informations to hammer down its agonizing rival. Epiphanius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyrill and Theodoretus, use material from the *Protrepticus*, either directly of from direct consultation, to attack Paganism. Many of the traditions in Christian literature about Greek religion, which can be seen in many scholia to classical Greek works, come from a distortion and exaggeration of Clement's source. Still in the 10th century, the informations of the Byzantine bishop Michael Psellus on the mysteries of Eleusis can be shown to spring ultimately from the *Protrepticus*[111]. Pasages of the *Protrepticus* appear occasionally on some *Catenae* in Biblical books. Its restricted difussion in respect to the other Clementine works is clear, however, in the fact that contrary to the *Paedagogus* and the *Stromata*, it has no presence in the florilegia[112]. This will be confirmed by the reduced number of manuscripts that have survived (cf. §13 *infra*). Its trace, however,

---

[108] The parallels are listed in the prologue to Chapter I.

[109] *Protr.* 2.11.2-23.1 in *PE* 2.3; *Protr.* 2.34.44-45 and 2.34.49 in *PE* 2.6; *Protr.* 4.42.1-43.1 in *PE* 4.16.12.

[110] Cf. e.g. Greg. Naz. *Or.* 5.31, 39.1. He may have also taken inspiration from Origen, who also compares Christianity to mysteries, though in a less metaphoric way (*CC* 3.59-61)

[111] Cf. commentary to 2.12.1, with all the references. In M. Herrero, *Tradición órfica y cristianismo antiguo*, Madrid 2007, chapter IV, I have demostrated this fact regarding Clement's informations on Orphism. In the commentary the correspondences with later authors are quoted. Specially Cyrill in the *Contra Iulianum* excerpts large parts of chapters 2 and 4.

[112] O. Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus* I, pp. LII, LXIV

was never completely lost, since in Photius' catalogue it is mentioned as "the other discourse which denounces the atheism of the Greeks"[113].

In the Latin side it had some early fortune, since two Latin apologists, Arnobius (2nd half of the 3rd cent.) and Firmicus Maternus (mid 4th cent.), make a generous use of the work to attack Paganism. There is an old controversy regarding the direct use of Clement by Arnobius[114], and it is not clear how much in Firmicus stems directly from him or from intermediate sources (including Arnobius himself)[115], but there is no doubt that they used it profusely. Hieronymus (347-420) mentions the work as *Adversus gentes liber unus*[116]. After these mentions, however, the trace of the *Protrepticus* is lost in the Latin West. Theree is no trace that it was known by Lactantius (±250-325) and even less by Augustine in the 5th century.

Only in the late Renaissance would Clement spring back into the public with the *editio princeps* of his preserved works by Pietro Vettori in 1550 in Florence. It was followed by a hurried Latin in translation by Aurelius Hervet in 1551 (reprinted many times alone or along with further editions of the Greek text, the last time in Migne's Patrologia Graeca). It was too late for Luther or Erasmus to have known Clement's works, and Calvin, though he could have had time to read them, does not show any trace that he knew Clement. In the following centuries new editions replaced the *editio princeps*: Friedrich Sylburg (1592), Daniel Heinse (1616, which became for the next centuries Clement's vulgate), John Potter, Archbishop of Canterbury (1715, reprinted by Migne). In the 19th century R. Klotz (1831-4) and G. Dindorf (1869) made th standard critical editions which were replaced by O. Stählin's in the 20th cent. (cf. next point). In the 19th century also the first translations to English and German. It is worth noting that all these editions and translations were of all Clementine works, of which the

---

[113] Phot. *cod.* 109-111. Von Stockhausen, *op. cit.*, 84, shows that the transmission as a treatise against Paganism added to the title *Protrepticus* the appendix πρός "Ελληνας (against the Greeks), which was not in the original.

[114] On Arnobius' relation to Clement, there are two divergent positions: A. Röhricht *De Clemente Alexandrino Arnobii in irridendo Gentilium Cultu Deorum Auctore*, Hamburg, 1893 and E. Rapisarda *Clemente Fonte di Arnobio*, Torino,1939 defended that the *Protrepticus* was the main source of Arnobius attack of Paganism in the 5th book of *Adversus Nationes*. F. Tullius**, *Die Quellen des Arnobius im 4., 5. und 6. Buch seiner Schrift Adversus Nationes*, Berlin 1934 and F. Mora, *Arnobio e i culti de mistero*, Roma, 1994 mantain that Arnobius does not depend from Clement in a fundamental way, though Mora admits that he must have known his work in the last phase of composition. Mora's work was received with some praise (Sfameni Gasparro (*BStudLat* 26.2 (1996), 636-639) and much hostility (Turcan (*AC* 1996 65 : 352-355), Champeaux (*Latomus* 1996 55 (2) : 427-430) and Zeller (*Kernos* 1996 (9): 440-442).

[115] Cf. the introduction and comments of R. Turcan to *De errore profanarum religionum*, Paris, 1982.

[116] *Vir. Ill.* 38. Cf. n. 113 on the title of the work.

Protrepticus constitutes a small part. Only in 1684 was there a French translation of the *Protrepticus* by D. Cousin, on which I have been unable to find out any information[117].

W. H. Wagner has studied in depth Clement's reception and distinguishes four lines of reception from the Renaissance to the 20th century[118]: the Catholic tradition, geographically centered in Italy, dwelt mainly on the problem of Clement's orthodoxy and his right to remain in the sanctoral; the Lutheran tradition in Germany worried with the problem of the Hellenization of Christianity; the Anglo-Saxon tradition (one of whose pioneers is John Milton, admirer of Clement) which would approach the same problem with a more favourable view; and the French tradition which was worried above all on Ethics, and therefore valued his *Paedagogus*.

Yet I would point out that beside these four traditions, which are mainly theological and therefore worried with the *Stromata*, there are two modern lines of approach to Clement which pay more attention to the *Protrepticus*. The first line of approach to the *Protrepticus* comes from the pastoral interest, which is interested in effective preaching rather than in speculative theology. Clement's first work offers, above all in its first and last parts, a spectacular model to preach conversion and present Christianity to non-believers[119]. The second line comes from the scholars of Antiquity, who view his work as a precious source of data about classical and post-classical Greece. The *Protrepticus* transmits many fragments of philosophers and poets and a good number of unique informations on Greek myths and cults. It is no chance that the last two main editors of the work, Otto Stählin and Miroslav Marcovich, were classicists devoted to classical Greece, and not theologians[120]. This commentary belongs to the second line.

---

[117] A detailed account of the editorial history of Clementine works in O. Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus,* I, LXV-LXXX. Cf. also next note.

[118] W. H. Wagner, "A Father's Fate: Attitudes Towards and Interpretations of Clement of Alexandria", *Journal of Religious History* 7 (1972), 209-231.

[119] To this tradition one should ascribe e. g. F. Storelli, "Itinerario a Dio nel *Protrettico* di Clemente Alessandrino", *Nicolaus* 8 (1980), 3-71.

[120] Stählin was disciple of Wilamowitz and is known, apart from his edition of Clement, by his monumental *Geschichte des griechischen Literatur* (1920). Marcovich arrived to work on the edition of Christian apologists, including Clement, from the study of Heraclitus, whose fragments he edited before starting to edit the sources he had worked with (Hyppolitus first, and then Ps.-Justin, Athenagoras, Tatian and Clement).

13. The text

There are few manuscripts (henceforth MSS) of the *Protrepticus*. The most important one is *Parisinus graecus* 451 (= **P**), written by the scribe Baanes in 914 for Aretas, archbishop of Capadocia[121]. It contains the *Protrepticus*, the *Paedagogus*, and works of Justin, Athenagoras and Eusebius. All the other MSS derive directly or indirectly from P: firstly, *Mutinensis* III D7 (nº 126) (= **M**), of the 10th-11th cent., from which were copied *Monacensis graecus* 97, *Valicellensis* F 33 and *Ottobonensis* 94; a second MSS derived from P is Laurentianus V 24 (= **F**), from which another one, *Gennensis Missionis Urbanae* 28 was copied in the 14th-15th century; *Oxoniensis Collegi Novi* 139 (= **N**) derives from it; finally, the latest MSS is *Parisinus Suppl. graec.* 254 (14th-15th cent.), also derived from P.

The text followed in this commentary (and added, without apparatus criticus, after the commentary to make its reading easier) is that of O. Stählin (Leipzig, CGS 1905, rev. U. Treu 1972). When I disagree from his text, the textual decision is explained in the commentary. The editions of G. W. Butterworth (Cambridge, Loeb 1919), C. Mondésert (Paris, SC 1949), and Q. Cataudella (Torino 1940) keep Stählin's text with very few variations. The edition of M. Marcovich (Leiden, Vigiliae Cristianae 1995) presents many novelties, but many of them are conjectures of the author which make his text difficult to accept as the basis for a commentary[122]. His variants, when they are considered relevant, are discussed in the commentary. Some variants porposed by other scholars to particular passages will be also occasionally discussed.

---

[121] The MSS are described in detail by Stählin voll. I, XVI-XXIII. Cf. also Feulner, *op. cit.* 50f.
[122] Cf. the review by A. van Winden in *Vig Christ* 50 (1996).

This commentary

There have been many studies of the *Protrepticus* from different approaches, even though it has been somewhat neglected by classicists for being a Christian work, and by theologians for its lack of ideological depth compared to the *Stromata*. Among these studies, however, there is not a single one which combines a detailed analysis of each specific passage with a general consideration of the whole work. To my knowledge no work has yet tried to sum the different approaches (theological, *religionsgeschichtlich*, stylistic, *Quellensforschung*, text criticism) and to combine the general comprehension of the work with the analysis of particular passages. This commentary tries to fill that gap.

A Greek text of the *Protrepticus* is offered which has no pretension of being at this stage a critical edition, but just intends to make the reading of the commentary easier. The text follows Stählin's edition, except in a few cases. The minimal *apparatus criticus* contains only these cases and those which are commented because of their particular interest for the meaning of the text. The editions of Stählin and Marcovich have an apparatus of *loci similes* which serves as a commentary limited to the spotting of parallels in earlier and later literature, above all in later works of Clement himself. Therefore, in this commentary I have only included the most relevant parallels, since the rest are easily traceable in those two works. This allows giving more space to other approaches when analysing each passage. I have tried not to become engaged into theological questions which regard, rather than the *Protrepticus*, either other later Clementine works, or other works quoted by him. I have only dealt with the content of these quotations when they are integrated in his discourse as an important element, or when their presence in Clement's text is important for other scholarly problems.

I have abbreviated with the name of the author those works which are most often quoted along the commentary. The bibliography at the end aims to offer a selection of the secondary literature relevant for particular passages or for the whole *Protrepticus*. This system, as well as the abbreviated citing of articles and book titles, follows the usual methods of commenting classical texts. The choice of English and of a terminology which tries to be precise but not abstruse is intended to reach the largest possible number of interested public, since Clement's *Protrepticus* is one of the few works of Early Greek Christian literature which are not addressed exclusively to specialists or devotees, but to all those who feel the appeal of his song.

Abbreviations

The abbreviations of names and works of ancient authors follow the conventions of the LSJ and the Oxford Latin Dictionary. Abbreviations of journals are those used by the *Année Philologique*. Other common abbreviations are *OF* for *Orphicorum Fragmenta* (ed. A. Bernabé, Bibliotheca Teubneriana, 3 vols. Leipzig, 2005-2007); *FGH* for *Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, (ed. F. Jacoby, Berlin, Weidmann, 1957-1964); *LSJ* for H. Liddell – R. Scott – H. S. Jones – R. McKenzie, *Greek - English Lexicon*, Oxford, 1996. The papyri are cited according to the conventions established by the *Checklist of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets* of the American Society of Papyrologists (April 2002).

The editions quoted and consulted of secondary literature are usually the first ones in its original language, except when the reedition or translation to English or to other language has mean a substantial updating. The works listed below are cited in the commentary with the name of the author and the relevant pages.

D. K. BUELL, *Making Christians: Clement of Alexandria and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy,* Princeton, 1999.

G. W. BUTTERWORTH, "Clement of Alexandria's *Protrepticus* and the *Phaedrus* of Plato", *CQ* 10 (1916), 198-205.

R. P. CASEY "Clement of Alexandria and the beginnings of Christian Platonism", *HThR* 18 (1925).

Q. CATAUDELLA, *Clemente Alessandrino, Protrettico ai Greci*, Tronio 1940.

J. DANIÉLOU, *Message évangelique et culture hellénistique aux IIe et IIIe siècles*, Paris-Tournais – New York – Roma, 1961.

M. GALLONI, *Cultura, Evangelizzazione e Fede nel Protrettico di Clemente Alessandrino*, Roma, 1986, 63

M. HERRERO, *Tradición órfica y cristianismo antiguo*, Madrid 2007.

G. W. H. LAMPE, A Patristic Greek Lexicon, Oxford, 1978.

S. R. C. LILLA., *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*, Oxford, 1971

L. LUGARESI, "Fuggiamo la consuetudine: pratiche sociali cristiane, rappresentazione e spettacoli in Clemente Alessandrino"*, Adamantius* 9 (2003), 10-29.

M. MARCOVICH, *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus*, Leiden 1995.

C. MONDÉSERT, *Clément d'Alexandrie: Introduction à l'étude de sa pensée religieuse à partir de l'Écriture*, Paris, 1944

- *Clément d'Alexandrie, Le Protréptique*, Paris 1949.

CH. RIEDWEG, *Mysterienterminologie bei Plato, Philo und Klemens von Alexandrien*, München 1987.

O. STÄHLIN, *Clemens Alexandrinus I: Protrepticus und Paedagogus*, Leipzig 1905 (1972^3)

H. STENEKER, *Peithous demiourgia: observations sur la fonction du style dans le protreptique de Clément d'Alexandrie*, Nijmegen, 1967.

A. VON STOCKHAUSEN, "Ein "neues Lied"? Der *Protreptikos* des Klemens von Alexandrien", in Ch. Schubert, A. von Stockhausen (eds.), *Ad veram religionem reformare. Frühchristliche Apologetik zwischen Anspruch und Wirklichkeit*, Erlangen 2006, 75-96

U. TREU, "Etymologie und Allegorie bei Klemens von Alexandrien", SP IV, 191-211, Oxford 1959,

J. C. M. VAN WINDEN, "Quotations from Philo in Clement of Alexandria's *Protrepticus*", *Vig Christ* 32 (1978), 208-213

R. E. WITT, "The Hellenism of Clement of Alexandria", *CQ* 25 (1931).

N. ZEEGERS-VAN DER VORST, *Les citations paiennes dans les apologistes grecs du II siècle*, Louvain 1972.

Reading text

<div align="center">

ΚΛΗΜΕΝΤΟΣ ΣΤΡΩΜΑΤΕΩΣ

ΠΡΟΤΡΕΠΤΙΚΟΣ ΠΡΟΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΑΣ

</div>

1.1.1 Ἀμφίων ὁ Θηβαῖος καὶ Ἀρίων ὁ Μηθυμναῖος "ἄμφω μὲν ἤστην ᾠδικώ, μῦθος δὲ ἄμφω" (καὶ τὸ ᾆσμα εἰσέτι τοῦτο Ἑλλήνων ᾄδεται χορῷ), τέχνῃ τῇ μουσικῇ ὃ μὲν ἰχθὺν δελεάσας, ὃ δὲ Θήβας τειχίσας. Θράκιος δὲ ἄλλος σοφιστὴς (ἄλλος οὗτος μῦθος Ἑλληνικός) ἐτιθάσευε τὰ θηρία γυμνῇ τῇ ᾠδῇ καὶ δὴ τὰ δένδρα, τὰς φηγούς, μετεφύτευε τῇ μουσικῇ. **1.2** Ἔχοιμ' ἂν σοι καὶ ἄλλον τούτοις ἀδελφὸν διηγήσασθαι μῦθον καὶ ᾠδόν, Εὔνομον τὸν Λοκρὸν καὶ τέττιγα τὸν Πυθικόν· πανήγυρις Ἑλληνικὴ ἐπὶ νεκρῷ δράκοντι συνεκροτεῖτο Πυθοῖ, ἐπιτάφιον ἑρπετοῦ ᾄδοντος Εὐνόμου· ὕμνος ἢ θρῆνος ὄφεως ἦν ἡ ᾠδή, οὐκ ἔχω λέγειν. Ἀγὼν δὲ ἦν καὶ ἐκιθάριζεν ὥρᾳ καύματος Εὔνομος, ὁπηνίκα οἱ τέττιγες ὑπὸ τοῖς πετάλοις ᾖδον ἀνὰ τὰ ὄρη θερόμενοι ἡλίῳ. Ἦιδον δὲ ἄρα οὐ τῷ δράκοντι τῷ νεκρῷ, τῷ Πυθικῷ, ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ τῷ πανσόφῳ αὐτόνομον ᾠδήν, τῶν Εὐνόμου βελτίονα νόμων. Ῥήγνυται χορδὴ τῷ Λοκρῷ· ἐφίπταται ὁ τέττιξ τῷ ζυγῷ· ἐτερέτιζεν ὡς ἐπὶ κλάδῳ τῷ ὀργάνῳ· καὶ τοῦ τέττιγος τῷ ᾄσματι ἁρμοσάμενος ὁ ᾠδὸς τὴν λείπουσαν ἀνεπλήρωσε χορδήν. **1.3** Οὔκουν ᾠδῇ τῇ Εὐνόμου ἄγεται ὁ τέττιξ, ὡς ὁ μῦθος βούλεται, χαλκοῦν ἀναστήσας Πυθοῖ τὸν Εὔνομον αὐτῇ τῇ κιθάρᾳ καὶ τὸν συναγωνιστὴν τοῦ Λοκροῦ· ὃ δὲ ἑκὼν ἐφίπταται καὶ ᾄδει ἑκών. Ἕλλησι δ' ἐδόκει ὑποκριτὴς γεγονέναι μουσικῆς.

2.1 Πῇ δὴ οὖν μύθοις κενοῖς πεπιστεύκατε, θέλγεσθαι μουσικῇ τὰ ζῷα ὑπολαμβάνοντες; Ἀληθείας δὲ ὑμῖν τὸ πρόσωπον τὸ φαιδρὸν μόνον, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐπίπλαστον εἶναι δοκεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἀπιστίας ὑποπέπτωκεν ὀφθαλμοῖς. Κιθαιρὼν δὲ ἄρα καὶ Ἑλικὼν καὶ τὰ Ὀδρυσῶν ὄρη καὶ Θρᾳκῶν τελεστήρια, τῆς πλάνης τὰ μυστήρια, τεθείασται καὶ καθύμνηται. **2.2** Ἐγὼ μέν, εἰ καὶ μῦθός εἰσι, δυσανασχετῶ τοσαύταις ἐκτραγῳδουμέναις συμφοραῖς· ὑμῖν δὲ καὶ τῶν κακῶν αἱ ἀναγραφαὶ γεγόνασι δράματα καὶ τῶν δραμάτων οἱ ὑποκριταὶ θυμηδίας θεάματα. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ τὰ μὲν δράματα καὶ τοὺς ληναΐζοντας ποιητάς, τέλεον ἤδη παροινοῦντας, κιττῷ που ἀναδήσαντες, ἀφραίνοντας ἐκτόπως τελετῇ βακχικῇ, αὐτοῖς σατύροις καὶ θιάσῳ μαινόλῃ, σὺν καὶ τῷ ἄλλῳ δαιμόνων χορῷ, Ἑλικῶνι καὶ Κιθαιρῶνι κατακλείσωμεν γεγηρακόσιν, κατάγωμεν δὲ ἄνωθεν ἐξ οὐρανῶν ἀλήθειαν ἅμα φανοτάτῃ φρονήσει εἰς ὄρος ἅγιον θεοῦ καὶ χορὸν τὸν ἅγιον τὸν προφητικόν. **2.3** Ἡ δὲ ὡς ὅτι μάλιστα τηλαυγὲς ἀποστίλβουσα φῶς καταυγαζέτω πάντῃ τοὺς ἐν σκότει κυλινδουμένους καὶ τῆς πλάνης τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀπαλλαττέτω, τὴν ὑπερτάτην ὀρέγουσα δεξιάν, τὴν σύνεσιν, εἰς σωτηρίαν· οἳ δὲ ἀνανεύσαντες καὶ ἀνακύψαντες Ἑλικῶνα μὲν καὶ Κιθαιρῶνα καταλειπόντων, οἰκούντων δὲ Σιών· "ἐκ γὰρ Σιὼν ἐξελεύσεται νόμος, καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ", λόγος οὐράνιος, ὁ γνήσιος ἀγωνιστὴς ἐπὶ τῷ παντὸς κόσμου θεάτρῳ στεφανούμενος. **2.4** Ἀίδει δέ γε ὁ Εὔνομος ὁ ἐμὸς οὐ τὸν Τερπάνδρου νόμον

οὐδὲ τὸν Κηπίωνος[1], οὐδὲ μὴν Φρύγιον ἢ Λύδιον ἢ Δώριον, ἀλλὰ τῆς καινῆς ἁρμονίας τὸν ἀίδιον νόμον, τὸν φερώνυμον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ ᾆσμα τὸ καινόν, τὸ Λευιτικόν, "νηπενθές τ' ἄχολόν τε, κακῶν ἐπίληθες ἁπάντων"· γλυκύ τι καὶ ἀληθινὸν φάρμακον πειθοῦς[2] ἐγκέκραται τῷ ᾄσματι.

3.1 Ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν δοκοῦσιν ὁ Θρᾴκιος ἐκεῖνος Ὀρφεὺς[3] καὶ ὁ Θηβαῖος καὶ ὁ Μηθυμναῖος, ἄνδρες τινὲς οὐκ ἄνδρες, ἀπατηλοὶ γεγονέναι, προσχήματι μουσικῆς λυμηνάμενοι τὸν βίον, ἐντέχνῳ τινὶ γοητείᾳ δαιμονῶντες εἰς διαφθοράς, ὕβρεις ὀργιάζοντες, πένθη ἐκθειάζοντες, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐπὶ τὰ εἴδωλα χειραγωγῆσαι πρῶτοι, ναὶ μὴν λίθοις καὶ ξύλοις, τουτέστιν ἀγάλμασι καὶ σκιαγραφίαις, ἀνοικοδομῆσαι τὴν σκαιότητα τοῦ ἔθους, τὴν καλὴν ὄντως ἐκείνην ἐλευθερίαν τῶν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν πεπολιτευμένων ᾠδαῖς καὶ ἐπῳδαῖς ἐσχάτῃ δουλείᾳ καταζεύξαντες.

3.2 Ἀλλ' οὐ τοιόσδε ὁ ᾠδὸς ὁ ἐμὸς οὐδ' εἰς μακρὰν καταλύσων ἀφῖκται τὴν δουλείαν τὴν πικρὰν τῶν τυραννούντων δαιμόνων, ὡς δὲ τὸν πρᾷον καὶ φιλάνθρωπον τῆς θεοσεβείας μετάγων ἡμᾶς ζυγὸν αὖθις εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνακαλεῖται τοὺς εἰς γῆν ἐρριμμένους. **4.1** Μόνος γοῦν τῶν πώποτε τὰ ἀργαλεώτατα θηρία, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἐτιθάσευεν, πτηνὰ μὲν τοὺς κούφους αὐτῶν, ἑρπετὰ δὲ τοὺς ἀπατεῶνας, καὶ λέοντας μὲν τοὺς θυμικούς, σύας δὲ τοὺς ἡδονικούς, λύκους δὲ τοὺς ἁρπακτικούς. Λίθοι δὲ καὶ ξύλα οἱ ἄφρονες· πρὸς δὲ καὶ λίθων ἀναισθητότερος ἄνθρωπος ἀγνοίᾳ βεβαπτισμένος. **4.2** Μάρτυς ἡμῖν προφητικὴ παρίτω φωνή, συνῳδὸς ἀληθείας, τοὺς ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ καὶ ἀνοίᾳ κατατετριμμένους οἰκτείρουσα· "δυνατὸς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐγεῖραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ". Ὃς κατελεήσας τὴν ἀμαθίαν τὴν πολλὴν καὶ τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν τῶν εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν λελιθωμένων ἤγειρεν θεοσεβείας σπέρμα ἀρετῆς αἰσθόμενον ἐκ λίθων ἐκείνων, τῶν λίθοις πεπιστευκότων ἐθνῶν. **4.3** Αὖθις οὖν ἰοβόλους τινὰς καὶ παλιμβόλους ὑποκριτὰς ἐφοδεύοντας δικαιοσύνη "γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν" κέκληκέ που· ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτων εἴ τις τῶν ὄφεων μετανοῆσαι ἑκών, ἑπόμενος δὴ τῷ λόγῳ "ἄνθρωπος" γίνεται "θεοῦ". "Λύκους" δὲ ἄλλους ἀλληγορεῖ προβάτων κῳδίοις ἠμφιεσμένους, τοὺς ἐν ἀνθρώπων μορφαῖς ἁρπακτικοὺς αἰνιττόμενος. Καὶ πάντα ἄρα ταῦτα ἀγριώτατα θηρία καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους λίθους ἡ οὐράνιος ᾠδὴ αὐτὴ μετεμόρφωσεν εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἡμέρους. **4.4** "Ἦμεν γάρ, ἦμέν ποτε καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνόητοι, ἀπειθεῖς, πλανώμενοι, δουλεύοντες ἡδοναῖς καὶ ἐπιθυμίαις ποικίλαις, ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φθόνῳ διάγοντες, στυγητοί, μισοῦντες ἀλλήλους", ᾗ φησιν ἡ ἀποστολικὴ γραφή· "ὅτε δὲ ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς". Ὅρα τὸ ᾆσμα τὸ καινὸν ὅσον ἴσχυσεν· ἀνθρώπους ἐκ λίθων καὶ ἀνθρώπους ἐκ θηρίων πεποίηκεν. Οἱ δὲ τηνάλλως νεκροί, οἱ τῆς ὄντως οὔσης ἀμέτοχοι ζωῆς, ἀκροαταὶ μόνον γενόμενοι τοῦ ᾄσματος ἀνεβίωσαν.

5.1 Τοῦτό τοι καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἐκόσμησεν ἐμμελῶς καὶ τῶν στοιχείων τὴν διαφωνίαν εἰς τάξιν ἐνέτεινε συμφωνίας, ἵνα δὴ ὅλος ὁ κόσμος αὐτῷ ἁρμονία γένηται. Καὶ θάλατταν μὲν ἀνῆκεν λελυμένην, γῆς δὲ ἐπιβαίνειν

---

[1] Mondésert : καπίτωνος P : Καπίωνος Marcovich
[2] P retinet Marcovich : πένθους Reinkens Stählin
[3] del. Wilamowitz

κεκώλυκεν αὐτήν, γῆν δ' ἔμπαλιν ἐστερέωσεν φερομένην καὶ ὅρον αὐτὴν ἔπηξεν θαλάττης· ναὶ μὴν καὶ πυρὸς ὁρμὴν ἐμάλαξεν ἀέρι, οἰονεὶ Δώριον ἁρμονίαν κεράσας Λυδίῳ· καὶ τὴν ἀέρος ἀπηνῆ ψυχρότητα τῇ παραπλοκῇ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐτιθάσευεν, τοὺς νεάτους τῶν ὅλων φθόγγους τούτους κιρνὰς ἐμμελῶς. **5.2** Καὶ δὴ τὸ ᾆσμα τὸ ἀκήρατον, ἔρεισμα τῶν ὅλων καὶ ἁρμονία τῶν πάντων, ἀπὸ τῶν μέσων ἐπὶ τὰ πέρατα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄκρων ἐπὶ τὰ μέσα διαταθέν, ἡρμόσατο τόδε τὸ πᾶν, οὐ κατὰ τὴν Θράκιον μουσικήν, τὴν παραπλήσιον Ἰουβάλ, κατὰ δὲ τὴν πάτριον τοῦ θεοῦ βούλησιν, ἣν ἐζήλωσε Δαβίδ. **5.3** Ὁ δὲ ἐκ Δαβὶδ καὶ πρὸ αὐτοῦ, ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, λύραν μὲν καὶ κιθάραν, τὰ ἄψυχα ὄργανα, ὑπεριδών, κόσμον δὲ τόνδε καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸν σμικρὸν κόσμον, τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ψυχήν τε καὶ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, ἁγίῳ πνεύματι ἁρμοσάμενος, ψάλλει τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ πολυφώνου ὀργάνου καὶ προσᾴδει τῷ ὀργάνῳ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. "Σὺ γὰρ εἶ κιθάρα καὶ αὐλὸς καὶ ναὸς ἐμοί·" κιθάρα διὰ τὴν ἁρμονίαν, αὐλὸς διὰ τὸ πνεῦμα, ναὸς διὰ τὸν λόγον, ἵν' ᾖ μὲν κρέκῃ, τὸ δὲ ἐμπνέῃ, ὃ δὲ χωρήσῃ τὸν κύριον. **5.4** Ναὶ μὴν ὁ Δαβὶδ ὁ βασιλεύς, ὁ κιθαριστής, οὗ μικρῷ πρόσθεν ἐμνήσθημεν, προὔτρεπεν ὡς τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἀπέτρεπε δὲ εἰδώλων, πολλοῦ γε ἔδει ὑμνεῖν αὐτὸν τοὺς δαίμονας ἀληθεῖ πρὸς αὐτοῦ διωκομένους μουσικῇ, ᾗ τοῦ Σαοὺλ ἐνεργουμένου ἐκεῖνος ᾄδων μόνον αὐτὸν ἰάσατο. Καλὸν ὁ κύριος ὄργανον ἔμπνουν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐξειργάσατο κατ' εἰκόνα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ· ἀμέλει καὶ αὐτὸς ὄργανόν ἐστι τοῦ θεοῦ παναρμόνιον, ἐμμελὲς καὶ ἅγιον, σοφία ὑπερκόσμιος, οὐράνιος λόγος.

 6.1 Τί δὴ οὖν τὸ ὄργανον, ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, ὁ κύριος, καὶ τὸ ᾆσμα τὸ καινὸν βούλεται; Ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀναπετάσαι τυφλῶν καὶ ὦτα ἀνοῖξαι κωφῶν καὶ σκάζοντας τὼ πόδε ἢ πλανωμένους εἰς δικαιοσύνην χειραγωγῆσαι, θεὸν ἀνθρώποις ἀφραίνουσιν ἐπιδεῖξαι, παῦσαι φθοράν, νικῆσαι θάνατον, υἱοὺς ἀπειθεῖς διαλλάξαι πατρί. **6.2** Φιλάνθρωπον τὸ ὄργανον τοῦ θεοῦ· ὁ κύριος ἐλεεῖ, παιδεύει, προτρέπει, νουθετεῖ, σῴζει, φυλάττει καὶ μισθὸν ἡμῖν τῆς μαθήσεως ἐκ περιουσίας βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν ἐπαγγέλλεται, τοῦτο μόνον ἀπολαύων ἡμῶν, ὃ σῳζόμεθα. Κακία μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβόσκεται φθοράν, ἡ δὲ ἀλήθεια, ὥσπερ ἡ μέλιττα λυμαινομένη τῶν ὄντων οὐδέν, ἐπὶ μόνης τῆς ἀνθρώπων ἀγάλλεται σωτηρίας. **6.3** Ἔχεις οὖν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, ἔχεις τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν· τῆς χάριτος μεταλάμβανε. Καί μου τὸ ᾆσμα τὸ σωτήριον μὴ καινὸν οὕτως ὑπολάβῃς ὡς σκεῦος ἢ ὡς οἰκίαν· "πρὸ ἑωσφόρου" γὰρ ἦν, καὶ "ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος".

 6.4 Παλαιὰ δὲ ἡ πλάνη, καινὸν δὲ ἡ ἀλήθεια φαίνεται. Εἴτ' οὖν ἀρχαίους τοὺς Φρύγας διδάσκουσιν αἶγες μυθικαί, εἴτε αὖ τοὺς Ἀρκάδας οἱ προσελήνους ἀναγράφοντες ποιηταί, εἴτε μὴν αὖ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους οἱ καὶ πρώτην ταύτην ἀναφῆναι τὴν γῆν θεούς τε καὶ ἀνθρώπους ὀνειρώσσοντες· ἀλλ' οὐ πρό γε τοῦ κόσμου τοῦδε τούτων οὐδὲ εἷς, πρὸ δὲ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου καταβολῆς ἡμεῖς, οἱ τῷ δεῖν ἔσεσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ πρότερον γεγεννημένοι τῷ θεῷ, τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου τὰ λογικὰ πλάσματα ἡμεῖς, δι' ὃν ἀρχαΐζομεν, ὅτι "ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ λόγος ἦν." **6.5** Ἀλλ' ὅτι μὲν ἦν ὁ λόγος ἄνωθεν, ἀρχὴ θεία τῶν πάντων ἦν τε καὶ ἔστιν· ὅτι δὲ νῦν ὄνομα ἔλαβεν τὸ πάλαι καθωσιωμένον, δυνάμεως ἄξιον, ὁ Χριστός, καινὸν ᾆσμά μοι κέκληται. **7.1** Αἴτιος γοῦν ὁ λόγος, ὁ Χριστός, καὶ τοῦ εἶναι πάλαι ἡμᾶς (ἦν γὰρ ἐν θεῷ), καὶ τοῦ εὖ

εἶναι (νῦν δὴ ἐπεφάνη ἀνθρώποις) αὐτὸς οὗτος ὁ λόγος, ὁ μόνος ἄμφω, θεός τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος, ἁπάντων ἡμῖν αἴτιος ἀγαθῶν· παρ' οὗ τὸ εὖ ζῆν ἐκδιδασκόμενοι εἰς ἀΐδιον ζωὴν παραπεμπόμεθα. **7.2** Κατὰ γὰρ τὸν θεσπέσιον ἐκεῖνον τοῦ κυρίου ἀπόστολον "ἡ χάρις ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐπεφάνη, παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι, προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ." **7.3** Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ᾆσμα τὸ καινόν, ἡ ἐπιφάνεια ἡ νῦν ἐκλάμψασα ἐν ἡμῖν τοῦ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντος καὶ προόντος λόγου· ἐπεφάνη δὲ ἔναγχος ὁ προὼν σωτήρ, ἐπεφάνη ὁ ἐν τῷ ὄντι ὤν, ὅτι "ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν," διδάσκαλος, ἐπεφάνη ᾧ τὰ πάντα δεδημιούργηται λόγος· καὶ τὸ ζῆν ἐν ἀρχῇ μετὰ τοῦ πλάσαι παρασχὼν ὡς δημιουργός, τὸ εὖ ζῆν ἐδίδαξεν ἐπιφανεὶς ὡς διδάσκαλος, ἵνα τὸ ἀεὶ ζῆν ὕστερον ὡς θεὸς χορηγήσῃ. **7.4** Ὁ δὲ οὐ νῦν γε πρῶτον ᾤκτειρεν ἡμᾶς τῆς πλάνης, ἀλλ' ἄνωθεν ἀρχῆθεν, νῦν δὲ ἤδη ἀπολλυμένους ἐπιφανεὶς περισέσωκεν. Τὸ γὰρ πονηρὸν καὶ ἑρπηστικὸν θηρίον γοητεῦον καταδουλοῦται καὶ αἰκίζεται εἰσέτι νῦν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, βαρβαρικῶς τιμωρούμενον, οἳ νεκροῖς τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους συνδεῖν λέγονται σώμασιν, ἔστ' ἂν αὐτοῖς καὶ συσσαπῶσιν. **7.5** Ὁ γοῦν πονηρὸς οὑτοσὶ τύραννος καὶ δράκων, οὓς ἂν οἷός τε εἴη ἐκ γενετῆς σφετερίσασθαι, λίθοις καὶ ξύλοις καὶ ἀγάλμασιν καὶ τοιούτοις τισὶν εἰδώλοις προσσφίγξας τῷ δεισιδαιμονίας ἀθλίῳ δεσμῷ, τοῦτο δὴ τὸ λεγόμενον, ζῶντας ἐπιφέρων συνέθαψεν αὐτούς, ἔστ' ἂν καὶ συμφθαρῶσιν. **7.6** Οὗ δὴ χάριν (εἷς γὰρ ὁ ἀπατεὼν ἄνωθεν μὲν τὴν Εὔαν, νῦν δὲ ἤδη καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους εἰς θάνατον ὑποφέρων) εἷς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίκουρος καὶ βοηθὸς ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος, προμηνύων ἀρχῆθεν προφητικῶς, νῦν δὲ ἤδη καὶ ἐναργῶς εἰς σωτηρίαν παρακαλῶν.

8.1 Φύγωμεν οὖν ἀποστολικῇ πειθόμενοι παραγγελίᾳ "τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας", καὶ τῷ σωτῆρι τῷ κυρίῳ προσδράμωμεν, ὃς καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ προύτρεπεν εἰς σωτηρίαν, διὰ τεράτων καὶ σημείων ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, ἐν ἐρήμῳ διά τε τῆς βάτου καὶ τῆς ἀκολουθούσης χάριτι φιλανθρωπίας θεραπαίνης δίκην Ἑβραίοις νεφέλης. **8.2** Τούτῳ μὲν δὴ τῷ φόβῳ τοὺς σκληροκαρδίους προύτρεπεν· ἤδη δὲ καὶ διὰ Μωσέως τοῦ πανσόφου καὶ τοῦ φιλαλήθους Ἡσαΐα καὶ παντὸς τοῦ προφητικοῦ χοροῦ λογικώτερον ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον ἐπιστρέφει τοὺς τὰ ὦτα κεκτημένους· καὶ ἔσθ' ὅπη μὲν λοιδορεῖται, ἔστιν δ' οὗ καὶ ἀπειλεῖ· τοὺς δὲ καὶ θρηνεῖ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ᾄδει δὲ ἄλλοις, καθάπερ ἰατρὸς ἀγαθὸς τῶν νοσούντων σωμάτων τὰ μὲν καταπλάττων, τὰ δὲ καταλεαίνων, τὰ δὲ καταντλῶν, τὰ δὲ καὶ σιδήρῳ διαιρῶν, ἐπικαίων δὲ ἄλλα, ἔστι δ' οὗ καὶ ἀποπρίων, εἴ πως οἷόν τε κἂν παρὰ μέρος ἢ μέλος τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὑγιᾶναι. **8.3** Πολύφωνός γε ὁ σωτὴρ καὶ πολύτροπος εἰς ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίαν· ἀπειλῶν νουθετεῖ, λοιδορούμενος ἐπιστρέφει, θρηνῶν ἐλεεῖ, ψάλλων παρακαλεῖ, διὰ βάτου λαλεῖ (σημείων ἐκεῖνοι καὶ τεράτων ἔχρῃζον) καὶ τῷ πυρὶ δεδίττεται τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἀνάπτων ἐκ κίονος τὴν φλόγα, δεῖγμα ὁμοῦ χάριτος καὶ φόβου· ἐὰν ὑπακούσῃς, τὸ φῶς, ἐὰν παρακούσῃς, τὸ πῦρ. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ κίονος καὶ βάτου ἡ σὰρξ τιμιωτέρα, προφῆται μετ' ἐκεῖνα φθέγγονται, αὐτὸς ἐν Ἡσαΐᾳ ὁ κύριος λαλῶν, αὐτὸς ἐν Ἡλίᾳ, ἐν στόματι προφητῶν

αὐτός· **8.4**. σὺ δὲ ἀλλ' εἰ προφήταις μὴ πιστεύεις, μῦθον δ' ὑπολαμβάνεις καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ τὸ πῦρ, αὐτός σοι λαλήσει ὁ κύριος, "ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ· ἐκένωσεν δὲ ἑαυτόν" ὁ φιλοικτίρμων θεός, σῶσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον γλιχόμενος· καὶ αὐτὸς ἤδη σοὶ ἐναργῶς ὁ λόγος λαλεῖ, δυσωπῶν τὴν ἀπιστίαν, ναί φημι, ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος, ἵνα δὴ καὶ σὺ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου μάθῃς, πῇ ποτε ἄρα ἄνθρωπος γένηται θεός.

9. 1   Εἶτ' οὐκ ἄτοπον, ὦ φίλοι, τὸν μὲν θεὸν ἀεὶ προτρέπειν ἡμᾶς ἐπ' ἀρετήν, ἡμᾶς δὲ ἀναδύεσθαι τὴν ὠφέλειαν καὶ ἀναβάλλεσθαι τὴν σωτηρίαν; Ἦ γὰρ οὐχὶ καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐπὶ σωτηρίαν παρακαλεῖ καὶ τὸ πᾶν γίνεται φωνὴ προτρεπτική; Πυθώμεθα τοίνυν αὐτοῦ· "τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν;" Ἠλίας μὲν οὐκ ἐρεῖ, Χριστὸς δὲ εἶναι ἀρνήσεται· φωνὴ δὲ ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐρήμῳ βοῶσα. Τίς οὖν ἔστιν Ἰωάννης; Ὡς τύπῳ λαβεῖν, ἐξέστω εἰπεῖν, φωνὴ τοῦ λόγου προτρεπτικὴ ἐν ἐρήμῳ βοῶσα. Τί βοᾷς, ὦ φωνή; "Εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν." **9.2** "Εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς ὁδοὺς κυρίου". Πρόδρομος Ἰωάννης καὶ ἡ φωνὴ πρόδρομος τοῦ λόγου, φωνὴ παρακλητική, προετοιμάζουσα εἰς σωτηρίαν, φωνὴ προτρέπουσα εἰς κληρονομίαν οὐρανῶν· δι' ἣν ἡ στεῖρα καὶ ἔρημος ἄγονος οὐκέτι. Ταύτην μοι τὴν κυοφορίαν προεθέσπισεν ἀγγέλου φωνή· πρόδρομος ἦν κἀκείνη τοῦ κυρίου, στεῖραν εὐαγγελιζομένη γυναῖκα, ὡς Ἰωάννης τὴν ἔρημον. **9.3** Διὰ ταύτην τοίνυν τοῦ λόγου τὴν φωνὴν ἡ στεῖρα εὐτεκνεῖ καὶ ἡ ἔρημος καρποφορεῖ· αἱ πρόδρομοι τοῦ κυρίου φωναὶ δύο, ἀγγέλου καὶ Ἰωάννου, αἰνίσσονταί μοι τὴν ἐναποκειμένην σωτηρίαν, ὡς ἐπιφανέντος τοῦ λόγου τοῦδε εὐτεκνίας ἡμᾶς καρπὸν ἀπενέγκασθαι, ζωὴν ἀίδιον. **9.4** Ἄμφω γοῦν ἐς ταὐτὸν ἀγαγοῦσα τὰ φωνὰ ἡ γραφὴ σαφηνίζει τὸ πᾶν· "Ἀκουσάτω ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα· ῥηξάτω φωνὴν ἡ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα, ὅτι πλείονα τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα." Ἡμῖν εὐηγγελίζετο ἄγγελος, ἡμᾶς προὔτρεπεν Ἰωάννης νοῆσαι τὸν γεωργόν, ζητῆσαι τὸν ἄνδρα. **9.5** Εἷς γὰρ καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος, ὁ τῆς στείρας ἀνήρ, ὁ τῆς ἐρήμου γεωργός, ὁ τῆς θείας ἐμπλήσας δυνάμεως καὶ τὴν στεῖραν καὶ τὴν ἔρημον. Ἐπεὶ γὰρ πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς εὐγενοῦς, ἄπαις δὲ ἦν δι' ἀπείθειαν ἡ πολύπαις ἀνέκαθεν Ἑβραία γυνή, ἡ στεῖρα τὸν ἄνδρα λαμβάνει καὶ ἡ ἔρημος τὸν γεωργόν· εἶτα ἡ μὲν καρπῶν, ἡ δὲ πιστῶν, ἄμφω δὲ μητέρες διὰ τὸν λόγον· ἀπίστοις δὲ εἰσέτι νῦν καὶ στεῖρα καὶ ἔρημος περιλείπεται.

10.1   Ὁ μὲν Ἰωάννης, ὁ κῆρυξ τοῦ λόγου, ταύτῃ πη παρεκάλει ἑτοίμους γίνεσθαι εἰς θεοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν, καὶ τοῦτο ἦν ὃ ἠνίσσετο ἡ Ζαχαρίου σιωπή, ἀναμένουσα τὸν πρόδρομον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καρπόν, ἵνα τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ φῶς, ὁ λόγος, τῶν προφητικῶν αἰνιγμάτων τὴν μυστικὴν ἀπολύσηται σιωπήν, εὐαγγέλιον γενόμενος. **10.2** Σὺ δὲ εἰ ποθεῖς ἰδεῖν ὡς ἀληθῶς τὸν θεόν, καθαρσίων μεταλάμβανε θεοπρεπῶν, οὐ δάφνης πετάλων καὶ ταινιῶν τινων ἐρίῳ καὶ πορφύρᾳ πεποικιλμένων, δικαιοσύνην δὲ ἀναδησάμενος καὶ τῆς ἐγκρατείας τὰ πέταλα περιθέμενος πολυπραγμόνει Χριστόν· "ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ἡ θύρα", φησί που· ἣν ἐκμαθεῖν δεῖ νοῆσαι θελήσασι τὸν θεόν, ὅπως ἡμῖν ἀθρόας τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀναπετάσῃ πύλας· **10.3** λογικαὶ γὰρ αἱ τοῦ λόγου πύλαι, πίστεως ἀνοιγνύμεναι κλειδί· "θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἔγνω, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ." Θύραν δὲ εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι τὴν ἀποκεκλεισμένην τέως ὁ ἀνοιγνὺς ὕστερον ἀποκαλύπτει τἄνδον καὶ δείκνυσιν ἃ μηδὲ γνῶναι οἷόν τε

ἦν πρότερον, εἰ μὴ διὰ Χριστοῦ πεπορευμένοις, δι' οὗ μόνου θεὸς ἐποπτεύεται.

2. 11. 1   Ἄδυτα τοίνυν ἄθεα μὴ πολυπραγμονεῖτε μηδὲ βαράθρων στόματα τερατείας ἔμπλεα ἢ λέβητα Θεσπρώτιον ἢ τρίποδα Κιρραῖον ἢ Δωδωναῖον χαλκεῖον· γεράνδρυον δὲ ψάμμοις ἐρήμαις τετιμημένον καὶ τὸ αὐτόθι μαντεῖον αὐτῇ δρυῒ μεμαρασμένον μύθοις γεγηρακόσι καταλείψατε. Σεσίγηται γοῦν ἡ Κασταλίας πηγὴ καὶ Κολοφῶνος ἄλλη πηγή, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὁμοίως τέθνηκε νάματα μαντικὰ καὶ δὴ τοῦ τύφου κενὰ ὀψὲ μέν, ὅμως δ' οὖν διελήλεγκται τοῖς ἰδίοις **11.2** συνεκρεύσαντα μύθοις. Διήγησαι ἡμῖν καὶ τῆς ἄλλης μαντικῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ μανικῆς, τὰ ἄχρηστα χρηστήρια, τὸν Κλάριον, τὸν Πύθιον, τὸν Διδυμέα, τὸν Ἀμφιάρεω, τὸν Ἀπόλλω[4], τὸν Ἀμφίλοχον, εἰ δὲ βούλει, καὶ τερατοσκόπους καὶ οἰωνοσκόπους καὶ τοὺς ὀνείρων κριτὰς ἀνέρου[5] σὺν αὐτοῖς στῆσον δὲ ὁμοῦ παρὰ τὸν Πύθιον τοὺς ἀλευρομάντεις ἄγων καὶ κριθομάντεις καὶ τοὺς εἰσέτι παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς τετιμημένους ἐγγαστριμύθους· ναὶ μὴν ἄδυτα Αἰγυπτίων καὶ **11.3** Τυρρηνῶν νεκυομαντεῖαι σκότῳ παραδιδόσθων. Μανικὰ ταῦτα ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀνθρώπων ἀπίστων σοφιστήρια καὶ πλάνης ἀκράτου κυβευτήρια· συνέμποροι τῆσδε τῆς γοητείας αἶγες αἱ ἐπὶ μαντικὴν ἠσκημέναι καὶ κόρακες ἀνθρώποις χρᾶν ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων διδασκόμενοι.

12 .1 Τί δ' εἴ σοι καταλέγοιμι τὰ μυστήρια; οὐκ ἐξορχήσομαι μέν, ὥσπερ Ἀλκιβιάδην λέγουσιν, ἀπογυμνώσω δὲ εὖ μάλα ἀνὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον τὴν γοητείαν τὴν ἐγκεκρυμμένην αὐτοῖς καὶ αὐτούς γε τοὺς καλουμένους ὑμῶν θεούς, ὧν αἱ τελεταὶ μυστικαί, οἷον ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τοῦ βίου τοῖς τῆς ἀληθείας ἐγκυκλήσω θεαταῖς.

12.2 Διόνυσον μαινόλην ὀργιάζουσι Βάκχοι ὠμοφαγίᾳ τὴν ἱερομανίαν ἄγοντες καὶ τελίσκουσι τὰς κρεονομίας τῶν φόνων ἀνεστεμμένοι τοῖς ὄφεσιν, ἐπολολύζοντες Εὐάν, Εὔαν ἐκείνην, δι' ἣν ἡ πλάνη παρηκολούθησεν· καὶ σημεῖον ὀργίων βακχικῶν ὄφις ἐστὶ τετελεσμένος. Αὐτίκα γοῦν κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβῆ τῶν Ἑβραίων φωνὴν ὄνομα τὸ Ἕυια δασυνόμενον ἑρμηνεύεται ὄφις ἡ θήλεια· Δηὼ δὲ καὶ Κόρη δρᾶμα ἤδη ἐγενέσθην μυστικόν, καὶ τὴν πλάνην καὶ τὴν ἁρπαγὴν καὶ τὸ πένθος αὐταῖν Ἐλευσὶς δᾳδουχεῖ.

13.1 Καί μοι δοκεῖ τὰ ὄργια καὶ τὰ μυστήρια δεῖν ἐτυμολογεῖν, τὰ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς Δηοῦς τῆς πρὸς Δία γεγενημένης, τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ μύσους τοῦ συμβεβηκότος περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον· εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ Μυοῦντός τινος Ἀττικοῦ, ὃν ἐν κυνηγίᾳ διαφθαρῆναι Ἀπολλόδωρος λέγει, οὐ φθόνος· **13.2** ὑμῶν δεδόξασται τὰ μυστήρια ἐπιτυμβίῳ τιμῇ. Πάρεστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλως μυθήριά σοι νοεῖν ἀντιστοιχούντων τῶν γραμμάτων τὰ μυστήρια· θηρεύουσι γὰρ εἰ καὶ ἄλλοι τινές, ἀτὰρ δὴ καὶ οἱ μῦθοι οἱ τοιοίδε Θρᾳκῶν τοὺς βαρβαρικωτάτους, Φρυγῶν τοὺς ἀνοητοτάτους, Ἑλλήνων τοὺς δεισιδαίμονας. **13.3** Ὄλοιτο οὖν ὁ τῆσδε ἄρξας τῆς ἀπάτης ἀνθρώποις, εἴτε ὁ Δάρδανος, ὁ Μητρὸς θεῶν καταδείξας τὰ μυστήρια, εἴτε Ἠετίων, ὁ τὰ Σαμοθρᾴκων ὄργια καὶ τελετὰς ὑποστησάμενος, εἴτε ὁ Φρὺξ ἐκεῖνος ὁ Μίδας, ὁ παρὰ τοῦ

---

[4] τὸν Ἀπόλλω ante τὸν Κλάριον trastulere Markland, Mayor, Marcovich : Τροφώνιον Cobet : Μόψον Wilamowitz.

[5] ἀνιέρου P: ἀνέρου Plassart Mondésert

Ὀδρύσου μαθών, ἔπειτα διαδοὺς τοῖς ὑποτεταγμένοις ἔντεχνον ἀπάτην. **13.4** Οὐ γάρ με ὁ Κύπριος ὁ νησιώτης Κινύρας παραπείσαι ποτ' ἄν, τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην μαχλῶντα ὄργια ἐκ νυκτὸς ἡμέρᾳ παραδοῦναι τολμήσας, φιλοτιμούμενος θειάσαι πόρνην **13.5** πολίτιδα. Μελάμποδα δὲ τὸν Ἀμυθάονος ἄλλοι φασὶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετακομίσαι τῇ Ἑλλάδι τὰς Δηοῦς ἑορτάς, πένθος ὑμνούμενον. Τούτους ἔγωγ' ἂν ἀρχεκάκους φήσαιμι μύθων ἀθέων καὶ δεισιδαιμονίας ὀλεθρίου πατέρας, σπέρμα κακίας καὶ φθορᾶς ἐγκαταφυτεύσαντας τῷ βίῳ τὰ μυστήρια.

14.1 Ἤδη δέ, καὶ γὰρ καιρός, αὐτὰ ὑμῶν τὰ ὄργια ἐξελέγξω ἀπάτης καὶ τερατείας ἔμπλεα. Καὶ εἰ μεμύησθε, ἐπιγελάσεσθε μᾶλλον τοῖς μύθοις ὑμῶν τούτοις τοῖς τιμωμένοις. Ἀγορεύω δὲ ἀναφανδὸν τὰ κεκρυμμένα, οὐκ αἰδούμενος λέγειν ἃ προσκυνεῖν οὐκ αἰσχύνεσθε. **14.2** Ἡ μὲν οὖν "ἀφρογενής" τε καὶ "κυπρογενής", ἡ Κινύρᾳ φίλη (τὴν Ἀφροδίτην λέγω, τὴν "φιλομηδέα, ὅτι μηδέων ἐξεφαάνθη," μηδέων ἐκείνων τῶν ἀποκεκομμένων Οὐρανοῦ, τῶν λάγνων, τῶν μετὰ τὴν τομὴν τὸ κῦμα βεβιασμένων), ὡς ἀσελγῶν ὑμῖν μορίων ἄξιος [Ἀφροδίτη] γίνεται καρπός, ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς ταύτης τῆς πελαγίας ἡδονῆς τεκμήριον τῆς γονῆς ἅλων χόνδρος καὶ φαλλὸς τοῖς μυουμένοις τὴν τέχνην τὴν μοιχικὴν ἐπιδίδοται· νόμισμα δὲ εἰσφέρουσιν αὐτῇ οἱ μυούμενοι ὡς ἑταίρᾳ ἐρασταί.

15.1 Δηοῦς δὲ μυστήρια καὶ Διὸς πρὸς μητέρα Δήμητρα ἀφροδίσιοι συμπλοκαὶ καὶ μῆνις (οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι φῶ λοιπὸν μητρὸς ἢ γυναικός) τῆς Δηοῦς, ἧς δὴ χάριν Βριμὼ προσαγορευθῆναι λέγεται, ἱκετηρίαι Διὸς καὶ πόμα χολῆς καὶ καρδιουλκίαι καὶ ἀρρητουργίαι· ταῦτα οἱ Φρύγες τελίσκουσιν Ἄττιδι καὶ Κυβέλῃ καὶ Κορύβασιν. **15.2** Τεθρυλήκασιν δὲ ὡς ἄρα ἀποσπάσας ὁ Ζεὺς τοῦ κριοῦ τοὺς διδύμους φέρων ἐν μέσοις ἔρριψε τοῖς κόλποις τῆς Δηοῦς, τιμωρίαν ψευδῆ τῆς βιαίας συμπλοκῆς ἐκτιννύων, ὡς ἑαυτὸν δῆθεν ἐκτεμών. **15.3** Τὰ σύμβολα τῆς μυήσεως ταύτης ἐκ περιουσίας παρατεθέντα οἶδ' ὅτι κινήσει γέλωτα καὶ μὴ γελασείουσιν ὑμῖν διὰ τοὺς ἐλέγχους· "Ἐκ τυμπάνου ἔφαγον· ἐκ κυμβάλου ἔπιον· ἐκιρνοφόρησα· ὑπὸ τὸν παστὸν ὑπέδυν." Ταῦτα οὐχ ὕβρις τὰ σύμβολα; Οὐ χλεύη τὰ μυστήρια;

16.1 Τί δ' εἰ καὶ τὰ ἐπίλοιπα προσθείην; Κυεῖ μὲν ἡ Δημήτηρ, ἀνατρέφεται δὲ ἡ Κόρη, μίγνυται δ' αὖθις ὁ γεννήσας οὑτοσὶ Ζεὺς τῇ Φερεφάττῃ, τῇ ἰδίᾳ θυγατρί, μετὰ τὴν μητέρα τὴν Δηώ, ἐκλαθόμενος τοῦ προτέρου μύσους, πατὴρ καὶ φθορεὺς κόρης ὁ Ζεύς, καὶ μίγνυται δράκων **16.2** γενόμενος, ὃς ἦν ἐλεγχθείς. Σαβαζίων γοῦν μυστηρίων σύμβολον τοῖς μυουμένοις ὁ διὰ κόλπου θεός· δράκων δέ ἐστιν οὗτος, διελκόμενος τοῦ κόλπου τῶν τελουμένων, **16.3** ἔλεγχος ἀκρασίας Διός. Κυεῖ καὶ ἡ Φερέφαττα παῖδα ταυρόμορφον· ἀμέλει, φησί τις ποιητὴς εἰδωλικός,

                                                     ...ταῦρος
           πατὴρ δράκοντος καὶ πατὴρ ταύρου δράκων,
           ἐν ὄρει τὸ κρύφιον, βουκόλος, τὸ κέντρον,
βουκολικόν, οἶμαι, κέντρον τὸν νάρθηκα ἐπικαλῶν, ὃν δὴ ἀναστέφουσιν οἱ βάκχοι.

17. 1 Βούλει καὶ τὰ Φερεφάττης ἀνθολόγια διηγήσωμαί σοι καὶ τὸν κάλαθον καὶ τὴν ἁρπαγὴν τὴν ὑπὸ Ἀιδωνέως καὶ τὸ σχίσμα τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰς ὗς τὰς Εὐβουλέως τὰς συγκαταποθείσας ταῖν θεαῖν, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἐν

τοῖς Θεσμοφορίοις μεγαρίζοντες χοίρους ἐμβάλλουσιν; Ταύτην τὴν μυθολογίαν αἱ γυναῖκες ποικίλως κατὰ πόλιν ἑορτάζουσι, Θεσμοφόρια, Σκιροφόρια, Ἀρρητοφόρια, πολυτρόπως τὴν Φερεφάττης ἐκτραγῳδοῦσαι ἁρπαγήν. **17.2** Τὰ γὰρ[6] Διονύσου μυστήρια τέλεον ἀπάνθρωπα· ὃν εἰσέτι παῖδα ὄντα ἐνόπλῳ κινήσει περιχορευόντων Κουρήτων, δόλῳ δὲ ὑποδύντων Τιτάνων, ἀπατήσαντες παιδαριώδεσιν ἀθύρμασιν, οὗτοι δὴ οἱ Τιτᾶνες διέσπασαν, ἔτι νηπίαχον ὄντα, ὡς ὁ τῆς Τελετῆς ποιητὴς Ὀρφεύς φησιν ὁ Θράκιος·

> κῶνος καὶ ῥόμβος καὶ παίγνια καμπεσίγυια,
> μῆλά τε χρύσεα καλὰ παρ' Ἑσπερίδων λιγυφώνων.

18.1 Καὶ τῆσδε ὑμῖν τῆς τελετῆς τὰ ἀχρεῖα σύμβολα οὐκ ἀχρεῖον εἰς κατάγνωσιν παραθέσθαι· ἀστράγαλος, σφαῖρα, στρόβιλος, μῆλα, ῥόμβος, ἔσοπτρον, πόκος. Ἀθηνᾶ μὲν οὖν τὴν καρδίαν τοῦ Διονύσου ὑφελομένη Παλλὰς ἐκ τοῦ πάλλειν τὴν καρδίαν προσηγορεύθη· οἱ δὲ Τιτᾶνες, οἱ καὶ διασπάσαντες αὐτόν, λέβητά τινα τρίποδι ἐπιθέντες καὶ τοῦ Διονύσου ἐμβαλόντες τὰ μέλη, καθήψουν πρότερον· ἔπειτα ὀβελίσκοις **18.2** περιπείραντες "ὑπείρεχον Ἡφαίστοιο." Ζεὺς δὲ ὕστερον ἐπιφανείς (εἰ θεὸς ἦν, τάχα που τῆς κνίσης τῶν ὀπτωμένων κρεῶν μεταλαβών, ἧς δὴ τὸ "γέρας λαχεῖν" ὁμολογοῦσιν ὑμῶν οἱ θεοί) κεραυνῷ τοὺς Τιτᾶνας αἰκίζεται καὶ τὰ μέλη τοῦ Διονύσου Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ παιδὶ παρακατατίθεται καταθάψαι. Ὁ δέ, οὐ γὰρ ἠπείθησε Διί, εἰς τὸν Παρνασσὸν φέρων κατατίθεται διεσπασμένον τὸν νεκρόν.

19.1 Εἰ θέλεις δ' ἐποπτεῦσαι καὶ Κορυβάντων ὄργια, τὸν τρίτον ἀδελφὸν ἀποκτείναντες οὗτοι τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ νεκροῦ φοινικίδι ἐπεκαλυψάτην καὶ καταστέψαντε ἐθαψάτην, φέροντες ἐπὶ χαλκῆς ἀσπίδος ὑπὸ τὰς ὑπωρείας τοῦ Ὀλύμπου **19.2** (καὶ ταῦτ' ἔστι τὰ μυστήρια, συνελόντι φάναι, φόνοι καὶ τάφοι). Οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς οἱ τῶνδε, οὓς Ἀνακτοτελεστὰς οἷς μέλον καλεῖν καλοῦσι, προσεπιτερατεύονται τῇ συμφορᾷ, ὁλόριζον ἀπαγορεύοντες σέλινον ἐπὶ τραπέζης τιθέναι·οἴονται γὰρ δὴ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἀπορρυέντος τοῦ Κορυβαντικοῦ τὸ σέλινον ἐκπεφυκέναι· **19.3** ὥσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ αἱ θεσμοφοριάζουσαι τῆς ῥοιᾶς τοὺς κόκκους παραφυλάττουσιν ἐσθίειν· τοὺς ‹γὰρ› ἀποπεπτωκότας χαμαὶ ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Διονύσου αἵματος σταγόνων βεβλαστηκέναι νομίζουσι τὰς ῥοιάς. **19.4** Καβείρους δὲ τοὺς Κορύβαντας καλοῦντες καὶ τελετὴν Καβειρικὴν καταγγέλλουσιν· αὐτὼ γὰρ δὴ τούτω τὼ ἀδελφοκτόνω τὴν κίστην ἀνελομένω, ἐν ᾗ τὸ τοῦ Διονύσου αἰδοῖον ἀπέκειτο, εἰς Τυρρηνίαν κατήγαγον, εὐκλεοῦς ἔμποροι φορτίου· κἀνταῦθα διετριβέτην, φυγάδε ὄντε, τὴν πολυτίμητον εὐσεβείας διδασκαλίαν αἰδοῖα καὶ κίστην θρησκεύειν παραθεμένω Τυρρηνοῖς. Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἀπεικότως τὸν Διόνυσόν τινες Ἄττιν προσαγορεύεσθαι θέλουσιν, αἰδοίων ἐστερημένον.

20.1 Καὶ τί θαυμαστὸν εἰ Τυρρηνοὶ οἱ βάρβαροι αἰσχροῖς οὕτως τελίσκονται παθήμασιν, ὅπου γε Ἀθηναίοις καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ Ἑλλάδι, αἰδοῦμαι καὶ λέγειν, αἰσχύνης ἔμπλεως ἡ περὶ τὴν Δηὼ μυθολογία; Ἀλωμένη γὰρ ἡ Δηὼ κατὰ ζήτησιν τῆς θυγατρὸς τῆς Κόρης περὶ τὴν Ἐλευσῖνα (τῆς Ἀττικῆς δέ ἐστι τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον) ἀποκάμνει καὶ φρέατι ἐπικαθίζει λυπουμένη. Τοῦτο τοῖς μυουμένοις ἀπαγορεύεται εἰσέτι νῦν, ἵνα μὴ δοκοῖεν

---

[6] δέ Marcovich

οἱ τετελεσμένοι μιμεῖσθαι τὴν ὀδυρομένην. **20.2** Ὤικουν δὲ τηνικάδε τὴν Ἐλευσῖνα οἱ γηγενεῖς· ὀνόματα αὐτοῖς Βαυβὼ καὶ Δυσαύλης καὶ Τριπτόλεμος, ἔτι δὲ Εὔμολπός τε καὶ Εὐβουλεύς· βουκόλος ὁ Τριπτόλεμος ἦν, ποιμὴν δὲ ὁ Εὔμολπος, συβώτης δὲ ὁ Εὐβουλεύς· ἀφ' ὧν τὸ Εὐμολπιδῶν καὶ τὸ Κηρύκων τὸ ἱεροφαντικὸν δὴ τοῦτο Ἀθήνησι γένος ἤνθησεν. **20.3** Καὶ δὴ (οὐ γὰρ ἀνήσω μὴ οὐχὶ εἰπεῖν) ξενίσασα ἡ Βαυβὼ τὴν Δηὼ ὀρέγει κυκεῶνα αὐτῇ· τῆς δὲ ἀναινομένης λαβεῖν καὶ πιεῖν οὐκ ἐθελούσης (πενθήρης γὰρ ἦν) περιαλγὴς ἡ Βαυβὼ γενομένη, ὡς ὑπεροραθεῖσα δῆθεν, ἀναστέλλεται τὰ αἰδοῖα καὶ ἐπιδεικνύει τῇ θεῷ· ἡ δὲ τέρπεται τῇ ὄψει ἡ Δηὼ καὶ μόλις ποτὲ δέχεται τὸ ποτόν, ἡσθεῖσα τῷ θεάματι. **21 1** Ταῦτ' ἔστι τὰ κρύφια τῶν Ἀθηναίων μυστήρια. Ταῦτά τοι καὶ Ὀρφεὺς ἀναγράφει. Παραθήσομαι δέ σοι αὐτὰ τοῦ Ὀρφέως τὰ ἔπη, ἵν' ἔχῃς μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναισχυντίας τὸν μυσταγωγόν·

> ὣς εἰποῦσα πέπλους ἀνεσύρατο, δεῖξε δὲ πάντα
> σώματος οὐδὲ πρέποντα τύπον· παῖς δ' ἦεν Ἴακχος,
> χειρί τέ μιν ῥίπτασκε γελῶν Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλποις·
> ἡ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν μείδησε θεά, μείδησ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ,
> δέξατο δ' αἰόλον ἄγγος, ἐν ᾧ κυκεὼν ἐνέκειτο.

21.2 Κἄστι τὸ σύνθημα Ἐλευσινίων μυστηρίων· "ἐνήστευσα, ἔπιον τὸν κυκεῶνα, ἔλαβον ἐκ κίστης, ἐργασάμενος ἀπεθέμην εἰς κάλαθον καὶ ἐκ καλάθου εἰς κίστην." Καλά γε τὰ θεάματα καὶ θεᾷ πρέποντα.

22.1 Ἄξια μὲν οὖν νυκτὸς τὰ τελέσματα καὶ πυρὸς καὶ τοῦ "μεγαλήτορος", μᾶλλον δὲ ματαιόφρονος Ἐρεχθειδῶν δήμου, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων, οὕστινας "μένει **22.2** τελευτήσαντας ἅσσα οὐδὲ ἔλπονται." Τίσι δὴ μαντεύεται Ἡράκλειτος ὁ Ἐφέσιος; "Νυκτιπόλοις, μάγοις, βάκχοις, λήναις, μύσταις", τούτοις ἀπειλεῖ τὰ μετὰ θάνατον, τούτοις μαντεύεται τὸ πῦρ· "τὰ γὰρ νομιζόμενα κατὰ ἀνθρώπους μυστήρια ἀνιερωστὶ μυοῦνται." **22.3** Νόμος οὖν καὶ ὑπόληψις κενὴ καὶ τοῦ δράκοντος τὰ μυστήρια ἀπάτη τίς ἐστιν θρησκευομένη, τὰς ἀμυήτους ὄντως μυήσεις καὶ τὰς ἀνοργιάστους τελετὰς εὐσεβείᾳ νόθῳ προστρεπομένων. **22.4** Οἷαι δὲ καὶ αἱ κίσται μυστικαί· δεῖ γὰρ ἀπογυμνῶσαι τὰ ἅγια αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ἄρρητα ἐξειπεῖν. Οὐ σησαμαῖ ταῦτα καὶ πυραμίδες καὶ τολύπαι καὶ πόπανα πολυόμφαλα χόνδροι τε ἁλῶν καὶ δράκων, ὄργιον Διονύσου Βασσάρου; Οὐχὶ δὲ ῥοιαὶ πρὸς τοῖσδε καὶ κράδαι νάρθηκές τε καὶ κιττοί, πρὸς δὲ καὶ φθοῖς καὶ μήκωνες; Ταῦτ' ἔστιν αὐτῶν τὰ ἅγια. **22.5** Καὶ προσέτι τῆς Θέμιδος[7] τὰ ἀπόρρητα σύμβολα ὀρίγανον, λύχνος, ξίφος, κτεὶς γυναικεῖος, ὅ ἐστιν εὐφήμως καὶ μυστικῶς εἰπεῖν μόριον γυναικεῖον. **22.6** Ὦ τῆς ἐμφανοῦς ἀναισχυντίας. Πάλαι μὲν ἀνθρώποις σωφρονοῦσιν ἐπικάλυμμα ἡδονῆς νὺξ ἦν σιωπωμένη· νυνὶ δὲ τοῖς μυουμένοις πεῖρα τῆς ἀκρασίας νύξ ἐστι λαλουμένη, καὶ τὸ πῦρ ἐλέγχει τὰ πάθη δᾳδουχούμενον. **22.7** Ἀπόσβεσον, ὦ ἱεροφάντα, τὸ πῦρ· αἰδέσθητι, δᾳδοῦχε, τὰς λαμπάδας· ἐλέγχει σου τὸν Ἴακχον τὸ φῶς· ἐπίτρεψον ἀποκρύψαι τῇ νυκτὶ τὰ μυστήρια· σκότει τετιμήσθω τὰ ὄργια· τὸ πῦρ οὐχ ὑποκρίνεται, ἐλέγχειν καὶκολάζειν κελεύεται.

---

[7] Γῆς Wilamowitz Stählin et Marcovich : P retinet Mondésert.

23 1 Ταῦτα τῶν ἀθέων τὰ μυστήρια· ἀθέους δὲ εἰκότως ἀποκαλῶ τούτους, οἳ τὸν μὲν ὄντως ὄντα θεὸν ἠγνοήκασιν, παιδίον δὲ ὑπὸ Τιτάνων διασπώμενον καὶ γύναιον πενθοῦν καὶ μόρια ἄρρητα ὡς ἀληθῶς ὑπ' αἰσχύνης ἀναισχύντως σέβουσιν, διττῇ ἐνεσχημένοι τῇ ἀθεότητι, προτέρᾳ μέν, καθ' ἣν ἀγνοοῦσι τὸν θεόν, τὸν ὄντα ὄντως μὴ γνωρίζοντες θεόν, ἑτέρᾳ δὲ καὶ δευτέρᾳ ταύτῃ πλάνῃ τοὺς οὐκ ὄντας ὡς ὄντας νομίζοντες καὶ θεοὺς τούτους ὀνομάζοντες τοὺς οὐκ ὄντως ὄντας, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲ ὄντας, μόνου δὲ τοῦ ὀνόματος τετυχηκότας. **23.2** Διὰ τοῦτό τοι καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος διελέγχει ἡμᾶς "Καὶ ἦτε ξένοι" λέγων "τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ".

24.1 Πολλὰ κἀγαθὰ γένοιτο τῷ τῶν Σκυθῶν βασιλεῖ, ὅστις ποτὲ ἦν [Ἀνάχαρσις][8]. Οὗτος τὸν πολίτην τὸν ἑαυτοῦ, τὴν παρὰ Κυζικηνοῖς Μητρὸς τῶν θεῶν τελετὴν ἀπομιμούμενον παρὰ Σκύθαις τύμπανόν τε ἐπικτυποῦντα καὶ κύμβαλον ἐπηχοῦντα καὶ τοῦ τραχήλου τινὰ μηναγυρτικὰ ἐξηρτημένον, κατετόξευσεν, ὡς ἄνανδρον αὐτόν τε παρ' Ἕλλησι γεγενημένον καὶ τῆς θηλείας τοῖς ἄλλοις Σκυθῶν διδάσκαλον νόσου. **24.2** Ὧν δὴ χάριν (οὐ γὰρ οὐδαμῶς ἀποκρυπτέον) θαυμάζειν ἔπεισί μοι ὅτῳ τρόπῳ Εὐήμερον τὸν Ἀκραγαντῖνον καὶ Νικάνορα τὸν Κύπριον καὶ Διαγόραν καὶ Ἵππωνα τὼ Μηλίω τόν τε Κυρηναῖον ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐκεῖνον (ὁ Θεόδωρος ὄνομα αὐτῷ) καί τινας ἄλλους συχνούς, σωφρόνως βεβιωκότας καὶ καθεωρακότας ὀξύτερόν που τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν ἀμφὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τούτους πλάνην, ἀθέους ἐπικεκλήκασιν, εἰ καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν αὐτὴν μὴ νενοηκότας, ἀλλὰ τὴν πλάνην γε ὑπωπτευκότας, ὅπερ οὐ σμικρὸν εἰς ἀλήθειαν φρονήσεως ζώπυρον ἀναφύεται σπέρμα· **24.3** ὧν ὃ μέν τις παρεγγυᾷ τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις, "εἰ θεοὺς νομίζετε, μὴ θρηνεῖτε αὐτοὺς μηδὲ κόπτεσθε· εἰ δὲ πενθεῖτε αὐτούς, μηκέτι τούτους ἡγεῖσθε εἶναι θεούς", **24.4** ὃ δ' Ἡρακλέα ἐκ ξύλου λαβὼν κατεσκευασμένον (ἔτυχε δὲ ἕψων τι οἴκοι, οἷα εἰκός)· "Εἶα δή, ὦ Ἡράκλεις", εἶπεν· "νῦν σοι ἤδη καιρός, ὥσπερ Εὐρυσθεῖ, ἀτὰρ δὴ καὶ ἡμῖν ὑπουργῆσαι τὸν τρισκαιδέκατον τοῦτον ἆθλον καὶ Διαγόρᾳ τοὔψον παρασκευάσαι", "κᾆτ' αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πῦρ ἐνέθηκεν ὡς ξύλον".

25 1 Ἀκρότητες ἄρα ἀμαθίας ἀθεότης καὶ δεισιδαιμονία, ὧν ἐκτὸς μένειν σπουδαστέον. Οὐχ ὁρᾷς τὸν ἱεροφάντην τῆς ἀληθείας Μωσέα προστάττοντα θλαδίαν καὶ ἀποκεκομμένον μὴ ἐκκλησιάζειν, καὶ προσέτι τὸν ἐκ πόρνης; **25.2** Αἰνίττεται δὲ διὰ μὲν τῶν προτέρων τὸν ἄθεον τρόπον τὸν τῆς θείας καὶ γονίμου δυνάμεως ἐστερημένον, διὰ δὲ τοῦ λοιποῦ τοῦ τρίτου τὸν πολλοὺς ἐπιγραφόμενον ψευδωνύμους θεοὺς ἀντὶ τοῦ μόνου ὄντος θεοῦ, ὥσπερ ὁ ἐκ τῆς πόρνης τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπιγράφεται πατέρας ἀγνοίᾳ τοῦ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν πατρός. **25.3** Ἦν δέ τις ἔμφυτος ἀρχαία πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀνθρώποις κοινωνία, ἀγνοίᾳ μὲν ἐσκοτισμένη, ἄφνω δέ που διεκθρῴσκουσα τοῦ σκότους καὶ ἀναλάμπουσα, οἷον δὴ ἐκεῖνο λέλεκταί τινι τὸ

> ὁρᾷς τὸν ὑψοῦ τόνδ' ἄπειρον αἰθέρα
> καὶ γῆν πέριξ ἔχονθ' ὑγραῖς ἐν ἀγκάλαις;

Καὶ τὸ

> ὦ γῆς ὄχημα κἀπὶ γῆς ἔχων ἕδραν,
> ὅστις ποτ' εἶ σύ, δυστόπαστος εἰσιδεῖν,

[8] del Casaubon edd

καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα ποιητῶν ᾄδουσι παῖδες. **25.4** Ἔννοιαι δὲ ἡμαρτημέναι καὶ παρηγμέναι τῆς εὐθείας, ὀλέθριαι ὡς ἀληθῶς, τὸ "οὐράνιον φυτόν", τὸν ἄνθρωπον, οὐρανίου ἐξέτρεψαν διαίτης καὶ ἐξετάνυσαν ἐπὶ γῆς, γηΐνοις προσανέχειν ἀναπείσασαι πλάσμασιν.

26 1 Οἳ μὲν γὰρ εὐθέως ἀμφὶ τὴν οὐρανοῦ θέαν ἀπατώμενοι καὶ ὄψει μόνῃ πεπιστευκότες τῶν ἀστέρων τὰς κινήσεις ἐπιθεώμενοι ἐθαύμασάν τε καὶ ἐξεθείασαν, θεοὺς ἐκ τοῦ θεῖν ὀνομάσαντες τοὺς ἀστέρας, καὶ προσεκύνησαν ἥλιον, ὡς Ἰνδοί, καὶ σελήνην, ὡς Φρύγες·**26.2** οἳ δὲ τῶν ἐκ γῆς φυομένων τοὺς ἡμέρους δρεπόμενοι καρποὺς Δηὼ τὸν σῖτον, ὡς Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ Διόνυσον τὴν ἄμπελον, ὡς Θηβαῖοι, προσηγόρευσαν. **26.3** Ἄλλοι τὰς ἀμοιβὰς τῆς κακίας ἐπισκοπήσαντες θεοποιοῦσι τὰς ἀντιδόσεις προσκυνοῦντες καὶ τὰς συμφοράς. Ἐντεῦθεν τὰς Ἐρινύας καὶ τὰς Εὐμενίδας Παλαμναίους τε καὶ Προστροπαίους, ἔτι δὲ Ἀλάστορας ἀναπεπλάκασιν οἱ ἀμφὶ τὴν σκηνὴν ποιηταί. **26.4** Φιλοσόφων δὲ ἤδη τινὲς καὶ αὐτοὶ μετὰ τοὺς ποιητικοὺς τῶν ἐν ὑμῖν παθῶν ἀνειδωλοποιοῦσι τύπους τὸν Φόβον καὶ τὸν Ἔρωτα καὶ τὴν Χαρὰν καὶ τὴν Ἐλπίδα, ὥσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ Ἐπιμενίδης ὁ παλαιὸς Ὕβρεως καὶ Ἀναιδείας Ἀθήνησιν ἀναστήσας βωμούς· **26.5** οἳ δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁρμώμενοι τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκθεοῦνται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ σωματικῶς ἀναπλάττονται, Δίκη τις καὶ Κλωθὼ καὶ Λάχεσις καὶ Ἄτροπος καὶ Εἱμαρμένη, Αὐξώ τε καὶ Θαλλώ, αἱ Ἀττικαί. **26.6** Ἕκτος ἐστὶν εἰσηγητικὸς τρόπος ἀπάτης, θεῶν περιποιητικός, καθ᾽ ὃν ἀριθμοῦσι θεοὺς τοὺς δώδεκα· ὧν καὶ θεογονίαν Ἡσίοδος ᾄδει τὴν αὑτοῦ, καὶ ὅσα θεολογεῖ Ὅμηρος. **26.7** Τελευταῖος δὲ ὑπολείπεται (ἑπτὰ γὰρ οἱ ἅπαντες οὗτοι τρόποι) ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς θείας εὐεργεσίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καταγινομένης ὁρμώμενος. Τὸν γὰρ εὐεργετοῦντα μὴ συνιέντες θεὸν ἀνέπλασάν τινας σωτῆρας Διοσκούρους καὶ Ἡρακλέα ἀλεξίκακον καὶ Ἀσκληπιὸν ἰατρόν.

27 1 Αὗται μὲν αἱ ὀλισθηραί τε καὶ ἐπιβλαβεῖς παρεκβάσεις τῆς ἀληθείας, καθέλκουσαι οὐρανόθεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ εἰς βάραθρον περιτρέπουσαι. Ἐθέλω δὲ ὑμῖν ἐν χρῷ τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐπιδεῖξαι ὁποῖοί τινες καὶ εἴ τινες, ἵν᾽ ἤδη ποτὲ τῆς πλάνης λήξητε, αὖθις δὲ παλινδρομήσητε εἰς οὐρανόν. **27.2** "Ἦμεν γάρ που καὶ ἡμεῖς τέκνα ὀργῆς, ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποί· ὁ δὲ θεὸς πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει, διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, ὄντας ἤδη νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ." "Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος" καὶ συνταφεὶς Χριστῷ συνυψοῦται θεῷ. Οἱ δὲ ἔτι ἄπιστοι "τέκνα ὀργῆς" ὀνομάζονται, τρεφόμενα ὀργῇ· ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ὀργῆς θρέμματα ἔτι, οἱ τῆς πλάνης ἀπεσπασμένοι, ᾄσσοντες δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. **27.3** Ταύτῃ τοι ἡμεῖς οἱ τῆς ἀνομίας υἱοί ποτε διὰ τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν τοῦ λόγου νῦν υἱοὶ γεγόναμεν τοῦ θεοῦ· ὑμῖν δὲ καὶ ὁ ὑμέτερος ὑποδύεται ποιητὴς ὁ Ἀκραγαντῖνος Ἐμπεδοκλῆς·

τοιγάρτοι χαλεπῇσιν ἀλύοντες κακότησιν
οὔ ποτε δειλαίων ἀχέων λωφήσετε θυμόν.

27.4 Τὰ μὲν δὴ πλεῖστα μεμύθευται καὶ πέπλασται περὶ θεῶν ὑμῖν· τὰ δὲ καὶ ὅσα γεγενῆσθαι ὑπείληπται, ταῦτα δὲ περὶ ἀνθρώπων αἰσχρῶν καὶ ἀσελγῶς βεβιωκότων ἀναγέγραπται·

τύφῳ καὶ μανίῃ δὲ βαδίζετε καὶ τρίβον ὀρθὴν
εὐθεῖαν προλιπόντες ἀπήλθετε τὴν δι᾽ ἀκανθῶν

καὶ σκολόπων. Τί πλανᾶσθε, βροτοί; παύσασθε, μάταιοι,
καλλίπετε σκοτίην νυκτός, φωτὸς δὲ λάβεσθε.

27.5 Ταῦτα ἡμῖν ἡ προφητικὴ παρεγγυᾷ καὶ ποιητικὴ Σίβυλλα· παρεγγυᾷ δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια, γυμνοῦσα τῶν καταπληκτικῶν τουτωνὶ καὶ ἐκπληκτικῶν προσωπείων τὸν ὄχλον τῶν θεῶν, συνωνυμίαις τισὶ τὰς δοξοποιίας διελέγχουσα.

28.1 Αὐτίκα γοῦν εἰσὶν οἱ τρεῖς τοὺς Ζῆνας ἀναγράφουσιν, τὸν μὲν Αἰθέρος ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ, τὼ δὲ λοιπὼ τοῦ Κρόνου παῖδε, τούτοιν τὸν μὲν ἐν Κρήτῃ, θάτερον δὲ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ πάλιν. **28.2** Εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ πέντε Ἀθηνᾶς ὑποτίθενται, τὴν μὲν Ἡφαίστου, τὴν Ἀθηναίαν· τὴν δὲ Νείλου, τὴν Αἰγυπτίαν· τρίτην τοῦ Κρόνου, τὴν πολέμου εὑρέτιν· τετάρτην τὴν Διός, ἣν Μεσσήνιοι Κορυφασίαν ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς ἐπικεκλήκασιν· ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὴν Πάλλαντος καὶ Τιτανίδος τῆς Ὠκεανοῦ, ἣ τὸν πατέρα δυσσεβῶς καταθύσασα τῷ πατρῴῳ κεκόσμηται δέρματι ὥσπερ κῳδίῳ. **28 3** Ναὶ μὴν Ἀπόλλωνα ὁ μὲν Ἀριστοτέλης πρῶτον Ἡφαίστου καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς (ἐνταῦθα δὴ οὐκέτι παρθένος ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ), δεύτερον ἐν Κρήτῃ τὸν Κύρβαντος, τρίτον τὸν Διὸς καὶ τέταρτον τὸν Ἀρκάδα τὸν Σιληνοῦ· Νόμιος οὗτος κέκληται παρὰ Ἀρκάσιν· ἐπὶ τούτοις τὸν Λίβυν καταλέγει τὸν Ἄμμωνος· ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος ὁ γραμματικὸς τούτοις ἕκτον ἐπιφέρει τὸν Μάγνητος. **28.4** Πόσοι δὲ καὶ νῦν Ἀπόλλωνες, ἀναρίθμητοι θνητοὶ καὶ ἐπίκηροί τινες ἄνθρωποι, εἰσίν, οἱ παραπλησίως τοῖς προειρημένοις ἐκείνοις κεκλημένοι;

29.1 Τί δ' εἴ σοι τοὺς πολλοὺς εἴποιμι Ἀσκληπιοὺς ἢ τοὺς Ἑρμᾶς τοὺς ἀριθμουμένους ἢ τοὺς Ἡφαίστους τοὺς μυθολογουμένους; Μὴ καὶ περιττὸς εἶναι δόξω τὰς ἀκοὰς ὑμῶν τοῖς πολλοῖς τούτοις ἐπικλύζων ὀνόμασιν; Ἀλλ' αἵ γε πατρίδες αὐτοὺς καὶ αἱ τέχναι καὶ οἱ βίοι, πρὸς δέ γε καὶ οἱ τάφοι ἀνθρώπους γεγονότας διελέγχουσιν. **29.2** Ἄρης γοῦν ὁ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς, ὡς οἷόν τε, τετιμημένος,

Ἆρες, Ἆρες, βροτολοιγέ, μιαιφόνε, τειχεσιπλῆτα,

ὁ "ἀλλοπρόσαλλος" οὗτος καὶ "ἀνάρσιος", ὡς μὲν Ἐπίχαρμός φησι, Σπαρτιάτης ἦν· Σοφοκλῆς δὲ Θρᾷκα οἶδεν αὐτόν· **29.3** ἄλλοι δὲ Ἀρκάδα. Τοῦτον δὲ Ὅμηρος δεδέσθαι φησὶν ἐπὶ μῆνας τρισκαίδεκα·

τλῆ μὲν Ἄρης, ὅτε μιν Ὦτος κρατερός τ' Ἐπιάλτης,
παῖδες Ἀλωῆος, δῆσαν κρατερῷ ἐνὶ δεσμῷ·
χαλκέῳ δ' ἐν κεράμῳ δέδετο τρισκαίδεκα μῆνας.

29.4 Πολλὰ κἀγαθὰ Κᾶρες σχοῖεν, οἳ καταθύουσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς κύνας. Σκύθαι δὲ τοὺς ὄνους ἱερεύοντες μὴ παυέσθων, ὡς Ἀπολλόδωρός φησι καὶ Καλλίμαχος,

Φοῖβος Ὑπερβορέοισιν ὄνων ἐπιτέλλεται ἱροῖς.

Ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ ἀλλαχοῦ

τέρπουσιν λιπαραὶ Φοῖβον ὀνοσφαγίαι.

29.5 Ἥφαιστος δέ, ὃν ἔρριψεν ἐξ Ὀλύμπου Ζεὺς "βηλοῦ ἀπὸ θεσπεσίοιο", ἐν Λήμνῳ καταπεσὼν ἐχάλκευε, πηρωθεὶς τὼ πόδε, "ὑπὸ δὲ κνῆμαι ῥώοντο ἀραιαί.

30.1 Ἔχεις καὶ ἰατρόν, οὐχὶ χαλκέα μόνον ἐν θεοῖς· ὁ δὲ ἰατρὸς φιλάργυρος ἦν, Ἀσκληπιὸς ὄνομα αὐτῷ. Καί σοι τὸν σὸν παραθήσομαι ποιητήν, τὸν Βοιώτιον Πίνδαρον·

ἔτραπε κἀκεῖνον ἀγάνορι μισθῷ χρυσὸς ἐν χερσὶ φανείς·
χερσὶ δ' ἄρα Κρονίων ῥίψας δι' ἀμφοῖν ἀμπνοὰς στέρνων καθεῖλεν
ὠκέως, αἴθων δὲ κεραυνὸς ἔσκηψε μόρον.

30.2 Καὶ Εὐριπίδης·
    Ζεὺς γὰρ κατακτὰς παῖδα τὸν ἐμὸν αἴτιος
    Ἀσκληπιόν, στέρνοισιν ἐμβαλὼν φλόγα.

Οὗτος μὲν οὖν κεῖται κεραυνωθεὶς ἐν τοῖς Κυνοσουρίδος ὁρίοις. **30.3** Φιλόχορος δὲ ἐν Τήνῳ Ποσειδῶνά φησι τιμᾶσθαι ἰατρόν, Κρόνῳ δὲ ἐπικεῖσθαι Σικελίαν καὶ ἐνταῦθα αὐτὸν τεθάφθαι. **30.4** Πατροκλῆς τε ὁ Θούριος καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ὁ νεώτερος ἐν τισι[9] τραγῳδίαις ἱστορεῖτον τοῖν Διοσκούροιν πέρι· ἀνθρώπω τινὲ τούτω τὼ Διοσκούρω ἐπικήρω ἐγενέσθην, εἴ τῳ ἱκανὸς πιστώσασθαι Ὅμηρος τὸ λελεγμένον·
    τοὺς δ' ἤδη κάτεχεν φυσίζοος αἶα
    ἐν Λακεδαίμονι αὖθι, φίλῃ ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ.

30.5 Προσίτω δὲ καὶ ὁ τὰ Κυπριακὰ ποιήματα γράψας·
    Κάστωρ μὲν θνητός, θανάτου δέ οἱ αἶσα πέπρωται·
    αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἀθάνατος Πολυδεύκης, ὄζος Ἄρηος.

30.6 Τοῦτο μὲν ποιητικῶς ἐψεύσατο· Ὅμηρος δὲ ἀξιοπιστότερος αὐτοῦ εἰπὼν περὶ ἀμφοῖν τοῖν Διοσκούροιν, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα "εἴδωλον" ἐλέγξας· "φῶτα" γὰρ "Ἡρακλῆα, μεγάλων ἐπίστορα ἔργων". **30.7** Ἡρακλέα οὖν καὶ αὐτὸς Ὅμηρος θνητὸν οἶδεν ἄνθρωπον, Ἱερώνυμος δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφος καὶ τὴν σχέσιν αὐτοῦ ὑφηγεῖται τοῦ σώματος, μικρόν, φριξότριχα, ῥωστικόν· Δικαίαρχος δὲ σχιζίαν, νευρώδη, μέλανα, γρυπόν, ὑποχαροπόν, τετανότριχα. Οὗτος οὖν ὁ Ἡρακλῆς δύο πρὸς τοῖς πεντήκοντα ἔτη βεβιωκὼς κατέστρεψε τὸν βίον διὰ τῆς ἐν Οἴτῃ πυρᾶς κεκηδευμένος.

31.1 Τὰς δὲ Μούσας, ἃς Ἀλκμὰν[10] Διὸς καὶ Μνημοσύνης γενεαλογεῖ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ποιηταὶ καὶ συγγραφεῖς ἐκθειάζουσιν καὶ σέβουσιν, ἤδη δὲ καὶ ὅλαι πόλεις μουσεῖα τεμενίζουσιν αὐταῖς, Μυσὰς οὔσας θεραπαινίδας ταύτας ἐώνηται Μεγακλὼ ἡ θυγάτηρ ἡ Μάκαρος. **31.2** Ὁ δὲ Μάκαρ Λεσβίων μὲν ἐβασίλευεν, διεφέρετο δὲ ἀεὶ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα, ἠγανάκτει δὲ ἡ Μεγακλὼ ὑπὲρ τῆς μητρός· τί δ' οὐκ ἔμελλε; Καὶ Μυσὰς θεραπαινίδας ταύτας τοσαύτας τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὠνεῖται καὶ καλεῖ Μοίσας κατὰ τὴν διάλεκτον τὴν Αἰολέων. **31.3** Ταύτας ἐδιδάξατο ᾄδειν καὶ κιθαρίζειν τὰς πράξεις τὰς παλαιὰς ἐμμελῶς. Αἳ δὲ συνεχῶς κιθαρίζουσαι καὶ καλῶς κατεπάδουσαι τὸν Μάκαρα ἔθελγον καὶ κατέπαυον τῆς ὀργῆς. **31.4** Οὗ δὴ χάριν ἡ Μεγακλὼ χαριστήριον αὐτὰς ὑπὲρ τῆς μητρὸς ἀνέθηκε χαλκᾶς καὶ ἀνὰ πάντα ἐκέλευσε τιμᾶσθαι τὰ ἱερά. Καὶ αἱ μὲν Μοῦσαι τοιαίδε· ἡ δὲ ἱστορία παρὰ Μυρσίλῳ τῷ Λεσβίῳ.

32.1 Ἀκούετε δὴ οὖν τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν θεῶν τοὺς ἔρωτας καὶ τὰς παραδόξους τῆς ἀκρασίας μυθολογίας καὶ τραύματα αὐτῶν καὶ δεσμὰ καὶ γέλωτας καὶ μάχας δουλείας τε ἔτι καὶ συμπόσια συμπλοκάς τ' αὖ καὶ δάκρυα καὶ πάθη καὶ μαχλώσας ἡδονάς. **32.2** Κάλει μοι τὸν Ποσειδῶ καὶ τὸν χορὸν τῶν διεφθαρμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, τὴν Ἀμφιτρίτην, τὴν Ἀμυμώνην, τὴν Ἀλόπην, τὴν Μελανίππην, τὴν Ἀλκυόνην, τὴν Ἱπποθόην, τὴν Χιόνην, τὰς ἄλλας τὰς

---

[9] τρισί P retinet Stählin : τισι Welcker Marcovich.
[10] Bergk : ἄλκμανδρος P m**1** : ἄλκανδρος m**2**

μυρίας· ἐν αἷς δὴ καὶ τοσαύταις οὔσαις ἔτι τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ὑμῶν ἐστενοχωρεῖτο τὰ πάθη. 32.3 Κάλει μοι καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλω· Φοῖβός ἐστιν οὗτος καὶ μάντις ἁγνὸς καὶ σύμβουλος ἀγαθός· ἀλλ' οὐ ταῦτα ἡ Στερόπη λέγει οὐδὲ ἡ Αἴθουσα οὐδὲ ἡ Ἀρσινόη οὐδὲ ἡ Ζευξίππη οὐδὲ ἡ Προθόη οὐδὲ ἡ Μάρπησσα οὐδὲ ἡ Ὑψιπύλη· Δάφνη γὰρ ἐξέφυγε μόνη καὶ τὸν μάντιν καὶ τὴν φθοράν. 32.4 Αὐτός τε ὁ Ζεὺς ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἡκέτω, ὁ "πατὴρ" καθ' ὑμᾶς "ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε"· τοσοῦτος περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια ἐξεχύθη, ὡς ἐπιθυμεῖν μὲν πασῶν, ἐκπληροῦν δὲ εἰς πάσας τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν. Ἐνεπίμπλατο γοῦν γυναικῶν οὐχ ἧττον ἢ αἰγῶν ὁ Θμουιτῶν τράγος. 33 .1

> Καὶ σοῦ, ὦ Ὅμηρε, τεθαύμακα τὰ ποιήματα·
> ἦ, καὶ κυανέῃσιν ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε Κρονίων·
> ἀμβρόσιαι δ' ἄρα χαῖται ἐπερρώσαντο ἄνακτος
> κρατὸς ἀπ' ἀθανάτοιο· μέγαν δ' ἐλέλιξεν Ὄλυμπον.

33.2 Σεμνὸν ἀναπλάττεις, Ὅμηρε, τὸν Δία καὶ νεῦμα περιάπτεις αὐτῷ τετιμημένον. Ἀλλ' ἐὰν ἐπιδείξῃς μόνον, ἄνθρωπε, τὸν κεστόν, ἐξελέγχεται καὶ ὁ Ζεὺς καὶ ἡ κόμη καταισχύνεται. 33.3 Εἰς ὅσον διελήλακεν ἀσελγείας ὁ Ζεὺς ἐκεῖνος ὁ μετ' Ἀλκμήνης τοσαύτας ἡδυπαθήσας νύκτας; οὐδὲ γὰρ αἱ νύκτες αἱ ἐννέα τῷ ἀκολάστῳ μακραί (ἅπας δὲ ἔμπαλιν ὁ βίος ἀκρασίᾳ βραχὺς ἦν), ἵνα δὴ ἡμῖν τὸν ἀλεξίκακον σπείρῃ θεόν. 33.4 Διὸς υἱὸς Ἡρακλῆς, Διὸς ὡς ἀληθῶς, ὁ ἐκ μακρᾶς γεννώμενος νυκτός, τοὺς μὲν ἄθλους τοὺς δώδεκα πολλῷ ταλαιπωρησάμενος χρόνῳ, τὰς δὲ πεντήκοντα Θεστίου θυγατέρας νυκτὶ διαφθείρας μιᾷ, μοιχὸς ὁμοῦ καὶ νυμφίος τοσούτων γενόμενος παρθένων. Οὔκουν ἀπεικότως οἱ ποιηταὶ "σχέτλιον" τοῦτον "καὶ αἰσυλοεργὸν" ἀποκαλοῦσιν. Μακρὸν δ' ἂν εἴη μοιχείας αὐτοῦ παντοδαπὰς καὶ παίδων διηγεῖσθαι φθοράς. 33.5 Οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ παίδων ἀπέσχοντο οἱ παρ' ὑμῖν θεοί, ὃ μέν τις Ὕλα, ὃ δὲ Ὑακίνθου, ὃ δὲ Πέλοπος, ὃ δὲ Χρυσίππου, ὃ δὲ Γανυμήδους ἐρῶντες. 33.6 Τούτους ὑμῶν αἱ γυναῖκες προσκυνούντων τοὺς θεούς, τοιούτους δὲ εὐχέσθων εἶναι τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἑαυτῶν, οὕτω σώφρονας, ἵν' ὦσιν ὅμοιοι τοῖς θεοῖς τὰ ἴσα ἐζηλωκότες· τούτους ἐθιζόντων οἱ παῖδες ὑμῶν σέβειν, ἵνα καὶ ἄνδρες γενήσονται εἰκόνα πορνείας ἐναργῆ τοὺς θεοὺς παραλαμβάνοντες. 33.7 Ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν ἄρρενες αὐτοῖς τῶν θεῶν ἴσως μόνοι ᾄττουσι περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια·

> θηλύτεραι δὲ θεαὶ μένον αἰδοῖ οἴκοι ἑκάστη,

φησὶν Ὅμηρος, αἰδούμεναι αἱ θεαὶ διὰ σεμνότητα Ἀφροδίτην ἰδεῖν μεμοιχευμένην. 33.8 Αἳ δὲ ἀκολασταίνουσιν ἐμπαθέστερον ἐν τῇ μοιχείᾳ δεδεμέναι, Ἡὼς ἐπὶ Τιθωνῷ, Σελήνη ⟨δ' ἐπὶ⟩ Ἐνδυμίωνι, Νηρηὶς ἐπὶ Αἰακῷ καὶ ἐπὶ Πηλεῖ Θέτις, ἐπὶ δὲ Ἰασίωνι Δημήτηρ καὶ ἐπὶ Ἀδώνιδι Φερέφαττα. 33.9 Ἀφροδίτη δὲ ἐπ' Ἄρει κατῃσχυμμένη μετῆλθεν ἐπὶ Κινύραν καὶ Ἀγχίσην ἔγημεν καὶ Φαέθοντα ἐλόχα καὶ ἤρα Ἀδώνιδος, ἐφιλονείκει δὲ τῇ βοῶπιδι[11] καὶ ἀποδυσάμεναι διὰ μῆλον αἱ θεαὶ γυμναὶ προσεῖχον τῷ ποιμένι, ἥτις αὐτῶν δόξει καλή.

34 1 Ἴθι δὴ καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας ἐν βραχεῖ περιοδεύσωμεν καὶ τὰς ἐπιτυμβίους ταυτασὶ πανηγύρεις καταλύσωμεν, Ἴσθμιά τε καὶ Νέμεα καὶ Πύθια καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις Ὀλύμπια. Πυθοῖ μὲν οὖν ὁ δράκων ὁ Πύθιος

---

[11] ⟨καὶ τῇ γλαυκώπιδι⟩ suppl. Jackson ret. Marcovich

θρησκεύεται καὶ τοῦ ὄφεως ἡ πανήγυρις καταγγέλλεται Πύθια· Ἰσθμοῖ δὲ σκύβαλον προσέπτυσεν ἐλεεινὸν ἡ θάλαττα καὶ Μελικέρτην ὀδύρεται τὰ Ἴσθμια· Νεμέασι δὲ ἄλλο παιδίον Ἀρχέμορος κεκήδευται καὶ τοῦ παιδίου ὁ ἐπιτάφιος προσαγορεύεται Νέμεα· Πῖσα δὲ ὑμῖν τάφος ἐστίν, ὦ Πανέλληνες, ἡνιόχου Φρυγός, καὶ τοῦ Πέλοπος τὰς χοάς, τὰ Ὀλύμπια, ὁ Φειδίου σφετερίζεται Ζεύς. Μυστήρια ἦσαν ἄρα, ὡς ἔοικεν, οἱ ἀγῶνες ἐπὶ νεκροῖς διαθλούμενοι, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ λόγια, καὶ δεδήμευνται ἄμφω. **34.2** Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἐπὶ Ἄγρᾳ μυστήρια καὶ τὰ ἐν Ἁλιμοῦντι τῆς Ἀττικῆς Ἀθήνησι περιώρισται· αἶσχος δὲ ἤδη κοσμικὸν οἵ τε ἀγῶνες καὶ οἱ φαλλοὶ οἱ Διονύσῳ ἐπιτελούμενοι, κακῶς ἐπινενεμημένοι τὸν βίον. **34.3** Διόνυσος γὰρ κατελθεῖν εἰς Ἅιδου γλιχόμενος ἠγνόει τὴν ὁδόν, ὑπισχνεῖται δ' αὐτῷ φράσειν, Πρόσυμνος τοὔνομα, οὐκ ἀμισθί· ὁ δὲ μισθὸς οὐ καλός, ἀλλὰ Διονύσῳ καλός· καὶ ἀφροδίσιος ἦν ἡ χάρις, ὁ μισθός, ὃν ᾐτεῖτο Διόνυσος βουλομένῳ δὲ τῷ θεῷ γέγονεν ἡ αἴτησις, καὶ δὴ ὑπισχνεῖται παρέξειν αὐτῷ, εἰ ἀναζεύξοι, ὅρκῳ πιστωσάμενος τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν. **34.4** Μαθὼν ἀπῆρεν· ἐπανῆλθεν αὖθις· οὐ καταλαμβάνει τὸν Πρόσυμνον (ἐτεθνήκει γάρ)· ἀφοσιούμενος τῷ ἐραστῇ ὁ Διόνυσος ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ὁρμᾷ καὶ πασχητιᾷ. Κλάδον οὖν συκῆς, ὡς ἔτυχεν, ἐκτεμὼν ἀνδρείου μορίου σκευάζεται τρόπον ἐφέζεταί τε τῷ κλάδῳ, τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν ἐκτελῶν τῷ νεκρῷ. **34.5** Ὑπόμνημα τοῦ πάθους τούτου μυστικὸν φαλλοὶ κατὰ πόλεις ἀνίστανται Διονύσῳ· "εἰ μὴ γὰρ Διονύσῳ πομπὴν ἐποιοῦντο καὶ ὕμνεον ᾆσμα αἰδοίοισιν, ἀναιδέστατα εἴργαστ' ἄν", φησὶν Ἡράκλειτος, "ωὑτὸς δὲ Ἅιδης καὶ Διόνυσος, ὅτεῳ μαίνονται καὶ ληναΐζουσιν", οὐ διὰ τὴν μέθην τοῦ σώματος, ὡς ἐγὼ οἶμαι, τοσοῦτον ὅσον διὰ τὴν ἐπονείδιστον τῆς ἀσελγείας ἱεροφαντίαν.

35 1 Εἰκότως ἄρα οἱ τοιοίδε ὑμῶν θεοὶ δοῦλοι παθῶν γεγονότες, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸ τῶν Εἱλώτων καλουμένων τῶν παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις δούλειον ὑπεισῆλθεν ζυγὸν Ἀπόλλων Ἀδμήτῳ ἐν Φεραῖς, Ἡρακλῆς ἐν Σάρδεσιν Ὀμφάλῃ, Λαομέδοντι δ' ἐθήτευε Ποσειδῶν καὶ Ἀπόλλων, καθάπερ ἀχρεῖος οἰκέτης, μηδὲ ἐλευθερίας δήπουθεν δυνηθεὶς τυχεῖν παρὰ τοῦ προτέρου δεσπότου· τότε καὶ τὰ Ἰλίου τείχη ἀνῳκοδομησάτην τῷ Φρυγί. **35.2** Ὅμηρος δὲ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν οὐκ αἰσχύνεται παραφαίνειν λέγων τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ "χρύσεον λύχνον ἔχουσαν" ἐν χεροῖν· τὴν δὲ Ἀφροδίτην ἀνέγνωμεν, οἷον ἀκόλαστόν τι θεραπαινίδιον, παραθεῖναι φέρουσαν τῇ Ἑλένῃ τὸν δίφρον τοῦ μοιχοῦ κατὰ πρόσωπον, ὅπως αὐτὸν εἰς συνουσίαν ὑπαγάγηται. **35.3** Πανύασσις γὰρ πρὸς τούτοις καὶ ἄλλους παμπόλλους ἀνθρώποις λατρεῦσαι θεοὺς ἱστορεῖ ὧδέ πως γράφων·

  τλῆ μὲν Δημήτηρ, τλῆ δὲ κλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυήεις,
  τλῆ δὲ Ποσειδάων, τλῆ δ' ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων
  ἀνδρὶ παρὰ θνητῷ θητευέμεν εἰς ἐνιαυτόν·
  τλῆ δ' ὀβριμόθυμος Ἄρης ὑπὸ πατρὸς ἀνάγκης,
  καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις.

36 1 Τούτοις οὖν εἰκότως ἕπεται τοὺς ἐρωτικοὺς ὑμῶν καὶ παθητικοὺς τούτους θεοὺς ἀνθρωποπαθεῖς ἐκ παντὸς εἰσάγειν τρόπου. "Καὶ γὰρ θην κείνοις θνητὸς χρώς". Τεκμηριοῖ δὲ Ὅμηρος μάλα ἀκριβῶς, Ἀφροδίτην ἐπὶ τῷ τραύματι παρεισάγων ὀξὺ καὶ μέγα ἰάχουσαν αὐτόν τε τὸν πολεμικώτατον Ἄρη ὑπὸ τοῦ Διομήδους κατὰ τοῦ κενεῶνος οὐτασμένον διηγούμενος. **36.2** Πολέμων δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν ὑπὸ Ὀρνύτου τρωθῆναι

λέγει· ναὶ μὴν καὶ τὸν Ἀιδωνέα ὑπὸ Ἡρακλέους τοξευθῆναι Ὅμηρος λέγει καὶ τὸν Ἥλιον [Αὐγέαν] Πανύασσις ἱστορεῖ. Ἤδη δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἥραν τὴν ζυγίαν ἱστορεῖ ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἡρακλέους ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος Πανύασσις "ἐν Πύλῳ ἠμαθόεντι". Σωσίβιος δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα πρὸς τῶν Ἱπποκοωντιδῶν κατὰ τῆς χειρὸς οὐτασθῆναι λέγει. **36.3** Εἰ δὴ τραύματα, καὶ αἵματα· οἱ γὰρ ἰχῶρες οἱ ποιητικοὶ εἰδεχθέστεροι καὶ τῶν αἱμάτων, σῆψις γὰρ αἵματος ἰχὼρ νοεῖται. Ἀνάγκη τοίνυν θεραπείας καὶ τροφὰς παρεισάγειν αὐτοῖς, ὧν εἰσιν ἐνδεεῖς. **36.4** Διὸ τράπεζαι καὶ μέθαι καὶ γέλωτες καὶ συνουσίαι, οὐκ ἂν ἀφροδισίοις χρωμένων ἀνθρωπ<ίν>οις[12] οὐδὲ παιδοποιουμένων οὐδὲ μὴν ὑπνωσσόντων, εἰ ἀθάνατοι καὶ ἀνενδεεῖς καὶ ἀγήρῳ ὑπῆρχον. **36.5** Μετέλαβεν δὲ καὶ τραπέζης ἀνθρωπίνης παρὰ τοῖς Αἰθίοψιν, ἀπανθρώπου δὲ καὶ ἀθέσμου αὐτὸς ὁ Ζεὺς παρὰ Λυκάονι τῷ Ἀρκάδι ἑστιώμενος· ἀνθρωπείων γοῦν ἐνεφορεῖτο σαρκῶν οὐχ ἑκών. Ἠγνόει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ὡς ἄρα Λυκάων ὁ Ἀρκὰς ὁ ἑστιάτωρ αὐτοῦ τὸν παῖδα κατασφάξας τὸν αὐτοῦ (Νύκτιμος ὄνομα αὐτῷ) παραθείη ὄψον τῷ Διί.

37 1 Καλός γε ὁ Ζεὺς ὁ μαντικός, ὁ ξένιος, ὁ ἱκέσιος, ὁ μειλίχιος, ὁ πανομφαῖος, ὁ προστροπαῖος· μᾶλλον δὲ <ὁ> ἄδικος, ὁ ἄθεσμος, ὁ ἄνομος, ὁ ἀνόσιος, ὁ ἀπάνθρωπος, ὁ βίαιος, ὁ φθορεύς, ὁ μοιχός, ὁ ἐρωτικός. Ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν ἦν, ὅτε τοιοῦτος ἦν, ὅτε ἄνθρωπος ἦν, νῦν δὲ ἤδη μοι δοκοῦσι καὶ οἱ μῦθοι ὑμῖν γεγηρακέναι. **37.2** Δράκων ὁ Ζεὺς οὐκέτι, οὐ κύκνος ἐστίν, οὐκ ἀετός, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ἐρωτικός· οὐχ ἵπταται θεός, οὐ παιδεραστεῖ, οὐ φιλεῖ, οὐ βιάζεται, καίτοι πολλαὶ καὶ καλαὶ καὶ νῦν ἔτι γυναῖκες καὶ Λήδας εὐπρεπέστεραι καὶ Σεμέλης ἀκμαιότεραι, μειράκια δὲ ὡραιότερα καὶ πολιτικώτερα τοῦ Φρυγίου βουκόλου. **37.3** Ποῦ νῦν ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἀετός; Ποῦ δὲ ὁ κύκνος; Ποῦ δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ Ζεύς; Γεγήρακε μετὰ τοῦ πτεροῦ· οὐ γὰρ δήπου μετανοεῖ τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς οὐδὲ παιδεύεται σωφρονεῖν. Γυμνοῦται δὲ ὑμῖν ὁ μῦθος· ἀπέθανεν ἡ Λήδα, ἀπέθανεν ὁ κύκνος, ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀετός. Ζητεῖς σου τὸν Δία; μὴ τὸν οὐρανόν, ἀλλὰ τὴν γῆν πολυπραγμόνει. **37.4** Ὁ Κρής σοι διηγήσεται, παρ' ᾧ καὶ τέθαπται· Καλλίμαχος ἐν ὕμνοις·

<div style="text-align:center">

καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ὦ ἄνα, σεῖο
Κρῆτες ἐτεκτήναντο.
</div>

Τέθνηκε γὰρ ὁ Ζεὺς (μὴ δυσφόρει) ὡς Λήδα, ὡς κύκνος, ὡς ἀετός, ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐρωτικός, ὡς δράκων.

38 1 Ἤδη δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ φαίνονται οἱ δεισιδαίμονες ἄκοντες μέν, ὅμως δ' οὖν συνιέντες τὴν πλάνην τὴν περὶ τοὺς θεούς·

<div style="text-align:center">

οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ δρυός εἰσι παλαιφάτου οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης,
</div>

ἀλλ' "ἀνδρῶν γένος εἰσί", μικρὸν δὲ ὕστερον καὶ δρύες ὄντες εὑρεθήσονται καὶ πέτραι. **38.2** Ἀγαμέμνονα γοῦν τινα Δία ἐν Σπάρτῃ τιμᾶσθαι Στάφυλος ἱστορεῖ· Φανοκλῆς δὲ ἐν Ἔρωσιν ἤτοι[13] Καλοῖς Ἀγαμέμνονα τὸν Ἑλλήνων βασιλέα Ἀργύννου νεὼν Ἀφροδίτης ἵστασθαι ἐπ' Ἀργύννῳ τῷ ἐρωμένῳ. **38.3** Ἄρτεμιν δὲ Ἀρκάδες Ἀπαγχομένην καλουμένην προστρέπονται, ὥς φησι Καλλίμαχος ἐν Αἰτίοις. Καὶ Κονδυλῖτις ἐν Μηθύμνῃ ἑτέρα τετίμηται Ἄρτεμις. Ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ποδάγρας ἄλλης Ἀρτέμιδος ἐν τῇ Λακωνικῇ ἱερόν,

---

[12] Reinkens edd : ἀνθρώποις P : ἀνθρώπων Sylburg
[13] Marcovich : τῖε P : ἢ Leopardus : τοῖς Sylburg

ὡς φησι Σωσίβιος. **38.4** Πολέμων δὲ Κεχηνότος Ἀπόλλωνος[14] οἶδεν ἄγαλμα, καὶ Ὀψοφάγου πάλιν Ἀπόλλωνος ἄλλο ἐν Ἤλιδι τιμώμενον. Ἐνταῦθα Ἀπομυίῳ Διὶ θύουσιν Ἠλεῖοι· Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ Ἀπομυίῳ Ἡρακλεῖ καὶ Πυρετῷ δὲ καὶ Φόβῳ θύουσιν, οὓς καὶ αὐτοὺς μετὰ τῶν ἀμφὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἐγγράφουσι. **38.5** Ἐῶ δὲ Ἀργείους ‹καὶ Λάκωνας›· Ἀφροδίτην Τυμβωρύχον θρησκεύουσιν Ἀργεῖοι [καὶ Λάκωνες], καὶ Χελύτιδα δὲ Ἄρτεμιν Σπαρτιᾶται σέβουσιν· ἐπεὶ τὸ βήττειν χελύττειν καλοῦσιν.

39 1 1 Οἴει ποθὲν παρέγγραπτα ταῦτά σοι κομίζεσθαι τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν παρατιθέμενα; Οὐδὲ τοὺς σοὺς γνωρίζειν ἔοικας συγγραφεῖς, οὓς ἐγὼ μάρτυρας ἐπὶ τὴν σὴν ἀπιστίαν καλῶ, ἀθέου χλεύης, ὦ δείλαιοι, τὸν πάντα ὑμῶν ἀβίωτον ὄντως βίον ἐμπεπληκότες[15]. **39.2** Οὐχὶ μέντοι Ζεὺς φαλακρὸς ἐν Ἄργει, τιμωρὸς δὲ ἄλλος ἐν Κύπρῳ τετίμησθον; Οὐχὶ δὲ Ἀφροδίτῃ περιβασοῖ μὲν Ἀργεῖοι, ἑταίρᾳ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ καλλιπύγῳ θύουσιν Συρακούσσιοι, ἣν Νίκανδρος ὁ ποιητὴς "καλλίγλου τόν" που κέκληκεν; **39.3** Διόνυσον δὲ ἤδη σιωπῶ τὸν χοιροψάλαν· Σικυώνιοι τοῦτον προσκυνοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῶν γυναικείων τάξαντες τὸν Διόνυσον μορίων, ἔφορον αἴσχους τὸν ὕβρεως σεβάζοντες ἀρχηγόν. Τοιοίδε μὲν αὐτοῖς οἱ θεοί, τοιοίδε ‹δὲ› καὶ αὐτοί, παίζοντες ἐν θεοῖς, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐμπαίζοντες καὶ ἐνυβρίζοντες σφίσιν αὐτοῖς. **39.4** Καὶ πόσῳ βελτίους Αἰγύπτιοι κωμηδὸν καὶ κατὰ πόλεις τὰ ἄλογα τῶν ζῴων ἐκτετιμηκότες ἤπερ Ἕλληνες τοιούτους προσκυνοῦντες θεούς; Τὰ μὲν γὰρ εἰ καὶ θηρία, ἀλλ' οὐ μοιχικά, ἀλλ' οὐ μάχλα, παρὰ φύσιν δὲ θηρεύει ἡδονὴν οὐδὲ ἕν. Οἳ δὲ ὁποῖοι, τί καὶ χρὴ λέγειν ἔτι, ἀποχρώντως αὐτῶν διεληλεγμένων; **39.5** Ἀλλ' οὖν γε Αἰγύπτιοι, ὧν νῦν δὴ ἐμνήσθην, κατὰ τὰς θρησκείας τὰς σφῶν ἐσκέδανται· σέβουσι δὲ αὐτῶν Συηνῖται φάγρον τὸν ἰχθύν, μαιώτην δὲ (ἄλλος οὗτος ἰχθύσ) οἱ τὴν Ἐλεφαντίνην οἰκοῦντες, Ὀξυρυγχῖται τὸν φερώνυμον τῆς χώρας αὐτῶν ὁμοίως ἰχθύν, ἔτι γε μὴν Ἡρακλεοπολῖται ἰχνεύμονα, Σαῗται δὲ καὶ Θηβαῖοι πρόβατον, Λυκοπολῖται δὲ λύκον, Κυνοπολῖται δὲ κύνα, τὸν Ἆπιν Μεμφῖται, Μενδήσιοι τὸν τράγον. **39.6** Ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ πάντ' ἀμείνους Αἰγυπτίων (ὀκνῶ δὲ εἰπεῖν χείρους), οἳ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ὁσημέραι γελῶντες οὐ παύεσθε, ὁποῖοί τινες καὶ περὶ τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα; Θεσσαλοὶ μὲν ὑμῶν τοὺς πελαργοὺς τετιμήκασι διὰ τὴν συνήθειαν, Θηβαῖοι δὲ τὰς γαλᾶς διὰ τὴν Ἡρακλέους γένεσιν. Τί δὲ πάλιν Θετταλοί; Μύρμηκας ἱστοροῦνται σέβειν, ἐπεὶ τὸν Δία μεμαθήκασιν ὁμοιωθέντα μύρμηκι τῇ Κλήτορος θυγατρὶ Εὐρυμεδούσῃ μιγῆναι καὶ Μυρμιδόνα γεννῆσαι· **39.7** Πολέμων δὲ τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὴν Τρωάδα κατοικοῦντας ἱστορεῖ τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους μῦς οὓς σμίνθους καλοῦσιν, ὅτι τὰς νευρὰς τῶν πολεμίων διέτρωγον τῶν τόξων· καὶ Σμίνθιον Ἀπόλλωνα ἀπὸ τῶν μυῶν **39.8** ἐκείνων ἐπεφήμισαν. Ἡρακλείδης δὲ ἐν Κτίσεσιν ἱερῶν περὶ τὴν Ἀκαρνανίαν φησίν, ἔνθα τὸ Ἄκτιόν ἐστιν ἀκρωτήριον καὶ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Ἀκτίου τὸ ἱερόν, ταῖς μυίαις προθύεσθαι βοῦν. **39.9** Οὐδὲ μὴν Σαμίων ἐκλήσομαι (πρόβατον, ὥς φησιν Εὐφορίων, σέβουσι Σάμιοι) οὐδέ γε τῶν τὴν Φοινίκην Σύρων κατοικούντων, ὧν οἱ μὲν τὰς περιστεράς, οἱ δὲ τοὺς ἰχθῦς οὕτω σέβουσι περιττῶς ὡς Ἠλεῖοι τὸν Δία.

---

[14] Διονύσου Bergk Marcovich
[15] ἐμπεπληκότας Stählin Marcovich : lacunam suspicatur Wilamowitz

40.1   Εἶεν δή· ἐπειδὴ οὐ θεοί, οὓς θρησκεύετε, αὖθις ἐπισκέψασθαί μοι δοκεῖ εἰ ὄντως εἶεν δαίμονες, δευτέρᾳ ταύτῃ, ὡς ὑμεῖς φατέ, ἐγκαταλεγόμενοι τάξει. Εἰ γὰρ οὖν δαίμονες, λίχνοι τε καὶ μιαροί. **40.2** Ἔστι μὲν ἐφευρεῖν καὶ ἀναφανδὸν οὕτω κατὰ πόλεις δαίμονας ἐπιχωρίους τιμὴν ἐπιδρεπομένους, παρὰ Κυθνίοις Μενέδημον, παρὰ Τηνίοις Καλλισταγόραν, παρὰ Δηλίοις Ἄνιον, παρὰ Λάκωσιν Ἀστράβακον. Τιμᾶται δέ τις καὶ Φαληροῖ κατὰ πρύμναν ἥρως· καὶ ἡ Πυθία συνέταξε θύειν Πλαταιεῦσιν Ἀνδροκράτει καὶ Δημοκράτει καὶ Κυκλαίῳ καὶ Λεύκωνι τῶν Μηδικῶν ἀκμαζόντων ἀγώνων. **41 1** Ἔστι καὶ ἄλλους παμπόλλους συνιδεῖν δαίμονας τῷ γε καὶ σμικρὸν διαθρεῖν δυναμένῳ·

      τρὶς γὰρ μύριοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ

      δαίμονες ἀθάνατοι, φύλακες μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.

41.2 Τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ φύλακες, ὦ Βοιώτιε, μὴ φθονέσῃς λέγειν. Ἢ δῆλον ὡς οὗτοι καὶ οἱ τούτων ἐπιτιμότεροι, οἱ μεγάλοι δαίμονες, ὁ Ἀπόλλων, ἡ Ἄρτεμις, ἡ Λητώ, ἡ Δημήτηρ, ἡ Κόρη, ὁ Πλούτων, ὁ Ἡρακλῆς, αὐτὸς ὁ Ζεύς. Ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἀποδρᾶναι ἡμᾶς φυλάττουσιν, Ἀσκραῖε, μὴ ἁμαρτάνειν δὲ ἴσως, οἱ ἁμαρτιῶν δῆτα οὐ πεπειραμένοι. Ἐνταῦθα δὴ τὸ παροιμιῶδες ἐπιφθέγξασθαι ἁρμόττει

      πατὴρ[16] ἀνουθέτητος[17] παῖδα νουθετεῖ.

41.3 Εἰ δ᾽ ἄρα καὶ εἰσὶ φύλακες οὗτοι, οὐκ εὐνοίᾳ τῇ πρὸς ὑμᾶς περιπαθεῖς, τῆς δὲ ὑμεδαπῆς ἀπωλείας ἐχόμενοι, κολάκων δίκην ἐγχρίμπτονται τῷ βίῳ, δελεαζόμενοι καπνῷ. Αὐτοί που ἐξομολογοῦνται οἱ δαίμονες τὴν γαστριμαργίαν τὴν αὑτῶν,

      λοιβῆς τε κνίσης τε· τὸ γὰρ λάχομεν γέρας ἡμεῖς,

λέγοντες. **41.4** Τίνα δ᾽ ἂν φωνὴν ἄλλην, εἰ φωνὴν λάβοιεν Αἰγυπτίων θεοί, οἷα αἴλουροι καὶ γαλαῖ, προήσονται ἢ τὴν Ὁμηρικήν τε καὶ ποιητικήν, τῆς κνίσης τε καὶ ὀψαρτυτικῆς φίλην; τοιοίδε μέντοι παρ᾽ ὑμῖν οἵ τε δαίμονες καὶ οἱ θεοὶ καὶ εἴ τινες ἡμίθεοι ὥσπερ ἡμίονοι κέκληνται· οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ ὀνομάτων ὑμῖν πενία πρὸς τὰς τῆς ἀσεβείας συνθέσεις.

3. 42 1   Φέρε δὴ οὖν καὶ τοῦτο προσθῶμεν, ὡς ἀπάνθρωποι καὶ μισάνθρωποι δαίμονες εἶεν ὑμῶν οἱ θεοὶ καὶ οὐχὶ μόνον ἐπιχαίροντες τῇ φρενοβλαβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πρὸς δὲ καὶ ἀνθρωποκτονίας ἀπολαύοντες· νυνὶ μὲν τὰς ἐν σταδίοις ἐνόπλους φιλονικίας, νυνὶ δὲ τὰς ἐν πολέμοις ἀναρίθμους φιλοτιμίας ἀφορμὰς σφίσιν ἡδονῆς ποριζόμενοι, ὅπως ὅτι μάλιστα ἔχοιεν ἀνθρωπείων ἀνέδην ἐμφορεῖσθαι φόνων· ἤδη δὲ κατὰ πόλεις καὶ ἔθνη, οἱονεὶ λοιμοὶ ἐπισκήψαντες, σπονδὰς ἀπήτησαν ἀνημέρους. **42.2** Ἀριστομένης γοῦν ὁ Μεσσήνιος τῷ Ἰθωμήτῃ Διὶ τριακοσίους ἀπέσφαξεν, τοσαύτας ὁμοῦ καὶ τοιαύτας καλλιερεῖν οἰόμενος ἑκατόμβας· ἐν οἷς καὶ Θεόπομπος ἦν Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεύς, ἱερεῖον εὐγενές.

42.3 Ταῦροι δὲ τὸ ἔθνος, οἱ περὶ τὴν Ταυρικὴν χερρόνησον κατοικοῦντες, οὓς ἂν τῶν ξένων παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἕλωσι, τούτων δὴ τῶν κατὰ θάλατταν ἐπταικότων, αὐτίκα μάλα τῇ Ταυρικῇ καταθύουσιν Ἀρτέμιδι· ταύτας σου τὰς θυσίας Εὐριπίδης ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τραγῳδεῖ. **42.4** Μόνιμος δ᾽ ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῇ Τῶν

---

[16] post νουθετεῖ trasposuit Marcovich
[17] ἀνουθέτητα Wilamowitz

Θαυμασίων Συναγωγῇ ἐν Πέλλῃ τῆς Θετταλίας Ἀχαιὸν ἄνθρωπον Πηλεῖ καὶ Χείρωνι καταθύεσθαι· **42.5** Λυκτίους γὰρ (Κρητῶν δὲ ἔθνος εἰσὶν οὗτοι) Ἀντικλείδης ἐν Νόστοις ἀποφαίνεται ἀνθρώπους ἀποσφάττειν τῷ Διί, καὶ Λεσβίους Διονύσῳ τὴν ὁμοίαν προσάγειν θυσίαν Δωσίδας λέγει· **42.6** Φωκαεῖς δέ (οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτοὺς παραπέμψομαι) τούτους Πυθοκλῆς ἐν τρίτῳ Περὶ ὁμονοίας τῇ Ταυροπόλῳ Ἀρτέμιδι ἄνθρωπον ὁλοκαυτεῖν ἱστορεῖ. **42.7** Ἐρεχθεὺς δὲ ὁ Ἀττικὸς καὶ Μάριος ὁ Ῥωμαῖος τὰς αὑτῶν ἐθυσάτην θυγατέρας· ὧν ὃ μὲν τῇ Φερεφάττῃ, ὡς Δημάρατος ἐν πρώτῃ Τραγῳδουμένων, ὃ δὲ τοῖς Ἀποτροπαίοις, ὁ Μάριος, ὡς Δωρόθεος ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ Ἰταλικῶν ἱστορεῖ. **42.8** Φιλάνθρωποί γε ἐκ τούτων καταφαίνονται οἱ δαίμονες· πῶς δὲ οὐχ ὅσιοι ἀναλόγως οἱ δεισιδαίμονες; Οἳ μὲν σωτῆρες εὐφημούμενοι, οἳ δὲ σωτηρίαν αἰτούμενοι παρὰ τῶν ἐπιβούλων σωτηρίας. Καλλιερεῖν γοῦν τοπάζοντες αὐτοῖς σφᾶς αὐτοὺς λελήθασιν ἀποσφάττοντες ἀνθρώπους. **42.9** Οὐ γὰρ οὖν παρὰ τὸν τόπον ἱερεῖον γίνεται ὁ φόνος, οὐδ᾽ εἰ Ἀρτέμιδί τις καὶ Διὶ ἐν ἱερῷ δῆθεν χωρίῳ μᾶλλον ἢ ὀργῇ καὶ φιλαργυρίᾳ, ἄλλοις ὁμοίοις δαίμοσιν, ἐπὶ βωμοῖς ἢ ἐν ὁδοῖς ἀποσφάττοι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἱερὸν ἱερεῖον ἐπιφημίσας[18], ἀλλὰ φόνος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀνδροκτασία ἡ τοιαύτη θυσία.

43 1   Τί δὴ οὖν, ὦ σοφώτατοι τῶν ἄλλων ζῴων ἄνθρωποι, τὰ μὲν θηρία περιφεύγομεν τὰ ἀνήμερα, κἄν που περιτύχωμεν ἄρκῳ ἢ λέοντι, ἐκτρεπόμεθα,

      ὡς δ᾽ ὅτε τίς τε δράκοντα ἰδὼν παλίνορσος ἀπέστη
      οὔρεος ἐν βήσσῃς, ὑπό τε τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα,
      ἄψ τ᾽ ἀνεχώρησεν·

δαίμονας δὲ ὀλεθρίους καὶ ἀλιτηρίους ἐπιβούλους τε καὶ μισανθρώπους καὶ λυμεῶνας ὄντας προαισθόμενοι καὶ συνιέντες οὐκ ἐκτρέπεσθε οὐδὲ ἀποστρέφεσθε; **43.2** Τί δ᾽ ἂν καὶ ἀληθεύσαιεν οἱ κακοί, ἢ τίνα ἂν ὠφελήσαιεν; Αὐτίκα γοῦν ἔχω σοι βελτίονα, τῶν ὑμεδαπῶν τούτων θεῶν, τῶν δαιμόνων, ἐπιδεῖξαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ μαντικοῦ τὸν Κῦρον καὶ τὸν Σόλωνα. **43.3** Φιλόδωρος ὑμῶν ὁ Φοῖβος, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ φιλάνθρωπος. Προὔδωκε τὸν Κροῖσον τὸν φίλον καὶ τοῦ μισθοῦ ἐκλαθόμενος (οὕτω φιλόδολος[19] ἦν) ἀνήγαγε τὸν Κροῖσον διὰ τοῦ Ἅλυος ἐπὶ τὴν πυράν. Οὕτω φιλοῦντες οἱ δαίμονες ὁδηγοῦσιν εἰς τὸ πῦρ. **43.4** Ἀλλ᾽, ὦ φιλανθρωπότερε καὶ ἀληθέστερε τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἄνθρωπε, τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς πυρᾶς οἴκτειρον δεδεμένον, καὶ σὺ μέν, ὦ Σόλων, μάντευσαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν, σὺ δέ, ὦ Κῦρε, κέλευσον ἀποσβεσθῆναι τὴν πυράν. Σωφρόνησον ὕστατον γοῦν, ὦ Κροῖσε, τῷ πάθει μεταμαθών· ἀχάριστός ἐστιν ὃν προσκυνεῖς, λαμβάνει τὸν μισθὸν καὶ μετὰ τὸ χρυσίον ψεύδεται πάλιν. "Τέλος ὅρα"[20] οὐχ ὁ δαίμων, ἀλλὰ ὁ ἄνθρωπός σοι λέγει. Οὐ λοξὰ μαντεύεται Σόλων· τοῦτον εὑρήσεις ἀληθῆ μόνον, ὦ βάρβαρε, τὸν χρησμόν·[21] τοῦτον ἐπὶ τῆς πυρᾶς δοκιμάσεις.

44 1   Ὅθεν ἔπεισί μοι θαυμάζειν τίσι ποτὲ φαντασίαις ἀπαχθέντες οἱ πρῶτοι πεπλανημένοι δεισιδαιμονίαν ἀνθρώποις κατήγγειλαν, δαίμονας

---

[18] P retinui : ἱερόν del Wilamowitz Stählin Marcovich : <τὸ > ἱερεῖον Marcovich : ἱερεῖον del Potter
[19] Marcovich : φιλόδοξος P : φιλόλοξος Toup Stählin
[20] ἄρα P : ὅρα **P1**
[21] χρησμῳδόν Marcovich

ἀλιτηρίους νομοθετοῦντες σέβειν, εἴτε Φορωνεὺς ἐκεῖνος ἦν εἴτε Μέροψ εἴτε ἄλλος τις, οἳ νεὼς καὶ βωμοὺς ἀνέστησαν αὐτοῖς, πρὸς δὲ καὶ θυσίας παραστῆσαι πρῶτοι μεμύθευνται. **44.2** Καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ κατὰ χρόνους ὕστερον ἀνέπλαττον θεούς, οἷς προσκυνοῖεν. Ἀμέλει τὸν Ἔρωτα τοῦτον ἐν τοῖς πρεσβυτάτοις τῶν θεῶν εἶναι λεγόμενον ἐτίμα πρότερον οὐδὲ εἷς πρὶν ἢ Χάρμον μειράκιόν τι ἑλεῖν καὶ βωμὸν ἱδρύσασθαι ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ χαριστήριον ἐπιτελοῦς γενομένης ἐπιθυμίας· καὶ τῆς νόσου τὴν ἀσέλγειαν Ἔρωτα κεκλήκασι, θεοποιοῦντες ἀκόλαστον ἐπιθυμίαν. **44.3** Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ οὐδὲ τὸν Πᾶνα ᾔδεσαν ὅστις ἦν, πρὶν ἢ Φιλιππίδην εἰπεῖν αὐτοῖς. Εἰκότως ἄρα ἀρχήν ποθεν ἡ δεισιδαιμονία λαβοῦσα κακίας ἀνοήτου γέγονε πηγή· εἶτα δὲ μὴ ἀνακοπεῖσα, ἀλλ' εἰς ἐπίδοσιν ἐλθοῦσα καὶ πολλὴ δὴ ῥυεῖσα, δημιουργὸς πολλῶν καθίσταται δαιμόνων, ἑκατόμβας θύουσα καὶ πανηγύρεις ἐπιτελοῦσα καὶ ἀγάλματα ἀνιστᾶσα καὶ

νεὼς ἀνοικοδομοῦσα, **44.4** τοὺς δή·οὐ γὰρ οὐδὲ τούτους σιωπήσομαι, πρὸς δὲ καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐξελέγξωνεὼς μὲν εὐφήμως ὀνομαζομένους, τάφους δὲ γενομένους [τουτέστι τοὺς τάφους νεὼς ἐπικεκλημένους]. Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀλλὰ κἂν νῦν δεισιδαιμονίας ἐκλάθεσθε, τοὺς τάφους τιμᾶν αἰσχυνόμενοι.

45 1   Ἐν τῷ νεῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐν Λαρίσῃ ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει τάφος ἐστὶν Ἀκρισίου, Ἀθήνησιν δὲ ἐν ἀκροπόλει Κέκροπος, ὥς φησιν Ἀντίοχος ἐν τῷ ἐνάτῳ τῶν Ἱστοριῶν. Τί δὲ Ἐριχθόνιος; Οὐχὶ ἐν τῷ νεῷ τῆς Πολιάδος κεκήδευται; Ἰμμάραδος[22] δὲ ὁ Εὐμόλπου καὶ Δαείρας οὐχὶ ἐν τῷ περιβόλῳ τοῦ Ἐλευσινίου τοῦ ὑπὸ τῇ ἀκροπόλει; Αἱ δὲ Κελεοῦ θυγατέρες οὐχὶ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι τετάφαται; **45.2** Τί σοι καταλέγω τὰς Ὑπερβορέων γυναῖκας; Ὑπερόχη καὶ Λαοδίκη κέκλησθον, ἐν τῷ Ἀρτεμισίῳ ἐν Δήλῳ κεκήδευσθον, τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Δηλίου ἐστὶν ἱερῷ. Λεάνδριος δὲ Κλέοχον[23] ἐν Μιλήτῳ τεθάφθαι ἐν τῷ Διδυμαίῳ φησίν. **45.3** Ἐνταῦθα τῆς Λευκοφρύνης τὸ μνημεῖον οὐκ ἄξιον παρελθεῖν ἑπομένους Ζήνωνι τῷ Μυνδίῳ, ἣ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἐν Μαγνησίᾳ κεκήδευται, οὐδὲ μὴν τὸν ἐν Τελμισσῷ βωμὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος· μνῆμα εἶναι καὶ τοῦτον Τελμισσέως τοῦ μάντεως ἱστοροῦσιν. **45.4** Πτολεμαῖος δὲ ὁ τοῦ Ἀγησάρχου ἐν τῷ α´ τῶν περὶ τὸν Φιλοπάτορα ἐν Πάφῳ λέγει ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἱερῷ Κινύραν τε καὶ τοὺς Κινύρου ἀπογόνους κεκηδεῦσθαι. **45.5** Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐπιόντι μοι τοὺς προσκυνουμένους ὑμῖν τάφους
           ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐδ' ὁ πᾶς ἂν ἀρκέσῃ χρόνος·
ὑμᾶς δὲ εἰ μὴ ὑπεισέρχεταί τις αἰσχύνη τῶν τολμωμένων, νεκροὶ ἄρα τέλεον ὄντες νεκροῖς ὄντως πεπιστευκότες περιέρχεσθε·
           ἆ δειλοί, τί κακὸν τόδε πάσχετε; νυκτὶ μὲν ὑμῶν
           εἰλύαται κεφαλαί.

4.46.1   Εἰ δ' ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις φέρων ὑμῖν τὰ ἀγάλματα αὐτὰ ἐπισκοπεῖν παραθείην, ἐπιόντες ὡς ἀληθῶς λῆρον εὑρήσετε τὴν συνήθειαν, "ἔργα χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων" ἀναίσθητα προστρεπόμενοι. **46.2** Πάλαι μὲν οὖν οἱ Σκύθαι τὸν ἀκινάκην, οἱ Ἄραβες τὸν λίθον, οἱ Πέρσαι τὸν ποταμὸν προσεκύνουν, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων οἱ ἔτι παλαιότεροι ξύλα ἱδρύοντο περιφανῆ καὶ κίονας

---

[22] ἴμμαρος P : ἴσμαρος Eusebius
[23] Müller edd : Κλέαρχον P Eusebius Cyrillus

ἵστων ἐκ λίθων· ἃ δὴ καὶ ξόανα προσηγορεύετο διὰ τὸ ἀπεξέσθαι τῆς ὕλης. **46.3** Ἀμέλει ἐν Ἰκάρῳ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τὸ ἄγαλμα ξύλον ἦν οὐκ εἰργασμένον, καὶ τῆς Κιθαιρωνίας Ἥρας ἐν Θεσπείᾳ πρέμνον ἐκκεκομμένον· καὶ τὸ τῆς Σαμίας Ἥρας, ὥς φησιν Ἀέθλιος, πρότερον μὲν ἦν σανίς, ὕστερον δὲ ἐπὶ Προκλέους ἄρχοντος

ἀνδριαντοειδὲς ἐγένετο. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀνθρώποις ἀπεικονίζεσθαι

τὰ ξόανα ἤρξατο, βρέτη τὴν ἐκ βροτῶν ἐπωνυμίαν ἐκαρπώσατο. **46.4** Ἐν Ῥώμῃ δὲ τὸ παλαιὸν δόρυ φησὶ γεγονέναι τοῦ Ἄρεως τὸ ξόανον Οὐάρρων ὁ συγγραφεύς, οὐδέπω τῶν τεχνιτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν εὐπρόσωπον ταύτην κακοτεχνίαν ὡρμηκότων. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἤνθησεν ἡ τέχνη, ηὔξησεν ἡ πλάνη.

47. 1 Ὡς μὲν οὖν τοὺς λίθους καὶ τὰ ξύλα καὶ συνελόντι φάναι τὴν ὕλην ἀγάλματα ἀνδρείκελα ἐποιήσαντο, οἷς ἐπιμορφάζετε εὐσέβειαν συκοφαντοῦντες τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἤδη μὲν αὐτόθεν δῆλον· οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποδείξεως ποσῆς ἐπιδεομένου τοῦ τόπου οὐ παραιτητέον. **47.2** Τὸν μὲν οὖν Ὀλυμπίασι Δία καὶ τὴν Ἀθήνησι Πολιάδα ἐκ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἐλέφαντος κατασκευάσαι Φειδίαν παντί που σαφές· τὸ δὲ ἐν Σάμῳ τῆς Ἥρας ξόανον Σμίλιδι τῷ Εὐκλείδου πεποιῆσθαι Ὀλύμπιχος ἐν Σαμιακοῖς ἱστορεῖ. **47.3** Μὴ οὖν ἀμφιβάλλετε, εἰ τῶν Σεμνῶν Ἀθήνησι καλουμένων θεῶν τὰς μὲν δύο Σκόπας ἐποίησεν ἐκ τοῦ καλουμένου λυχνέως λίθου, Κάλως δὲ τὴν μέσην αὐταῖν[24]· ἱστοροῦντα ἔχω σοι Πολέμωνα δεικνύναι ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν Πρὸς Τίμαιον· **47.4** μηδὲ τὰ ἐν Πατάροις τῆς Λυκίας ἀγάλματα Διὸς καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος «εἰ» Φειδίας πάλιν ἐκεῖνα τὰ ἀγάλματα καθάπερ τοὺς λέοντας τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀνακειμένους εἴργασται· εἰ δέ, ὥς φασί τινες, Βρυάξιος ἦν τέχνη, οὐ διαφέρομαι· ἔχεις καὶ τοῦτον ἀγαλματουργόν· **47.5** ὁπότερον αὐτοῖν βούλει ἐπίγραφε. Καὶ μὴν Τελεσίου τοῦ Ἀθηναίου, ὥς φησι Φιλόχορος, ἔργον εἰσὶν ἀγάλματα ἐννεαπήχη Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Ἀμφιτρίτης ἐν Τήνῳ προσκυνούμενα. Δημήτριος γὰρ ἐν δευτέρῳ τῶν Ἀργολικῶν τοῦ ἐν Τίρυνθι τῆς Ἥρας ξοάνου καὶ τὴν ὕλην ὄγχνην καὶ τὸν ποιητὴν Ἄργον ἀναγράφει.

47.6 Πολλοὶ δ᾽ ἂν τάχα που θαυμάσειαν, εἰ μάθοιεν τὸ Παλλάδιον τὸ διοπετὲς καλούμενον, ὃ Διομήδης καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἱστοροῦνται μὲν ὑφελέσθαι ἀπὸ Ἰλίου, παρακαταθέσθαι δὲ Δημοφῶντι, ἐκ τῶν Πέλοπος ὀστῶν κατεσκευάσθαι, καθάπερ τὸν Ὀλύμπιον ἐξ ἄλλων ὀστῶν Ἰνδικοῦ θηρίου. Καὶ δὴ τὸν ἱστοροῦντα Διονύσιον ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ μέρει τοῦ Κύκλου παρίστημι. **47.7** Ἀπελλᾶς δὲ ἐν τοῖς Δελφικοῖς δύο φησὶ γεγονέναι τὰ Παλλάδια, ἄμφω δ᾽ ὑπ᾽ ἀνθρώπων δεδημιουργῆσθαι. Ἀλλ᾽ ὅπως μηδεὶς ὑπολάβῃ καὶ ταῦτά με ἀγνοίᾳ παρεικέναι, παραθήσομαι τοῦ Μορύχου Διονύσου τὸ ἄγαλμα Ἀθήνησι γεγονέναι μὲν ἐκ τοῦ φελλάτα καλουμένου λίθου, ἔργον δὲ εἶναι Σίκωνος τοῦ Εὐπαλάμου, ὥς φησι Πολέμων ἔν τινι ἐπιστολῇ. **47.8** Ἐγενέσθην δὲ καὶ ἄλλω τινὲ δύο Κρητικὼ οἶμαι ἀνδριαντοποιώ (Σκύλλις καὶ Δίποινος ὠνομαζέσθην)· τούτω δὲ τὰ ἐν Ἄργει τοῖν Διοσκούροιν ἀγάλματα κατεσκευασάτην καὶ τὸν ἐν Τίρυνθι Ἡρακλέους ἀνδριάντα καὶ τὸ τῆς Μουνυχίας Ἀρτέμιδος ξόανον ἐν Σικυῶνι.

48 1 Καὶ τί περὶ ταῦτα διατρίβω, ἐξὸν αὐτὸν τὸν μεγαλοδαίμονα ὑμῖν ἐπιδεῖξαι ὅστις ἦν, ὃν δὴ κατ᾽ ἐξοχὴν πρὸς πάντων σεβασμοῦ κατηξιωμένον

---

[24] αὐτῶν Marcovich

ἀκούομεν, τοῦτον ἀχειροποίητον εἰπεῖν τετολμήκασιν, τὸν Αἰγύπτιον Σάραπιν; **48.2** Οἳ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἱστοροῦσιν χαριστήριον ὑπὸ Σινωπέων Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Φιλαδέλφῳ τῷ Αἰγυπτίων πεμφθῆναι βασιλεῖ, ὃς λιμῷ τρυχομένους αὐτοὺς ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου μεταπεμψαμένους σῖτον [ὁ Πτολεμαῖοσ] ἀνεκτήσατο, εἶναι δὲ τὸ ξόανον τοῦτο ἄγαλμα Πλούτωνος· ὅς, δεξάμενος τὸν ἀνδριάντα, καθίδρυσεν ἐπὶ τῆς ἄκρας, ἣν νῦν Ῥάκωτιν καλοῦσιν, ἔνθα καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τετίμηται τοῦ Σαράπιδος, γειτνιᾷ δὲ τοῖς τόποις τὸ χωρίον. Βλιστίχην δὲ τὴν παλλακίδα τελευτήσασαν ἐν Κανώβῳ μεταγαγὼν ὁ Πτολεμαῖος ἔθαψεν ὑπὸ τὸν προδεδηλωμένον σηκόν. **48.3** Ἄλλοι δέ φασι Ποντικὸν εἶναι βρέτας τὸν Σάραπιν, μετῆχθαι δὲ εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν μετὰ τιμῆς πανηγυρικῆς. Ἰσίδωρος μόνος παρὰ Σελευκέων τῶν πρὸς Ἀντιοχείᾳ τὸ ἄγαλμα μεταχθῆναι λέγει, ἐν σιτοδείᾳ καὶ αὐτῶν γενομένων καὶ ὑπὸ Πτολεμαίου διατραφέντων. **48.4** Ἀλλ' ὅ γε Ἀθηνόδωρος ὁ τοῦ Σάνδωνος ἀρχαΐζειν τὸν Σάραπιν βουληθεὶς οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως περιέπεσεν, ἐλέγξας αὐτὸν ἄγαλμα εἶναι γενητόν· Σέσωστρίν φησι τὸν Αἰγύπτιον βασιλέα, τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησι παραστησάμενον ἐθνῶν, ἐπανελθόντα εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐπαγαγέσθαι τεχνίτας ἱκανούς· **48.5** τὸν οὖν Ὄσιριν τὸν προπάτορα τὸν αὑτοῦ δαιδαλθῆναι ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸς πολυτελῶς, κατασκευάζει δὲ αὐτὸν Βρύαξις ὁ δημιουργός, οὐχ ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, ἄλλος δέ τις ὁμώνυμος ἐκείνῳ τῷ Βρυάξιδι· ὃς ὕλῃ κατακέχρηται εἰς δημιουργίαν μικτῇ καὶ ποικίλῃ. Ῥίνημα γὰρ χρυσοῦ ἦν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀργύρου χαλκοῦ τε καὶ σιδήρου καὶ μολίβδου, πρὸς δὲ καὶ κασσιτέρου, λίθων δὲ Αἰγυπτίων ἐνέδει οὐδὲ εἷς, σαπφείρου καὶ αἱματίτου θραύσματα σμαράγδου τε, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοπαζίου. **48.6** Λεάνας οὖν τὰ πάντα καὶ ἀναμίξας ἔχρωσε κυάνῳ, οὗ δὴ χάριν μελάντερον τὸ χρῶμα τοῦ ἀγάλματος, καὶ τῷ ἐκ τῆς Ὀσίριδος καὶ τοῦ Ἄπιος κηδείας ὑπολελειμμένῳ φαρμάκῳ φυράσας τὰ πάντα διέπλασεν τὸν Σάραπιν· οὗ καὶ τοὔνομα αἰνίττεται τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς κηδείας καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῆς ταφῆς δημιουργίαν, σύνθετον ἀπό τε Ὀσίριδος καὶ Ἄπιος γενόμενον Ὀσίραπις.

49 1 Καινὸν δὲ ἄλλον ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, ὀλίγου δεῖν καὶ παρ' Ἕλλησι, σεβασμίως τεθείακεν θεὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ Ῥωμαίων τὸν ἐρώμενον ὡραιότατον σφόδρα γενόμενον, Ἀντίνοον, ὃν ἀνιέρωσεν οὕτως ὡς Γανυμήδην ὁ Ζεύς· οὐ γὰρ κωλύεται ῥᾳδίως ἐπιθυμία φόβον οὐκ ἔχουσα· καὶ νύκτας ἱερὰς τὰς Ἀντινόου προσκυνοῦσιν ἄνθρωποι νῦν, ἃς αἰσχρὰς ἠπίστατο ὁ συναγρυπνήσας ἐραστής. **49.2** Τί μοι θεὸν καταλέγεις τὸν πορνείᾳ τετιμημένον; τί δὲ καὶ ὡς υἱὸν θρηνεῖσθαι προσέταξας; τί δὲ καὶ τὸ κάλλος αὐτοῦ διηγῇ; αἰσχρόν ἐστι τὸ κάλλος ὕβρει μεμαραμμένον. Μὴ τυραννήσῃς, ἄνθρωπε, τοῦ κάλλους μηδὲ ἐνυβρίσῃς ἀνθοῦντι τῷ νέῳ· τήρησον αὐτὸ καθαρόν, ἵνα ᾖ καλόν. Βασιλεὺς τοῦ κάλλους γενοῦ, μὴ τύραννος· ἐλεύθερον μεινάτω· τότε σου γνωρίσω τὸ κάλλος, ὅτε καθαρὰν τετήρηκας τὴν εἰκόνα· τότε προσκυνήσω τὸ κάλλος, ὅτε ἀληθινὸν ἀρχέτυπόν ἐστι τῶν καλῶν. **49.3** Ἤδη δὲ τάφος ἐστὶ τοῦ ἐρωμένου, νεώς ἐστιν Ἀντινόου καὶ πόλις· καθάπερ δέ, οἶμαι, οἱ ναοί, οὕτω δὲ καὶ οἱ τάφοι θαυμάζονται, πυραμίδες καὶ μαυσώλεια καὶ λαβύρινθοι, ἄλλοι ναοὶ τῶν νεκρῶν, ὡς ἐκεῖνοι τάφοι τῶν θεῶν.

50 1 Διδάσκαλον δὲ ὑμῖν παραθήσομαι τὴν προφῆτιν Σίβυλλαν

οὐ ψευδοῦς Φοίβου χρησμηγόρον, ὅν τε μάταιοι
ἄνθρωποι θεὸν εἶπον, ἐπεψεύσαντο δὲ μάντιν,

ἀλλὰ θεοῦ μεγάλοιο, τὸν οὐ χέρες ἔπλασαν ἀνδρῶν
εἰδώλοις ἀλάλοις λιθοξέστοισιν ὅμοιον.

50.2 Αὕτη μέντοι ἐρείπια τοὺς νεὼς προσαγορεύει, τὸν μὲν τῆς Ἐφεσίας Ἀρτέμιδος "χάσμασι καὶ σεισμοῖς" καταποθήσεσθαι προμηνύουσα οὕτως,

ὕπτια δ' οἰμώξει Ἔφεσος κλαίουσα παρ' ὄχθαις
καὶ νηὸν ζητοῦσα τὸν οὐκέτι ναιετάοντα·

50.3 τὸν δὲ Ἴσιδος καὶ Σαράπιδος ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ κατενεχθήσεσθαί φησι καὶ ἐμπρησθήσεσθαι·

Ἴσι, θεὰ τριτάλαινα, μένεις ἐπὶ χεύματα Νείλου
μούνη, μαινὰς ἄναυδος ἐπὶ ψαμάθοις Ἀχέροντος,

εἶτα ὑποβᾶσα·

καὶ σύ, Σάραπι λίθους ἀργοὺς ἐπικείμενε πολλούς,
κεῖσαι πτῶμα μέγιστον ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ τριταλαίνη.

50.4 Σὺ δὲ ἀλλ' εἰ μὴ προφήτιδος ἐπακούεις, τοῦ γε σοῦ ἄκουσον φιλοσόφου, τοῦ Ἐφεσίου Ἡρακλείτου, τὴν ἀναισθησίαν ὀνειδίζοντος τοῖς ἀγάλμασι· "καὶ τοῖς ἀγάλμασι τουτέοισιν εὔχονται, ὁκοῖον εἴ τις δόμοις λεσχηνεύοιτο". **50.5** Ἦ γὰρ οὐχὶ τερατώδεις οἱ λίθους προστρεπόμενοι, εἶτα μέντοι καὶ πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν ἱστάντες αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐνεργεῖς; Ἑρμῆν προσκυνοῦσιν ὡς θεὸν καὶ τὸν Ἀγυιέα θυρωρὸν ἱστάντες. Εἰ γὰρ ὡς ἀναισθήτους ὑβρίζουσιν, τί προσκυνοῦσιν ὡς θεούς; Εἰ δὲ αἰσθήσεως αὐτοὺς μετέχειν οἴονται, τί τούτους ἱστᾶσι θυρωρούς; **51 1** Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ τὰ μέγιστα κατορθώματα τῇ Τύχῃ ἀνατιθέντες καὶ ταύτην μεγίστην οἰόμενοι θεόν, φέροντες εἰς τὸν κοπρῶνα ἀνέθηκαν αὐτήν, ἄξιον νεὼν τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα νείμαντες τῇ θεῷ.

51.2 Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἀναισθήτῳ λίθῳ καὶ ξύλῳ καὶ χρυσίῳ πλουσίῳ οὐθ' ὁτιοῦν μέλει, οὐ κνίσης, οὐχ αἵματος, οὐ καπνοῦ, ᾧ δὴ τιμώμενοι καὶ τυφόμενοι ἐκμελαίνονται· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τιμῆς, οὐχ ὕβρεως· τὰ δὲ καὶ παντός ἐστιν ἀτιμότερα ζῴου, τὰ ἀγάλματα. **51.3** Καὶ ὅπως γε τεθείασται τὰ ἀναίσθητα, ἀπορεῖν ἔπεισί μοι καὶ κατελεεῖν τοὺς πλανωμένους τῆς ἀνοίας ὡς δειλαίους· εἰ γὰρ καί τινα τῶν ζῴων οὐχὶ πάσας ἔχει τὰς αἰσθήσεις, ὥσπερ εὐλαὶ καὶ κάμπαι καὶ ὅσα διὰ τῆς πρώτης γενέσεως εὐθὺς ἀνάπηρα φαίνεται, καθάπερ οἱ σπάλακες καὶ ἡ μυγαλῆ, ἥν φησιν ὁ Νίκανδρος "τυφλήν τε σμερδνήν τε"· **51.4** ἀλλά γε ἀμείνους εἰσὶ τῶν ξοάνων τούτων καὶ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων τέλεον ὄντων κωφῶν· ἔχουσιν γὰρ αἴσθησιν μίαν γέ τινα, φέρε εἰπεῖν ἀκουστικὴν ἢ ἁπτικὴν ἢ τὴν ἀναλογοῦσαν τῇ ὀσφρήσει ἢ τῇ γεύσει· τὰ δὲ οὐδὲ μιᾶς αἰσθήσεως μετέχει, τὰ ἀγάλματα. **51.5** Πολλὰ δέ ἐστι τῶν ζῴων, ὅσα οὐδὲ ὅρασιν ἔχει οὔτε ἀκοὴν οὔτε μὴν φωνήν, οἷον καὶ τὸ τῶν ὀστρέων γένος, ἀλλὰ ζῇ γε καὶ αὔξεται, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τῇ σελήνῃ συμπάσχει· τὰ δὲ ἀγάλματα ἀργά, ἄπρακτα, ἀναίσθητα, προσδεῖται καὶ προσκαθηλοῦται καὶ προσπήγνυται, χωνεύεται, ῥινᾶται, πρίεται, περιξέεται, γλύφεται. **51.6** Κωφὴν μὲν δὴ γαῖαν ἀεικίζουσιν οἱ ἀγαλματοποιοί, τῆς οἰκείας ἐξιστάντες φύσεως, ὑπὸ τῆς τέχνης προσκυνεῖν ἀναπείθοντες· προσκυνοῦσιν δὲ οἱ θεοποιοὶ οὐ θεοὺς καὶ δαίμονας κατά γε αἴσθησιν τὴν ἐμήν, γῆν δὲ καὶ τέχνην, τὰ ἀγάλματα ὅπερ ἐστίν. Ἔστιν γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς τὸ ἄγαλμα ὕλη νεκρὰ τεχνίτου χειρὶ μεμορφωμένη· ἡμῖν δὲ οὐχ ὕλης αἰσθητῆς αἰσθητόν,

νοητὸν δὲ τὸ ἄγαλμά ἐστιν. Νοητόν, οὐκ αἰσθητόν ἐστι [τὸ ἄγαλμα]²⁵ ὁ θεός, ὁ μόνος ὄντως θεός.

52.1 Καὶ δὴ ἔμπαλιν ἐν αὐταῖς που ταῖς περιστάσεσιν οἱ δεισιδαίμονες, οἱ τῶν λίθων προσκυνηταί, ἔργῳ μαθόντες ἀναίσθητον ὕλην μὴ σέβειν, αὐτῆς ἡττώμενοι τῆς χρείας ἀπόλλυνται ὑπὸ δεισιδαιμονίας· καταφρονοῦντες δ' ὅμως τῶν ἀγαλμάτων, φαίνεσθαι δὲ μὴ βουλόμενοι αὐτῶν ὅλως περιφρονοῦντες, ἐλέγχονται ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῶν θεῶν, οἷς δὴ τὰ ἀγάλματα ἐπιπεφήμισται. **52.2** Διονύσιος μὲν γὰρ ὁ τύραννος ὁ νεώτερος θοἰμάτιον τὸ χρύσεον περιελόμενος τοῦ Διὸς ἐν Σικελίᾳ προσέταξεν αὐτῷ ἐρεοῦν περιτεθῆναι, χαριέντως φήσας τοῦτο ἄμεινον εἶναι τοῦ χρυσίου, καὶ θέρους κουφότερον καὶ κρύους ἀλεεινότερον. **52.3** Ἀντίοχος δὲ ὁ Κυζικηνὸς ἀπορούμενος χρημάτων τοῦ Διὸς τὸ ἄγαλμα τὸ χρυσοῦν, πεντεκαίδεκα πηχῶν τὸ μέγεθος ὄν, προσέταξε χωνεῦσαι καὶ τῆς ἄλλης τῆς ἀτιμοτέρας ὕλης ἄγαλμα παραπλήσιον ἐκείνῳ πετάλοις κεχρυσωμένον ἀναθεῖναι πάλιν. **52.4** Αἱ δὲ χελιδόνες καὶ τῶν ὀρνέων τὰ πλεῖστα κατεξερῶσιν αὐτῶν τῶν ἀγαλμάτων εἰσπετόμενα, οὐδὲν φροντίσαντα οὔτε Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς οὔτε Ἐπιδαυρίου Ἀσκληπιοῦ οὐδὲ μὴν Ἀθηνᾶς Πολιάδος ἢ Σαράπιδος Αἰγυπτίου· παρ' ὧν οὐδὲ αὐτῶν τὴν ἀναισθησίαν τῶν ἀγαλμάτων ἐκμανθάνετε. **55.5** Ἀλλ' εἰσὶ μὲν κακοῦργοί τινες ἢ πολέμιοι ἐπιθέμενοι, οἳ δι' αἰσχροκέρδειαν ἐδήωσαν τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ τὰ ἀναθήματα ἐσύλησαν ἢ καὶ αὐτὰ ἐχώνευσαν τὰ ἀγάλματα. **55.6** Καὶ εἰ Καμβύσης τις ἢ Δαρεῖος ἢ ἄλλος μαινόμενος τοιαῦτα ἄττα ἐπεχείρησεν καὶ εἰ τὸν Αἰγύπτιόν τις ἀπέκτεινεν Ἄπιν, γελῶ μὲν ὅτι τὸν θεὸν ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτῶν, ἀγανακτῶ δὲ εἰ κέρδους χάριν ἐπλημμέλει.

53.1 Ἑκὼν οὖν ἐκλήσομαί τι τῆσδε τῆς κακουργίας, πλεονεξίας ἔργα, οὐχὶ δὲ ἀδρανείας τῶν εἰδώλων ἔλεγχον νομίζων. Ἀλλ' οὔτι γε τὸ πῦρ καὶ οἱ σεισμοὶ κερδαλέοι, οὐδὲ μὴν φοβοῦνται ἢ δυσωποῦνται οὐ τοὺς δαίμονας, οὐ τὰ ἀγάλματα, οὐ μᾶλλον ἢ τὰς ψηφῖδας τὰς παρὰ τοῖς αἰγιαλοῖς σεσωρευμένας τὰ κύματα. **53.2** Οἶδα ἐγὼ πῦρ ἐλεγκτικὸν καὶ δεισιδαιμονίας ἰατικόν· εἰ βούλει παύσασθαι τῆς ἀνοίας, φωταγωγήσει σε τὸ πῦρ. Τοῦτο τὸ πῦρ καὶ τὸν ἐν Ἄργει νεὼν σὺν καὶ τῇ ἱερείᾳ κατέφλεξεν Χρυσίδι, καὶ τὸν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος δεύτερον μετὰ Ἀμαζόνας καὶ τὸ ἐν Ῥώμῃ Καπιτώλιον ἐπινενέμηται πολλάκις· οὐκ ἀπέσχετο δὲ οὐδὲ τοῦ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρέων πόλει Σαράπιδος ἱεροῦ. **53.3** Ἀθήνησι γὰρ τοῦ Διονύσου τοῦ Ἐλευθερέως κατήρειψε τὸν νεών, καὶ τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος πρότερον ἥρπασεν θύελλα, ἔπειτα ἠφάνισε πῦρ σωφρονοῦν. Τοῦτό σοι προοίμιον ἐπιδείκνυται ὧν ὑπισχνεῖται τὸ πῦρ.

53.4 Οἱ δὲ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων δημιουργοὶ οὐ δυσωποῦσιν ὑμῶν τοὺς ἔμφρονας τῆς ὕλης καταφρονεῖν; Ὁ μὲν Ἀθηναῖος Φειδίας ἐπὶ τῷ δακτύλῳ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου ἐπιγράψας "Παντάρκης καλός"· οὐ γὰρ καλὸς αὐτῷ ὁ Ζεύς, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐρώμενος ἦν· **53.5** ὁ Πραξιτέλης δέ, ὡς Ποσίδιππος ἐν τῷ περὶ Κνίδου διασαφεῖ, τὸ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἄγαλμα τῆς Κνιδίας κατασκευάζων τῷ Κρατίνης τῆς ἐρωμένης εἴδει παραπλήσιον πεποίηκεν αὐτήν, ἵν' ἔχοιεν οἱ δείλαιοι τὴν Πραξιτέλους ἐρωμένην προσκυνεῖν. **53.6** Φρύνη δὲ ὁπηνίκα ἤνθει ἡ ἑταίρα ἡ Θεσπιακή, οἱ ζωγράφοι πάντες τῆς Ἀφροδίτης εἰκόνας πρὸς τὸ

---

²⁵ del Wilamowitz edd

κάλλος ἀπεμιμοῦντο Φρύνης, ὥσπερ αὖ καὶ οἱ λιθοξόοι τοὺς Ἑρμᾶς Ἀθήνησι πρὸς Ἀλκιβιάδην ἀπείκαζον. Ὑπολείπεται τῆς σῆς κρίσεως τὸ ἔργον ἐπάξαι, εἰ βούλει καὶ τὰς ἑταίρας προσκυνεῖν.

54.1 Ἐντεῦθεν, οἶμαι, κινηθέντες οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ παλαιοί, καταφρονοῦντες τῶν μύθων τούτων, ἀνέδην διὰ τὸ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀκίνδυνον σφᾶς αὐτοὺς θεοὺς ἀνηγόρευον, ταύτη κἀκείνους διὰ τὴν δόξαν ἀπηθανατίσθαι διδάσκοντες· Κῆυξ μὲν ὁ Αἰόλου Ζεὺς ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀλκυόνης τῆς γυναικός, Ἀλκυόνη δὲ αὖθις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς Ἥρα προσαγορευομένη. **54.2** Πτολεμαῖος δὲ ὁ τέταρτος Διόνυσος ἐκαλεῖτο· καὶ Μιθριδάτης ὁ Ποντικὸς Διόνυσος καὶ αὐτός· ἐβούλετο δὲ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος Ἄμμωνος υἱὸς εἶναι δοκεῖν καὶ κερασφόρος ἀναπλάττεσθαι πρὸς τῶν ἀγαλματοποιῶν, τὸ καλὸν ἀνθρώπου πρόσωπον ὑβρίσαι σπεύδων κέρατι. **54.3** Καὶ οὔτι γε βασιλεῖς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰδιῶται θείαις προσηγορίαις σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐσέμνυνον, ὡς Μενεκράτης ὁ ἰατρός, Ζεὺς οὗτος ἐπικεκλημένος. Τί με δεῖ καταλέγειν Ἀλέξαρχον (γραμματικὸς οὗτος τὴν ἐπιστήμην γεγονώς, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Ἄριστος ὁ Σαλαμίνιος, αὐτὸν κατεσχημάτιζεν εἰς Ἥλιον); **54.4** Τί δεῖ καὶ Νικαγόρου μεμνῆσθαι (Ζελείτης τὸ γένος ἦν κατὰ τοὺς Ἀλεξάνδρου γεγονὼς χρόνους· Ἑρμῆς προσηγορεύετο ὁ Νικαγόρας καὶ τῇ στολῇ τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ ἐκέχρητο, ὡς Βάτων μαρτυρεῖ)[26], **54.5** ὅπου γε καὶ ὅλα ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις αὔτανδροι, κολακείαν ὑποδυόμεναι, ἐξευτελίζουσιν τοὺς μύθους τοὺς περὶ τῶν θεῶν, ἰσοθέους ἄνθρωποι κατασχηματίζοντες ἑαυτούς, ὑπὸ δόξης πεφυσημένοι, ἐπιψηφιζόμενοι τιμὰς ἑαυτοῖς ὑπερόγκους; Νῦν μὲν τὸν Μακεδόνα τὸν ἐκ Πέλλης τὸν Ἀμύντου Φίλιππον ἐν Κυνοσάργει νομοθετοῦντες προσκυνεῖν, τὸν "τὴν κλεῖν κατεαγότα καὶ τὸ σκέλος πεπηρωμένον", ὃς ἐξεκόπη τὸν ὀφθαλμόν· **54.6** αὖθις δὲ τὸν Δημήτριον θεὸν καὶ αὐτὸν ἀναγορεύοντες· καὶ ἔνθα μὲν ἀπέβη τοῦ ἵππου Ἀθήναζε εἰσιών, Καταιβάτου ἱερόν ἐστι Δημητρίου, βωμοὶ δὲ πανταχοῦ· καὶ γάμος ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων αὐτῷ ὁ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ηὐτρεπίζετο· ὁ δὲ τὴν μὲν θεὸν ὑπερηφάνει, τὸ ἄγαλμα γῆμαι μὴ δυνάμενος· Λάμιαν δὲ τὴν ἑταίραν ἔχων εἰς ἀκρόπολιν ἀνῄει καὶ τῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐνεφύρατο παστῷ, τῇ παλαιᾷ παρθένῳ τὰ τῆς νέας ἐπιδεικνὺς ἑταίρας σχήματα.

55 1 Οὐ νέμεσις τοίνυν οὐδὲ Ἵππωνι ἀπαθανατίζοντι τὸν θάνατον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ· ὁ Ἵππων οὗτος ἐπιγραφῆναι ἐκέλευσεν τῷ μνήματι τῷ ἑαυτοῦ τόδε τὸ ἐλεγεῖον·

> Ἵππωνος τόδε σῆμα, τὸν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν
> ἶσον ἐποίησεν Μοῖρα καταφθίμενον.

Εὖ γε, Ἵππων, ἐπιδεικνύεις ἡμῖν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην πλάνην. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ λαλοῦντί σοι μὴ πεπιστεύκασι, νεκροῦ γενέσθωσαν μαθηταί. Χρησμὸς οὗτός ἐστιν Ἵππωνος· νοήσωμεν αὐτόν. **55.2** Οἱ προσκυνούμενοι παρ' ὑμῖν, ἄνθρωποι γενόμενοί ποτε, εἶτα μέντοι τεθνᾶσιν· τετίμηκεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ὁ μῦθος καὶ ὁ χρόνος. Φιλεῖ γάρ πως τὰ μὲν παρόντα συνηθείᾳ καταφρονεῖσθαι, τὰ δὲ παρῳχηκότα τοῦ παραυτίκα ἐλέγχου κεχωρισμένα χρόνων ἀδηλίᾳ τετιμῆσθαι τῷ πλάσματι, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀπιστεῖσθαι, τὰ δὲ καὶ θαυμάζεσθαι. **55.3** Αὐτίκα γοῦν οἱ παλαιοὶ νεκροὶ τῷ πολλῷ τῆς πλάνης χρόνῳ σεμνυνόμενοι τοῖς ἔπειτα νομίζονται θεοί. Πίστις ὑμῖν τῶνδε αὐτὰ ὑμῶν τὰ μυστήρια, αἱ πανηγύρεις, δεσμὰ καὶ τραύματα καὶ δακρύοντες θεοί·

---

[26] proposuit Stählin agnovit Marcovich : αὐτός P

79

ὤ μοι ἐγώ, ὅτε μοι Σαρπηδόνα φίλτατον ἀνδρῶν
μοῖρ᾿ ὑπὸ Πατρόκλοιο Μενοιτιάδαο δαμῆναι.

55.4 Κεκράτηται τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Διὸς καὶ ὁ Ζεὺς ὑμῖν διὰ Σαρπηδόνα οἰμώζει νενικημένος. Εἴδωλα γοῦν εἰκότως αὐτοὺς καὶ δαίμονας ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κεκλήκατε, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν αὐτὴν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς κακίᾳ τιμήσας Ὅμηρος δαίμονας προσηγόρευσεν·
ἡ δ᾿ Οὐλυμπόνδε βεβήκει
δώματ᾿ ἐς αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς μετὰ δαίμονας ἄλλους.

55.5 Πῶς οὖν ἔτι θεοὶ τὰ εἴδωλα καὶ οἱ δαίμονες, βδελυρὰ ὄντως καὶ πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα, πρὸς πάντων ὁμολογούμενα γήινα καὶ δεισαλέα, κάτω βρίθοντα, "περὶ τοὺς τάφους καὶ τὰ μνημεῖα καλινδούμενα", περὶ ἃ δὴ καὶ ὑποφαίνονται ἀμυδρῶς "σκιοειδῆ φαντάσματα";

56 1 Ταῦθ᾿ ὑμῶν οἱ θεοὶ τὰ εἴδωλα, αἱ σκιαὶ καὶ πρὸς τούτοις "χωλαὶ" ἐκεῖναι καὶ "ῥυσαί, παραβλῶπες ὀφθαλμῶν", αἱ Λιταὶ αἱ Θερσίτου μᾶλλον ἢ Διὸς θυγατέρες, ὥστε μοι δοκεῖν χαριέντως φάναι τὸν Βίωνα, πῶς ἂν ἐνδίκως οἱ ἄνθρωποι παρὰ τοῦ Διὸς αἰτήσονται τὴν εὐτεκνίαν, ἣν οὐδ᾿ αὐτῷ παρασχεῖν ἴσχυσεν; **56.2** Οἴμοι τῆς ἀθεότητος· τὴν ἀκήρατον οὐσίαν, τὸ ὅσον ἐφ᾿ ὑμῖν, κατορύττετε καὶ τὸ ἄχραντον ἐκεῖνο καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς τάφοις ἐπικεχώκατε, τῆς ἀληθῶς ὄντως οὐσίας συλήσαντες τὸ θεῖον. **56.3** Τί δὴ οὖν τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῖς οὐ θεοῖς προσενείματε γέρα; Τί δὲ καταλιπόντες τὸν οὐρανὸν τὴν γῆν τετιμήκατε; Τί δ᾿ ἄλλο χρυσὸς ἢ ἄργυρος ἢ ἀδάμας ἢ σίδηρος ἢ χαλκὸς ἢ ἐλέφας ἢ λίθοι τίμιοι; Οὐχὶ γῆ τε καὶ ἐκ γῆς; οὐχὶ δὲ μιᾶς μητρὸς ἔκγονα, τῆς γῆς, τὰ πάντα ταῦτα ὅσα ὁρᾷς;**56.4** Τί δὴ οὖν, ὦ μάταιοι καὶ κενόφρονες (πάλιν γὰρ δὴ ἐπαναλήψομαι), τὸν ὑπερουράνιον βλασφημήσαντες τόπον εἰς τοὔδαφος κατεσύρατε τὴν εὐσέβειαν, χθονίους ὑμῖν ἀναπλάττοντες θεοὺς καὶ τὰ γενητὰ ταῦτα πρὸ τοῦ ἀγενήτου μετιόντες θεοῦ βαθυτέρῳ περιπεπτώκατε ζόφῳ; **56.5** Καλὸς ὁ Πάριος λίθος, ἀλλ᾿ οὐδέπω Ποσειδῶν· καλὸς ὁ ἐλέφας, ἀλλ᾿ οὐδέπω Ὀλύμπιος· ἐνδεὴς ἀεί ποτε ἡ ὕλη τῆς τέχνης, ὁ θεὸς δὲ ἀνενδεής. Προῆλθεν ἡ τέχνη, περιβέβληται τὸ σχῆμα ἡ ὕλη, καὶ τὸ πλούσιον τῆς οὐσίας πρὸς μὲν τὸ κέρδος ἀγώγιμον, μόνῳ δὲ τῷ σχήματι γίνεται σεβάσμιον. **56.6** Χρυσός ἐστι τὸ ἄγαλμά σου, ξύλον ἐστίν, λίθος ἐστίν, γῆ ἐστιν, ἐὰν ἄνωθεν νοήσῃς, μορφὴν παρὰ τοῦ τεχνίτου προσλαβοῦσα. Γῆν δὲ ἐγὼ πατεῖν, οὐ προσκυνεῖν μεμελέτηκα· οὐ γάρ μοι θέμις ἐμπιστεῦσαί ποτε τοῖς ἀψύχοις τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς ἐλπίδας.

57.1 Ἰτέον οὖν ὡς ἔνι μάλιστα ἐγγυτάτω τῶν ἀγαλμάτων, ὡς οἰκεία ἡ πλάνη κἀκ τῆς προσόψεως ἐλέγχηται· ἐναπομέμακται γὰρ πάνυ δὴ σαφῶς τὰ εἴδη τῶν ἀγαλμάτων τὴν διάθεσιν τῶν δαιμόνων. **57.2** Εἰ γοῦν τις τὰς γραφὰς καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα περινοστῶν θεῷτο, γνωριεῖ ὑμῶν παραυτίκα τοὺς θεοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἐπονειδίστων σχημάτων, τὸν Διόνυσον ἀπὸ τῆς στολῆς, τὸν Ἥφαιστον ἀπὸ τῆς τέχνης, τὴν Δηὼ ἀπὸ τῆς συμφορᾶς, ἀπὸ τοῦ κρηδέμνου τὴν Ἰνώ, ἀπὸ τῆς τριαίνης τὸν Ποσειδῶ, ἀπὸ τοῦ κύκνου τὸν Δία· τὸν δὲ Ἡρακλέα δείκνυσιν ἡ πυρά, κἂν γυμνὴν ἴδῃ τις ἀνάγραπτον γυναῖκα, τὴν "χρυσῆν" Ἀφροδίτην νοεῖ. **57.3** Οὕτως ὁ Κύπριος ὁ Πυγμαλίων ἐκεῖνος ἐλεφαντίνου ἠράσθη ἀγάλματος· τὸ ἄγαλμα Ἀφροδίτης ἦν καὶ γυμνὴ ἦν· νικᾶται ὁ Κύπριος τῷ σχήματι καὶ συνέρχεται τῷ ἀγάλματι, καὶ τοῦτο Φιλοστέφανος ἱστορεῖ· Ἀφροδίτη δὲ ἄλλη ἐν Κνίδῳ λίθος ἦν καὶ καλὴ ἦν,

ἕτερος ἠράσθη ταύτης καὶ μίγνυται τῇ λίθῳ· Ποσίδιππος ἱστορεῖ, ὁ μὲν πρότερος ἐν τῷ περὶ Κύπρου, ὁ δὲ ἕτερος ἐν τῷ περὶ Κνίδου. Τοσοῦτον ἴσχυσεν ἀπατῆσαι τέχνη προαγωγὸς ἀνθρώποις ἐρωτικοῖς εἰς βάραθρον γενομένη. **57.4** Δραστήριος μὲν ἡ δημιουργική, ἀλλ' οὐχ οἵα τε ἀπατῆσαι λογικὸν οὐδὲ μὴν τοὺς κατὰ λόγον βεβιωκότας· ζωγραφίας μὲν γὰρ, δι' ὁμοιότητα σκιαγραφίας περιστερᾶς, προσέπτησαν πελειάδες καὶ ἵπποις καλῶς γεγραμμέναις προσεχρεμέτισαν ἵπποι. Ἐρασθῆναι κόρην εἰκόνος λέγουσιν καὶ νέον καλὸν Κνιδίου ἀγάλματος, ἀλλ' ἦσαν τῶν θεατῶν αἱ ὄψεις ἠπατημέναι ὑπὸ τῆς τέχνης. **57.5** Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν θεᾷ τις συνεπλάκη, οὐδ' ἂν νεκρᾷ τις συνετάφη, οὐδ' ἂν ἠράσθη δαίμονος καὶ λίθου ἄνθρωπος σωφρονῶν. Ὑμᾶς δὲ ἄλλη γοητεία ἀπατᾷ ἡ τέχνη, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐπὶ τὸ ἐρᾶν προσάγουσα, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ τιμᾶν καὶ προσκυνεῖν τά τε ἀγάλματα καὶ τὰς γραφάς. **57.6** Ὁμοία γε ἡ γραφή· ἐπαινείσθω μὲν ἡ τέχνη, μὴ ἀπατάτω δὲ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὡς ἀλήθεια. Ἕστηκεν ὁ ἵππος ἡσυχῇ, ἡ πελειὰς ἀτρεμής, ἀργὸν τὸ πτερόν, ἡ δὲ βοῦς ἡ Δαιδάλου ἡ ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου πεποιημένη ταῦρον εἷλεν ἄγριον καὶ κατηνάγκασεν τὸ θηρίον ἡ τέχνη πλανήσασα ἐρώσης ἐπιβῆναι γυναικός.

58 1 Τοσοῦτον οἶστρον αἱ τέχναι κακοτεχνοῦσαι τοῖς ἀνοήτοις ἐνεποίησαν. Ἀλλὰ τοὺς μὲν πιθήκους οἱ τούτων τροφεῖς καὶ μελεδωνοὶ τεθαυμάκασιν, ὅτι τῶν κηρίνων ἢ πηλίνων ὁμοιωμάτων καὶ κορωκοσμίων ἀπατᾷ τούτους οὐδέν· ὑμεῖς δὲ ἄρα καὶ πιθήκων χείρους γενήσεσθε λιθίνοις καὶ ξυλίνοις καὶ χρυσέοις καὶ ἐλεφαντίνοις ἀγαλματίοις καὶ γραφαῖς προσανέχοντες. **58.2** Τοσούτων ὑμῖν οἱ δημιουργοὶ ἀθυρμάτων ὀλεθρίων οἱ λιθοξόοι καὶ οἱ ἀνδριαντοποιοὶ γραφεῖς τε αὖ καὶ τέκτονες καὶ ποιηταί, πολύν τινα καὶ τοιοῦτον ὄχλον παρεισάγοντες, κατ' ἀγροὺς μὲν Σατύρους καὶ Πᾶνας, ἀνὰ δὲ τὰς ὕλας Νύμφας τὰς ὀρειάδας καὶ τὰς ἁμαδρυάδας, ναὶ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τὰ ὕδατα καὶ περὶ τοὺς ποταμοὺς καὶ τὰς πηγὰς τὰς Ναΐδας καὶ περὶ τὴν θάλατταν τὰς Νηρεΐδας. **58.3** Μάγοι δὲ ἤδη ἀσεβείας τῆς σφῶν αὐτῶν ὑπηρέτας δαίμονας αὐχοῦσιν, οἰκέτας αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς καταγράψαντες, τοὺς κατηναγκασμένους δούλους ταῖς ἐπαοιδαῖς πεποιηκότες. Γάμοι τε οὖν ἔτι καὶ παιδοποιΐαι καὶ λοχεῖαι θεῶν μνημονευόμεναι καὶ μοιχεῖαι ᾀδόμεναι καὶ εὐωχίαι κωμῳδούμεναι καὶ γέλωτες παρὰ πότον εἰσαγόμενοι προτρέπουσι δή με ἀνακραγεῖν, κἂν σιωπῆσαι θέλω· οἴμοι τῆς ἀθεότητος. **58.4** Σκηνὴν πεποιήκατε τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὸ θεῖον ὑμῖν δρᾶμα γεγένηται καὶ τὸ ἅγιον προσωπείοις δαιμονίων κεκωμῳδήκατε, τὴν ἀληθῆ θεοσέβειαν δεισιδαιμονίᾳ σατυρίσαντες.

59 1   Αὐτὰρ ὁ φορμίζων ἀνεβάλλετο καλὸν ἀείδειν
ᾆσον ἡμῖν, Ὅμηρε, τὴν φωνὴν τὴν καλήν,
          ἀμφ' Ἄρεως φιλότητος ἐυστεφάνου τ' Ἀφροδίτης
          ὡς τὰ πρῶτα μίγησαν ἐν Ἡφαίστοιο δόμοισι
          λάθρη· πολλὰ δ' ἔδωκε, λέχος δ' ᾔσχυνε καὶ εὐνὴν
          Ἡφαίστοιο ἄνακτος.

59.2   Κατάπαυσον, Ὅμηρε, τὴν ᾠδήν· οὐκ ἔστι καλή, μοιχείαν διδάσκει· πορνεύειν δὲ ἡμεῖς καὶ τὰ ὦτα παρῃτήμεθα· ἡμεῖς γάρ, ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν οἱ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ περιφέροντες ἐν τῷ ζῶντι καὶ κινουμένῳ τούτῳ ἀγάλματι, τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, σύνοικον εἰκόνα, σύμβουλον, συνόμιλον, συνέστιον, συμπαθῆ, ὑπερπαθῆ· ἀνάθημα γεγόναμεν τῷ θεῷ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ· **59.3** ἡμεῖς τὸ γένος τὸ

ἐκλεκτόν, τὸ βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς περιούσιος, οἱ ποτὲ οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ"· οἱ κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην οὐκ ὄντες "ἐκ τῶν κάτω", παρὰ δὲ τοῦ ἄνωθεν ἐλθόντος τὸ πᾶν μεμαθηκότες, οἱ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ κατανενοηκότες, οἱ "ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατεῖν" μεμελετηκότες.

60 1 Ἀλλ' οὐ ταῦτα φρονοῦσιν οἱ πολλοί· ἀπορρίψαντες δὲ τὴν αἰδὼ καὶ τὸν φόβον οἴκοι τοὺς τῶν δαιμόνων ἐγγράφονται πασχητιασμούς. Πινακίοις γοῦν τισὶ καταγράφοις μετεωρότερον ἀνακειμένοις προσεσχηκότες ἀσελγείᾳ τοὺς θαλάμους κεκοσμήκασι, τὴν ἀκολασίαν εὐσέβειαν νομίζοντες·**60.2** κἀπὶ τοῦ σκίμποδος κατακείμενοι παρ' αὐτὰς ἔτι τὰς περιπλοκὰς ἀφορῶσιν εἰς τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἐκείνην τὴν γυμνήν, τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ συμπλοκῇ δεδεμένην, καὶ τῇ Λήδᾳ περιπτωμένον τὸν ὄρνιν τὸν ἐρωτικὸν τῆς θηλύτητος, ἀποδεχόμενοι τὴν γραφήν, ἀποτυποῦσι ταῖς σφενδόναις, σφραγῖδι χρώμενοι καταλλήλῳ τῇ Διὸς ἀκολασίᾳ.

61 1 Ταῦτα ὑμῶν τῆς ἡδυπαθείας τὰ ἀρχέτυπα, αὗται τῆς ὕβρεως αἱ θεολογίαι, αὗται τῶν συμπορνευόντων ὑμῖν θεῶν αἱ διδασκαλίαι· "ὃ γὰρ βούλεται, τοῦθ' ἕκαστος καὶ οἴεται" κατὰ τὸν Ἀθηναῖον ῥήτορα. Οἷαι δὲ αὖ καὶ ἄλλαι ὑμῶν εἰκόνες, πανίσκοι τινὲς καὶ γυμναὶ κόραι καὶ σάτυροι μεθύοντες καὶ μορίων ἐντάσεις, ταῖς γραφαῖς ἀπογυμνούμεναι, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκρασίας ἐλεγχόμεναι. **61.2** Ἤδη δὲ ἀναφανδὸν τῆς ἀκολασίας ὅλης τὰ σχήματα ἀνάγραπτα πανδημεὶ θεώμενοι οὐκ αἰσχύνεσθε, φυλάττετε δὲ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἀνακείμενα, ὥσπερ ἀμέλει τῶν θεῶν ὑμῶν τὰς εἰκόνας, στήλας ἀναισχυντίας καθιερώσαντες οἴκοι, ἐπ' ἴσης ἐγγραφόμενοι τὰ Φιλαινίδος σχήματα ὡς τὰ Ἡρακλέους ἀθλήματα. **61 3** Τούτων οὐ μόνον τῆς χρήσεως, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τῆς ὄψεως καὶ τῆς ἀκοῆς αὐτῆς ἀμνηστίαν καταγγέλλομεν. Ἡταίρηκεν ὑμῖν τὰ ὦτα, πεπορνεύκασιν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ τὸ καινότερον πρὸ τῆς συμπλοκῆς αἱ ὄψεις ὑμῖν μεμοιχεύκασιν. **61.4** Ὦ βιασάμενοι τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ τὸ ἔνθεον τοῦ πλάσματος ἐλέγχει ἀπαράξαντες, πάντα ἀπιστεῖτε, ἵνα ἐκπαθαίνησθε· καὶ πιστεύετε μὲν τοῖς εἰδώλοις ζηλοῦντες αὐτῶν τὴν ἀκρασίαν, ἀπιστεῖτε δὲ τῷ θεῷ σωφροσύνην μὴ φέροντες· καὶ τὰ μὲν κρείττω μεμισήκατε, τὰ δὲ ἥττω τετιμήκατε, ἀρετῆς μὲν θεαταί, κακίας δὲ ἀγωνισταὶ γεγενημένοι.

62 1 "Ὄλβιοι" μόνοι τοίνυν, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐκεῖνοι πάντες κατὰ τὴν Σίβυλλαν

οἳ ναοὺς πάντας ἀπαρνήσονται ἰδόντες
καὶ βωμούς, εἰκαῖα λίθων ἱδρύματα κωφῶν,
καὶ λίθινα ξόανα καὶ ἀγάλματα χειροποίητα,
αἵματι ἐμψύχῳ μεμιασμένα καὶ θυσίαισι
τετραπόδων, διπόδων, πτηνῶν θηρῶν τε φόνοισιν.

62.2 Καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ ἀπηγόρευται ἡμῖν ἀναφανδὸν ἀπατηλὸν ἐργάζεσθαι τέχνην. "Οὐ γὰρ ποιήσεις," φησὶν ὁ προφήτης, "παντὸς ὁμοίωμα, ὅσα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω καὶ ὅσα ἐν τῇ γῇ κάτω." **62.3** Ἦ πού γ' ἂν ἔτι τὴν Πραξιτέλους Δήμητρα καὶ Κόρην καὶ τὸν Ἴακχον τὸν μυστικὸν θεοὺς ὑπολάβοιμεν ἢ τὰς Λυσίππου τέχνας ἢ τὰς χεῖρας τὰς Ἀπελλικάς, αἳ δὴ τῆς θεοδοξίας τὸ σχῆμα τῇ ὕλῃ περιτεθείκασιν; Ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν ὅπως ποτὲ ὁ ἀνδριὰς ὅτι μάλιστα ὡραιότατος τεκταίνηται, προσκαρτερεῖτε, ὅπως δὲ αὐτοὶ μὴ ὅμοιοι δι' ἀναισθησίαν τοῖς ἀνδριᾶσιν ἀποτελεσθῆτε, οὐ φροντίζετε·

62.4 πάνυ γοῦν ἐμφανῶς καὶ συντόμως ὁ προφητικὸς ἐλέγχει τὴν συνήθειαν λόγος ὅτι "πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν δαιμονίων εἰσὶν εἴδωλα· ὁ δὲ θεὸς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἐποίησεν" καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.

63 1 Πλανώμενοι γοῦν τινες ἐντεῦθεν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως θείαν μὲν τέχνην, πλὴν ἀλλ' οὐ θεὸν προσκυνοῦσιν ἥλιόν τε καὶ σελήνην καὶ τὸν ἄλλον τῶν ἀστέρων χορόν, παραλόγως τούτους θεοὺς ὑπολαμβάνοντες, τὰ ὄργανα τοῦ χρόνου. "Τῷ γὰρ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ ἐστερεώθησαν καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν." **63.2** Ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν ἀνθρωπεία τέχνη οἰκίας τε καὶ ναῦς καὶ πόλεις καὶ γραφὰς δημιουργεῖ, θεὸς δὲ πῶς ἂν εἴποιμι ὅσα ποιεῖ; Ὅλον ἴδε τὸν κόσμον, ἐκείνου ἔργον ἐστίν· καὶ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἥλιος καὶ ἄγγελοι καὶ ἄνθρωποι "ἔργα τῶν δακτύλων αὐτοῦ." **63.3** Ὅση γε ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ. Μόνον αὐτοῦ τὸ βούλημα κοσμοποιία· μόνος γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν, ἐπεὶ καὶ μόνος ὄντως ἐστὶ θεός· ψιλῷ τῷ βούλεσθαι δημιουργεῖ καὶ τῷ μόνον ἐθελῆσαι αὐτὸν ἕπεται τὸ γεγενῆσθαι. **63.4** Ἐνταῦθα φιλοσόφων παρατρέπεται χορὸς πρὸς μὲν τὴν οὐρανοῦ θέαν παγκάλως γεγονέναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁμολογούντων, τὰ δὲ ἐν οὐρανῷ φαινόμενα καὶ ὄψει καταλαμβανόμενα προσκυνούντων. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ μὴ ἀνθρώπινα τὰ ἔργα τὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ, ἀλλὰ γοῦν ἀνθρώποις δεδημιούργηται. **63.5** Καὶ μὴ τὸν ἥλιόν τις ὑμῶν προσκυνείτω, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἡλίου ποιητὴν ἐπιποθείτω, μηδὲ τὸν κόσμον ἐκθειαζέτω, ἀλλὰ τὸν κόσμου δημιουργὸν ἐπιζητησάτω. Μόνη ἄρα, ὡς ἔοικεν, καταφυγὴ τῷ μέλλοντι ἐπὶ τὰς σωτηρίους ἀφικνεῖσθαι θύρας ὑπολείπεται σοφία θεϊκή· ἐντεῦθεν ὥσπερ ἐξ ἱεροῦ τινος ἀσύλου οὐδενὶ οὐκέτι ἀγώγιμος τῶν δαιμόνων ὁ ἄνθρωπος γίνεται σπεύδων εἰς σωτηρίαν.

5 64 1 Ἐπιδράμωμεν δέ, εἰ βούλει, καὶ τῶν φιλοσόφων τὰς δόξας, ὅσας αὐχοῦσι περὶ τῶν θεῶν, εἴ πως καὶ φιλοσοφίαν αὐτὴν κενοδοξίας ἕνεκεν ἀνειδωλοποιοῦσαν τὴν ὕλην ἐφεύρωμεν, εἰ καὶ δαιμόνια ἄττα ἐκθειάζουσαν κατὰ παραδρομὴν παραστῆσαι δυνηθῶμεν ὀνειρώττουσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. **64.2** Στοιχεῖα μὲν οὖν ἀρχὰς ἀπέλιπον ἐξυμνήσαντες Θαλῆς ὁ Μιλήσιος τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ Ἀναξιμένης ὁ καὶ αὐτὸς Μιλήσιος τὸν ἀέρα, ᾧ Διογένης ὕστερον ὁ Ἀπολλωνιάτης κατηκολούθησεν. Παρμενίδης δὲ ὁ Ἐλεάτης θεοὺς εἰσηγήσατο πῦρ καὶ γῆν, θάτερον δὲ αὐτοῖν μόνον, τὸ πῦρ, θεὸν ὑπειλήφατον Ἵππασός τε ὁ Μεταποντῖνος καὶ ὁ Ἐφέσιος Ἡράκλειτος· Ἐμπεδοκλῆς γὰρ ὁ Ἀκραγαντῖνος εἰς πλῆθος ἐμπεσὼν πρὸς τοῖς τέτταρσι στοιχείοις τούτοις νεῖκος καὶ φιλίαν καταριθμεῖται.

64.3 Ἄθεοι μὲν δὴ καὶ οὗτοι, σοφίᾳ τινὶ ἀσόφῳ τὴν ὕλην προσκυνήσαντες καὶ λίθους μὲν ἢ ξύλα οὐ τιμήσαντες, γῆν δὲ τὴν τούτων μητέρα ἐκθειάσαντες καὶ Ποσειδῶνα μὲν οὐκ ἀναπλάττοντες, ὕδωρ δὲ αὐτὸ προστρεπόμενοι. **64.4** Τί γάρ ἐστί ποτε ἕτερον Ποσειδῶν ἢ ὑγρά τις οὐσία ἐκ τῆς πόσεως ὀνοματοποιουμένη; ὥσπερ ἀμέλει ὁ πολέμιος Ἄρης ἀπὸ τῆς ἄρσεως καὶ ἀναιρέσεως κεκλημένος. **64.5** Ἧι καὶ δοκοῦσί μοι πολλοὶ μάλιστα τὸ ξίφος μόνον πήξαντες ἐπιθύειν ὡς Ἄρει· ἔστι δὲ Σκυθῶν τὸ τοιοῦτον, καθάπερ Εὔδοξος ἐν δευτέρᾳ Γῆς περιόδου λέγει. Σκυθῶν δὲ οἱ Σαυρομάται, ὥς φησιν Ἰκέσιος ἐν τῷ Περὶ μυστηρίων, ἀκινάκην σέβουσιν. **64.6** Τοῦτό τοι καὶ οἱ ἀμφὶ τὸν Ἡράκλειτον τὸ πῦρ ὡς ἀρχέγονον σέβοντες πεπόνθασιν· τὸ γὰρ πῦρ τοῦτο ἕτεροι Ἥφαιστον ὠνόμασαν.

65 1 Περσῶν δὲ οἱ Μάγοι τὸ πῦρ τετιμήκασι καὶ τῶν τὴν Ἀσίαν κατοικούντων πολλοί, πρὸς δὲ καὶ Μακεδόνες, ὥς φησι Διογένης ἐν α# Περσικῶν. Τί μοι Σαυρομάτας καταλέγειν, οὓς Νυμφόδωρος ἐν Νομίμοις βαρβαρικοῖς τὸ πῦρ σέβειν ἱστορεῖ, ἢ τοὺς Πέρσας καὶ τοὺς Μήδους καὶ τοὺς Μάγους; Θύειν ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ τούτους ὁ Δίνων λέγει, θεῶν ἀγάλματα μόνα τὸ πῦρ καὶ ὕδωρ νομίζοντας. **65.2** Οὐκ ἀπεκρυψάμην οὐδὲ τὴν τούτων ἄγνοιαν. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα ἀποφεύγειν οἴονται τῆς πλάνης, ἀλλ᾿ εἰς ἑτέραν κατολισθαίνουσιν ἀπάτην· ἀγάλματα μὲν θεῶν οὐ ξύλα καὶ λίθους ὑπειλήφασιν ὥσπερ Ἕλληνες οὐδὲ μὴν ἴβιδας καὶ ἰχνεύμονας καθάπερ Αἰγύπτιοι, ἀλλὰ πῦρ τε καὶ ὕδωρ ὡς φιλόσοφοι. **65.3** Μετὰ πολλὰς μέντοι ὕστερον περιόδους ἐτῶν ἀνθρωποειδῆ ἀγάλματα σέβειν αὐτοὺς Βήρωσσος ἐν τρίτῃ Χαλδαϊκῶν παρίστησι, τοῦτο Ἀρταξέρξου τοῦ Δαρείου τοῦ Ὤχου εἰσηγησαμένου, ὃς πρῶτος τῆς Ἀφροδίτης Ἀναΐτιδος τὸ ἄγαλμα ἀναστήσας ἐν Βαβυλῶνι καὶ Σούσοις καὶ Ἐκβατάνοις Πέρσαις καὶ Βάκτροις καὶ Δαμασκῷ καὶ Σάρδεσιν ὑπέδειξε σέβειν. **65.4** Ὁμολογούντων τοίνυν οἱ φιλόσοφοι τοὺς διδασκάλους τοὺς σφῶν Πέρσας ἢ Σαυρομάτας ἢ Μάγους, παρ᾿ ὧν τὴν ἀθεότητα τῶν σεβασμίων αὐτοῖς μεμαθήκασιν ἀρχῶν, ἄρχοντα τὸν πάντων ποιητὴν καὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν αὐτῶν δημιουργὸν ἀγνοοῦντες, τὸν ἄναρχον θεόν, τὰ δὲ "πτωχὰ" ταῦτα καὶ "ἀσθενῆ", ᾗ φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος, τὰ εἰς τὴν ἀνθρώπων ὑπηρεσίαν πεποιημένα "στοιχεῖα" προστρεπόμενοι.

66.1 Τῶν δὲ ἄλλων φιλοσόφων ὅσοι τὰ στοιχεῖα ὑπερβάντες ἐπολυπραγμόνησάν τι ὑψηλότερον καὶ περιττότερον, οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν τὸ ἄπειρον καθύμνησαν, ὡς Ἀναξίμανδρος (Μιλήσιος ἦν) καὶ Ἀναξαγόρας ὁ Κλαζομένιος καὶ ὁ Ἀθηναῖος Ἀρχέλαος. Τούτω μέν γε ἄμφω τὸν νοῦν ἐπεστησάτην τῇ ἀπειρίᾳ, ὁ δὲ Μιλήσιος Λεύκιππος καὶ ὁ Χῖος Μητρόδωρος διττάς, ὡς ἔοικεν, καὶ αὐτὼ ἀρχὰς ἀπελιπέτην τὸ πλῆρες καὶ τὸ κενόν· **66.2** προσέθηκε δὲ λαβὼν τούτοιν τοῖν δυεῖν τὰ εἴδωλα ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης Δημόκριτος. Ὁ γάρ τοι Κροτωνιάτης Ἀλκμαίων θεοὺς ᾤετο τοὺς ἀστέρας εἶναι ἐμψύχους ὄντας. Οὐ σιωπήσομαι τὴν τούτων ἀναισχυντίαν· Ξενοκράτης (Καλχηδόνιος οὗτος) ἑπτὰ μὲν θεοὺς τοὺς πλανήτας, ὄγδοον δὲ τὸν ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἀπλανῶν συνεστῶτα κόσμον αἰνίττεται. **66.3** Οὐδὲ μὴν τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς παρελεύσομαι διὰ πάσης ὕλης καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀτιμοτάτης τὸ θεῖον διήκειν λέγοντας, οἳ καταισχύνουσιν ἀτεχνῶς τὴν φιλοσοφίαν. **66.4** Οὐδὲν δὲ οἶμαι χαλεπὸν ἐνταῦθα γενόμενος καὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Περιπάτου μνησθῆναι· καὶ ὅ γε τῆς αἱρέσεως πατήρ, τῶν ὅλων οὐ νοήσας τὸν πατέρα, τὸν καλούμενον "ὕπατον" ψυχὴν εἶναι τοῦ παντὸς οἴεται· τουτέστι τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ψυχὴν θεὸν ὑπολαμβάνων αὐτὸς αὑτῷ περιπείρεται. Ὁ γάρ τοι μέχρι τῆς σελήνης αὐτῆς διορίζων τὴν πρόνοιαν, ἔπειτα τὸν κόσμον θεὸν ἡγούμενος περιτρέπεται, τὸν ἄμοιρον τοῦ θεοῦ θεὸν δογματίζων. **66.5** Ὁ δὲ Ἐρέσιος ἐκεῖνος Θεόφραστος ὁ Ἀριστοτέλους γνώριμος πῇ μὲν οὐρανόν, πῇ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸν θεὸν ὑπονοεῖ. Ἐπικούρου μὲν γὰρ μόνου καὶ ἑκὼν ἐκλήσομαι, ὃς οὐδὲν μέλειν οἴεται τῷ θεῷ, διὰ πάντων ἀσεβῶν. Τί δὲ[27] Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Ποντικός; Ἔσθ᾿ ὅπῃ οὐκ ἐπὶ τὰ Δημοκρίτου καὶ αὐτὸς κατασύρεται εἴδωλα.

---

[27] Marcovich : γάρ P

6.67.1   Καὶ πολύς μοι ἐπιρρεῖ τοιοῦτος ὄχλος, οἱονεὶ μορμὼ τινα δαιμονίων παρεισάγων ξένων ἄτοπον σκιαγραφίαν, μυθολογῶν ὕθλῳ γραϊκῷ· πολλοῦ γε δεῖ ἀνδράσιν ἐπιτρέπειν ἀκροᾶσθαι τοιούτων λόγων, οἷς μηδὲ τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς ἑαυτῶν, τοῦτο δὴ τὸ λεγόμενον, κλαυθμυριζομένους ἐθίζομεν παρηγορεῖσθαι μυθίζοντες, ὀρρωδοῦντες συνανατρέφειν αὐτοῖς ἀθεότητα τὴν πρὸς τῶν δοκησισόφων[28] δὴ τούτων καταγγελλομένην, μηδέν τι νηπίων μᾶλλον τἀληθὲς εἰδότων. **67.2** Τί γάρ, ὦ πρὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, τοὺς σοὶ πεπιστευκότας δεικνύεις ῥύσει καὶ φθορᾷ[29] δειναῖς τε καὶ ἀτάκτοις[30] ὑποβεβλημένους; Τί δέ μοι εἰδώλων ἀναπίμπλης τὸν βίον, ἀνέμους τε ἢ ἀέρα ἢ πῦρ ἢ γῆν ἢ λίθους ἢ ξύλα ἢ σίδηρον, κόσμον τόνδε θεοὺς ἀναπλάττουσα, θεοὺς δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας τοὺς πλανήτας, τοῖς ὄντως πεπλανημένοις τῶν ἀνθρώπων διὰ τῆς πολυθρυλήτου ταύτης ἀστρολογίας, οὐκ ἀστρονομίας, μετεωρολογοῦσα καὶ ἀδολεσχοῦσα; Τὸν κύριον τῶν πνευμάτων ποθῶ, τὸν κύριον τοῦ πυρός, τὸν κόσμου δημιουργόν, τὸν ἡλίου φωταγωγόν· θεὸν ἐπιζητῶ, οὐ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ.

68.1   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; **68.2** "Ῥητὸν[31] γὰρ οὐδαμῶς ἐστίν." Εὖ γε, ὦ Πλάτων, ἐπαφᾶσαι τῆς ἀληθείας· ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀποκάμῃς· ξύν μοι λαβοῦ τῆς ζητήσεως τἀγαθοῦ πέρι· πᾶσιν γὰρ ἁπαξαπλῶς ἀνθρώποις, μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς περὶ λόγους ἐνδιατρίβουσιν ἐνέστακταί τις ἀπόρροια θεϊκή. **68.3** Οὗ δὴ χάριν καὶ ἄκοντες μὲν ὁμολογοῦσιν ἕνα τε εἶναι θεόν, ἀνώλεθρον καὶ ἀγένητον τοῦτον, ἄνω που περὶ τὰ νῶτα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ καὶ οἰκείᾳ περιωπῇ ὄντως ὄντα ἀεί·

        θεὸν δὲ ποῖον εἰπέ μοι νοητέον;

        Τὸν πάνθ' ὁρῶντα καὐτὸν οὐχ ὁρώμενον,

68.4 Εὐριπίδης λέγει. Πεπλανῆσθαι γοῦν ὁ Μένανδρός μοι δοκεῖ, ἔνθα φησίν

        ἥλιε, σὲ γὰρ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν πρῶτον θεῶν,

        δι' ὃν θεωρεῖν ἔστι τοὺς ἄλλους θεούς·

οὐδὲ γὰρ ἥλιος ἐπιδείξει ποτ' ἂν τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἀληθῆ, ὁ δὲ λόγος ὁ ὑγιής, ὅς ἐστιν ἥλιος ψυχῆς, δι' οὗ μόνου ἔνδον ἀνατείλαντος ἐν τῷ βάθει τοῦ νοῦ αὐτοῦ καταυγάζεται τὸ ὄμμα· **68.5** ὅθεν οὐκ ἀπεικότως ὁ Δημόκριτος "τῶν λογίων ἀνθρώπων ὀλίγους" φησίν "ἀνατείναντας τὰς χεῖρας ἐνταῦθα ὃν νῦν ἠέρα καλέομεν οἱ Ἕλληνες, πάντα διαμυθεῖσθαι[32], καὶ πάντα οὗτος οἶδε καὶ διδοῖ καὶ ἀφαιρεῖται, καὶ βασιλεὺς οὗτος τῶν πάντων". Ταύτῃ πη καὶ Πλάτων διανοούμενος τὸν θεὸν αἰνίττεται "περὶ τὸν πάντων βασιλέα πάντ' ἐστί, κἀκεῖνο αἴτιον ἁπάντων καλῶν."

69.1   Τίς οὖν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν πάντων; Θεὸς τῆς τῶν ὄντων ἀληθείας τὸ μέτρον. Ὥσπερ οὖν τῷ μέτρῳ καταληπτὰ τὰ μετρούμενα, οὑτωσὶ δὲ καὶ τῷ νοῆσαι τὸν θεὸν μετρεῖται καὶ καταλαμβάνεται ἡ ἀλήθεια. **69.2** Ὁ δὲ ἱερὸς

---

[28] Potter Marcovich : δοκήσει σοφῶν P
[29] P retinet van Winden : φορᾷ Muenzel Stählin Marcovich
[30] P retinet van Winden : διναῖς τε ἀτάκτοις Heyse Stählin, Marcovich
[31] Dindorf Marcovich : ῥητέον P retinet Stählin
[32] P retinui : Δία μυθεῖσθαι Heinse edd (etiam Democritus *apud* Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 5.102.1) : <φάναι> supplevit Marcovich

ὄντως Μωυσῆς "οὐκ ἔσται", φησίν, "ἐν τῷ μαρσίππῳ σου στάθμιον καὶ στάθμιον μέγα ἢ μικρόν, οὐδὲ ἔσται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ σου μέτρον μέγα ἢ μικρόν, ἀλλ' ἢ στάθμιον ἀληθινὸν καὶ δίκαιον ἔσται σοι", στάθμιον καὶ μέτρον καὶ ἀριθμὸν τῶν ὅλων ὑπολαμβάνων τὸν θεόν· **69.3** τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄδικα καὶ ἄνισα εἴδωλα οἴκοι ἐν τῷ μαρσίππῳ καὶ ἐν τῇ ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν ῥυπώσῃ ψυχῇ κατακέκρυπται· τὸ δὲ μόνον δίκαιον μέτρον, ὁ μόνος ὄντως θεός, ἴσος ἀεὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχων, μετρεῖ τε πάντα καὶ σταθμᾶται, οἱονεὶ τρυτάνῃ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τὴν τῶν ὅλων ἀρρεπῶς περιλαμβάνων καὶ ἀνέχων φύσιν. **69.4** "Ὁ μὲν δὴ θεός, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ παλαιὸς λόγος, ἀρχὴν καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μέσα τῶν ὄντων ἁπάντων ἔχων, εὐθεῖαν περαίνει κατὰ φύσιν περιπορευόμενος· τῷ δ' ἀεὶ ξυνέπεται δίκη τῶν ἀπολειπομένων τοῦ θείου νόμου τιμωρός."

70.1 Πόθεν, ὦ Πλάτων, ἀλήθειαν αἰνίττῃ; Πόθεν ἡ τῶν λόγων ἄφθονος χορηγία τὴν θεοσέβειαν μαντεύεται; Σοφώτερα, φησίν, τούτων βαρβάρων τὰ γένη. Οἶδά σου τοὺς διδασκάλους, κἂν ἀποκρύπτειν ἐθέλῃς· γεωμετρίαν παρ' Αἰγυπτίων μανθάνεις, ἀστρονομίαν παρὰ Βαβυλωνίων, ἐπῳδὰς τὰς ὑγιεῖς παρὰ Θρᾳκῶν λαμβάνεις, πολλά σε καὶ Ἀσσύριοι πεπαιδεύκασι, νόμους δὲ τοὺς ὅσοι ἀληθεῖς καὶ δόξαν τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ παρ' αὐτῶν ὠφέλησαι τῶν Ἑβραίων,

70.2 οἵτινες οὐκ ἀπάτῃσι κεναῖς, οὐδὲ ἔργα ἀνθρώπων
χρύσεα καὶ χάλκεα καὶ ἀργύρου ἠδ' ἐλέφαντος
καὶ ξυλίνων λιθίνων τε βροτῶν εἴδωλα θανόντων
τιμῶσιν, ὅσα πέρ τε βροτοὶ κενεόφρονι βουλῇ·
ἀλλὰ γὰρ αἴρουσι πρὸς οὐρανὸν ὠλένας ἁγνάς,
ὄρθριοι ἐξ εὐνῆς, ἀεὶ χρόα ἁγνίζοντες
ὕδασι, καὶ τιμῶσι μόνον τὸν ἀεὶ μεδέοντα
ἀθάνατον.

71.1 Καί μοι μὴ μόνον, ὦ φιλοσοφία, ἕνα τοῦτον Πλάτωνα, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ ἄλλους παραστῆσαι σπούδασον, τὸν ἕνα ὄντως μόνον θεὸν ἀναφθεγγομένους θεὸν κατ' ἐπίπνοιαν αὐτοῦ, εἴ που τῆς ἀληθείας ἐπιδράξαιντο. **71.2** Ἀντισθένης μὲν γὰρ οὐ Κυνικὸν δὴ τοῦτο ἐνενόησεν, Σωκράτους δὲ ἅτε γνώριμος "θεὸν οὐδενὶ ἐοικέναι" φησίν· "διόπερ αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς ἐκμαθεῖν ἐξ εἰκόνος δύναται". **71.3** Ξενοφῶν δὲ ὁ Ἀθηναῖος διαρρήδην ἂν καὶ αὐτὸς περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐγεγράφει τι μαρτυρῶν ὡς Σωκράτης, εἰ μὴ τὸ Σωκράτους ἐδεδίει φάρμακον· οὐδὲν δὲ ἧττον αἰνίττεται. "Ὁ γοῦν τὰ πάντα", φησί, "σείων καὶ ἀτρεμίζων ὡς μὲν μέγας τις καὶ δυνατός, φανερός· ὁποῖος δέ τις μορφήν, ἀφανής· οὐδὲ μὴν ὁ παμφαὴς δοκῶν εἶναι ἥλιος οὐδ' αὐτὸς ἔοικεν ὁρᾶν αὐτὸν ἐπιτρέπειν, ἀλλ' ἤν τις ἀναιδῶς αὐτὸν θεάσηται, τὴν ὄψιν ἀφαιρεῖται." Πόθεν ἄρα ὁ τοῦ Γρύλλου σοφίζεται ἢ δηλαδὴ παρὰ τῆς προφήτιδος τῆς Ἑβραίων θεσπιζούσης ὧδέ πως; **71.4**
Τίς γὰρ σὰρξ δύναται τὸν ἐπουράνιον καὶ ἀληθῆ
ὀφθαλμοῖς ἰδεῖν θεὸν ἄμβροτον, ὃς πόλον οἰκεῖ;
Ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἀκτίνων κατεναντίον ἠελίοιο
ἄνθρωποι στῆναι δυνατοί, θνητοὶ γεγαῶτες.

72 1   Κλεάνθης δὲ ὁ Πηδασεύς, ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς φιλόσοφος, οὐ θεογονίαν ποιητικήν, θεολογίαν δὲ ἀληθινὴν ἐνδείκνυται. Οὐκ ἀπεκρύψατο τοῦ θεοῦ πέρι ὅ τί περ εἶχεν φρονῶν· **72.2**

> τἀγαθὸν ἐρωτᾷς μ' οἷόν ἐστ'; Ἄκουε δή·
> τεταγμένον, δίκαιον, ὅσιον, εὐσεβές,
> κρατοῦν ἑαυτοῦ, χρήσιμον, καλόν, δέον,
> αὐστηρόν, αὐθέκαστον, ἀεὶ συμφέρον,
> ἄφοβον, ἄλυπον, λυσιτελές, ἀνώδυνον,
> ὠφέλιμον, εὐάρεστον, ἀσφαλές, φίλον,
> ἔντιμον, ὁμολογούμενον * * * * *
> εὐκλεές, ἄτυφον, ἐπιμελές, πρᾷον, σφοδρόν,
> χρονιζόμενον, ἄμεμπτον, ἀεὶ διαμένον.
> Ἀνελεύθερος πᾶς ὅστις εἰς δόξαν βλέπει,
> ὡς δὴ παρ' ἐκείνης τευξόμενος καλοῦ τινος.

72.3 Ἐνταῦθα δὴ σαφῶς, οἶμαι, διδάσκει ὁποῖός ἐστιν ὁ θεός, καὶ ὡς ἡ δόξα ἡ κοινὴ καὶ ἡ συνήθεια τοὺς ἑπομένους αὐταῖν, ἀλλὰ μὴ τὸν θεὸν ἐπιζητοῦντας, ἐξανδραποδίζεσθον. **72.4** Οὐκ ἀποκρυπτέον οὐδὲ τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸν Πυθαγόραν, οἵ φασιν "ὁ μὲν θεὸς εἷς, χοῦτος δὲ οὐχ, ὥς τινες ὑπονοοῦσιν, ἐκτὸς τᾶς διακοσμήσιος, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτᾷ, ὅλος ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κύκλῳ ἐπίσκοπος πάσας γενέσιος, κρᾶσις τῶν ὅλων, ἀεὶ ὢν καὶ ἐργάτας τῶν αὐτοῦ δυνάμιων καὶ ἔργων, ἁπάντων ἐν οὐρανῷ φωστὴρ καὶ πάντων πατήρ, νοῦς καὶ ψύχωσις τῷ ὅλῳ κύκλῳ, πάντων κίνασις." **72.5** Ἀπόχρη καὶ τάδε εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν θεοῦ ἐπιπνοίᾳ θεοῦ πρὸς αὐτῶν μὲν ἀναγεγραμμένα, πρὸς δὲ ἡμῶν ἐξειλεγμένα τῷ γε καὶ σμικρὸν διαθρεῖν ἀλήθειαν δυναμένῳ.

7. 73 1   Ἴτω δὲ ἡμῖν (οὐ γὰρ αὐταρκεῖ μόνον ἡ φιλοσοφία) ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ ποιητικὴ ἡ περὶ τὸ ψεῦδος τὰ πάντα ἠσχολημένη, μόλις ποτὲ ἤδη ἀλήθειαν μαρτυρήσουσα, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐξομολογουμένη τῷ θεῷ τὴν μυθώδη παρέκβασιν· παρίτω δὴ ὅστις καὶ βούλεται ποιητὴς πρῶτος. **73.2** Ἄρατος μὲν οὖν διὰ πάντων τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ διήκειν νοεῖ,

> ὄφρ' ἔμπεδα πάντα φύωνται,
> τῷ μιν ἀεὶ πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον ἱλάσκονται·
> χαῖρε, πάτερ, μέγα θαῦμα, μέγ' ἀνθρώποισιν ὄνειαρ.

73.3 Ταύτῃ τοι καὶ ὁ Ἀσκραῖος αἰνίττεται Ἡσίοδος τὸν θεόν·

> αὐτὸς γὰρ πάντων βασιλεὺς καὶ κοίρανός ἐστιν·
> ἀθανάτων τῷ δ' οὔτις ἐρήρισται κράτος ἄλλος.

74 1   Ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς παραγυμνοῦσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν· ὁ μὲν καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰθέρα καὶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβλέψας "τόνδε ἡγοῦ θεόν", φησίν, Εὐριπίδης· **74.2** ὁ δὲ τοῦ Σοφίλλου Σοφοκλῆς,

> εἷς ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν, εἷς ἐστιν θεός,
> ὃς οὐρανόν τ' ἔτευξε καὶ γαῖαν μακρὴν
> πόντου τε χαροπὸν οἶδμα καὶ ἀνέμων βίας·
> θνητοὶ δὲ πολλοὶ καρδίᾳ πλανώμενοι
> ἱδρυσάμεσθα πημάτων παραψυχὴν
> θεῶν ἀγάλματ' ἐκ λίθων, ἢ χαλκέων
> ἢ χρυσοτεύκτων ἢ ἐλεφαντίνων τύπους·

θυσίας τε τούτοις καὶ κενὰς πανηγύρεις
νέμοντες, οὕτως εὐσεβεῖν νομίζομεν.

Οὑτοσὶ μὲν ἤδη καὶ παρακεκινδυνευμένως ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῖς θεαταῖς παρεισήγαγεν. **74.3** Ὁ δὲ Θράκιος ἱεροφάντης καὶ ποιητὴς ἅμα, ὁ τοῦ Οἰάγρου Ὀρφεύς, μετὰ τὴν τῶν ὀργίων ἱεροφαντίαν καὶ τῶν εἰδώλων τὴν θεολογίαν, παλινῳδίαν ἀληθείας εἰσάγει, τὸν ἱερὸν ὄντως ὀψέ ποτε, ὅμως δ' οὖν ᾄδων λόγον· **74.4**

φθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐστί· θύρας δ' ἐπίθεσθε βέβηλοι
πάντες ὁμῶς· σὺ δ' ἄκουε, φαεσφόρου ἔκγονε Μήνης,
Μουσαῖε, ἐξερέω γὰρ ἀληθέα, μηδέ σε τὰ πρὶν
ἐν στήθεσσι φανέντα φίλης αἰῶνος ἀμέρσῃ.
Εἰς δὲ λόγον θεῖον βλέψας τούτῳ προσέδρευε,
ἰθύνων κραδίης νοερὸν κύτος· εὖ δ' ἐπίβαινε
ἀτραπιτοῦ, μοῦνον δ' ἐσόρα κόσμοιο ἄνακτα
ἀθάνατον.

74.5 Εἶτα ὑποβὰς διαρρήδην ἐπιφέρει·

εἷς ἔστ', αὐτογενής, ἑνὸς ἔκγονα πάντα τέτυκται·
ἐν δ' αὐτοῖς αὐτὸς περινίσσεται, οὐδέ τις αὐτὸν
εἰσορᾷ θνητῶν, αὐτὸς δέ γε πάντας ὁρᾶται.

Οὕτως μὲν δὴ Ὀρφεὺς χρόνῳ τέ ποτε συνῆκεν πεπλανημένος. **74.6**

Ἀλλὰ σὺ μὴ μέλλων, βροτὲ ποικιλόμητι, βράδυνε,
ἀλλὰ παλίμπλαγκτος στρέψας θεὸν ἱλάσκοιο.

74.7 Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα ἐναύσματά τινα τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θείου λαβόντες Ἕλληνες ὀλίγα ἄττα τῆς ἀληθείας ἐφθέγξαντο, προσμαρτυροῦσι μὲν τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῆς οὐκ ἀποκεκρυμμένην, σφᾶς δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐλέγχουσιν ἀσθενεῖς, οὐκ ἐφικόμενοι τοῦ τέλους.

75 1 Ἤδη γὰρ οἶμαι παντί τῳ δῆλον γεγονέναι ὡς τῶν χωρὶς τοῦ λόγου τῆς ἀληθείας ἐνεργούντων τι ἢ καὶ φθεγγομένων ὁμοίων ὄντων τοῖς χωρὶς βάσεως βαδίζειν βιαζομένοις. Δυσωπούντων δέ σε εἰς σωτηρίαν καὶ οἱ περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ὑμῶν ἔλεγχοι, οὓς διὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐκβιαζόμενοι κωμῳδοῦσι ποιηταί. **75.2** Μένανδρος γοῦν ὁ κωμικὸς ἐν Ἡνιόχῳ [ἐν Ὑποβολιμαίῳ] τῷ δράματι

οὐδείς μ' ἀρέσκει (φησὶ) περιπατῶν ἔξω θεὸς
μετὰ γραός, οὐδ' εἰς οἰκίας παρεισιὼν
ἐπὶ τοῦ σανιδίου

[μητραγύρτης][33]·**75.3** τοιοῦτοι γὰρ οἱ μητραγύρται. Ὅθεν εἰκότως ὁ Ἀντισθένης ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς μεταιτοῦσιν· "οὐ τρέφω τὴν μητέρα τῶν θεῶν, ἣν οἱ θεοὶ τρέφωσιν". **75.4** Πάλιν δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς κωμῳδιοποιὸς ἐν Ἱερείᾳ τῷ δράματι χαλεπαίνων πρὸς τὴν συνήθειαν διελέγχειν πειρᾶται τὸν ἄθεον τῆς πλάνης τῦφον, ἐπιφθεγγόμενος ἐμφρόνως

εἰ γὰρ ἕλκει τὸν θεὸν
τοῖς κυμβάλοις ἄνθρωπος εἰς ὃ βούλεται,
ὁ τοῦτο ποιῶν ἐστι μείζων τοῦ θεοῦ·
ἀλλ' ἔστι τόλμης καὶ βίας ταῦτ' ὄργανα
εὑρημέν' ἀνθρώποισιν.

---

[33] del Dindorf Marcovich

76 1   Καὶ οὐχὶ μόνος ὁ Μένανδρος, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ὅμηρος καὶ Εὐριπίδης καὶ ἄλλοι συχνοὶ ποιηταὶ διελέγχουσιν ὑμῶν τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ λοιδορεῖσθαι οὐ δεδίασιν οὐδὲ καθ' ὁπόσον αὐτοῖς. Αὐτίκα τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν "κυνάμυιαν" καὶ τὸν Ἥφαιστον "ἀμφιγύην" καλοῦσιν, τῇ δὲ Ἀφροδίτῃ ἡ Ἑλένη φησὶ

μηκέτι σοῖσι πόδεσσιν ὑποστρέψειας Ὄλυμπον.

76.2 Ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ Διονύσου ἀναφανδὸν Ὅμηρος γράφει

ὅς ποτε μαινομένοιο Διωνύσοιο τιθήνας
σεῦε κατ' ἡγάθεον Νυσήιον· αἱ δ' ἅμα πᾶσαι
θύσθλα χαμαὶ κατέχευαν ὑπ' ἀνδροφόνοιο Λυκούργου.

76.3 Ἄξιος ὡς ἀληθῶς Σωκρατικῆς διατριβῆς ὁ Εὐριπίδης εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀπιδὼν καὶ τοὺς θεατὰς ὑπεριδών, ποτὲ μὲν τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα,

ὃς μεσομφάλους ἕδρας
ναίει βροτοῖσι στόμα νέμων σαφέστατα,

διελέγχων, **76.4**

κείνῳ πειθόμενος τὴν τεκοῦσαν ἔκτανον,
ἐκεῖνον ἡγεῖσθ' ἀνόσιον καὶ κτείνετε·
ἐκεῖνος ἥμαρτ', οὐκ ἐγώ,
ἀμαθέστερος ὢν τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τῆς δίκης,

76.5 τοτὲ δ' ἐμμανῆ εἰσάγων Ἡρακλέα καὶ μεθύοντα ἀλλαχόθι καὶ ἄπληστον· πῶς γὰρ οὐχί; Ὃς ἑστιώμενος τοῖς κρέασι

χλωρὰ σῦκ' ἐπήσθιεν
ἄμουσ' ὑλακτῶν ὥστε βαρβάρῳ μαθεῖν.

76.6 Ἤδη δὲ ἐν Ἴωνι τῷ δράματι γυμνῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ ἐκκυκλεῖ τῷ θεάτρῳ τοὺς θεούς·

πῶς οὖν δίκαιον τοὺς νόμους ὑμᾶς βροτοῖς
γράψαντας αὐτοὺς ἀδικίας ὀφλισκάνειν;
Εἰ δ', οὐ γὰρ ἔσται, τῷ λόγῳ δὲ χρήσομαι,
δίκας βιαίων δώσετ' ἀνθρώποις γάμων,
σὺ καὶ Ποσειδῶν Ζεὺς δ', ὃς οὐρανοῦ κρατεῖ,
ναοὺς τίνοντες ἀδικίας κενώσετε.

8.77 1   Ὥρα τοίνυν τῶν ἄλλων ἡμῖν τῇ τάξει προδιηνυσμένων ἐπὶ τὰς προφητικὰς ἰέναι γραφάς· καὶ γὰρ οἱ χρησμοὶ τὰς εἰς τὴν θεοσέβειαν ἡμῖν ἀφορμὰς ἐναργέστατα προτείνοντες θεμελιοῦσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν· γραφαὶ δὲ αἱ θεῖαι καὶ πολιτεῖαι σώφρονες σύντομοι σωτηρίας ὁδοί· γυμναὶ κομμωτικῆς καὶ τῆς ἐκτὸς[34] καλλιφωνίας καὶ στωμυλίας καὶ κολακείας ὑπάρχουσαι ἀνιστῶσιν ἀγχόμενον ὑπὸ κακίας τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὑπερείδουσαι τὸν ὄλισθον τὸν βιωτικόν, μιᾷ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ φωνῇ πολλὰ θεραπεύουσαι, ἀποτρέπουσαι μὲν ἡμᾶς τῆς ἐπιζημίου ἀπάτης, προτρέπουσαι δὲ ἐμφανῶς εἰς προὖπτον σωτηρίαν. **77.2** Αὐτίκα γοῦν ἡ προφῆτις ἡμῖν ᾀσάτω πρώτη Σίβυλλα τὸ ᾆσμα τὸ σωτήριον·

οὗτος ἰδοὺ πάντ' ἐστὶ σαφής, ἀπλάνητος ὑπάρχει·
ἔλθετε, μὴ σκοτίην δὲ διώκετε καὶ ζόφον αἰεί.
Ἠελίου γλυκυδερκές, ἰδού, φάος ἔξοχα λάμπει.

---

[34] ἐκτὸς τῆς Arcerius apud Sylburg, Marcovich

Γνῶτε δὲ κατθέμενοι σοφίην ἐν στήθεσιν ὑμῶν.
Εἷς θεός ἐστι βροχάς, ἀνέμους, σεισμούς τ᾽ ἐπιπέμπων,
ἀστεροπάς, λιμούς, λοιμοὺς καὶ κήδεα λυγρὰ
καὶ νιφετούς, κρύσταλλα· τί δὴ καθ᾽ ἓν ἐξαγορεύω;
Οὐρανοῦ ἡγεῖται, γαίης κρατεῖ, αὐτὸς ὑπάρχει.

77.3 Ἐνθέως σφόδρα τὴν μὲν ἀπάτην ἀπεικάζουσα τῷ σκότει, τὴν δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ γνῶσιν ἡλίῳ καὶ φωτί, ἄμφω δὲ παραθεμένη τῇ συγκρίσει τὴν ἐκλογὴν διδάσκει· τὸ γὰρ ψεῦδος οὐ ψιλῇ τῇ παραθέσει τἀληθοῦς διασκεδάννυται, τῇ δὲ χρήσει τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκβιαζόμενον φυγαδεύεται.

78.1 Ἱερεμίας δὲ ὁ προφήτης ὁ πάνσοφος, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐν Ἱερεμίᾳ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐπιδείκνυσι τὸν θεόν. "Θεὸς ἐγγίζων ἐγώ εἰμι", φησί, "καὶ οὐχὶ θεὸς πόρρωθεν. Εἰ ποιήσει τι ἄνθρωπος ἐν κρυφαίοις, καὶ ἐγὼ οὐκ ὄψομαι αὐτόν; Οὐχὶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὴν γῆν ἐγὼ πληρῶ; Λέγει κύριος.**78.2** " Πάλιν δὲ αὖ διὰ Ἡσαΐου "Τίς μετρήσει", φησί, "τὸν οὐρανὸν σπιθαμῇ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν δρακί;" Ὅρα τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ καταπλάγηθι. Τοῦτον προσκυνήσωμεν, ἐφ᾽ οὗ φησιν ὁ προφήτης "ἀπὸ προσώπου σου ὄρη τακήσονται, ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου πυρὸς τήκεται κηρός." Οὗτος, φησίν, ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, "οὗ θρόνος μέν ἐστιν ὁ οὐρανός, ὑποπόδιον δὲ ἡ γῆ", "ὃς ἐὰν ἀνοίξῃ τὸν οὐρανόν, τρόμος σε λήψεται. **78.3** " Βούλει καὶ περὶ τῶν εἰδώλων ἀκοῦσαι τί φησιν προφήτης οὗτος; "Παραδειγματισθήσονται ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ ἔσται τὰ θνησιμαῖα αὐτῶν βρώματα τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς, καὶ σαπήσεται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ τῆς σελήνης, ἃ αὐτοὶ ἠγάπησαν καὶ οἷς αὐτοὶ ἐδούλευσαν, καὶ ἐμπρησθήσεται ἡ πόλις αὐτῶν. **78.4** "Φθαρήσεσθαι δὲ καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ τὸν κόσμον σὺν καὶ αὐτοῖς λέγει· "ἡ γῆ", φησί, "παλαιωθήσεται καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς παρελεύσεται", "τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα."

79.1 Τί δὲ ὅταν πάλιν ἑαυτὸν δεικνύναι ὁ θεὸς βουληθῇ διὰ Μωυσέως; "᾽Ίδετε ἴδετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι καὶ οὐκ ἔστι θεὸς ἕτερος πλὴν ἐμοῦ. Ἐγὼ ἀποκτενῶ καὶ ζῆν ποιήσω· πατάξω κἀγὼ ἰάσομαι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὃς ἐξελεῖται ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν μου." **79.2** Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑτέρου ἐπακοῦσαι θέλεις χρησμῳδοῦ; Ἔχεις τὸν χορὸν πάντα τὸν προφητικόν, τοὺς συνθιασώτας τοῦ Μωυσέως. Τί φησιν αὐτοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ Ὡσηέ; Οὐκ ὀκνήσω λέγειν "ἰδού, ἐγὼ στερεῶν βροντὴν καὶ κτίζων πνεῦμα", οὗ αἱ χεῖρες τὴν στρατιὰν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐθεμελίωσαν. **79.3** Ἔτι δὲ καὶ διὰ Ἡσαΐου (καὶ ταύτην ἀπομνημονεύσω σοι τὴν φωνήν)· "ἐγώ εἰμι, ἐγώ εἰμι", φησίν, "ὁ κύριος ὁ λαλῶν δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀναγγέλλων ἀλήθειαν· συνάχθητε καὶ ἥκετε· βουλεύσασθε ἅμα, οἱ σῳζόμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν. Οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ αἴροντες τὸ ξύλον γλύμμα αὐτῶν, καὶ προσευχόμενοι θεοῖς οἳ οὐ σώσουσιν αὐτούς." **79.4** Εἶθ᾽ ὑποβάς "ἐγώ", φησίν, "ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι πλὴν ἐμοῦ δίκαιος, καὶ σωτὴρ οὐκ ἔστι πάρεξ ἐμοῦ· ἐπιστράφητε πρός με καὶ σωθήσεσθε οἱ ἀπ᾽ ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς. Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος· κατ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ ὀμνύω." **79.5** Τοῖς δὲ εἰδωλολάτραις δυσχεραίνει λέγων "τίνι ὡμοιώσατε κύριον; ἢ τίνι ὁμοιώματι ὡμοιώσατε αὐτόν; Μὴ εἰκόνα ἐποίησεν τέκτων, ἢ χρυσοχόος χωνεύσας χρυσίον περιεχρύσωσεν αὐτόν;" Καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις. **79.6** Μὴ οὖν ἔτι ὑμεῖς εἰδωλολάτραι; Ἀλλὰ κἂν νῦν φυλάξασθε τὰς ἀπειλάς· ὀλολύξει γὰρ τὰ γλυπτὰ καὶ τὰ χειροποίητα, μᾶλλον δὲ οἱ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς πεποιθότες, ἀναίσθητος

γὰρ ἡ ὕλη. Ἔτι φησίν· "ὁ κύριος σείσει πόλεις κατοικουμένας καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην καταλήψεται τῇ χειρὶ ὡς νοσσιάν."

80.1 Τί <δ' εἰ> σοι[35] σοφίας ἀναγγέλλω μυστήρια καὶ ῥήσεις ἐκ παιδὸς Ἑβραίου σεσοφισμένου; "Κύριος ἔκτισέν με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ", καὶ "Κύριος δίδωσι σοφίαν καὶ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ γνῶσις καὶ σύνεσις". **80.2** "Ἕως πότε, ὀκνηρέ, κατάκεισαι; Πότε δὲ ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθήσῃ; Ἐὰν δὲ ἄοκνος ᾖς, ἥξει σοι ὥσπερ πηγὴ ὁ ἄμητός σου", ὁ λόγος ὁ πατρικός, ὁ ἀγαθὸς λύχνος, ὁ κύριος ἐπάγων τὸ φῶς, τὴν πίστιν πᾶσι καὶ σωτηρίαν. **80.3** "Κύριος" γὰρ "ὁ ποιήσας τὴν γῆν ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ," ὡς φησιν Ἰερεμίας, "ἀνώρθωσεν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ." Ἀποπεσόντας γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰ εἴδωλα ἡ σοφία, ἥ ἐστιν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ, ἀνορθοῖ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. **80.4** Καὶ αὕτη πρώτη τοῦ παραπτώματος ἀνάστασις· ὅθεν ἀποτρέπων εἰδωλολατρείας ἁπάσης ὁ θεσπέσιος παγκάλως ἀνακέκραγε Μωυσῆς· "Ἄκουε Ἰσραήλ· κύριος ὁ θεός σου, κύριος εἷς ἐστι", καὶ "κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις"· **80.5** νῦν δὴ οὖν σύνετε, ὦ ἄνθρωποι, κατὰ τὸν μακάριον ψαλμῳδὸν ἐκεῖνον τὸν Δαβίδ· "Δράξασθε παιδείας, μή ποτε ὀργισθῇ κύριος, καὶ ἀπολεῖσθε ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαίας, ὅταν ἐκκαυθῇ ἐν τάχει ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ. Μακάριοι πάντες οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπ' αὐτῷ."

81.1 Ἤδη δὲ ὑπεροικτείρων ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος τὸ σωτήριον ἐνδίδωσι μέλος, οἷον ἐμβατήριον ῥυθμόν· "Υἱοὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἕως πότε βαρυκάρδιοι; Ἵνα τί ἀγαπᾶτε ματαιότητα καὶ ζητεῖτε ψεῦδος;" Τίς οὖν ἡ ματαιότης καὶ τί τὸ ψεῦδος; **81.2** Ὁ ἅγιος ἀπόστολος τοῦ κυρίου τοὺς Ἕλληνας αἰτιώμενος ἐξηγήσεταί σοι· "ὅτι γνόντες τὸν θεὸν οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ηὐχαρίστησαν, ἀλλ' ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἤλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα." **81.3** Καὶ μὴν ὅ γε θεὸς οὗτος, ὃς "ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησε τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν"· σὺ δὲ τὸν μὲν θεὸν οὐ νοεῖς, τὸν δὲ οὐρανὸν προσκυνεῖς, καὶ πῶς οὐκ ἀσεβεῖς; **81.4** Ἄκουε πάλιν προφήτου λέγοντος "ἐκλείψει μὲν ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς σκοτισθήσεται, λάμψει δὲ ὁ παντοκράτωρ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται καὶ οἱ οὐρανοὶ εἰλιγήσονται ὡς δέρρις ἐκτεινόμενοι καὶ συστελλόμενοι" (αὗται γὰρ αἱ προφητικαὶ φωναί) "καὶ ἡ γῆ φεύξεται ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου."

9.82.1 Καὶ μυρίας ἂν ἔχοιμί σοι γραφὰς παραφέρειν, ὧν οὐδὲ "κεραία παρελεύσεται μία", μὴ οὐχὶ ἐπιτελὴς γενομένη· "τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου", τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, "ἐλάλησεν ταῦτα." "Μὴ τοίνυν μηκέτι," φησίν, "υἱέ μου, ὀλιγώρει παιδείας κυρίου, μηδ' ἐκλύου ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχόμενος." **82.2** Ὦ τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης φιλανθρωπίας· οὐδ' ὡς μαθηταῖς ὁ διδάσκαλος οὐδ' ὡς οἰκέταις ὁ κύριος οὐδ' ὡς θεὸς ἀνθρώποις, "πατὴρ δὲ ὡς ἤπιος" νουθετεῖ υἱούς. **82.3** Εἶτα Μωυσῆς μὲν ὁμολογεῖ "ἔμφοβος εἶναι καὶ ἔντρομος", ἀκούων περὶ τοῦ λόγου, σὺ δὲ τοῦ λόγου ἀκροώμενος τοῦ θείου οὐ δέδιας; Οὐκ ἀγωνιᾷς; Οὐχὶ ἅμα τε εὐλαβῇ καὶ σπεύδεις ἐκμαθεῖν, τουτέστι σπεύδεις εἰς σωτηρίαν, φοβούμενος τὴν ὀργήν, ἀγαπήσας τὴν χάριν, ζηλώσας τὴν ἐλπίδα,

---

[35] τι σοι P : τι <δ' οὐ> σοι Marcovich : <ἔ>τι σοι Stählin

ἵνα ἐκκλίνῃς τὴν κρίσιν; **82.4** Ἥκετε ἥκετε, ὦ νεολαία ἡ ἐμή· "ἢν γὰρ μὴ αὖθις ὡς τὰ παιδία γένησθε καὶ ἀναγεννηθῆτε," ὥς φησιν ἡ γραφή, τὸν ὄντως ὄντα πατέρα οὐ μὴ ἀπολάβητε, "οὐδ' οὐ μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθέ ποτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν." **82.5** Πῶς γὰρ εἰσελθεῖν ἐπιτέτραπται τῷ ξένῳ; Ἀλλ' ὅταν, οἶμαι, ἐγγραφῇ καὶ πολιτευθῇ καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἀπολάβῃ, τότε "ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς" γενήσεται, τότε κληρονομῆσαι καταξιωθήσεται, τότε τῆς βασιλείας τῆς πατρῴας κοινωνήσει τῷ γνησίῳ[36], τῷ "ἠγαπημένῳ". **82.6** Αὕτη γὰρ ἡ πρωτότοκος ἐκκλησία ἡ ἐκ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν συγκειμένη παιδίων· ταῦτ' ἔστι τὰ "πρωτότοκα τὰ ἐναπογεγραμμένα ἐν οὐρανοῖς" καὶ τοσαύταις "μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων" συμπανηγυρίζοντα· **82.7** πρωτότοκοι δὲ παῖδες ἡμεῖς οἱ τρόφιμοι τοῦ θεοῦ, οἱ τοῦ "πρωτοτόκου" γνήσιοι φίλοι, οἱ πρῶτοι τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων τὸν θεὸν νενοηκότες, οἱ πρῶτοι τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπεσπασμένοι, οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ διαβόλου κεχωρισμένοι.

83 1 Νυνὶ δὲ τοσούτῳ τινές εἰσιν ἀθεώτεροι, ὅσῳ φιλανθρωπότερος ὁ θεός· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ δούλων υἱοὺς ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι βούλεται, οἳ δὲ καὶ υἱοὶ γενέσθαι ὑπερηφανήκασιν. Ὦ τῆς ἀπονοίας τῆς πολλῆς·**83.2** τὸν κύριον ἐπαισχύνεσθε. Ἐλευθερίαν ἐπαγγέλλεται, ὑμεῖς δὲ εἰς δουλείαν ἀποδιδράσκετε. Σωτηρίαν χαρίζεται, ὑμεῖς δὲ εἰς θάνατον[37] ὑποφέρεσθε. Ζωὴν δωρεῖται αἰώνιον, ὑμεῖς δὲ τὴν κόλασιν ἀναμένετε, καὶ "τὸ πῦρ" δὲ προσκοπεῖτε, "ὃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ κύριος τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ." **83.3** Διὰ τοῦτο ὁ μακάριος ἀπόστολος "μαρτύρομαι ἐν κυρίῳ," φησίν, "μηκέτι ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν, καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν, ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ ὄντες καὶ ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ, διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν τὴν οὖσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὴν πώρωσιν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν· οἵτινες ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν ἀπηλγηκότες τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης καὶ πλεονεξίας."

84 1 Τοιούτου μάρτυρος ἐλέγχοντος τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἄνοιαν καὶ θεὸν ἐπιβοωμένου, τί δὴ ἕτερον ὑπολείπεται τοῖς ἀπίστοις ἢ κρίσις καὶ καταδίκη; Οὐ κάμνει δὲ ὁ κύριος παραινῶν, ἐκφοβῶν, προτρέπων, διεγείρων, νουθετῶν· ἀφυπνίζει γέ τοι καὶ τοῦ σκότους αὐτοῦ τοὺς πεπλανημένους διανίστησιν· **84.2** "ἔγειρε," φησίν, "ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστὸς κύριος," ὁ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἥλιος, ὁ "πρὸ ἑωσφόρου" γεννώμενος, ὁ ζωὴν χαρισάμενος ἀκτῖσιν ἰδίαις. **84.3** Μὴ οὖν περιφρονείτω τις τοῦ λόγου, μὴ λάθῃ καταφρονῶν ἑαυτοῦ. Λέγει γάρ που ἡ γραφή· "σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκληρύνητε τοῦ καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οὗ ἐπείρασαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ." **84.4** Ἡ δὲ δοκιμασία τίς ἐστιν εἰ θέλεις μαθεῖν, τὸ ἅγιόν σοι πνεῦμα ἐξηγήσεται· "καὶ εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου," φησί, "τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη· διὸ προσώχθισα τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ καὶ εἶπον· ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ· αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς ὁδούς μου, ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου· **1**εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου." **84.5** Ὁρᾶτε τὴν ἀπειλήν· ὁρᾶτε τὴν προτροπήν· ὁρᾶτε τὴν τιμήν· τί δὴ οὖν ἔτι τὴν χάριν εἰς ὀργὴν μεταλλάσσομεν καὶ οὐχὶ ἀναπεπταμέναις ταῖς ἀκοαῖς καταδεχόμενοι τὸν λόγον ἐν ἁγναῖς ξενοδοχοῦμεν ταῖς ψυχαῖς τὸν θεόν; Μεγάλη γὰρ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας αὐτοῦ ἡ χάρις, ἐὰν σήμερον τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ

---

[36] γνησίῳ <υἱῷ> Marcovich

[37] Stählin Marcovich : ἄν(θρωπ)ον P def. Festugière : ἀπώλειαν Sylburg.

ἀκούσωμεν· τὸ δὲ σήμερον καθ' ἑκάστην [αὐτοῦ] αὔξεται τὴν ἡμέραν, ἔστ' ἂν ἡ σήμερον ὀνομάζηται. **84.6** Μέχρι δὲ συντελείας καὶ ἡ σήμερον καὶ ἡ μάθησις διαμένει· καὶ τότε ἡ ὄντως σήμερον ἡ ἀνελλιπὴς τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμέρα τοῖς αἰῶσι συνεκτείνεται. Ἀεὶ οὖν τῆς φωνῆς ὑπακούωμεν τοῦ θείου λόγου· ἡ σήμερον γὰρ ἀίδιος· αἰώνων[38] ἐστὶν εἰκών, σύμβολον δὲ τοῦ φωτὸς ἡ ἡμέρα, φῶς δὲ ὁ λόγος ἀνθρώποις, δι' οὗ καταυγαζόμεθα τὸν θεόν.

85 1 Εἰκότως ἄρα πιστεύσασι μὲν καὶ ὑπακούουσιν ἡ χάρις ὑπερπλεονάσει, ἀπειθήσασι δὲ καὶ πλανωμένοις κατὰ καρδίαν, ὁδούς τε τὰς κυριακὰς μὴ ἐγνωκόσιν, ἃς εὐθείας ποιεῖν καὶ εὐτρεπίζειν παρήγγειλεν Ἰωάννης, τούτοις δὴ προσώχθισεν ὁ θεὸς καὶ ἀπειλεῖ· **85.2** καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς ἀπειλῆς αἰνιγματωδῶς ἀπειλήφασιν οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν Ἑβραίων πλανῆται· οὐ γὰρ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν λέγονται διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν, πρὶν ἢ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς κατακολουθήσαντας τῷ Μωυσέως διαδόχῳ ὀψέ ποτε ἔργῳ μαθεῖν, οὐκ ἂν ἄλλως σωθῆναι, μὴ οὐχὶ ὡς Ἰησοῦς πεπιστευκότας. **85.3** Φιλάνθρωπος δὲ ὢν ὁ κύριος πάντας ἀνθρώπους "εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας" παρακαλεῖ, ὁ τὸν παράκλητον ἀποστέλλων. Τίς οὖν ἡ ἐπίγνωσις; Θεοσέβεια· "θεοσέβεια δὲ πρὸς πάντα ὠφέλιμος" κατὰ τὸν Παῦλον, "ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχουσα ζωῆς τῆς νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης."**85.4** Πόσου, ὁμολογήσατε, ὦ ἄνθρωποι, εἰ ἐπιπράσκετο σωτηρία ἀίδιος, ὠνήσασθαι[39] ἄν; Οὐδὲ εἰ τὸν Πακτωλόν τις ὅλον, τοῦ χρυσίου τὸ ῥεῦμα τὸ μυθικόν, ἀπομετρῆσαι, ἀντάξιον σωτηρίας μισθὸν ἀριθμήσει.

86.1 Μὴ οὖν ἀποκάμητε· ἔξεστιν ὑμῖν, ἢν ἐθέλητε, ἐξωνήσασθαι τὴν πολυτίμητον σωτηρίαν οἰκείῳ θησαυρῷ, ἀγάπῃ καὶ πίστει, ζωῆς ὅς ἐστιν ἀξιόλογος μισθός. Ταύτην ἡδέως τὴν τιμὴν ὁ θεὸς λαμβάνει. "Ἠλπίκαμεν γὰρ ἐπὶ θεῷ ζῶντι, ὅς ἐστι σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν." **86.2** Οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι περιπεφυκότες τῷ κόσμῳ, οἷα φυκία τινὰ ἐνάλοις πέτραις, ἀθανασίας ὀλιγωροῦσιν, καθάπερ ὁ Ἰθακήσιος γέρων οὐ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τῆς ἐν οὐρανῷ πατρίδος, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος ἱμειρόμενοι φωτός, ἀλλὰ τοῦ καπνοῦ. Θεοσέβεια δὲ ἐξομοιοῦσα τῷ θεῷ κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν τὸν ἄνθρωπον κατάλληλον ἐπιγράφεται διδάσκαλον θεὸν τὸν καὶ μόνον ἀπεικάσαι κατ' ἀξίαν δυνάμενον ἄνθρωπον θεῷ.

87. 1 Ταύτην ὁ ἀπόστολος τὴν διδασκαλίαν θείαν ὄντως ἐπιστάμενος "σὺ δέ, ὦ Τιμόθεε," φησίν, "ἀπὸ βρέφους ἱερὰ γράμματα οἶδας, τὰ δυνάμενά σε σοφίσαι εἰς σωτηρίαν διὰ πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ." Ἱερὰ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς τὰ ἱεροποιοῦντα καὶ θεοποιοῦντα γράμματα, **87.2** ἐξ ὧν γραμμάτων καὶ συλλαβῶν τῶν ἱερῶν τὰς συγκειμένας γραφάς, τὰ συντάγματα, ὁ αὐτὸς ἀκολούθως ἀπόστολος "θεοπνεύστους" καλεῖ, "ὠφελίμους οὔσας πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς ἔλεγχον, πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν, πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ἵνα ἄρτιος ᾖ ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρτημένος." **87.3** Οὐκ ἄν τις οὕτως ἐκπλαγείη τῶν ἄλλων ἁγίων τὰς προτροπὰς ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν κύριον τὸν φιλάνθρωπον· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀλλ' ἢ τοῦτο ἔργον μόνον ἐστὶν αὐτῷ σώζεσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Βοᾷ γοῦν ἐπείγων εἰς σωτηρίαν αὐτὸς "ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν·" ἐπιστρέφει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους πλησιάζοντας τῷ φόβῳ. **87.4** Ταύτῃ καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος τοῦ κυρίου παρακαλῶν τοὺς Μακεδόνας ἑρμηνεὺς γίνεται

---

[38] Jackson Stählin : ἀΐδιος αἰών P Catena : ἀϊδίου αἰων<ος> Arcerius Marcovich

[39] P retinet Marcovich : ὠνήσασθε Jackson Stählin.

τῆς θείας φωνῆς, "ὁ κύριος ἤγγικεν" λέγων, "εὐλαβεῖσθε μὴ καταληφθῶμεν κενοί." Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐς τοσοῦτον ἀδεεῖς, μᾶλλον δὲ ἄπιστοι, μήτε αὐτῷ πειθόμενοι τῷ κυρίῳ μήτε τῷ Παύλῳ, καὶ ταῦτα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ δεομένῳ.

88 1 Γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ θεός." Ἡ πίστις εἰσάξει, ἡ πεῖρα διδάξει, ἡ γραφὴ παιδαγωγήσει "δεῦτε, ὦ τέκνα," λέγουσα, "ἀκούσατέ μου, φόβον κυρίου διδάξω ὑμᾶς." Εἶτα ὡς ἤδη πεπιστευκόσι συντόμως ἐπιλέγει "τίς ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὁ θέλων ζωήν, ἀγαπῶν ἡμέρας ἰδεῖν ἀγαθάς"; Ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν, φήσομεν, οἱ τἀγαθοῦ προσκυνηταί, οἱ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ζηλωταί. **88.2** Ἀκούσατε οὖν "οἱ μακράν," ἀκούσατε "οἱ ἐγγύς"· οὐκ ἀπεκρύβη τινὰς ὁ λόγος· φῶς ἐστι κοινόν, ἐπιλάμπει πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις· οὐδεὶς Κιμμέριος ἐν λόγῳ· σπεύσωμεν εἰς σωτηρίαν, ἐπὶ τὴν παλιγγενεσίαν· εἰς μίαν ἀγάπην[40] συναχθῆναι οἱ πολλοὶ κατὰ τὴν τῆς μοναδικῆς οὐσίας ἕνωσιν σπεύσωμεν. Ἀγαθοεργούμενοι ἀναλόγως ἑνότητα διώκωμεν, τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐκζητοῦντες μονάδα. **88.3** Ἡ δὲ ἐκ πολλῶν ἕνωσις ἐκ πολυφωνίας καὶ διασπορᾶς ἁρμονίαν λαβοῦσα θεϊκὴν μία γίνεται συμφωνία, ἑνὶ χορηγῷ[41] καὶ διδασκάλῳ τῷ λόγῳ ἑπομένη, ἐπ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀναπαυομένη, "Ἀββᾶ" λέγουσα "ὁ πατήρ"· ταύτην ὁ θεὸς τὴν φωνὴν τὴν ἀληθινὴν ἀσπάζεται παρὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ παίδων πρώτην καρπούμενος.

10 89 1 Ἀλλ' ἐκ πατέρων, φατέ, παραδεδομένον ἡμῖν ἔθος ἀνατρέπειν οὐκ εὔλογον. Καὶ τί δὴ οὐχὶ τῇ πρώτῃ τροφῇ, τῷ γάλακτι, χρώμεθα, ᾧ δήπουθεν συνείθισαν ἡμᾶς ἐκ γενετῆς αἱ τίτθαι; Τί δὲ αὐξάνομεν ἢ μειοῦμεν τὴν πατρῴαν οὐσίαν, καὶ οὐχὶ τὴν ἴσην, ὡς παρειλήφαμεν, διαφυλάττομεν; Τί δὲ οὐκέτι τοῖς κόλποις τοῖς πατρῴοις ἐναποβλύζομεν, ἢ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα, ἃ νηπιάζοντες ὑπὸ μητράσιν τε ἐκτρεφόμενοι γέλωτα ὤφλομεν, ἐπιτελοῦμεν ἔτι, ἀλλὰ σφᾶς αὐτούς, καὶ εἰ μὴ παιδαγωγῶν ἐτύχομεν ἀγαθῶν, ἐπανωρθώσαμεν;

89. 2 Εἶτα ἐπὶ τῶν πάτων[42] αἱ παρεκβάσεις καίτοι ἐπιζήμιοι καὶ ἐπισφαλεῖς οὖσαι, ὅμως γλυκεῖαί πως προσπίπτουσιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ βίου οὐχὶ τὸ ἔθος καταλιπόντες τὸ πονηρὸν καὶ ἐμπαθὲς καὶ ἄθεον, κἂν οἱ πατέρες χαλεπαίνωσιν, ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐκκλινοῦμεν καὶ τὸν ὄντως ὄντα πατέρα ἐπιζητήσομεν, οἷον δηλητήριον φάρμακον τὴν συνήθειαν ἀπωσάμενοι; **89.3** Τοῦτ' αὐτὸ γάρ τοι τὸ κάλλιστον τῶν ἐγχειρουμένων ἐστίν, ὑποδεῖξαι ὑμῖν ὡς ἀπὸ μανίας καὶ τοῦ τρισαθλίου τούτου ἔθους ἐμισήθη ἡ θεοσέβεια· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐμισήθη ποτὲ ἢ ἀπηγορεύθη ἀγαθὸν τοσοῦτον, οὗ μεῖζον οὐδὲν ἐκ θεοῦ δεδώρηταί πω τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γενέσει, εἰ μὴ συναρπαζόμενοι τῷ ἔθει, εἶτα μέντοι ἀποβύσαντες τὰ ὦτα ἡμῖν, οἷον ἵπποι σκληραύχενες ἀφηνιάζοντες, τοὺς χαλινοὺς ἐνδακόντες, ἀποφεύγετε τοὺς λόγους, ἀποσείσασθαι μὲν τοὺς ἡνιόχους ὑμῶν τοῦ βίου ἡμᾶς ἐπιποθοῦντες, ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς κρημνοὺς τῆς ἀπωλείας ὑπὸ τῆς ἀνοίας φερόμενοι ἐναγῆ τὸν ἅγιον ὑπολαμβάνετε τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον.

90.1 Ἕπεται τοιγαροῦν ὑμῖν κατὰ τὸν Σοφοκλέα τὰ ἐπίχειρα τῆς ἐκλογῆς,
νοῦς φροῦδος, ὦτα ἀχρεῖα, φροντίδες κεναί,

---

[40] P : ἀγέλην coni. Stählin
[41] χορηγῷ Jackson edd: χορευτῇ P
[42] πάτων Casel Stählin Marcovich : πλόων Cobet : παίδων Schwartz : P παθῶν defensuit Galloni.

καὶ οὐκ ἴστε ὡς παντὸς μᾶλλον τοῦτο ἀληθές, ὅτι ἄρα οἱ μὲν ἀγαθοὶ καὶ θεοσεβεῖς ἀγαθῆς τῆς ἀμοιβῆς τεύξονται τάγαθὸν τετιμηκότες, οἱ δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων πονηροὶ τῆς καταλλήλου τιμωρίας, καὶ τῷ γε ἄρχοντι τῆς κακίας ἐπήρτηται κόλασις. **90.2** Ἀπειλεῖ γοῦν αὐτῷ ὁ προφήτης Ζαχαρίας "ἐπιτιμήσαι ἐν σοὶ ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὴν Ἰερουσαλήμ· οὐκ ἰδοὺ τοῦτο δαλὸς ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρός;" Τίς οὖν ἔτι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὄρεξις ἔγκειται θανάτου ἑκουσίου; Τί δὲ τῷ δαλῷ τῷ θανατηφόρῳ τούτῳ προσπεφεύγασιν, μεθ' οὗ καταφλεχθήσονται, ἐξὸν βιῶναι καλῶς κατὰ τὸν θεόν, οὐ κατὰ τὸ ἔθος; **90.3** Θεὸς μὲν γὰρ ζωὴν χαρίζεται, ἔθος δὲ πονηρὸν μετὰ τὴν ἐνθένδε ἀπαλλαγὴν μετάνοιαν κενὴν ἅμα τιμωρίᾳ προστρίβεται, "παθὼν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω", ὡς ἀπολλύει δεισιδαιμονία καὶ σῴζει θεοσέβεια.

91.1 Ἰδέτω τις ὑμῶν τοὺς παρὰ τοῖς εἰδώλοις[43] λατρεύοντας, κόμῃ ῥυπῶντας, ἐσθῆτι πιναρᾷ καὶ κατερρωγυίᾳ καθυβρισμένους, λουτρῶν μὲν παντάπασιν ἀπειράτους, ταῖς δὲ τῶν ὀνύχων ἀκμαῖς ἐκτεθηριωμένους, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ τῶν αἰδοίων ἀφῃρημένους, ἔργῳ δεικνύντας τῶν εἰδώλων τὰ τεμένη τάφους τινὰς ἢ δεσμωτήρια· οὗτοί μοι δοκοῦσι πενθεῖν, οὐ θρησκεύειν τοὺς θεούς, ἐλέου μᾶλλον ἢ θεοσεβείας ἄξια πεπονθότες. **91.2** Καὶ ταῦτα ὁρῶντες ἔτι τυφλώττετε καὶ οὐχὶ πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην τῶν πάντων καὶ κύριον τῶν ὅλων ἀναβλέψετε; Οὐχὶ δὲ καταφεύξεσθε, ἐκ τῶν ἐνταῦθα δεσμωτηρίων ἐκφεύγοντες, ἐπὶ τὸν ἔλεον τὸν ἐξ οὐρανῶν;

91.3 Ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἐκ πολλῆς τῆς φιλανθρωπίας ἀντέχεται τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὥσπερ ἐκ καλιᾶς ἐκπίπτοντος νεοττοῦ ἡ μήτηρ ὄρνις ἐφίπταται· εἰ δέ που καὶ θηρίον ἑρπηστικὸν περιχάνοι τῷ νεοττῷ,

μήτηρ δ' ἀμφιποτᾶται ὀδυρομένη φίλα τέκνα·

ὁ δὲ θεὸς πατὴρ καὶ ζητεῖ τὸ πλάσμα καὶ ἰᾶται τὸ παράπτωμα καὶ διώκει τὸ θηρίον καὶ τὸν νεοττὸν αὖθις ἀναλαμβάνει ἐπὶ τὴν καλιὰν ἀναπτῆναι παρορμῶν.

92.1 Εἶτα κύνες μὲν ἤδη πεπλανημένοι ὀδμαῖς ῥινηλατοῦντες ἐξίχνευσαν τὸν δεσπότην καὶ ἵπποι τὸν ἀναβάτην ἀποσεισάμενοι ἑνί που συρίγματι ὑπήκουσαν τῷ δεσπότῃ· "ἔγνω δέ", φησί, "βοῦς τὸν κτησάμενον καὶ ὄνος τὴν φάτνην τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ, Ἰσραὴλ δέ με οὐκ ἔγνω." Τί οὖν ὁ κύριος; **92.2** Οὐ μνησικακεῖ, ἔτι ἐλεεῖ, ἔτι τὴν μετάνοιαν ἀπαιτεῖ. Ἐρέσθαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰ οὐκ ἄτοπον ὑμῖν δοκεῖ πλάσμα ὑμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιγεγονότας τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν εἰληφότας καὶ ὄντας ὅλως τοῦ θεοῦ ἑτέρῳ δουλεύειν δεσπότῃ, πρὸς δὲ καὶ θεραπεύειν ἀντὶ μὲν τοῦ βασιλέως τὸν τύραννον, ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τὸν πονηρόν. **92.3** Τίς γάρ, ὦ πρὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, σωφρονῶν γε τάγαθὸν καταλείπων κακίᾳ σύνεστιν; Τίς δὲ ὅστις τὸν θεὸν ἀποφεύγων δαιμονίοις συμβιοῖ; Τίς δὲ υἱὸς εἶναι δυνάμενος τοῦ θεοῦ δουλεύειν ᾔδεται; Ἢ τίς οὐρανοῦ πολίτης εἶναι δυνάμενος ἔρεβος διώκει, ἐξὸν παράδεισον γεωργεῖν καὶ οὐρανὸν περιπολεῖν καὶ τῆς ζωτικῆς καὶ ἀκηράτου μεταλαμβάνειν πηγῆς, κατ' ἴχνος ἐκείνης τῆς φωτεινῆς ἀεροβατοῦντα νεφέλης, ὥσπερ ὁ Ἠλίας, θεωροῦντα τὸν ὑετὸν σωτήριον; **92.4** Οἱ δὲ σκωλήκων δίκην περὶ τέλματα καὶ βορβόρους, τὰ ἡδονῆς ῥεύματα, καλινδούμενοι ἀνονήτους καὶ ἀνοήτους ἐκβόσκονται τρυφάς, ὑώδεις τινὲς ἄνθρωποι. Ὕες γάρ, φησίν, "ἥδονται βορβόρῳ" μᾶλλον ἢ καθαρῷ ὕδατι

---

[43] P : παρὰ del Heyse : παρὰ τοῖς <Ἕλλησιν> εἰδώλοις Marcovich

καὶ "ἐπὶ φορυτῷ μαργαίνουσιν" κατὰ Δημόκριτον. **92.5** Μὴ δῆτα οὖν, μὴ δῆτα ἐξανδραποδισθῶμεν μηδὲ ὑώδεις γενώμεθα, ἀλλ' "ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς" γνήσια ἀναθρήσωμεν καὶ ἀναβλέψωμεν εἰς τὸ φῶς, μὴ νόθους ἡμᾶς ἐξελέγξῃ ὁ κύριος ὥσπερ ὁ ἥλιος τοὺς ἀετούς.

93 1 Μετανοήσωμεν οὖν καὶ μεταστῶμεν ἐξ ἀμαθίας εἰς ἐπιστήμην, ἐξ ἀφροσύνης εἰς φρόνησιν, ἐξ ἀκρασίας εἰς ἐγκράτειαν, ἐξ ἀδικίας εἰς δικαιοσύνην, ἐξ ἀθεότητος εἰς θεόν. **93.2** Καλὸς ὁ κίνδυνος αὐτομολεῖν πρὸς θεόν. Πολλῶν δὲ καὶ ἄλλων ἔστιν ἀπολαῦσαι ἀγαθῶν τοὺς δικαιοσύνης ἐραστάς, οἳ τὴν ἀίδιον διώκομεν σωτηρίαν, ἀτὰρ δὴ καὶ ὧν αὐτὸς αἰνίττεται ὁ θεὸς διὰ Ἡσαΐου λαλῶν "ἔστι κληρονομία τοῖς θεραπεύουσι κύριον"· **93.3** καλή γε καὶ ἐράσμιος ἡ κληρονομία, οὐ χρυσίον, οὐκ ἄργυρος, οὐκ ἐσθής, τὰ τῆς γῆς, ἔνθα που σὴς καὶ λῃστής[44] που καταδύεται περὶ τὸν χαμαίζηλον πλοῦτον ὀφθαλμιῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος ὁ θησαυρὸς τῆς σωτηρίας, πρὸς ὅν γε ἐπείγεσθαι χρὴ φιλολόγους γενομένους, συναπαίρει δὲ ἡμῖν ἐνθένδε τὰ ἔργα τὰ ἀστεῖα καὶ συνίπταται τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας πτερῷ.

94 1 Ταύτην ἡμῖν τὴν κληρονομίαν ἐγχειρίζει ἡ ἀίδιος διαθήκη τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ἀίδιον δωρεὰν χορηγοῦσα· ὁ δὲ φιλόστοργος οὗτος ἡμῶν πατήρ, ὁ ὄντως πατήρ, οὐ παύεται προτρέπων, νουθετῶν, παιδεύων, φιλῶν· οὐδὲ γὰρ σῴζων παύεται, συμβουλεύει δὲ τὰ ἄριστα· "δίκαιοι γένεσθε, λέγει κύριος· οἱ διψῶντες πορεύεσθε ἐφ' ὕδωρ, καὶ ὅσοι μὴ ἔχετε ἀργύριον, βαδίσατε καὶ ἀγοράσατε καὶ πίετε ἄνευ ἀργυρίου." **94.2** Ἐπὶ τὸ λουτρόν, ἐπὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν, ἐπὶ τὸν φωτισμὸν παρακαλεῖ μονονουχὶ βοῶν καὶ λέγων· γῆν σοι δίδωμι καὶ θάλατταν, παιδίον, οὐρανόν τε καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντα ζῷά σοι χαρίζομαι· μόνον, ὦ παιδίον, δίψησον τοῦ πατρός, ἀμισθεί σοι δειχθήσεται ὁ θεός· οὐ καπηλεύεται ἡ ἀλήθεια, δίδωσί σοι καὶ τὰ πτηνὰ καὶ τὰ νηκτὰ καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· ταῦτά σου ταῖς εὐχαρίστοις τρυφαῖς δεδημιούργηκεν ὁ πατήρ. **94.3** Ἀργυρίῳ μὲν ὠνήσεται ὁ νόθος, ἀπωλείας ἐστὶ παιδίον, ὃς "μαμωνᾷ δουλεύειν" προῄρηται, σοὶ δὲ τὰ σὰ ἐπιτρέπει, τῷ γνησίῳ λέγω, τῷ φιλοῦντι τὸν πατέρα, δι' ὃν ἔτι ἐργάζεται, ᾧ μόνῳ καὶ ὑπισχνεῖται λέγων· "καὶ ἡ γῆ οὐ πραθήσεται εἰς βεβαίωσιν·" οὐ γὰρ κυροῦται τῇ φθορᾷ· "ἐμὴ γάρ ἐστιν πᾶσα ἡ γῆ," ἔστι δὲ καὶ σή, ἐὰν ἀπολάβῃς τὸν θεόν. **94.4** Ὅθεν ἡ γραφὴ εἰκότως εὐαγγελίζεται τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν· "οἱ δὲ ἅγιοι κυρίου κληρονομήσουσι τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ." Ποίαν, ὦ μακάριε, δόξαν, εἰπέ μοι· "ἣν ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν οὐδὲ οὖς ἤκουσεν, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη· καὶ χαρήσονται ἐπὶ τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ κυρίου αὐτῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν."

95 1 Ἔχετε, ὦ ἄνθρωποι, τὴν θείαν τῆς χάριτος ἐπαγγελίαν, ἀκηκόατε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην τῆς κολάσεως ἀπειλήν, δι' ὧν ὁ κύριος σῴζει, φόβῳ καὶ χάριτι παιδαγωγῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον· τί μέλλομεν; Τί οὐκ ἐκκλίνομεν τὴν κόλασιν; Τί οὐ καταδεχόμεθα τὴν δωρεάν; Τί δὲ οὐχ αἱρούμεθα τὰ βελτίονα, θεὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ, καὶ σοφίαν εἰδωλολατρείας προκρίνομεν, καὶ ζωὴν ἀντικαταλλασσόμενοι θανάτου; **95.2** "Ἰδοὺ τέθεικα πρὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν", φησί, "τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὴν ζωήν." Πειράζει σε ὁ κύριος ἐκλέξασθαι τὴν ζωήν, συμβουλεύει σοι ὡς πατὴρ πείθεσθαι τῷ θεῷ. "Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀκούσητέ μου", φησί, "καὶ θελήσητε, τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῆς γῆς φάγεσθε," ὑπακοῆς ἡ χάρις· "ἐὰν δὲ μὴ

---

[44] Markland Mondésert et Marcovich : καὶ τὰ τῆς γῆς λῃστής P : τὰ τῆς γῆς del Stählin

ὑπακούσητέ μου μηδὲ θελήσητε, μάχαιρα ὑμᾶς καὶ πῦρ κατέδεται," παρακοῆς ἡ κρίσις. "Τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησεν ταῦτα"· νόμος ἀληθείας λόγος κυρίου· βούλεσθε ὑμῖν ἀγαθὸς γένωμαι σύμβουλος; **95.3** Ἀλλ᾽ ὑμεῖς μὲν ἀκούσατε· ἐγὼ δέ, εἰ δυνατόν, ἐνδείξομαι. Ἐχρῆν μὲν ὑμᾶς, ὦ ἄνθρωποι, αὐτοῦ πέρι ἐννοουμένους τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἔμφυτον ἐπάγεσθαι πίστιν, μάρτυρα ἀξιόχρεων αὐτόθεν οἴκοθεν, περιφανῶς αἱρουμένην τὸ βέλτιστον, μηδὲ ζητεῖν εἰ μεταδιωκτέον, ‹τὸ δ᾽ ἀγαθὸν› ἐκπονεῖν. **95.4** Καὶ γὰρ εἴ τῳ μεθυστέον, φέρε εἰπεῖν, ἀμφιβάλλειν χρή· ὑμεῖς δὲ πρὶν ἢ ἐπισκέψασθαι μεθύετε· καὶ εἰ ὑβριστέον, οὐ πολυπραγμονεῖτε, ἀλλ᾽ ᾗ τάχος ὑβρίζετε. Μόνον δ᾽ ἄρα εἰ θεοσεβητέον, ζητεῖτε, καὶ εἰ τῷ σοφῷ τούτῳ [δὴ] τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ κατακολουθητέον, τοῦτο δὴ βουλῆς καὶ σκέψεως ἀξιοῦτε, οὐδ᾽ ὃ πρέπει θεῷ, ὅ τι ποτέ ἐστι, νενοηκότες.

96 1 Πιστεύσατε ἡμῖν κἂν ὡς μέθῃ, ἵνα σωφρονήσητε· πιστεύσατε κἂν ὡς ὕβρει, ἵνα ζήσητε. Εἰ δὲ ‹μὴ›[45] πείθεσθαι βούλεσθε τὴν ἐναργῆ τῶν ἀρητῶν[46] ὑποπτεύσαντες[47] πίστιν, φέρε ὑμῖν ἐκ περιουσίας τὴν περὶ τοῦ λόγου παραθήσομαι πειθώ. **96.2** Ὑμεῖς δέ, οὐ γὰρ τὰ πάτρια ὑμᾶς ἔτι τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπασχολεῖ ἔθη προκατηχημένους, ἀκούοιτ᾽ ἂν ἤδη τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο ὅπως ἔχει· καὶ δὴ μή τις ὑμᾶς τοῦδε τοῦ ὀνόματος αἰσχύνη προκαταλαμβανέτω, "ἥτ᾽ ἄνδρας μέγα σίνεται," παρατρέπουσα σωτηρίας. **96.3** Ἀποδυσάμενοι δ᾽ οὖν περιφανῶς ἐν τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας σταδίῳ γνησίως ἀγωνιζώμεθα, βραβεύοντος μὲν τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἁγίου, ἀγωνοθετοῦντος δὲ τοῦ δεσπότου τῶν ὅλων. Οὐ γὰρ σμικρὸν ἡμῖν τὸ ἆθλον ἀθανασία πρόκειται. **96.4** Μὴ οὖν ἔτι φροντίζετε μηδὲ [εἰ] ὀλίγον, τί ὑμᾶς ἀγορεύουσι[48] σύρφακές τινες ἀγοραῖοι, δεισιδαιμονίας ἄθεοι χορευταί, ἀνοίᾳ καὶ παρανοίᾳ ἐς αὐτὸ ὠθούμενοι τὸ βάραθρον, εἰδώλων ποιηταὶ καὶ λίθων προσκυνηταί· οἵδε γὰρ ἀνθρώπους ἀποθεοῦν τετολμήκασι, τρισκαιδέκατον Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Μακεδόνα ἀναγράφοντες θεόν, "ὃν Βαβυλὼν ἤλεγξε νεκρόν".

97. 1 Ἄγαμαι τοίνυν τὸν Χῖον[49] σοφιστήν, Θεόκριτος ὄνομα αὐτῷ· μετὰ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου τελευτὴν ἐπισκώπτων ὁ Θεόκριτος τὰς δόξας τὰς κενὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἃς εἶχον περὶ θεῶν, πρὸς τοὺς πολίτας "ἄνδρες," εἶπεν, "θαρρεῖτε ἄχρις ἂν ὁρᾶτε τοὺς θεοὺς πρότερον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀποθνήσκοντας." **97.2** Θεοὺς δὲ δὴ τοὺς ὁρατοὺς καὶ τὸν σύγκλυδα τῶν γενητῶν τούτων ὄχλον ὁ προσκυνῶν καὶ προσεταιριζόμενος, αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν δαιμόνων ἀθλιώτερος μακρῷ. "Θεὸς" γὰρ "οὐδαμῇ οὐδαμῶς ἄδικος" ὥσπερ οἱ δαίμονες, "ἀλλ᾽ ὡς οἷόν τε δικαιότατος, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ ὁμοιότερον οὐδὲν ἢ ὃς ἂν ἡμῶν γένηται ὅτι δικαιότατος." **97.3**

> Βᾶτ᾽ εἰς ὁδὸν δὴ πᾶς ὁ χειρῶναξ λεώς,
> οἳ τὴν Διὸς γοργῶπιν Ἐργάνην θεὸν
> στατοῖσι λίκνοις προστρέπεσθε,

ἠλίθιοι τῶν λίθων δημιουργοί τε καὶ προσκυνηταί.

---

[45] Potter : καὶ P retinere Stählin et Marcovich
[46] P retinui: ἀρρήτων Jackson Stählin : ἀρετῶν μητήρα Marcovich
[47] P : ἐποπτεύσαντες Potter Stählin et Marcovich
[48] ἀγορεύ‹σ›ουσι Jackson Marcovich
[49] Cobet edd : θεῖον P

98 1   Ὁ Φειδίας ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ Πολύκλειτος ἡκόντων Πραξιτέλης τε αὖ καὶ Ἀπελλῆς καὶ ὅσοι τὰς βαναύσους μετέρχονται τέχνας, γήινοι γῆς ὄντες ἐργάται. Τότε γάρ, φησί τις προφητεία, δυστυχήσειν τὰ τῇδε πράγματα, ὅταν ἀνδριᾶσι⁵⁰ πιστεύσωσιν. **98.2** Ἡκόντων οὖν αὖθις, οὐ γὰρ ἀνήσω καλῶν, οἱ μικροτέχναι. Οὐδείς που τούτων ἔμπνουν εἰκόνα δεδημιούργηκεν, οὐδὲ μὴν ἐκ γῆς μαλθακὴν ἐμάλαξε σάρκα. Τίς ἔτηξε μυελὸν ἢ τίς ἔπηξεν ὀστέα; Τίς νεῦρα διέτεινεν, τίς φλέβας ἐφύσησεν; Τίς αἷμα ἐνέχεεν ἐν αὐταῖς ἢ τίς δέρμα περιέτεινεν; Ποῦ δ' ἄν τις αὐτῶν ὀφθαλμοὺς ποιήσαι βλέποντας; Τίς ἐνεφύσησε ψυχήν; Τίς δικαιοσύνην ἐδωρήσατο; **98.3** Τίς ἀθανασίαν ὑπέσχηται; Μόνος ὁ τῶν ὅλων δημιουργός, ὁ "ἀριστοτέχνας πατήρ," τοιοῦτον ἄγαλμα ἔμψυχον ἡμᾶς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἔπλασεν· ὁ δὲ Ὀλύμπιος ὑμῶν, εἰκόνος εἰκών, πολύ τι τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπάδων, ἔργον ἐστὶ κωφὸν χειρῶν Ἀττικῶν. **98.4** "Εἰκὼν" μὲν γὰρ "τοῦ θεοῦ" ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ (καὶ υἱὸς τοῦ νοῦ γνήσιος ὁ θεῖος λόγος, φωτὸς ἀρχέτυπον φῶς), εἰκὼν δὲ τοῦ λόγου ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀληθινός, ὁ νοῦς ὁ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ, ὁ "κατ' εἰκόνα" τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ "καθ' ὁμοίωσιν" διὰ τοῦτο γεγενῆσθαι λεγόμενος, τῇ κατὰ καρδίαν φρονήσει τῷ θείῳ παρεικαζόμενος λόγῳ καὶ ταύτῃ λογικός. Ἀνθρώπου δὲ τοῦ ὁρωμένου τοῦ γηγενοῦς γήινος εἰκὼν τὰ ἀγάλματα ἀνδρείκελα, πόρρω τῆς ἀληθείας ἐπίκαιρον ἐκμαγεῖον, καταφαίνεται.

99 1   Οὐδὲν οὖν ἀλλ' ἢ μανίας ἔμπλεως ὁ βίος ἔδοξέ μοι γεγονέναι, τοσαύτῃ σπουδῇ περὶ τὴν ὕλην καταγινόμενος. Ἐπιτέτριπται δὲ ὑπὸ κενῆς δόξης ἡ συνήθεια δουλείας μὲν γεύσασα ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀλόγου περιεργασίας· **99.2** νομίμων δὲ ἀνόμων καὶ ἀπατηλῶν ὑποκρίσεων ἄγνοια αἰτία, ἢ δὴ † κατασκευασθεῖσα τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος κηρῶν ὀλεθρίων καὶ εἰδώλων ἐπιστυγῶν πολλὰς τῶν δαιμόνων ἐπινοήσασα μορφάς, κηλῖδα τοῖς ἑπομένοις αὐτῇ ἐναπεμάξατο θανάτου μακροῦ.

99.3 Λάβετε οὖν ὕδωρ λογικόν, λούσασθε οἱ μεμολυσμένοι, περιρράνατε αὑτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς συνηθείας ταῖς ἀληθιναῖς σταγόσιν· καθαροὺς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναβῆναι δεῖ. Ἄνθρωπος εἶ, τὸ κοινότατον, ἐπιζήτησον τὸν δημιουργήσαντά σε· υἱὸς εἶ, τὸ ἰδιαίτατον, ἀναγνώρισον τὸν πατέρα. **99.4** Σὺ δὲ ἔτι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις παραμένεις, προστετηκὼς ἡδοναῖς; Τίνι λαλήσει κύριος "ὑμῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν"; Ὑμῶν ἐστιν, ἐὰν θελήσητε, τῶν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὴν προαίρεσιν ἐσχηκότων· ὑμῶν, ἐὰν ἐθελήσητε πιστεῦσαι μόνον καὶ τῇ συντομίᾳ τοῦ κηρύγματος ἕπεσθαι, ἧς ὑπακούσαντες οἱ Νινευῖται τῆς προσδοκηθείσης ἁλώσεως μετανοίᾳ γνησίῳ τὴν καλὴν ἀντικατηλλάξαντο σωτηρίαν.

100 1   Πῶς οὖν ἀνέλθω, φησίν, εἰς οὐρανούς; "Ὁδός" ἐστιν ὁ κύριος, "στενὴ" μέν, ἀλλ' "ἐξ οὐρανῶν," στενὴ μέν, ἀλλ' εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναπέμπουσα· στενὴ ἐπὶ γῆς ὑπερορωμένη, πλατεῖα ἐν οὐρανοῖς προσκυνουμένη. **100.2 1** Εἶθ' ὁ μὲν ἄπυστος τοῦ λόγου συγγνώμην τῆς πλάνης ἔχει τὴν ἄγνοιαν, ὁ δὲ εἰς ὦτα βαλόμενος καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ ⟨παρακούσασ⟩ παρὰ τῆς γνώμης φέρει τὴν ἀπείθειαν, καὶ ὅσῳ γε φρονιμώτερος εἶναι δόξει, πρὸς κακοῦ ἡ σύνεσις αὐτῷ, ὅτι τῇ φρονήσει κέχρηται κατηγόρῳ τὸ βέλτιστον οὐχ ἑλόμενος· πέφυκε γὰρ ὡς ἄνθρωπος οἰκείως ἔχειν πρὸς θεόν. **100.3** Ὥσπερ οὖν τὸν ἵππον ἀροῦν οὐ

---

⁵⁰ ⟨ἄνθρωποι⟩ suppl.Marcovich.

βιαζόμεθα οὐδὲ τὸν ταῦρον κυνηγετεῖν, πρὸς ὃ πέφυκε δὲ ἕκαστον τῶν ζῴων περιέλκομεν, οὕτως ἀμέλει καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ τὴν οὐρανοῦ γενόμενον θέαν, "φυτὸν οὐράνιον" ὡς ἀληθῶς, ἐπὶ τὴν γνῶσιν παρακαλοῦμεν τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ οἰκεῖον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξαίρετον καὶ ἰδιωματικὸν παρὰ τὰ ἄλλα ζῷα κατειλημμένοι, αὔταρκες ἐφόδιον αἰώνων, θεοσέβειαν, παρασκευάζεσθαι συμβουλεύοντες. **100.4** Γεώργει, φαμέν, εἰ γεωργὸς εἶ, ἀλλὰ γνῶθι τὸν θεὸν γεωργόν[51], καὶ πλεῖθι ὁ τῆς ναυτιλίας ἐρῶν, ἀλλὰ τὸν οὐράνιον κυβερνήτην παρακαλῶν· στρατευόμενόν σε κατείληφεν ἡ γνῶσις· τοῦ δίκαια σημαίνοντος ἄκουε στρατηγοῦ.

101 1 Καθάπερ οὖν κάρῳ καὶ μέθῃ βεβαρημένοι ἀνανήψατε καὶ διαβλέψαντες ὀλίγον ἐννοήθητε, τί θέλουσιν ὑμῖν οἱ προσκυνούμενοι λίθοι καὶ ἃ περὶ τὴν ὕλην κενοσπούδως δαπανᾶτε· εἰς ἄγνοιαν [καὶ] τὰ χρήματα καὶ τὸν βίον ὡς τὸ ζῆν ὑμῶν εἰς θάνατον καταναλίσκετε, τοῦτο μόνον τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἐλπίδος εὑρόμενοι τὸ πέρας, οὐδὲ αὐτοὺς οἷοί τε ὄντες οἰκτεῖραι, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοῖς κατελεῶσιν ὑμᾶς τῆς πλάνης ἐπιτήδειοι πείθεσθαι γίνεσθε, συνηθείᾳ κακῇ δεδουλωμένοι, ἧς ἀπηρτημένοι αὐθαίρετοι μέχρι τῆς ἐσχάτης ἀναπνοῆς εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑποφέρεσθε· **101.2** "ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς," ἐξὸν ἀπομάξασθαι τὰ ἐμποδὼν τῇ σωτηρίᾳ καὶ τὸν τῦφον καὶ τὸν πλοῦτον καὶ τὸν φόβον, ἐπιφθεγγομένους τὸ ποιητικὸν δὴ τοῦτο·

πῇ δὴ χρήματα πολλὰ φέρω τάδε; Πῇ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς
πλάζομαι;

101.3 Οὐ βούλεσθε οὖν τὰς φαντασίας ταύτας κενὰς ἀπορρίψαντες τῇ συνηθείᾳ αὐτῇ ἀποτάξασθαι, κενοδοξίᾳ ἐπιλέγοντες·

ψευδεῖς ὄνειροι χαίρετ', οὐδὲν ἦτ' ἄρα;

102.1 Τί γὰρ ἡγεῖσθε, ὦ ἄνθρωποι, τὸν Τύχωνα[52] Ἑρμῆν καὶ τὸν Ἀνδοκίδου καὶ τὸν Ἀμύητον; Ἢ παντί τῳ δῆλον ὅτι λίθους, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸν Ἑρμῆν. Ὡς δὲ οὐκ ἔστι θεὸς ἡ ἅλως καὶ ὡς οὐκ ἔστι θεὸς ἡ ἶρις, ἀλλὰ πάθη ἀέρων καὶ νεφῶν, καὶ ὃν τρόπον οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα θεός, οὐδὲ μὴν οὐδὲ ἐνιαυτὸς οὐδὲ χρόνος ὁ ἐκ τούτων συμπληρούμενος, οὕτως οὐδὲ ἥλιος οὐδὲ σελήνη, οἷς ἕκαστον τῶν προειρημένων διορίζεται. **102.2** Τίς ἂν οὖν τὴν εὔθυναν καὶ τὴν κόλασιν καὶ τὴν δίκην καὶ τὴν νέμεσιν εὖ φρονῶν ὑπολάβοι θεούς; Οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδ' ἐρινῦς οὐδὲ μοῖραι οὐδὲ εἱμαρμένη, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ πολιτεία μηδὲ δόξα μηδὲ πλοῦτος θεοί, ὃν καὶ ζωγράφοι τυφλὸν ἐπιδεικνύουσιν· **102.3** εἰ δὲ αἰδῶ καὶ ἔρωτα καὶ ἀφροδίτην ἐκθειάζετε, ἀκολουθούντων αὐτοῖς αἰσχύνη καὶ ὁρμὴ καὶ κάλλος καὶ συνουσία. Οὔκουν ἔτ' ἂν εἰκότως ὕπνος καὶ θάνατος θεὼ διδυμάονε παρ' ὑμῖν νομίζοιντο, πάθη ταῦτα περὶ τὰ ζῷα συμβαίνοντα φυσικῶς· οὐδὲ μὴν κῆρα οὐδὲ εἱμαρμένην οὐδὲ μοίρας θεὰς ἐνδίκως ἐρεῖτε. **102.4** Εἰ δὲ ἔρις καὶ μάχη οὐ θεοί, οὐδὲ Ἄρης οὐδὲ Ἐνυώ. Ἔτι τε ⟨εἰ⟩ αἱ ἀστραπαὶ καὶ οἱ κεραυνοὶ καὶ οἱ ὄμβροι οὐ θεοί, πῶς τὸ πῦρ καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ θεοί; Πῶς δὲ καὶ οἱ διάσσοντες καὶ οἱ κομῆται διὰ πάθος ἀέρος γεγενημένοι; Ὁ δὲ τὴν τύχην θεὸν λέγων καὶ τὴν πρᾶξιν λεγέτω θεόν. **103 1** Εἰ δὴ οὖν τούτων οὐδὲ ἓν θεὸς εἶναι νομίζεται οὐδὲ μὴν ἐκείνων τῶν χειροκμήτων καὶ ἀναισθήτων πλασμάτων, πρόνοια δέ τις περὶ ἡμᾶς

---

[51] Marcovich : γεωργῶν P Stählin
[52] τυφῶνα P

καταφαίνεται δυνάμεως θεϊκῆς, λείπεται οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ τοῦτο ὁμολογεῖν, ὅτι ἄρα ὄντως μόνος ἔστι τε καὶ ὑφέστηκεν ὁ μόνος ὄντως ὑπάρχων θεός. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ μανδραγόραν ἤ τι ἄλλο φάρμακον πεπωκόσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐοίκατε οἱ ἀνόητοι· **103.2** θεὸς δὲ ὑμῖν ἀνανῆψαι δοίη ποτὲ τοῦδε τοῦ ὕπνου καὶ συνιέναι θεὸν μηδὲ χρυσὸν ἢ λίθον ἢ δένδρον ἢ πρᾶξιν ἢ πάθος ἢ νόσον ἢ φόβον ἰνδάλλεσθαι ὡς θεόν. "Τρὶς γὰρ μύριοί εἰσιν" ὡς ἀληθῶς "ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ δαίμονες" οὐκ "ἀθάνατοι" οὐδὲ μὴν θνητοί (οὐδὲ γὰρ αἰσθήσεως, ἵνα καὶ θανάτου, μετειλήφασιν), λίθινοι δὲ καὶ ξύλινοι δεσπόται ἀνθρώπων, ὑβρίζοντες καὶ παρασπονδοῦντες τὸν βίον διὰ τῆς συνηθείας. **103.3** "Ἡ γῆ δὲ τοῦ κυρίου," φησί, "καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς"· εἶτα τί τολμᾷς ἐν τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου τρυφῶν ἀγνοεῖν τὸν δεσπότην; Κατάλειπε τὴν γῆν τὴν ἐμήν, ἐρεῖ σοι ὁ κύριος, μὴ θίγῃς τοῦ ὕδατος ὃ ἐγὼ ἀναδίδωμι, τῶν καρπῶν ὧν ἐγὼ γεωργῶ, μὴ μεταλάμβανε· ἀπόδος, ἄνθρωπε, τὰ τροφεῖα τῷ θεῷ· ἐπίγνωθί σου τὸν δεσπότην· ἴδιον εἶ πλάσμα τοῦ θεοῦ· τὸ δὲ οἰκεῖον αὐτοῦ πῶς ἂν ἐνδίκως ἀλλότριον γένοιτο; Τὸ γὰρ ἀπηλλοτριωμένον στερόμενον τῆς οἰκειότητος στέρεται τῆς ἀληθείας. **103.4** Ἢ γὰρ οὐχ ᾗ Νιόβη τρόπον τινά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα μυστικώτερον πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀποφθέγξωμαι, γυναικὸς τῆς Ἑβραίας δίκην (Λὼτ ἐκάλουν αὐτὴν οἱ παλαιοὶ) εἰς ἀναισθησίαν μετατρέπεσθε; Λελιθωμένην ταύτην παρειλήφαμεν τὴν γυναῖκα διὰ τὸ Σοδόμων ἐρᾶν· Σοδομῖται δὲ οἱ ἄθεοι καὶ οἱ πρὸς τὴν ἀσέβειαν ἐπιστρεφόμενοι σκληροκάρδιοί τε καὶ ἠλίθιοι.

104 1 Ταύτας οἴου θεόθεν ἐπιλέγεσθαί σοι τὰς φωνάς· "μὴ γὰρ οἴου λίθους μὲν εἶναι ἱερὰ καὶ ξύλα καὶ ὄρνεα καὶ ὄφεις, ἀνθρώπους δὲ μή"· πολὺ δὲ τοὐναντίον ἱεροὺς μὲν ὄντως τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὑπολαμβάνετε, τὰ δὲ θηρία καὶ τοὺς λίθους ὅπερ εἰσίν. **104.2** Οἱ γάρ τοι δείλαιοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἄθλιοι διὰ μὲν κόρακος καὶ κολοιοῦ νομίζουσι τὸν θεὸν ἐμβοᾶν, διὰ δὲ ἀνθρώπου σιωπᾶν, καὶ τὸν μὲν κόρακα τετιμήκασιν ὡς ἄγγελον θεοῦ, τὸν δὲ ἄνθρωπον τοῦ θεοῦ διώκουσιν, οὐ κρώζοντα, οὐ κλώζοντα, φθεγγόμενον δέ, οἶμαι, λογικῶς καὶ φιλανθρώπως κατηχοῦντα ἀποσφάττειν ἀπανθρώπως ἐπιχειροῦσιν, ἐπὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην καλοῦντα, οὔτε τὴν χάριν τὴν ἄνωθεν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι οὔτε τὴν κόλασιν ἐκτρεπόμενοι.

104.3 Οὐ γὰρ πιστεύουσι τῷ θεῷ οὐδὲ ἐκμανθάνουσι τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ. Οὗ δὲ ἄρρητος ἡ φιλανθρωπία, τούτου ἀχώρητος ἡ μισοπονηρία. Τρέφει δὲ ὁ μὲν θυμὸς τὴν κόλασιν ἐπὶ ἁμαρτίᾳ, εὖ ποιεῖ δὲ ἐπὶ μετανοίᾳ ἡ φιλανθρωπία. Οἰκτρότατον δὲ τὸ στέρεσθαι τῆς παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπικουρίας. **104.4** Ὀμμάτων μὲν οὖν ἡ πήρωσις καὶ τῆς ἀκοῆς ἡ κώφωσις ἀλγεινοτέρα παρὰ τὰς λοιπὰς τοῦ πονηροῦ πλεονεξίας· ἢ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἀφήρηται τῆς οὐρανίου προσόψεως, ἢ δὲ τῆς θείας μαθήσεως ἐστέρηται.

105.1 Ὑμεῖς δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀνάπηροι καὶ τυφλοὶ μὲν τὸν νοῦν, κωφοὶ δὲ τὴν σύνεσιν ὄντες οὐκ ἀλγεῖτε, οὐκ ἀγανακτεῖτε, οὐ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἰδεῖν καὶ τὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ποιητὴν ἐπεθυμήσατε, οὐδὲ τὸν τῶν πάντων δημιουργὸν καὶ πατέρα ἀκοῦσαι καὶ μαθεῖν ἐξεζητήσατε, τὴν προαίρεσιν τῇ σωτηρίᾳ συνάψαντες·**105.2** ἐμποδὼν γὰρ ἵσταται οὐδὲν τῷ σπεύδοντι πρὸς γνῶσιν θεοῦ, οὐκ ἀπαιδευσία, οὐ πενία, οὐκ ἀδοξία, οὐκ ἀκτημοσύνη· οὐδέ τις τὴν ὄντως ἀληθῆ σοφίαν "χαλκῷ δῃώσας" μεταλλάξαι εὔχεται οὐδὲ σιδήρῳ· εὖ γάρ τοι παντὸς μᾶλλον τοῦτο εἴρηται·

ὁ χρηστός[53] ἐστι πανταχοῦ σωτήριος·

105.3 ὁ γὰρ τοῦ δικαίου ζηλωτής, ὡς ἂν τοῦ ἀνενδεοῦς ἐραστής, ὀλιγοδεής, οὐκ ἐν ἄλλῳ τινὶ ἢ ἐν αὑτῷ [καὶ] τῷ θεῷ τὸ μακάριον θησαυρίσας, ἔνθα οὐ σής, οὐ λῃστής, οὐ πειρατής, ἀλλ' ὁ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀίδιος δοτήρ. **105.4** Ἆρα οὖν εἰκότως ὡμοίωσθε τοῖς ὄφεσιν ἐκείνοις, οἷς τὰ ὦτα πρὸς τοὺς κατεπάδοντας ἀποκέκλεισται. "Θυμὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς," φησὶν ἡ γραφή, "κατὰ τὴν ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ ὄφεως, ὡσεὶ ἀσπίδος κωφῆς καὶ βυούσης τὰ ὦτα αὐτῆς, ἥτις οὐκ εἰσακούσεται φωνῆς ἐπᾳδόντων."

106 1 Ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς γε κατεπᾴσθητε τὴν ἀγριότητα καὶ παραδέξασθε τὸν ἥμερον καὶ[54] ἡμέτερον λόγον καὶ τὸν ἰὸν ἀποπτύσατε τὸν δηλητήριον, ὅπως ὅτι μάλιστα ὑμῖν τὴν φθοράν, ὡς ἐκείνοις τὸ γῆρας, ἀποδύσασθαι δοθῇ. Ἀκούσατέ μου καὶ μὴ τὰ ὦτα ἀποβύσητε μηδὲ τὰς ἀκοὰς ἀποφράξητε, ἀλλ' εἰς νοῦν βάλεσθε τὰ λεγόμενα. **106.2** Καλόν ἐστι τὸ φάρμακον τῆς ἀθανασίας· στήσατέ ποτε τοὺς ὁλκοὺς τοὺς ἑρπηστικούς. "Οἱ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ κυρίου χοῦν λείξουσι", φησίν [ἡ γραφὴ λέγει]· ἀνανεύσατε τῆς γῆς εἰς αἰθέρα, ἀναβλέψατε εἰς οὐρανόν, θαυμάσατε, παύσασθε καραδοκοῦντες τῶν δικαίων τὴν πτέρναν καὶ "τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς ἀληθείας" ἐμποδίζοντες· **106.3** φρόνιμοι γένεσθε καὶ ἀβλαβεῖς· τάχα που ὁ κύριος ἁπλότητος ὑμῖν δωρήσεται πτερόν (πτερῶσαι προῄρηται τοὺς γηγενεῖς), ἵνα δὴ τοὺς χηραμοὺς καταλιπόντες οἰκήσητε τοὺς οὐρανούς. Μόνον ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας μετανοήσωμεν, ὡς ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ δυνηθῆναι χωρῆσαι τὸν θεόν. **106.4** "Ἐλπίσατε ἐπ' αὐτόν", φησί, "πᾶσα συναγωγὴ λαοῦ, ἐκχέετε ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ πάσας τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν." Πρὸς τοὺς κενοὺς τῆς πονηρίας λέγει· ἐλεεῖ καὶ δικαιοσύνης πληροῖ· πίστευσον, ἄνθρωπε, ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ θεῷ· πίστευσον, ἄνθρωπε, τῷ παθόντι καὶ προσκυνουμένῳ, θεῷ ζῶντι πιστεύσατε οἱ δοῦλοι τῷ νεκρῷ[55]· **106.5** πάντες ἄνθρωποι πιστεύσατε μόνῳ τῷ πάντων ἀνθρώπων θεῷ· πιστεύσατε καὶ μισθὸν λάβετε σωτηρίαν· "ἐκζητήσατε τὸν θεόν, καὶ ζήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν." Ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεὸν τὴν ἰδίαν πολυπραγμονεῖ σωτηρίαν· εὗρες τὸν θεόν, ἔχεις τὴν ζωήν.

107.1 Ζητήσωμεν οὖν, ἵνα καὶ ζήσωμεν. Ὁ μισθὸς τῆς εὑρέσεως ζωὴ παρὰ θεῷ. "Ἀγαλλιάσθωσαν καὶ εὐφρανθήτωσαν ἐπὶ σοὶ πάντες οἱ ζητοῦντές σε καὶ λεγέτωσαν διὰ παντός, μεγαλυνθήτω ὁ θεός." Καλὸς ὕμνος[56] τοῦ θεοῦ ἀθάνατος ἄνθρωπος, δικαιοσύνῃ οἰκοδομούμενος, ἐν ᾧ τὰ λόγια τῆς ἀληθείας ἐγκεχάρακται. Ποῦ γὰρ ἀλλαχόθι ἢ ἐν σώφρονι ψυχῇ δικαιοσύνην ἐγγραπτέον; Ποῦ ἀγάπην; αἰδῶ δὲ ποῦ; πρᾳότητα δὲ ποῦ; **107.2** Ταύτας, οἶμαι, τὰς θείας γραφὰς ἐναποσφραγισαμένους χρὴ τῇ ψυχῇ καλὸν ἀφετήριον σοφίαν ἡγεῖσθαι τοῖς ἐφ' ὁτιοῦν τοῦ βίου τραπεῖσι μέρος, ὅρμον τε τὴν αὐτὴν ἀκύμονα σωτηρίας σοφίαν νομίζειν· **107.3** δι' ἣν ἀγαθοὶ μὲν πατέρες τέκνων οἱ τῷ πατρὶ προσδεδραμηκότες, ἀγαθοὶ δὲ γονεῦσιν υἱοὶ οἱ τὸν υἱὸν νενοηκότες, ἀγαθοὶ δὲ ἄνδρες γυναικῶν οἱ μεμνημένοι τοῦ νυμφίου, ἀγαθοὶ δὲ οἰκετῶν δεσπόται οἱ τῆς ἐσχάτης δουλείας λελυτρωμένοι.

---

[53] χριστός P
[54] καὶ del. Marcovich
[55] κυρίῳ Jackson : δούλῳ Mayor (conl. Ph.2.7)
[56] καλὸν τέμενος Marcovich : καλὸς ναός Markland

108 1 Ὦ μακαριώτερα τῆς ἐν ἀνθρώποις πλάνης τὰ θηρία· ἐπινέμεται τὴν ἄγνοιαν, ὡς ὑμεῖς, οὐχ ὑποκρίνεται δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν· οὐκ ἔστι παρ' αὐτοῖς κολάκων γένη, οὐ δεισιδαιμονοῦσιν ἰχθύες, οὐκ εἰδωλολατρεῖ τὰ ὄρνεα, ἕνα μόνον ἐκπλήττεται τὸν οὐρανόν, ἐπεὶ θεὸν νοῆσαι μὴ δύναται ἀπηξιωμένα τοῦ λόγου. **108.2** Εἶτ' οὐκ αἰσχύνεσθε καὶ τῶν ἀλόγων σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἀλογωτέρους πεποιηκότες, οἳ διὰ τοσούτων ἡλικιῶν ἐν ἀθεότητι κατατέτριφθε; Παῖδες γεγόνατε, εἶτα μειράκια, εἶτα ἔφηβοι, εἶτα ἄνδρες, χρηστοὶ δὲ οὐδέποτε. **108.3** Κἂν τὸ γῆρας αἰδέσθητε, ἐπὶ δυσμαῖς τοῦ βίου γενόμενοι σωφρονήσατε, κἂν ἐπὶ τέλει τοῦ βίου τὸν θεὸν ἐπίγνωτε, ὡς δὴ τὸ τέλος ὑμῖν τοῦ βίου ἀρχὴν ἀναλάβοι σωτηρίας. Γηράσατε πρὸς δεισιδαιμονίαν, νέοι ἀφίκεσθε πρὸς θεοσέβειαν· **108.4** παῖδας ἀκάκους ἐγκρινεῖ θεός. Ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἀθηναῖος τοῖς Σόλωνος ἐπέσθω νόμοις καὶ ὁ Ἀργεῖος τοῖς Φορωνέως καὶ ὁ Σπαρτιάτης τοῖς Λυκούργου, εἰ δὲ σεαυτὸν ἀναγράφεις τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐρανὸς μέν σοι ἡ πατρίς, ὁ δὲ θεὸς νομοθέτης.**108.5** Τίνες δὲ καὶ οἱ νόμοι; "Οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου." Εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ τούτων τὰ παραπληρώματα, λόγιοι νόμοι καὶ ἅγιοι λόγοι ἐν αὐταῖς ἐγγραφόμενοι ταῖς καρδίαις· "ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν", καὶ "τῷ τύπτοντί σε εἰς τὴν σιαγόνα πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην", καὶ "οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, ἐπιθυμίᾳ γὰρ μόνῃ μεμοίχευκας."

109 1 Πόσῳ γοῦν ἄμεινον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τοῦ τυγχάνειν τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἀρχὴν μηδὲ ἐπιθυμεῖν ἐθέλειν ὧν μὴ δεῖ; Ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν τὸ αὐστηρὸν τῆς σωτηρίας ὑπομένειν οὐ καρτερεῖτε, καθάπερ δὲ τῶν σιτίων τοῖς γλυκέσιν ἡδόμεθα διὰ τὴν λειότητα τῆς ἡδονῆς προτιμῶντες, ἰᾶται δὲ ἡμᾶς καὶ ὑγιάζει τὰ πικρὰ τραχύνοντα τὴν αἴσθησιν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς τὸν στόμαχον ῥώννυσιν ἡ τῶν φαρμάκων αὐστηρία, οὕτως ἤδει μὲν καὶ γαργαλίζει ἡ συνήθεια, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν εἰς τὸ βάραθρον ὠθεῖ, ἡ συνήθεια, ἡ δὲ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνάγει, ἡ ἀλήθεια, "τραχεῖα" μὲν τὸ πρῶτον, "ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ κουροτρόφος"· **109.2** καὶ σεμνὴ μὲν ἡ γυναικωνῖτις αὕτη, σώφρων δὲ ἡ γερουσία· οὐδέ ἐστι δυσπρόσιτος οὐδὲ ἀδύνατος λαβεῖν, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἐγγυτάτω ἔνοικος ἡμῶν, ᾗ φησιν αἰνιττόμενος ὁ πάνσοφος Μωυσῆς, τρισὶ τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐνδιαιτωμένη μέρεσι, "χερσὶ καὶ στόματι καὶ καρδίᾳ."**109.3** Σύμβολον τοῦτο γνήσιον τρισὶ τοῖς πᾶσι συμπληρουμένης τῆς ἀληθείας, βουλῇ καὶ πράξει καὶ λόγῳ μηδὲ γὰρ τόδε δείμαινε, μή σε τὰ πολλὰ καὶ ἐπιτερπῆ φανταζόμενα ἀφέληται σοφίας· αὐτὸς ἑκὼν ὑπερβήσῃ τὸν λῆρον τῆς συνηθείας, καθάπερ καὶ οἱ παῖδες τὰ ἀθύρματα ἄνδρες γενόμενοι ἀπέρριψαν.

110 1 Τάχει μὲν δὴ ἀνυπερβλήτῳ εὐνοίᾳ τε εὐπροσίτῳ ἡ δύναμις ἡ θεϊκὴ ἐπιλάμψασα τὴν γῆν σωτηρίου σπέρματος ἐνέπλησε τὸ πᾶν. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν οὕτως ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ τοσοῦτον ἔργον ἄνευ θείας κομιδῆς ἐξήνυσεν ὁ κύριος, ὄψει καταφρονούμενος, ἔργῳ προσκυνούμενος, ὁ καθάρσιος καὶ σωτήριος καὶ μειλίχιος, ὁ θεῖος λόγος, ὁ φανερώτατος ὄντως θεός, ὁ τῷ δεσπότῃ τῶν ὅλων ἐξισωθείς, ὅτι ἦν υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ "ὁ λόγος ἦν ἐν τῷ θεῷ", **110.2** οὔθ' ὅτε τὸ πρῶτον προεκηρύχθη, ἀπιστηθείς, οὔθ' ὅτε τὸ ἀνθρώπου προσωπεῖον ἀναλαβὼν καὶ σαρκὶ ἀναπλασάμενος τὸ σωτήριον δρᾶμα τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος ὑπεκρίνετο, ἀγνοηθείς· γνήσιος γὰρ ἦν ἀγωνιστὴς καὶ τοῦ πλάσματος συναγωνιστής, τάχιστα δὲ εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους διαδοθεὶς

θᾶττον ἡλίου ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀνατείλας τῆς πατρικῆς βουλήσεως, ῥᾷστα ἡμῖν ἐπέλαμψε, τὸν θεόν, ὅθεν τε ἦν αὐτὸς καὶ ὃς ἦν, δι' ὧν ἐδίδαξεν καὶ ἐνεδείξατο, παραστησάμενος, ὁ σπονδοφόρος καὶ διαλλακτὴς καὶ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν λόγος, πηγὴ ζωοποιός, εἰρηνική, ἐπὶ πᾶν τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς χεόμενος, δι' ὃν ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν τὰ πάντα ἤδη πέλαγος γέγονεν ἀγαθῶν.

11 111 1 Μικρὸν δέ, εἰ βούλει, ἄνωθεν ἄθρει τὴν θείαν εὐεργεσίαν. Ὁ πρῶτος ὅτε ἐν παραδείσῳ ἔπαιζε λελυμένος, ἔτι παιδίον ἦν τοῦ θεοῦ· ὅτε δὲ ὑποπίπτων[57] ἡδονῇ (ὄφις ἀλληγορεῖται ἡδονὴ ἐπὶ γαστέρα ἕρπουσα, κακία γηΐνη, εἰς ὕλας στρεφομένη) παρήγετο ἐπιθυμίαις, ὁ παῖς ἀνδριζόμενος ἀπειθείᾳ καὶ παρακούσας τοῦ πατρὸς ᾐσχύνετο τὸν θεόν. Οἶον ἴσχυσεν ἡδονή· ὁ δι' ἁπλότητα λελυμένος ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτίαις εὑρέθη δεδεμένος. **111.2** Τῶν δεσμῶν λῦσαι τοῦτον ὁ κύριος αὖθις ἠθέλησεν, καὶ σαρκὶ ἐνδεθεὶς (μυστήριον θεῖον τοῦτο) τὸν ὄφιν ἐχειρώσατο καὶ τὸν τύραννον ἐδουλώσατο, τὸν θάνατον, καί, τὸ παραδοξότατον, ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν ἡδονῇ πεπλανημένον, τὸν τῇ φθορᾷ δεδεμένον, χερσὶν ἡπλωμέναις[58] ἔδειξε λελυμένον. **111.3** Ὦ θαύματος μυστικοῦ· κέκλιται μὲν ὁ κύριος, ἀνέστη δὲ ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ παραδείσου πεσὼν μεῖζον ὑπακοῆς ἆθλον, οὐρανούς, ἀπολαμβάνει.

112 1 Διό μοι δοκεῖ, ἐπεὶ αὐτὸς ἧκεν ὡς ἡμᾶς οὐρανόθεν ὁ λόγος, ἡμᾶς ἐπ' ἀνθρωπίνην ἰέναι μὴ χρῆναι διδασκαλίαν ἔτι, Ἀθήνας καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα, πρὸς δὲ καὶ Ἰωνίαν πολυπραγμονοῦντας. Εἰ γὰρ ἡμῖν ὁ διδάσκαλος ὁ πληρώσας τὰ πάντα δυνάμεσιν ἁγίαις, δημιουργίᾳ σωτηρίᾳ εὐεργεσίᾳ, νομοθεσίᾳ προφητείᾳ διδασκαλίᾳ, πάντα νῦν ὁ διδάσκαλος κατηχεῖ, καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἤδη Ἀθῆναι καὶ Ἑλλὰς γέγονεν τῷ λόγῳ. **112.2** Οὐ γὰρ δὴ μύθῳ μὲν ἐπιστεύετε ποιητικῷ τὸν Μίνω τὸν Κρῆτα τοῦ Διὸς ὀαριστὴν ἀναγράφοντι, ἡμᾶς δὲ ἀπιστήσετε μαθητὰς θεοῦ γεγονότας, τὴν ὄντως ἀληθῆ σοφίαν ἐπανῃρημένους, ἣν φιλοσοφίας ἄκροι μόνον ᾐνίξαντο, οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μαθηταὶ καὶ κατειλήφασι καὶ ἀνεκήρυξαν. **112.3** Καὶ δὴ καὶ πᾶς, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ὁ Χριστὸς οὐ μερίζεται· οὔτε βάρβαρός ἐστιν οὔτε Ἰουδαῖος οὔτε Ἕλλην, οὐκ ἄρρεν, οὐ θῆλυ· καινὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος θεοῦ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ μεταπεπλασμένος.

113.1 Εἶθ' αἱ μὲν ἄλλαι συμβουλαί τε καὶ ὑποθῆκαι λυπραὶ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μέρους εἰσίν, εἰ γαμητέον, εἰ πολιτευτέον, εἰ παιδοποιητέον· καθολικὴ δὲ ἄρα προτροπὴ μόνη καὶ πρὸς ὅλον δηλαδὴ τὸν βίον, ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ, ἐν πάσῃ περιστάσει πρὸς τὸ κυριώτατον τέλος, τὴν ζωήν, συντείνουσα ἡ θεοσέβεια· καθ' ὃ καὶ μόνον ἐπάναγκές ἐστι ζῆν, ἵνα ζήσωμεν ἀεί· φιλοσοφία δέ[59], ᾗ φασιν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, πολυχρόνιός ἐστι συμβουλή, σοφίας ἀίδιον μνηστευομένη ἔρωτα· "ἐντολὴ δὲ κυρίου τηλαυγής, φωτίζουσα ὀφθαλμούς." **113.2** Ἀπόλαβε τὸν Χριστόν, ἀπόλαβε τὸ βλέπειν, ἀπόλαβέ σου τὸ φῶς,

ὄφρ' εὖ γινώσκοις ἠμὲν θεὸν ἠδὲ καὶ ἄνδρα.

"Γλυκὺς" ὁ λόγος ὁ φωτίσας ἡμᾶς "ὑπὲρ χρυσίον καὶ λίθον τίμιον· ποθεινός ἐστιν ὑπὲρ μέλι καὶ κηρίον." Πῶς γὰρ οὐ ποθεινὸς ὁ τὸν ἐν σκότει

---

[57] Schwartz Stählin : ὑπέπιπτεν P retinet Marcovich
[58] ἡλομέναις Windhorst
[59] γάρ Marcovich

κατορωρυγμένον νοῦν ἐναργῆ ποιησάμενος καὶ τὰ "φωσφόρα" τῆς ψυχῆς ἀποξύνας "ὄμματα"; 113.3 Καὶ γὰρ ὥσπερ "ἡλίου μὴ ὄντος ἕνεκα τῶν ἄλλων ἄστρων νὺξ ἂν ἦν τὰ πάντα", οὕτως εἰ μὴ τὸν λόγον ἔγνωμεν καὶ τούτῳ κατηυγάσθημεν, οὐδὲν ἂν τῶν σιτευομένων ὀρνίθων ἐλειπόμεθα, ἐν σκότει πιαινόμενοι καὶ θανάτῳ τρεφόμενοι. 113.4 Χωρήσωμεν τὸ φῶς, ἵνα χωρήσωμεν τὸν θεόν· χωρήσωμεν τὸ φῶς καὶ μαθητεύσωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ. Τοῦτό τοι καὶ ἐπήγγελται τῷ πατρὶ "διηγήσομαι τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου· ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσω σε". Ὕμνησον καὶ διήγησαί μοι τὸν πατέρα σου τὸν θεόν· σώσει σου τὰ διηγήματα, παιδεύσει με ἡ ᾠδή. 113.5 Ὡς μέχρι νῦν ἐπλανώμην ζητῶν τὸν θεόν, ἐπεὶ δέ με φωταγωγεῖς, κύριε, καὶ τὸν θεὸν εὑρίσκω διὰ σοῦ καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἀπολαμβάνω παρὰ σοῦ, γίνομαί σου συγκληρονόμος, ἐπεὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν οὐκ ἐπῃσχύνθης.

114 1 Ἀφέλωμεν οὖν, ἀφέλωμεν τὴν λήθην τῆς ἀληθείας· τὴν ἄγνοιαν καὶ τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐμποδὼν ὡς ἀχλὺν ὄψεως καταγαγόντες τὸν ὄντως ὄντα θεὸν ἐποπτεύσωμεν, ταύτην αὐτῷ πρῶτον ἀνυμνήσαντες τὴν φωνήν "χαῖρε φῶς"· φῶς ἡμῖν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ τοῖς ἐν σκότει κατορωρυγμένοις καὶ ἐν σκιᾷ θανάτου κατακεκλεισμένοις ἐξέλαμψεν ἡλίου καθαρώτερον, ζωῆς τῆς ἐνταῦθα γλυκύτερον. 114.2 Τὸ φῶς ἐκεῖνο ζωή ἐστιν ἀίδιος, καὶ ὅσα μετείληφεν αὐτοῦ, ζῇ, ἡ νὺξ δὲ εὐλαβεῖται τὸ φῶς καὶ δύνουσα διὰ τὸν φόβον παραχωρεῖ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κυρίου· τὰ πάντα φῶς ἀκοίμητον γέγονεν καὶ ἡ δύσις εἰς ἀνατολὴν περιέστηκεν[60]. 114.3 Τοῦτο ἡ κτίσις ἡ καινὴ βεβούληται· ὁ γὰρ τὰ πάντα καθιππεύων "δικαιοσύνης ἥλιος" ἐπ᾿ ἴσης περιπολεῖ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, τὸν πατέρα μιμούμενος, ὃς "ἐπὶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἀνατέλλει τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ", καὶ καταψεκάζει τὴν δρόσον τῆς ἀληθείας.

114.4 1 Οὗτος τὴν δύσιν εἰς ἀνατολὴν μετήγαγεν καὶ τὸν θάνατον εἰς ζωὴν ἀνασταυρώσει, ἐξαρπάσας δὲ τῆς ἀπωλείας τὸν ἄνθρωπον προσεκρέμασεν αἰθέρι, μεταφυτεύων τὴν φθορὰν εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ γῆν μεταβάλλων εἰς οὐρανούς, ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ γεωργός, "δεξιὰ σημαίνων, λαοὺς δ᾿ ἐπὶ ἔργον" ἀγαθὸν "ἐγείρων, μιμνήσκων βιότοιο" ἀληθινοῦ, καὶ τὸν μέγαν ὄντως καὶ θεῖον καὶ ἀναφαίρετον τοῦ πατρὸς κλῆρον χαριζόμενος ἡμῖν, οὐρανίῳ διδασκαλίᾳ θεοποιῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, "διδοὺς νόμους εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν γράφων αὐτούς."114.5 Τίνας ὑπογράφει νόμους; "Ὅτι πάντες εἴσονται τὸν θεὸν ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου, καὶ ἵλεως", φησὶν ὁ θεός, "ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ
μὴ μνησθῶ."

115 1 Δεξώμεθα τοὺς νόμους τῆς ζωῆς, πεισθῶμεν προτρεπομένῳ θεῷ, μάθωμεν αὐτόν, ἵνα ἵλεως ᾖ, ἀποδῶμεν καὶ μὴ δεομένῳ μισθὸν εὐχάριστον, εὐπαθείας[61], οἷόν τι ἐνοίκιον [τὴν εὐσέβειαν] τῷ θεῷ τῆς ἐνταῦθα ἐνοικήσεως.
          Χρύσεα χαλκείων, ἑκατόμβοι᾿ ἐννεαβοίων,
ὀλίγης πίστεως γῆν σοι δίδωσι τὴν τοσαύτην γεωργεῖν, ὕδωρ πίνειν καὶ ἄλλο πλεῖν, ἀέρα ἀναπνεῖν, πῦρ ὑπουργεῖν, κόσμον οἰκεῖν· ἐντεῦθεν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀποικίαν στείλασθαί σοι συγκεχώρηκεν· τὰ μεγάλα ταῦτα καὶ τοσαῦτά σοι δημιουργήματα καὶ χαρίσματα ὀλίγης πίστεως μεμίσθωκεν.

---

[60] Wilamowitz: ἀναστολὴ πεπίστευκεν P : ἀναστολῇ πεπίστυται Marcovich
[61] Mayor Marcovich : εὐπάθειαν P : εὐπείθειαν Heyse Stählin : εὐμάθειαν Wilamowitz

115.2 Εἶθ' οἱ μὲν τοῖς γόησι πεπιστευκότες τὰ περίαπτα καὶ τὰς ἐπαοιδὰς ὡς σωτηρίους δῆθεν ἀποδέχονται, ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐ βούλεσθε τὸν οὐράνιον αὐτὸν περιάψασθαι, τὸν σωτῆρα λόγον, καὶ τῇ ἐπῳδῇ τοῦ θεοῦ πιστεύσαντες ἀπαλλαγῆναι μὲν παθῶν, ἃ δὴ ψυχῆς νόσοι, ἀποσπασθῆναι δὲ ἁμαρτίας; **115.3** Θάνατος γὰρ ἀίδιος ἁμαρτία. Ἢ τέλεον νωδοὶ[62] καὶ τυφλοὶ καθάπερ οἱ σπάλακες οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ ἐσθίοντες ἐν σκότῳ διαιτᾶσθε, περικαταρρέοντες τῇ φθορᾷ. Ἀλλ' ἔστιν, ἔστιν **1**ἡ ἀλήθεια ἡ κεκραγυῖα "ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψει". **115.4** Λαμψάτω οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀποκεκρυμμένῳ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, τὸ φῶς, καὶ τῆς γνώσεως αἱ ἀκτῖνες ἀνατειλάτωσαν τὸν ἐγκεκρυμμένον ἔνδον ἐκφαίνουσαι καὶ ἀποστίλβουσαι ἄνθρωπον, τὸν μαθητὴν τοῦ φωτός, τὸν Χριστοῦ γνώριμόν τε καὶ συγκληρονόμον, μάλιστα ἐπειδὰν τὸ τιμιώτατον καὶ σεβασμιώτατον εὐσεβεῖ τε καὶ ἀγαθῷ παιδὶ ἀγαθοῦ πατρὸς ὄνομα εἰς γνῶσιν ἀφίκηται, προστάττοντος ἤπια καὶ τῷ παιδὶ ἐγκελευομένου τὰ σωτήρια. **115.5** Ὁ δὲ πειθόμενος αὐτῷ κατὰ πάντα δὴ πλεονεκτεῖ· ἕπεται τῷ θεῷ, πείθεται τῷ πατρί, ἔγνω πλανώμενος αὐτόν, ἠγάπησε τὸν θεόν, ἠγάπησε τὸν πλησίον, ἐπλήρωσε τὴν ἐντολήν, τὸ ἆθλον ἐπιζητεῖ, τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἀπαιτεῖ.

116.1 Πρόκειται δὲ ἀεὶ τῷ θεῷ τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἀγέλην σῴζειν. Ταύτῃ καὶ τὸν ἀγαθὸν ποιμένα ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἀπέστειλεν θεός· ἁπλώσας δὲ ὁ λόγος τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἔδειξε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὸ ὕψος τῆς σωτηρίας, ὅπως ἢ μετανοήσαντες σωθῶσιν ἢ μὴ ὑπακούσαντες κριθῶσιν. Τοῦτο τῆς δικαιοσύνης τὸ κήρυγμα ὑπακούουσιν εὐαγγέλιον, παρακούσασιν κριτήριον. **116.2** Ἀλλὰ σάλπιγξ μὲν ἡ μεγαλόκλονος ἠχήσασα στρατιώτας συνήγαγεν καὶ πόλεμον κατήγγειλεν· Χριστὸς δὲ εἰρηνικὸν ἐπὶ τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς ἐπιπνεύσας μέλος οὐ συνάξει ἄρα τοὺς εἰρηνικοὺς στρατιώτας τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ; Συνήγαγε μὲν οὖν, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, τὸ στρατιωτικὸν τὸ ἀναίμακτον αἵματι καὶ λόγῳ, καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν αὐτοῖς ἐνεχείρισεν.

116.3 Σάλπιγξ ἐστὶ Χριστοῦ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ, ὃ μὲν ἐσάλπισεν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠκούσαμεν. Ἐξοπλισώμεθα εἰρηνικῶς, "ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης" καὶ τὴν ἀσπίδα τῆς πίστεως ἀναλαβόντες καὶ τὴν κόρυν τοῦ σωτηρίου περιθέμενοι καὶ "τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστι ῥῆμα θεοῦ", ἀκονήσωμεν. Οὕτως ἡμᾶς ὁ ἀπόστολος εἰρηνικῶς ἐκτάττει· **116.4** ταῦτα ἡμῶν τὰ ὅπλα τὰ ἄτρωτα· τούτοις ἐξοπλισάμενοι παραταξώμεθα τῷ πονηρῷ· τὰ πεπυρακτωμένα τοῦ πονηροῦ ἀποσβέσωμεν βέλη ταῖς ὑδατίναις ἀκμαῖς ταῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου βεβαμμέναις, εὐχαρίστοις ἀμειβόμενοι τὰς εὐποιίας εὐλογίαις καὶ τὸν θεὸν τῷ θείῳ γεραίροντες λόγῳ. "Ἔτι γὰρ λαλοῦντός σου ἐρεῖ", φησίν, "ἰδοὺ πάρειμι."

117.1 Ὦ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ μακαρίας ταύτης δυνάμεως, δι' ἧς ἀνθρώποις συμπολιτεύεται θεός. Λῷον οὖν καὶ ἄμεινον τῆς ἀρίστης τῶν ὄντων οὐσίας μιμητὴν ὁμοῦ καὶ θεραπευτὴν γενέσθαι· οὐ γὰρ μιμεῖσθαί τις δυνήσεται τὸν θεὸν ἢ δι' ὧν ὁσίως θεραπεύσει οὐδ' αὖ θεραπεύειν καὶ σέβειν ἢ μιμούμενος. **117.2** Ὅ γέ τοι οὐράνιος καὶ θεῖος ὄντως ἔρως ταύτῃ προσγίνεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ὅταν ἐν αὐτῇ που τῇ ψυχῇ τὸ ὄντως καλὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ θείου λόγου ἀναζωπυρούμενον ἐκλάμπειν δυνηθῇ· καὶ τὸ μέγιστον ἅμα τῷ βουληθῆναι γνησίως τὸ σωθῆναι συντρέχει, ὁμοζυγούντων, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, προαιρέσεως

---

[62] νωθροί Marcovich

καὶ ζωῆς. **117.3** Τοιγάρτοι μόνη αὕτη ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας προτροπὴ τοῖς πιστοτάτοις ἀπείκασται τῶν φίλων μέχρι τῆς ἐσχάτης ἀναπνοῆς παραμένουσα καὶ παραπομπὸς ἀγαθὴ ὅλῳ καὶ τελείῳ τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς πνεύματι τοῖς εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀπαίρουσι γινομένη. Τί δή σε προτρέπω; Σωθῆναί σε ἐπείγομαι. Τοῦτο Χριστὸς βούλεται· ἑνὶ λόγῳ ζωήν σοι χαρίζεται. **117.4** Καὶ τίς ἐστιν οὗτος; Μάθε συντόμως· λόγος ἀληθείας, λόγος ἀφθαρσίας, ὁ ἀναγεννῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἰς ἀλήθειαν αὐτὸν ἀναφέρων, τὸ κέντρον τῆς σωτηρίας, ὁ ἐξελαύνων τὴν φθοράν, ὁ ἐκδιώκων τὸν θάνατον, ὁ ἐν ἀνθρώποις οἰκοδομήσας νεών, ἵνα ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἱδρύσῃ τὸν θεόν. **117.5** Ἅγνισον τὸν νεών, καὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς καὶ τὰς ῥαθυμίας ὥσπερ ἄνθος ἐφήμερον καταλίμπανε ἀνέμῳ καὶ πυρί, σωφροσύνης δὲ τοὺς καρποὺς γεώργησον ἐμφρόνως, καὶ σεαυτὸν ἀκροθίνιον ἀνάστησον τῷ θεῷ, ὅπως οὐκ ἔργον μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ χάρις ᾖς τοῦ θεοῦ· πρέπει δὲ ἄμφω τῷ Χριστοῦ γνωρίμῳ, καὶ βασιλείας ἄξιον φανῆναι καὶ βασιλείας κατηξιῶσθαι.

12.118.1 Φύγωμεν οὖν τὴν συνήθειαν, φύγωμεν οἷον ἄκραν χαλεπὴν ἢ Χαρύβδεως ἀπειλὴν ἢ Σειρῆνας μυθικάς· ἄγχει τὸν ἄνθρωπον, τῆς ἀληθείας ἀποτρέπει, ἀπάγει τῆς ζωῆς, παγίς ἐστιν, βάραθρόν ἐστιν, βόθρος ἐστί, λίχνον[63] ἐστὶν κακὸν ἡ συνήθεια·

> κείνου μὲν καπνοῦ καὶ κύματος ἐκτὸς ἔεργε
> νῆα.

118.2 Φεύγωμεν, ὦ συνναῦται, φεύγωμεν τὸ κῦμα τοῦτο, πῦρ ἐρεύγεται, νῆσός ἐστι πονηρὰ ὀστοῖς καὶ νεκροῖς σεσωρευμένη, ᾄδει δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ πορνίδιον ὡραῖον, ἡδονή, πανδήμῳ τερπόμενον μουσικῇ.

> δεῦρ' ἄγ' ἰών, πολύαιν' Ὀδυσεῦ, μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν,
> νῆα κατάστησον, ἵνα θειοτέρην ὄπ' ἀκούσῃς.

118.3 Ἐπαινεῖ σε, ὦ ναῦτα, καὶ πολυύμνητον λέγει, καὶ τὸ κῦδος τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἡ πόρνη σφετερίζεται· ἔασον αὐτὴν ἐπινέμεσθαι τοὺς νεκρούς, πνεῦμά σοι οὐράνιον βοηθεῖ· πάριθι τὴν ἡδονήν, βουκολεῖ·

> μηδὲ γυνή σε νόον πυγοστόλος ἐξαπατάτω,
> αἱμύλα κωτίλλουσα, τεὴν διφῶσα καλιήν.

118.4 Παράπλει τὴν ᾠδήν, θάνατον ἐργάζεται· ἐὰν ἐθέλῃς μόνον, νενίκηκας τὴν ἀπώλειαν καὶ τῷ ξύλῳ προσδεδεμένος ἁπάσης ἔσῃ τῆς φθορᾶς λελυμένος, κυβερνήσει σε ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοῖς λιμέσι καθορμίσει τῶν οὐρανῶν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· τότε μου κατοπτεύσεις τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐκείνοις τελεσθήσῃ μυστηρίοις καὶ τῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀπολαύσεις ἀποκεκρυμμένων, τῶν ἐμοὶ τετηρημένων, "ἃ οὔτε οὖς ἤκουσεν οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνέβη" τινός. **118.5**

> Καὶ μὴν ὁρᾶν μοι δύο μὲν ἡλίους δοκῶ,
> δισσὰς δὲ Θήβας

βακχεύων ἔλεγέν τις εἰδώλοις, ἀγνοίᾳ μεθύων ἀκράτῳ· ἐγὼ δ' αὐτὸν οἰκτείραιμι παροινοῦντα καὶ τὸν οὕτω παρανοοῦντα ἐπὶ σωτηρίαν παρακαλέσαιμι σωφρονοῦσαν, ὅτι καὶ κύριος μετάνοιαν ἁμαρτωλοῦ καὶ οὐχὶ θάνατον ἀσπάζεται.

---

[63] λίχνον Mayor: λίχνος P: λίνον Cataudella

119.1   Ἧκε, ὦ παραπλήξ, μὴ θύρσῳ σκηριπτόμενος, μὴ κιττῷ ἀναδούμενος, ῥῖψον τὴν μίτραν, ῥῖψον τὴν νεβρίδα, σωφρόνησον· δείξω σοι τὸν λόγον καὶ τοῦ λόγου τὰ μυστήρια, κατὰ τὴν σὴν διηγούμενος εἰκόνα. Ὄρος ἐστὶ τοῦτο θεῷ πεφιλημένον, οὐ τραγῳδίαις ὡς Κιθαιρὼν ὑποκείμενον, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀληθείας ἀνακείμενον δράμασιν, ὄρος νηφάλιον, ἁγναῖς ὕλαις σύσκιον· βακχεύουσι δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ οὐχ αἱ Σεμέλης "τῆς κεραυνίας" ἀδελφαί, αἱ μαινάδες, αἱ δύσαγνον κρεανομίαν μυούμεναι, ἀλλ' αἱ τοῦ θεοῦ θυγατέρες, αἱ ἀμνάδες αἱ καλαί, τὰ σεμνὰ τοῦ λόγου θεσπίζουσαι ὄργια, χορὸν ἀγείρουσαι σώφρονα. **119.2**   Ὁ χορὸς οἱ δίκαιοι, τὸ ᾆσμα ὕμνος ἐστὶ τοῦ πάντων βασιλέως· ψάλλουσιν αἱ κόραι, δοξάζουσιν ἄγγελοι, προφῆται λαλοῦσιν, ἦχος στέλλεται μουσικῆς, δρόμῳ τὸν θίασον διώκουσιν, σπεύδουσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι πατέρα ποθοῦντες ἀπολαβεῖν. **119.3**   Ἧκέ μοι, ὦ πρέσβυ, καὶ σύ, τὰς Θήβας λιπὼν καὶ τὴν μαντικὴν καὶ τὴν βακχικὴν ἀπορρίψας πρὸς ἀλήθειαν χειραγωγοῦ· ἰδού σοι τὸ ξύλον ἐπερείδεσθαι δίδωμι· σπεῦσον, Τειρεσία, πίστευσον· ὄψει. Χριστὸς ἐπιλάμπει φαιδρότερον ἡλίου, δι' ὃν ὀφθαλμοὶ τυφλῶν ἀναβλέπουσιν· νύξ σε φεύξεται, πῦρ φοβηθήσεται, θάνατος οἰχήσεται· ὄψει τοὺς οὐρανούς, ὦ γέρον, ὁ Θήβας μὴ βλέπων.

120.1   Ὦ τῶν ἁγίων ὡς ἀληθῶς μυστηρίων, ὦ φωτὸς ἀκηράτου. Δᾳδουχοῦμαι τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἐποπτεῦσαι, ἅγιος γίνομαι μυούμενος, ἱεροφαντεῖ δὲ ὁ κύριος καὶ τὸν μύστην σφραγίζεται φωταγωγῶν, καὶ παρατίθεται τῷ πατρὶ τὸν πεπιστευκότα αἰῶσι τηρούμενον. **120.2**   Ταῦτα τῶν ἐμῶν μυστηρίων τὰ βακχεύματα· εἰ βούλει, καὶ σὺ μυοῦ, καὶ χορεύσεις μετ' ἀγγέλων ἀμφὶ τὸν ἀγέννητον καὶ ἀνώλεθρον καὶ μόνον ὄντως θεόν, συνυμνοῦντος ἡμῖν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου. Ἀίδιος οὗτος Ἰησοῦς, εἷς ὁ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς θεοῦ τε ἑνὸς τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ πατρός, ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων εὔχεται καὶ ἀνθρώποις ἐγκελεύεται "κέκλυτε, μυρία φῦλα", μᾶλλον δὲ ὅσοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων λογικοί, καὶ βάρβαροι καὶ Ἕλληνες· τὸ πᾶν ἀνθρώπων γένος καλῶ, ὧν ἐγὼ δημιουργὸς θελήματι πατρός. **120.3** Ἥκετε ὡς ἐμέ, ὑφ' ἕνα ταχθησόμενοι θεὸν καὶ τὸν ἕνα λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ μὴ μόνον τῶν ἀλόγων ζῴων πλεονεκτεῖτε τῷ λόγῳ, ἐκ δὲ τῶν θνητῶν ἁπάντων ὑμῖν ἀθανασίαν μόνοις καρπώσασθαι δίδωμι. Ἐθέλω γάρ, ἐθέλω καὶ ταύτης ὑμῖν μεταδοῦναι τῆς χάριτος, ὁλόκληρον χορηγῶν τὴν εὐεργεσίαν, ἀφθαρσίαν· καὶ λόγον χαρίζομαι ὑμῖν, τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ θεοῦ, τέλειον ἐμαυτὸν χαρίζομαι. **120.4** Τοῦτό εἰμι ἐγώ, τοῦτο βούλεται ὁ θεός, τοῦτο συμφωνία ἐστί, τοῦτο ἁρμονία πατρός, τοῦτο υἱός, τοῦτο Χριστός, τοῦτο ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, βραχίων κυρίου, δύναμις τῶν ὅλων, τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός. Ὦ πᾶσαι μὲν εἰκόνες, οὐ πᾶσαι δὲ ἐμφερεῖς· διορθώσασθαι ὑμᾶς πρὸς τὸ ἀρχέτυπον βούλομαι, ἵνα μοι καὶ ὅμοιοι γένησθε. **120.5** Χρίσω ὑμᾶς τῷ πίστεως ἀλείμματι, δι' οὗ τὴν φθορὰν ἀποβάλλετε, καὶ γυμνὸν δικαιοσύνης ἐπιδείξω τὸ σχῆμα, δι' οὗ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀναβαίνετε. "Δεῦτε πρός με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι, κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς· ἄρατε τὸν ζυγόν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς καὶ μάθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι πραΰς εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, καὶ εὑρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν· ὁ γὰρ ζυγός μου χρηστὸς καὶ τὸ φορτίον μου ἐλαφρόν ἐστιν."

121.1 Σπεύσωμεν, δράμωμεν, ὦ θεοφιλῆ καὶ θεοείκελα τοῦ λόγου [ἄνθρωποι] ἀγάλματα· σπεύσωμεν, δράμωμεν, ἄρωμεν τὸν ζυγὸν αὐτοῦ, ἐπιβάλωμεν ἀφθαρσίᾳ, καλὸν ἡνίοχον ἀνθρώπων τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγαπήσωμεν· τὸν πῶλον

ὑποζύγιον ἤγαγε σὺν τῷ παλαιῷ· καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν συνωρίδα καταζεύξας, εἰς ἀθανασίαν κατιθύνει τὸ ἅρμα, σπεύδων πρὸς τὸν θεὸν πληρῶσαι ἐναργῶς ὃ ᾐνίξατο, πρότερον μὲν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, νῦν δὲ εἰσελαύνων οὐρανούς, κάλλιστον θέαμα τῷ πατρὶ υἱὸς ἀΐδιος νικηφόρος. **121.2** Φιλότιμοι τοίνυν πρὸς τὰ καλὰ καὶ θεοφιλεῖς ἄνθρωποι γενώμεθα, καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν τὰ μέγιστα, θεὸν καὶ ζωήν, κτησώμεθα. Ἀρωγὸς δὲ ὁ λόγος· θαρρῶμεν αὐτῷ καὶ μή ποτε ἡμᾶς τοσοῦτος ἀργύρου καὶ χρυσοῦ, μὴ δόξης ἐπέλθῃ πόθος, ὅσος αὐτοῦ τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας λόγου. **121.3** Οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ τῷ θεῷ αὐτῷ ἀρεστόν, εἰ ἡμεῖς τὰ μὲν πλείστου ἄξια περὶ ἐλαχίστου ποιούμεθα, ἀνοίας δὲ καὶ ἀμαθίας καὶ ῥαθυμίας καὶ εἰδωλολατρείας ὕβρεις περιφανεῖς καὶ τὴν ἐσχάτην δυσσέβειαν περὶ πλείονος αἱρούμεθα.

122.1 Οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ τρόπου φιλοσόφων παῖδες πάντα ὅσα πράττουσιν οἱ ἀνόητοι, ἀνοσιουργεῖν καὶ ἀσεβεῖν νομίζουσιν, καὶ αὐτήν γε ἔτι τὴν ἄγνοιαν μανίας εἶδος ὑπογράφοντες οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ μεμηνέναι τοὺς πολλοὺς ὁμολογοῦσιν. **122.2** Οὐ δὴ οὖν ἀμφιβάλλειν αἱρεῖ ὁ λόγος, ὁπότερον αὐτοῖν ἄμεινον, σωφρονεῖν ἢ μεμηνέναι. Ἐχομένους δὲ ἀπρὶξ τῆς ἀληθείας παντὶ σθένει ἕπεσθαι χρὴ τῷ θεῷ σωφρονοῦντας καὶ πάντα αὐτοῦ νομίζειν, ὥσπερ ἔστι, πρὸς δὲ καὶ ἡμᾶς τὸ κάλλιστον τῶν κτημάτων μεμαθηκότας ὄντας αὐτοῦ, σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐπιτρέπειν τῷ θεῷ, ἀγαπῶντας κύριον τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοῦτο παρ' ὅλον τὸν βίον ἔργον ἡγουμένους. **122 3** Εἰ δὲ "κοινὰ τὰ φίλων", θεοφιλὴς δὲ ὁ ἄνθρωπος (καὶ γὰρ οὖν φίλος τῷ θεῷ, μεσιτεύοντος τοῦ λόγου), γίνεται δὴ οὖν τὰ πάντα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι τὰ πάντα τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ κοινὰ ἀμφοῖν τοῖν φίλοιν τὰ πάντα, τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου. **122.4** Ὥρα οὖν ἡμῖν μόνον θεοσεβῆ τὸν Χριστιανὸν εἰπεῖν πλούσιόν τε καὶ σώφρονα καὶ εὐγενῆ καὶ ταύτῃ εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ μεθ' ὁμοιώσεως, καὶ λέγειν καὶ πιστεύειν "δίκαιον καὶ ὅσιον μετὰ φρονήσεως" γενόμενον ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ εἰς τοσοῦτον ὅμοιον ἤδη καὶ θεῷ.

123.1 Οὐκ ἀποκρύπτεται γοῦν ὁ προφήτης τὴν χάριν λέγων, "ἐγὼ εἶπον ὅτι θεοί ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ὑψίστου πάντες." Ἡμᾶς γάρ, ἡμᾶς εἰσπεποίηται καὶ ἡμῶν ἐθέλει μόνων κεκλῆσθαι πατήρ, οὐ τῶν ἀπειθούντων. Καὶ γὰρ οὖν ὧδέ πως ἔχει τὰ ἡμέτερα τῶν Χριστοῦ ὀπαδῶν· οἷαι μὲν αἱ βουλαί, τοῖοι καὶ οἱ λόγοι, ὁποῖοι δὲ οἱ λόγοι, τοιαίδε καὶ αἱ πράξεις, καὶ ὁποῖα τὰ ἔργα, τοιοῦτος ὁ βίος· χρηστὸς ὁ σύμπας ἀνθρώπων βίος τῶν Χριστὸν ἐγνωκότων.

123.2 Ἅλις οἶμαι τῶν λόγων, εἰ καὶ μακροτέρω προῆλθον ὑπὸ φιλανθρωπίας ὅ τι περ εἶχον ἐκ θεοῦ ἐκχέων, ὡς ἂν ἐπὶ τὸ μέγιστον τῶν ἀγαθῶν, τὴν σωτηρίαν, παρακαλῶν· περὶ γάρ τοι τῆς παῦλαν οὐδαμῇ οὐδαμῶς ἐχούσης ζωῆς οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν οὐδ' οἱ λόγοι παύσασθαί ποτε ἱεροφαντοῦντες. Ὑμῖν δὲ ἔτι τοῦτο περιλείπεται πέρας τὸ λυσιτελοῦν ἑλέσθαι, ἢ κρίσιν ἢ χάριν· ὡς ἔγωγε οὐδ' ἀμφιβάλλειν ἀξιῶ, πότερον ἄμεινον αὐτοῖν· οὐδὲ μὴν συγκρίνεσθαι θέμις ζωὴν ἀπωλείᾳ.

Chapter I

The beginning of the *Protrepticus* has the rhetorical effectiveness of an *exordium* (Steneker, 42; E. Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa,* Stuttgart, 1958 II, 549; W. Jäger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*, Cambridge Mass. 1965, 105 n.27). As in the *peroratio* at the end of the discourse, it calls to conversion in a highly emotional way, with an elaborate net of metaphors and images which aims so much at literary effect as at some apologetic goals. The main metaphor is that of the singer whose music has the power of guiding animals and the whole nature: the Logos is presented as the true Orpheus. The musical metaphor will be used to introduce some Biblical concepts like *nomos*, *pneuma*, or the power of the divine word (Logos). In connection with the musical imagery there are some secondary metaphors, which will appear several times throughout the book: theatre, trial, agon, mysteries. They all collaborate to the main motif of exhortation to conversion. Cf. C. H. Cosgrove, *JEChSt* 14 (2006), 255-282.

The fundamental contraposition between Greek Paganism and Christianity is built by defining two opposed fields, that of superstition (δεισιδαιμονία, γοητεία) and that of religion (θεοσέβεια). The former is represented by the misleading song of Pagan poets (mainly Orpheus), the latter by the song of the Logos. Clement proposes, according to the paradigm of conversion, the substitution of one song for another one. Christianity is therefore presented in traditional Greek categories, under a Greek myth like Orpheus', just as it will be presented along the whole work as the true philosophy or the true mystery. The symmetry between the Pagan field and the Christian one is complemented by a strict hierarchy between them to avoid any possible syncretism or equivalence. Dualistic oppositions like falsehood / truth, darkness / light, slavery / freedom, or the insistence on the "true" (ἀληθής) or "real" (ὄντως) song, freedom, truth or God, reveals the effort to neatly separate both fields.

Correspondingly to the presentation of Christianity in Greek moulds, "Paganism" is also constructed in a form adequate to the dualistic discourse. Cf. M. Rizzi, *Ideologia e retorica negli "exordia" apologetici. Il problema dell''altro'*, Milano 1993, 172-287. Clement presents Orpheus' song as his mysteries, thus fusing two aspects of his myth which were hitherto separate: the power of his music and his role as patron, founder and poet of mystery cults. "Paganism" is made a single conglomerate of evil and misleading mystery cults, Dionysiac festivals and traditional myths, all of them

represented by the song of Orpheus. This role of the Thracian poet is consistent with his other appearances in the *Protrepticus* (2.12-22, 7.74.3-5).

Clement's juxtaposition of Orpheus' song with Christ's is the first textual precedents of the image of Orpheus-Christ, very successful in later centuries (cf. J. B. Friedman, *Orpheus in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge Mass. 1970, and the introduction of J.-M. Roessli to the French version of the book). It was recovered by Eusebius in the *Laudes Constantini* (14.5.15) with a purely ornamental purpose (cf. 4.1). These texts have often been put into relation with the mosaics and frescoes which present Christ as Orpheus. Some Jewish mosaics of Orpheus-David probably led the way to this depicting Christ with some features of the Thracian singer. It is possible that Clement was influenced by such images, or that he was led by the same idea of profitting from the literary myth of Orpheus to present Christ and thus fuse Greek and Biblical traditions. Still, the religious role of Orpheus as patron of Greek mysteries, which is evidently present in Clement, does not seem to be significant in the iconographic Jewish and Christian evidence: cf. H. Stern, *Cah. Arch.* 23 (1974), 1-16; J. M. Roessli, Arch. Bob 25 (2003), 79-133; Ch. Markschies, in R von Haehling (ed.), *Griechische Mythologie und frühes Christentum*, Darmstadt 2005.

The chapter can be roughly divided in four sections: the metaphorical presentation of the New Song of the Logos, and its properties as creator and sustainer of the cosmos, its theological proposal of salvation, and its announcement through the Biblical prophecies. The first three are presented through the images of music and Orpheus, which appeal to the Greek sensibility of his audience, while the fourth part of the *exordium* is built over Biblical images, specially the first chapter of the Gospel of John: its prologue announces the Logos and contains the protreptic preaching of John the Baptist, whose exhortations to conversion are appropiated by Clement to make his own one. The exhortative tone of the *exordium* will be recovered in the last chapters.

ΠΡΟΤΡΕΠΤΙΚΟΣ: "*Protrepticus* against the Greeks of Clement (author) of the *Stromata*" is the title in P. It has been shown by Von Stockhausen (cf. introd nn. 113 and 51) to be a title which was added not much later after Clement's death, because it was the apologetic element which most attracted attention to the work. The original title was just *Protrepticus*, which linked the work to philosophical tradition (cf. introd. §4).

Old Song vs New Song

1.1. These first paragraphs pay great attention to metrical parallelism of the *cola*. Cf. Steneker, 38-45. The rhythmical effect is doubly adequate to an effective *exordium* and to the musical subject.

Ἀμφίων ὁ Θηβαῖος καὶ Ἀρίων ὁ Μηθυμναῖος: Amphion (Hdt. 1.23-24, Ael. *NA* 2.6, 6.15, 12.45) and Arion (*Od.* 11.262, Paus. 9.5.6-7, Hor. *Art. Poet.* 394-396) are coordinated with Orpheus as miraculous singers in Menand. Rhet. 2.392.19; Mart. Cap. 9.906-8; Stat. *Silv.* 2.2.60-61. They appear mainly as literary characters, contrary to Orpheus (*pace* I. M. Linforth, *The Arts of Orpheus*, Berkeley - LA 1941, 225, who would have Orpheus just as singer and not as patron of mysteries). They also have some Dionysiac connections: cf. *OF* 964-965 and W. Burkert, *Homo Necans*, Berkeley -LA 1983, 186-188 on Amphion and 199-201 on Arion).

Θρᾴκιος: Orpheus enters gradually, in the third place of the row and without mention of his name (cf. 1.3.1), a similar presentation to that of the Logos (cf. 1.2.3).

1.2. ἀδελφόν... μῦθον καὶ ᾠδόν: this prologue is full of parallels with the *Phaedrus*, of which this is the first (*Phaedr.* 238b, 276d). Cf. Butterworth and commentary to 1.3.

Εὔνομον: the myth of Eunomos (Tim. *FGH* 566 fr. 43, Strab. 6.1.9, 260C, *Ant. Pal.* 9.584, 6.54) is taken over by Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 75 probably from this passage. The name of the singer initiates a word-play with *nomos* in its double sense of "melody" and "law" continued through the next paragraphs. In *Corp. Herm.* 18.6 a similar image is used. Cf. Steneker, 13; and R. Merkelbach in *Mélanges Mondésert*, Paris, 1987, 191-194.

αὐτόνομον: this epithet is here used in musical sense for the first and only time in Greek literature. It has usually the sense of political independence but sometimes expresses inner independence (Soph. *Ant.* 821). It symbolizes the independence and superiority of Biblical Revelation towards Greek cults, and indicates, at the same time, that any hints of truth in them may have come from the true God (a theme which will be developed in chapters VI-VIII). There is not much symbolism in the *Protrepticus*, but this exceptional instance (perhaps due to its special place in the *proemium*) is confirmed by the ἑκών of the following paragraph.

1.3: τέττιξ: the cicada recalls Plato's *Phaedrus* (230c, 258e). In 259 bd the cicadas are said to come from men who died for their love of the Muses. The setting of

the scene also recalls that of the *Phaedrus* (229a: the hottest hour), which looms large over the whole book. Cf. Butterworth, 198f.

ἑκών: the chiastic sentence repeats the point of αὐτόνομον. The Greeks do not perceive that the true song comes from elsewhere (Ἕλλησι δ᾽ ἐδόκει ὑποκριτής).

2.1. μύθοις κενοῖς: Greek myths, sang by poets, are a main target of Clement's attack. The word *mythos* has always here a very negative sense as a tale not worth believing (1.8.4).

θέλγεσθαι μουσικῇ: the enchanting power of music is a traditional idea which Clement uses for his apologetic purposes (cf.1.3.1). Cf. H. Versnel, in Mirecki-Meyer (eds.): *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, Leiden 1999, 105-156.

Κιθαιρὼν δὲ ἄρα καὶ Ἑλικών: the location of "Paganism" in these two mountains, in contraposition to Christianity located in Sion, is a powerful metaphor which reflects the notion of conversion as a spacial movement (cf. introd. 18ff.). Cf. 1.2.3: "Let us leave Helicon and Sion, which are already old, and let us go to the holy mountain of God". 1.3.1: "Let them leave Helicon and Citheron and live in Sion". Citheron is the mountain of the *Bacchai* (cf. 12.119), where the image is recovered for the *peroratio*), Helicon is that of the Muses. Their juxtaposition is consistent with the identification between all Pagan poems and all cults intended by Clement to create a consistent Paganism out of them opposed to Christianity.

2.2. ἐγὼ μέν... ὑμῖν δέ: the dualistic structure of θεοσέβεια vs. δεισιδαιμονία is reflected also in the opposition Clement vs. the Greeks. It is not strange in the protreptic genre (Steneker, 124) but it is above all typical of the revelatory style in religious discourse, where a divine (or divinely inspired) speaker reveals his teaching to a generic crowd: *Hymn. Dem.* 120, *Il.* 24.460, Emped. Fr. 112.4 DK, Mt.5.20-43. Cf. 12.123.2 and other passages quoted in introd. n. 40.

δράματα καὶ τοὺς ληναΐζοντας ποιητάς: another element of the "Pagan conglomerate" is theatre. The Dionysiac origin of Greek theatre and the plot of the *Bacchai* is used to depict all dramatic festivals with maenadic features (wine, ivy leaves, ecstatic dances) in a prototypic image of the "Bacchic ritual" (τελετῇ βακχικῇ) "with satires and the maddened thiasos" (θιάσῳ μαινόλῃ, an expression used also in Phil. *De Plantat*. 148 and Orig. *CC* 3.23). This Dionysiac vocabulary anticipates the attacks on Dionysiac mysteries in 2.12ff. But the emphasis here is in theatre, which allows to

112

oppose the Pagan drama to the Christian one. The theatrical metaphor has been deeply studied by L. Lugaresi, *Adamantius* 9 (2003), 10-29. Cf. also 2.3.

γεγηρακόσιν: on the oldness of Greek cults against the novelty of Christianity, cf. 2.4 and 6.3.

2.3: τηλαυγὲς φῶς... τοὺς ἐν σκότει κυλινδουμένους: the opposition light / darkness is present along the whole work (cf. 11.113.2-4ff.), and here it brings an association with theatrical lights. These expressions have classical roots, Pind. *Pyth* 3.75, *Nem*. 3.64, Plat. *Phaed*. 82e4, *Polit*. 309 a5, and also Biblical resonance (Ps.18.9, quoted in 11.13.1). The immediate source may be Philo, *Spec*. 4.52.7.

ἐκ γὰρ Σιὼν ἐξελεύσεται νόμος, καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἰερουσαλήμ: the Biblical quotation (*Is*. 2.3) is skilfully used to reinforce the word-play with *nomos* and to introduce another key word of the *exordium*: *Logos*, which also has a double sense, both musical (the words of the song) and theological. Only in 1.7.1 the Logos will be named as Christ, in a gradual introduction similar to that of Orpheus (cf.1.1.1, 1.3.1).

ὁ γνήσιος ἀγωνιστής: the Logos triumphs in a cosmic contest over the Greek myths and poets. Cf. 10.96.3, 10.110.3. The adjective γνήσιος meaning both "noble" and "legitimate" (cf. 9.82.1ff) as opposed to "bastard" or "false" (νόθος, cf. 2.22.3).

τῷ παντὸς κόσμου θεάτρῳ: in combination with the agonistic image Clement introduces the theatrical metaphor which opposes the Christian drama to the Pagan one (1.2.2, 2.12.1-2, 2.21.2, 4.56-58, 4.60-61, 12.112). Cf. L. Lugaresi, *Vanitas ludus omnis". Il problema dei spettacoli Pagani nel critianesimo antico*, Doct. diss. Bologna 2006 (242-283 on the idea of *theatrum mundi*). As Mondésert 202 points out, Clement takes over the image in *Strom*. 7.3.20.3-4, recovering it in the other extreme of his work.

2.4: ᾄδει δέ γε ὁ Εὔνομος ὁ ἐμός: Clement prefers making his metaphors effective rather than consistent. The Logos is now not the song but the singer, a new Eunomos (cf.1.1.2). Terpander and Cepion (correcting with Mondésert καπίτωνος in P by Κηπίωνος, following Plut. *De mus*. 1132D, 1133C in spite of Hesychius' Καπίων), and the Phrygian, Lydian and Dorian modes (M. L. West, *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford, 1992, 174-189) represent traditional Greek music, replaced now by the Christian song.

τῆς καινῆς ἁρμονίας τὸν ἀΐδιον νόμον: "new" (*kainos*) is an epithet constantly applied to the song of the Logos (cf. *Ap. Joh*. 14.3: ᾄδουσιν ᾠδὴν καινήν). The novelty of Christianity was firstly emphasized against the Old Alliance of Judaism and then the apologists used it against the old cults of the Greeks (cf. W. Kinzig,

Novitas Christiana, Göttingen 1994, esp. 284ff). But novelties were traditionally looked with suspicion in the ancient world and it is one the accusations agaist the Christians (cf. 6.3). The other epithet ἀΐδιος (eternal) counterweighs the possible impression that it is a late invention.

τὸ Λευιτικόν: the Biblical Law is opposed to the aforementioned Greek melodies, as a result of the double sense of *nomos*. Uniting the Biblical and Greek tradition, Clement applies to his "new song" this epithet, which stands in clear opposition to the aformentioned Phrygian, Lydian and Dorian.

νηπενθές τ' ἄχολόν τε, κακῶν ἐπίληθες ἀπάντων: the Biblical new song is described with a Homeric line used for wine (*Od.* 4.221). The line, which in the Odyssey refers to a drink prepared by Helen in Egypt, was frequently quoted in context of miraculous curations: Iamblichus (*VP* 113) attributes one to Empedocles, who accomplished through its recitation (or as metaphor for cythara-playing); Luc. *Salt*. 79 and Dio Chrysost. *Or*. 12.52 think it a symbol of psychic catharsis which cures the soul. This use, which is similar to Clement's, has a clear Pythagorean root (cf. Zeegers 265, 271-273). But there is also another possible dimension of Clement's quotation: Ps.-Iust. *Cohort*. 28.2 quotes the Homeric line to illustrate a passage of Diodorus which proves Greek dependence from Egypt, since Helen was there (cf. Riedweg *ad loc*. for other passages which underline the Egyptian connection). It could also, therefore, refer to the fact that Clement is writing his work in Alexandria, or even to the idea that the fusion of Biblical and Greek tradition takes place through Egypt (cf. 6.70.1).

φάρμακον πειθοῦς ἐγκέκραται: Clement carries on the image of wine to justify his using of rhetoric: to "mix in the song a medicine of persuasion both sweet and true". The verbal parallel of Long. *Art. Rhet*. 190.12 Hammer supports keeping the reading in P πειθοῦς (against the conjecture πένθους), which allows the correspondence with Plat. *Phaedr*. 230d ("a spell to bring me out": cf. Butterworth, 199) and 275a, and keeps an etymological link with "faith" (πίστις) which will make those who are persuaded "believers" (cf. 12.123.1). Cf. 10.106.2 on φάρμακον.

3.1. ὁ Θράκιος ἐκεῖνος Ὀρφεύς: Orpheus is now mentioned by his name for the first time, in the head of the row of three singers, inversely to their appearence in 1.1. The parallelism with Logos (cf. 1.2.3) makes unlikely Wilamowitz's supposition that the name Orpheus is an inserted gloss. Cf. P. Vicari and E. Irwin in J. Warden (ed.)

Orpheus: Metamorphoses of a Myth, Toronto 1982; and M. Naldini, *CCC* 14 (1993) 331-343

γοητείᾳ: "magic" is one of the most prominent Christian accusations against Pagan cults, just as Christians were accused of the same charge by their Pagan critics. They all follow a tradition starting in Classical times, when the γόης is perceived as a dangerous outsider of polis religion (W. Burkert, *RhM* 105 (1962), 36-55): the word refers to poetic-musical, ritual and magical dimensions, but it ends up taking the pejorative sense of "wizard". Orpheus was called γόης by Strab. 7 fr. 10a Radt, possibly through identification with the itinerant priests which took him as authority (A. Bernabé in *Actas del X Congreso de la SEEC* III, Madrid 2002). Clement takes the word in the most negative sense ("witchcraft"), since the music of poets like Orpheus leads into *deisidaimonia*.

τὴν σκαιότητα τοῦ ἔθους: contrary to the traditional possitive consideration of "custom", Clement, like other Church Fathers, attacks it as an institutionalized perpetuation of error. Cf. 10.89.1 on the attack on συνήθεια. Such opposition to tradition is consistent with the reinversion of categories by which the new (καινός) is better than the old (παλαιός): cf. 1.6.3.

ᾠδαῖς καὶ ἐπῳδαῖς: The etymological game (cf. Steneker, 18f) shows the close relationship between music, poetry and magic (cf. 1.2.1). Cf. Latin *cantum / in-cantum*. Clement unites these three aspects of the figure of Orpheus as maximal γόης.

3.2: οὐ τοιόσδε: Within the symmetrical opposition of the singer of truth vs. the singer of falsehood, Clement presents the Logos as "new Orpheus", whose song liberates and vivifies men, in the same way that Orpheus' song led them to slavery and idolatry.

δουλείαν: the idea that Paganism enslaves is a Christian *topos*: Rm. 8.21, Gal 5.13, Tat. *Orat.* 29.3. Paed. 3.2.3, Ecl. 20.1. Philonic precedent in Mos.1.247.

εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνακαλεῖται τοὺς εἰς γῆν ἐρριμμένους: this image reflects the Gnostic motif of the fallen soul, which derives from vulgarized Platonism. Cf. J. Hering, *Étude sur la doctrine de la chute et de la préexistence des âmes chez Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1923; cf. 2.25.3-4, 10.100.3 on the affinities of Clement with Gnosticism, cf. Lilla.

4.1. τὰ ἀργαλεώτατα θηρία, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους: the comparison of men with animals probably belongs to the tradition of the protreptic genre (cf. 12.120.3-4). The

allegory is carefully explained: cf. J.-M. Roessli, *RHR* 219 (2002), 503-513, on these precautions, which are not necessary when Eusebius takes over the image in *Laud. Const.* 14.5.15. The equation of men with animals depending on the prominent feature of their character is an ancient theme (Semonides fr. 7 West) which Plato adapts to the theory of metempsychosis, where the soul is reincarnated in animals corresponding to its previous sins (*Tim.* 91, *Phaed.* 81e, *Resp.* 10.620a). Cf. *Strom.* 4.12.4, Boet. *Consol.* 4.3, following on the topic. There is not enough evidence to support R. Eisler's proposition (*Orphish-dionysische Mysteriengedanken in der christlichen Antike,* Leipzig-Berlin 1925, 61-86) that the myth of Orpheus and the animals was used to depict reincarnation in animals in some "Orphic" tale where Clement would have taken inspiration to draw a Christian response. Some of these comparisons will be followed up in later chapters (birds, cf. 10.91.3; snakes, cf. 7.4; pigs, cf.10.92.4). Cf. L. Alfonsi, in *Romanitas et Christianitas*, Amsterdam 1973, 1-3, and in general M. G. Murphy, *Nature Allusions in the works of Clement of Alexandria*, Washington 1941.

λίθοι καὶ ξύλα οἱ ἄφρονες: The comparison of the foolish with stones and wood follows the myths of Orpheus and Amphion (1.1) and prepares the ground for the critique of the cult of statues of wood and stone in chapter 4.

4.2. φωνή: The musical metaphor now incorporates the "voice of the prophets, co-singer of the truth". A quotation of Mt 3.9 (= Lc 3.8) equating men and stones helps to unite in the image the Biblical and the Hellenic tradition.

ἀγνοίᾳ καὶ ἀνοίᾳ: this type of phonetic word-plays are frequent in the *exordium* and *peroratio* of the discourse (Steneker, 40).

4.3. ἰοβόλους καὶ παλίμβολους: The snake (given this epithet in *Paed.* 3.5.3, *Strom.* 2.56.2) is designed by the quotation of Mt. 3.7 (=Lc 3.8). It takes the representation of the animals, as the lowest specimen, connected with the Fall of Man in Genesis and also with Pagan mystery cults (cf. 1.7.4). Yet even the snake can be turned into "men of God" (1 Tm.6.11, 2 Tm.3.17, cf. *Strom.*4.77.1). The quotation of Mt.7.15 extends the image to wolfs and lambs (cf. *Strom.*1.40.5), which will be retaken in 12.119.1.

ὑποκριτάς: Contrary the technical sense which this word had in 1.3, 1.2 (interpreter), the negative sense of "hypocrite" is predominant here, as in 108.1. Apologetics taints with negative (or positive) meanings formerly neutral words. Cf. Steneker, 12.

μετεμόρφωσεν εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἡμέρους: The verb μεταμορφέω is the metaphorical equivalent to μετανοέω ("to convert"). The notion of internal change coexists with that of spacial deplacement as images for conversion (cf. introd. pp. 9ff.). There might be a ring of Plat. *Phaedr.* 230a (cf. Butterworth 199).

4.4: Tit 3.3.5 illustrates the transformative power of God to change men. The quotation ends just before mentioning "baptism" and "the Holy Spirit". Clement prefers to stay in the abstract level of God's mercy, avoiding sacramental and dogmatical complexities (cf. introd. pp. 32ff.).

ὅρα τὸ ἆσμα τὸ καινόν: This expression is one of the most famous in the *Protrepticus*. Clement in 1.6.5 (μοι κέκληται) attributes to himself its coining to name Christ. It has precedents in Jdt. 16.13; Sal. 33 (32).3; 46 (45), 1; 48 (47), 1. It can also be found in Ap. 5.9, 14.3.

ἀκροαταὶ... ἀνεβίωσαν: Clement attributes to his singer (the Logos) a power of resurrecting which Orpheus' voice never had. The vivificating power of the Word of God, a common Biblical notion (*Gn.* 1.3; *Sal.* 10.20; *Mt.* 8.5-13) strange to the Greeks, is introduced here through the image of a familiar myth which is slightly modified. Iren. *Adv. haer.* 4.7.2 attributes this curative and vivifying power to "Jesus", not to "the Logos". The musical metaphor allows to present striking novelties smoothly.

The cosmic music of the Logos

5.1. τὸ πᾶν ἐκόσμησεν ἐμμελῶς: the Pythagorean image of the harmony of the world through music is attributed to the New Song in very similar terms to those of the *Orphic Hymn* 34, which attributes similar effects to Apollo's lyre (cf. T. Halton, *Sec Cent* 3 (1983), 177-199). It seems probable that Clement is drawing from some neo-Pythagorean speculation of cosmic harmony attained through music (cf. Plut. *De mus.* 1147A, Quint. *Instit*. 1.10.12; DL 8.33, Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math*. 4.6, 7.98, 10.283),. In this way he Hellenizes the Biblical account of creation in Gn 1.9-10, Job 38.10-11. Cf. Hippol. *Refut*. 1.2.2, 4.10.5; Method. *De resurr*. 2.10.2; *Epist. ad Diogn*. 7.2.

5.2. ἔρεισμα τῶν ὅλων: This passage is directly inspired in Philo *De Plant*. 8-9 (inspired himself by Plat. *Tim*. 32b). Daniélou 335; Lilla 209-211; and Van Winden 209. Other passages in Clement where the Logos appears as *anima mundi* (a doctrine shared with different nuances by Platonists and Stoics), are *Strom*. 5.104.4, 7.5.4, 7.9.2.

τὴν Θράκιον μουσικήν, τὴν παραπλήσιον Ἰουβάλ: the comparison between Orpheus and Jubal (Gn. 4.21, cf. Phil. *Cain*. 111), as Pagan and Biblical inventors of music, appears also in Theoph. *Autol*. 2.30, who says Jubal lived before Apollo or Orpheus, who came after the deluge. Clement takes over the chronological debate to a universalizing theological level: the New Song is superior to both the Greek and the Jewish song, which are contemporary. The paragraph ends with a relative clause which introduces David in order to link it with the next paragraph.

5.3: ἐκ Δαβίδ καὶ πρὸ αὐτοῦ: The link of the Logos with David refers to Jesus' genealogy, while as Logos he is prior to him (cf. 6.3). The figure of David is introduced here to be developed a bit later (5.4) in a typically Clementine gradual introduction.

σμικρὸν κόσμον, τὸν ἄνθρωπον... ἁρμοσάμενος: presenting man as a micro-cosmos Clement links the harmony of the cosmos to that of the human soul. The classical analogy (e. g. Democr. B 34) was taken over by Christians (R. Allers, *Traditio* 2 (1944), 319-407). It may well have been present in the Pythagorean source of Clement (cf. Greg. Naz. *De Anima* 17-20 refuting the theory that the soul is harmony).

ἁγίῳ πνεύματι: The agent of this harmony is the Holy Spirit, who enters the stage through the musical metaphor, taking *pneuma* as the wind necessary to produce sound in an instrument. After a mention to the Logos and before one of God, Galloni 114 sees in this passage a first affirmation of the Trinity. Cf. also 9.88.2 and 12.118.4.

τῷ ὀργάνῳ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ: the image of man as a (musical) instrument of God has both classical and Biblical precedents. Cf. R. A. Skeris, *XPΩMA ΘEOY*, Altötting, 1976, 131: "the idea was a Platonic commonplace". Plat. *Prot*. 338b, *Gorg*. 483d, *Leg*. 3.690b. Plutarch developed it as explanation of prophetic inspiration in *De Pythiae Orac*. 404b. Cf. also Porph. *Philos. ex Orac*. fr. 349.1 Smith. Philo (*Her*. 259, *Spec*. 1.65, *Mos*. 1.274, *Mut*. 139) and the Christians (Athenag. Leg. 7.3; Theoph. Autol. 2.9; Montan. fr 3 Heine; Ps.-Iust. *Cohort*. 8.2; Hippol. *Antichr*. 2; Orig. *CC* 2.9) took it to express the action of the Spirit over man, helped by Biblical precedents like those below. In Clement cf. *Paed*. 2.41.4-5, *Strom*. 6.168.3. M. Pujiula, *Körper und christiche. Lebensweise*, Berlin 2006, 150.

σὺ γὰρ εἶ κιθάρα καὶ αὐλὸς καὶ ναὸς ἐμοί: this sentence addressed from God to man is a quotation from some unidentified Jewish or Christian work. Similar

images to this *adespoton* are Ps. 56.8-9, 107.3. It may have been modified by Clement to correspond to the triad "harmony, spirit, logos". Cf. *Strom.* 6.88.3.

5.4. ὑμνεῖν αὐτὸν τοὺς δαίμονας: while Orpheus sings hymns to the "daemons" (the Pagan gods: cf. 2.41.1), David reappears ("whom we mentioned a few lines earlier") to fight them with true music. He recalls the therapeutic power of the divine song with his curation of Saoul through music (1 Sm 16.23). Precisely because they were easily compared, Orpheus and David have to be neatly opposed (προὔτρεπεν / ἀπέτρεπε) to avoid any possibility of syncretism. The same happened with Orpheus and Christ, and hence this insistence in associating the music of the Logos, presented with the myth of Orpheus, also with David. It reflects the need to add a Biblical link to the presentation of Christ as Orpheus (when Eusebius uses the image this link disappears, cf. J.-M. Roessli, *RHR* 219 (2002), 503-513). David as intermediate litereary step of Christ-Orpheus recalls the iconographic process: Jewish mosaics present David as Orpheus for the power of his music. Christian mosaics expand the image to Christ-Orpheus.

σοφία ὑπερκόσμιος: in *Paed.* 1.21.3 this expression indicates a wisdom which can understand mysteries incomprehensible for humans. It is equivalent to the "heavenly Logos" (2.3, 11.115.2, *Strom.* 4.31.4). Cf. A. K. Koffas, *Die Sophia-Lehre bein Klemens von Alexandrien*, Frankfurt am Main, 1982.

Theological presentation of the Logos

6.1: κύριος: previous images (instrument, song, Logos) are now concentrated on this unambiguous cult-title to designate in Christianity (as in many mystery cults), the Lord. (cf. A. D. Nock, *Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background*, New York 1964). Apart from the quotation of Isaiah in 1.2.3, the word has began to appear from 1.5.3, and it now turns to be the main title of the Logos. Biblical properties (to cure the blind and deaf, to vanquish death) can be now attributed to the Lord, turning away from the cover of Orpheus' myth, with expressions of umistakeable Biblical ring (Is. 35.5-6, Mt. 11.5, Lc. 7.22; Rm. 8.21; 1 Cor 15.26; 1 Cor 15.54; 2 Tm 1.10).

6.2: ἐλεεῖ, παιδευεῖ, προτρέπει...: these strings of words accumulating the various properties or actions of God are typical of the *Protrepticus* and confer it a hymnic tone. Cf. 8.2-3, 9.84.1, 10.94.1, 11.115.5. The following line ("just asking us

one thing, that we be saved"), is quoted by Zacharias of Mytilene, *De opif. mundi* (PG 85.1136A) as a sentence of "Clement, illustrious and just".

ὥσπερ ἡ μέλιττα: on the comparison of the truth with a bee (and other metaphors for truth), cf. T. I. Klibengajtis, *Eph Theol Lov* 80 (2004), 60-75. The bee was a classic model of virtues (cf. Semon fr. 7 West, Arist. *Hist. Anim.* 554a11, 625b33, Ael. *NA* 5.11.30), and it was a favourite image for Clement, who compares his master Pantaenus with it in *Strom.* 1.11.2 (W. Telfer, *JThS* 28 (1927), 167-178.).

6.3: μὴ καινόν ὡς σκεῦος: presenting novelty to the Greeks requires much subtility, since *kainotomia* was looked upon with suspicion and it will be the main criticism addressed to Christianity (Celsus *apud* Orig. *CC* 1.17, 5.37; Iambl. *De Myst.* 7.5, Iul. *Ep.* 46, 11, 136). Clement endeavours to explain how this newness must be understood by giving the question of priority a new dimension. The New Song will replace ancient Greek cults (2.2-4): Undoubtedly "error seems (φαίνεται) old, and truth seems a new thing". Yet the Logos existed much before them, since it is eternal. Through the citations of Ps. 109.3, 84.7 and Jn. 1.1 the chronological question is carried to cosmic terms, and the Logos turns out to be prior to the peoples who traditionally claimed to be first. Cf. Clement's solution to this question in 1.7.4.

6.4: Φρύγας... Ἀρκάδας, Αἰγυπτίους: on the claims of these peoples to be the oldest of all, cf. Hdt. 2.2, A. R. 4.264f (with scholion); Call. *Iamb.* I fr. 191.56 Pfeiffer; Stat. *Theb.* 4.275. The subject of chronological priority was much used by Christian apologists to show the priority of Biblical tradition (Hippol. *Refut.* 5.7.3-6, Orig. *CC* 4.36 with the same examples), cf. H. Pilhofer, *PRESBYTERON KREITTON. Der Alterbeweis der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte*, Tübingen, 1990.

ἀρχαΐζομεν: Jn. 1.1. is repeated after some lines to remark that God is the *arché* of man in philosophical terms (also in Iust. *Apol.*1.10.4, 1.28.3), which leaves without importance which people was the first. This is consistent with the construction of a human genos of God's children, which goes over previous ethnic barriers, developed in chapter 9.

6.5: Χριστός: Christ is finally presented as the name that the Logos, who has been given the highest philosophical status as ἀρχὴ θεία, has "taken now". It is a similar technique to the introduction of Orpheus (1.2.3). And to sum up and reunite all the effects of the musical metaphor, he explains: "I call him New Song".

7.1-2: εὖ ζῆν: After announcing salvation, Clement frequently underlines the paedagogic character of the Logos, whose call demands an ethical response. This practical side of conversion equates "being" and "being good" and is part of his theology (cf. *Paed*. 1.130.2, *Strom*. 4.18.3, 5.14.1, 5.6.3, 6.65.6, 6.100.2), and of Christian tradition (as is shown by the lengthy quotation of Tt. 2.11-13). But it is also part of the philosophical tradition and of the protreptic genre (the expression in Arist. *Pol*. 1252b 29, Plat. *Resp*. 1.353, SVF III 16). The "living well" will be developed in Chapter 1 and will be the subject-matter of the *Paedagogus*.

7.3: τοῦτο ἐστι τὸ ᾆσμα τὸ καινόν: insistence through repetition of images is a typical stylistic resource of Clement, which can be at times close to monotony. Repetition is also frequent on the conceptual level: Clement insists on the existence of the Logos before everything else (προών) through the quotation of Jn.1.1 (cf. 6.3, 6.4).

ὡς δημιουργός,... ὡς διδάσκαλος... ὡς θεός: the Logos makes men live (τὸ ζῆν), live well (τὸ εὖ ζῆν) and be saved (τὸ ἀεὶ ζῆν). This sentence shows that rhetorical effect is for Clement more important than theological precision in this persuasive work, since this tripartition has little to do with Trinitarian theology and much with the word-play around the verb "to live".

7.4: οὐ νῦν γε πρῶτον... ἀλλ' ἄνωθεν ἀρχῆθεν... νῦν δέ ἠδή: the conciliation of eternity and historicity, of oldness and newness (unresolved e. g. in 1 Jn 2.7-8) is attempted through juxtaposition of opposed terms. A similar solution to the question of newness in Mel. Sard. *Hymn. Pasch*. or Aug. *Conf*. 10.27: *pulchritudo tam antiqua et tam nova*.

ἑρπηστικὸν θηρίον γοητεῦον: the Devil is not given a name, though the allusion to a "reptile monster" leaves clear who the enemy is. The enslaving of men through magic (γοητεία) associates him with Orpheus' song (1.3.1). The snakes often appearing in the mysteries help to identify the Devil as inspirer of superstition and false cults (2.12.2, 2.22.3, 3.43.1, 10.91.3, etc.).

7.5: νεκροῖς τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους συνδεῖν: Aristotle's *Protrepticus* (fr. 107 Düring), compares the situation of the soul in the body to a punishment attributed to Etrurian pirates. He allegedly transmits an image from "the ancient initiatiors", i. e. Orphic poets, who developed many images on the imprisonment of the soul in the body: cf. P. Courcelle, *REA* 78 (1966) 101-122. Aristotle is echoed by his imitators: Cicero in his *Hortensius* (fr. 112 Grilli), whence come other Latin allusions (Aug. *C. Iul. Pelag.*

4.15.78, Macr. *Somn. Scip.* 1.11.3, Serv. *In Aen.* 8.497, Val. Max. 9.2.ext. 10.); and Iamblichus (*Protr.* 8). An influence of Aristotle's model is therefore probable in this passage (Cataudella, xxiv-xxxi). On this *topos*, cf. Brunschwig, *Rev. Phil. de la France et de l'étranger* 88 (1963), 171-190; J. Pépin, in *Mélanges Gandillac*, Paris 1985, 387-406; A. P. Bos, *The Soul and its Instrumental Body*, Leiden-Boston 2003, 315ff; and specifically on this passage, J. Piquemal, *Rev Phil* 153 (1963), 191-198. Clement makes a particular interpretation by making superstition the chain which ties men, and identifying the idols with the corpses.

τύραννος καὶ δράκων: Clement puts under the power of the Devil (the snake) the idolatry which he will attack in chapters 2, 3, and 4. On tyranny as opposed to God's freedom, cf. also 2.49.2.

7.6: εἷς ὁ ἀπατεών... εἷς καὶ ἐπικούρος...: the exact parallelism of the sentence draws a fundamental dualism of the Devil (Gn. 3.1) vs. the Lord, who fight over the destiny of men from the beginning (ἄνωθεν, ἀρχῆθεν) till now (νῦν δὲ ἤδή). In this cosmic fight men are the same as Eve (cf. 2.12.2).

Biblical presentation of the Logos

8.1-2: φύγωμεν... καὶ προσδράμωμεν: the same exhortative expression in the *peroratio* (12.118.1). It draws on the basic idea of conversion as a spatial percourse from A to B, over which a rhetorical tone of urgence is added.

τὸν ἄρχοντα: the Devil is described with the words of Eph. 2.2 (cf. 10.90.1), and the Lord through the story of *Exodus* (7.3, 3.2). This contraposition is the link of the previous references to the Enemy with the subject which dominates the end of Chapter I, namely, the variety of ways that the Logos has to exhort men (a subject which will be raised again in chapter IX).

8.2: φόβῳ προΰτρεπεν... λογικώτερον ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον ἐπιστρέφει: cf. 9.83-85 for this justification of frightening with punishment in order to convert, as a father does with his children. The simile of a doctor who gives different medicines to different cases (καθάπερ ἰατρός) was already a *topos* of ethical teaching. For the rhythmic enumeration of the different activities of the Logos (also in the next paragraph), cf. 1.6.2. The etymological insistence on the root of *logos* insists in the true rationality offered by Clement (cf. also 10.3): cf. C. Mondésert, *RecSR* 42 (1954), 258-265.

8.3: μέρος ἢ μέλος: this word-play (through the phonetic similarity and the fact that the "members" are "parts" of the body) was a favourite of Plato (*Phileb*. 14e 1, *Tim*. 77a1, *Leg*. 7.795e4), who was followed by Philo (*Spec*. 3.182, *Virt*. 32.). Clement perhaps adds the other sense of μέλος "melody", since he immediately links the medical simile with musical imagery (πολύφωνος). Metaphors come and go to form a cluster of different images linked by one common element, a constant dualistic opposition.

φῶς / πῦρ: this contraposition, underlined by the syntactic and semantic parallelism of the sentence, clarifies the positive and negative meaning that these two elements will keep as signs of grace and punishment along the *Protrepticus*, where they abound since they are both fix elements of the Eleusinian imagery (2.22.2, 22.6-7).

8.4: ἐν στόματι προφητῶν αὐτός: the prophets sing as the poets (φθέγγονται), but they do not sing myths (cf. 1.1.2). The Logos speaks through them and at last will speak himself. The style of the sentence, with the repetition of αὐτός three times, is highly emphatic, almost hymnic. The revelation of the Logos is progressive: first in the *Exodus*, then through the prophets, then speaking himself (in Christ, i. e. in the New Testament).

ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος... ἄνθρωπος γένηται θεός: the chiastic sentence reformulates the *kenosis* (the incarnation in flesh of the Logos) after quoting its classical formulation in Ph. 2.6-7. Revelation of God as reason of the Incarnation is also given in Jn. 1.12 (quoted at the very end of the chapter in 10.3: it is probably already at the background of this sentence, after quoting Jn.1.1. in 1.6 and Jn.1.15ff in the next paragraph). Cf. Casey 55 and 12.122.4, where the theme of divinization of man (ὁμοίωσις θεῷ) is taken again.

9.1: φωνή: John the Baptist is introduced as the "voice of the Logos", which preaches conversion (προτρεπτική, παρακλητική, προτρέπουσα). His staging in follows closely the guidelines of the first chapter of the Gospel of John (already hinted at in 1.6 and the preceding paragraph): In Jn. 1.15 John announces the Logos and denies to be Elijah or Christ, but "the voice who cries in the desert". So does Clement, paraphrasing the Gospel in a rhetorical style. The "voice", mentioned 11 times in two paragraphs, allows an easy link with the musical images of the rest of the chapter.

τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν;: in Jn. 1.19 John the Baptist is asked σύ τις εἶ; Clement uses instead a well-known Homeric formula to ask about identity (*Il*. 21.150, *Od*. 1.170), in a clear example of Hellenization of the Biblical tradition along the whole

work. The following line goes on with the same technique, asking John with Homeric words (*Od.* 1.10): εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν and getting the answer from the Biblical text (Is.40.3 used by Mt 3.3, Mc 1.3, Lc 3.4, Jo 1.23). This kind of short question is often used in the *Protrepticus* as introduction to a longer explanation of a new subject (Steneker 128).

9.2-4: ἀγγέλου φωνή: the voice of an angel (as πρόδρομος of the Lord: cf. Orig. *In Jo* II.194) joins that of John. The reference is now to Lc.1.36 where the conception of John the Baptist is narrated. The mention of the angel comes quite unexpectedly, as a result of a mental association through the figure of John the Baptist. But he is easily integrated, since both φωναί have the same vivifying force as that of the Logos. The power to make fertile a woman is compared to making fertile a desert through the quotation of Is 54.1 (= Gal 4.27). Cf. V. Pavan, *Vet. Christ*. 18 (1981) 341-355. He mentions similar passages in Iust. *Apol.* 1.53.5, *Dial.* 52.10-54.6, Iren. *Haer.* 1.10.3. In Clement, cf. *Strom.* 2.28.5, 2.31.1-3.

αἰνίσσονται μοι: the dative personal pronoun reveals that this is a personal allegoresis. Clement is a staunch defensor or allegorical interpretation of the Bible (he dedicates the 5th book of the *Stromata* to justify it), on the steps of Philo, whom he follows in many occasions (cf. A. van der Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and his Use of Philo in the Stromateis*, Leiden, 1988).

9.5: Εἷς γὰρ καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος: the two images of John and the angel have been forced to be parallel in the last paragraph. They end up being two instances of one and the same divine power, the Logos.

τέκνα τῆς εὐγενοῦς: the theory of the children of the free and those of the slave (Gal. 4.21-31) is adapted to the image of the desert and the sterile woman, and both to Clement's allegory which interprets them in terms of faith. The desert and the sterile Hebraic woman give children, the believers (πιστοί), through the Logos. The unfaithful (ἄπιστοι) still belong to the sterile and the desert. These images will be developed in chapter 9.

10.1: τὴν μυστικὴν ἀπολῦσαι σιωπήν: the birth of John the Baptist, herald (κῆρυξ) of the Logos is recuperated to treat his dumbness, which is allegorized as the silence and enigmatic style of the prophets, broken when the Logos comes and speaks (*Strom.* 4.134.4). Since silence was a characteristic feature of mysteries (as also was the *keryx*), this interpretation is used to introduce the metaphor of Christian mysteries at the

end of the chapter. It will be developed in the *peroratio* (12.119). Cf. Riedweg 135. It also prepares the attack on Greek mysteries of the next chapter.

10.2-3: καθαρσίων**:** Clement devises a three-stage process to contemplate God which is moulded on the Pagan mysteries, which he wants to substitute for those of the Logos: purification (moral purity instead of ritual purifications, a usual Christian argument (cf. 2 Tm 4.8, Orig. *CC* 3.16, 4.10, 8.48ff); learning (ἐκμαθεῖν), and contemplation (ἐποπτεῦσαι). This structure is described in *Strom.* 5.70.7 as belonging to the mysteries. Cf. Riedweg 143.

δάφνης πετάλων καὶ ταινιῶν τινων ἐρίῳ: a long scholion explains the use of these elements in Apolline rites and the Panathenaic procession. Plut. *V. Thesei* 22.6-7. They are not technically "purifications" (as Clement probably knows, cf. *Strom.* 4.7.2) but the exhortative tone of the *exordium* allows these imprecisions. In this way the whole Pagan religion is being represented by the mysteries.

πύλαι: the image of the gates is opened by the citation of Jn 10.9 "I am the door (θύρα), which is complemented by Mt 11.27 about the Son as the only way to attain knowledge of God. Gates are a usual image to designate the revelation of hidden truth, from Parmenides' prologue (fr. 1. DK) and Orphic poems (*OF* 1, cf. 7.74.2) to Plato and Gnostic visions. They are literary metaphors based on the basic conceptual notion of knowing, as hearing, enters in the mind through an open gate. No doubt all this tradition is present here as a Greek complement to the Biblical phrase, based on the same basic image. The "gates of reason" (λογικαί) opened with the "keys of faith" express nicely the complementarity between faith and reason (cf. 4.63.5 abounding on the image). The link to the mysteries may be purely metaphorical, but one cannot exclude that gates played some role in Eleusinian ritual as an element of revelation and secret.

Chapter II

After the *exordium*, this chapter starts the *refutatio* of the discourse. It is a forceful attack on Greek cults and gods, which aims to show their most ridiculous or scandalous sides. It is full of apologetic *topoi*, which Clement exploits with great rhetorical skill: within the metaphorical frame of a trial against Paganism, he passes through all fields of Greek religion, with special emphasis on the most popular ones – divination, mysteries, Olympian gods like Zeus, saviour-gods like Heracles, Asclepios or Dionysus–. In this exposure of Greek religion he transmits very valuable pieces of information on cults and myths, and some fragments of poets and philosophers. Many of these are shared with other Christian apologists and Pagan critiques of Greek religion, since most of them come from literary sources shared by all these authors. But on the other hand, many of his informations are unique, and in other cases this text is the source from which later descriptions of Greek religion come (like the sections on divination and mysteries, taken over by Eusebius in his *PE* 2.3.1-42, who transmitted them to other Christian later authors). It is also remarkable how he manages to link one bookish source with another through rhetorical techniques (like the frame of the trial) to form a coherent discourse which though it may be sometimes monotonous, is far from being a mere list of examples. Since the sections of these chapter cover various themes, they shall be treated separately.

The condemnation of Greek divination

11.1: μὴ πολυπραγμονεῖτε: chapter I ended exhorting with this verb ("to inquire") to follow Christ, and now this negative exhortation links it with the mockery of Greek divination which opens chapter II. The despective allusions to different Greek sanctuaries (a short anticipation of the long refutation of Greek mysteries) will be taken over by Arn. *Adv. Nat* 1.26.4; Eus. PE 2.3.1 and *Theoph.* 3.13; Thdt. *Aff.* 10.3; Greg. Naz. *Or.* 5.32. The allusions do not go beyond naming the sanctuaries and they do not seem to follow any order other than the mental association of the most famous ones, so there is no need to think of any written source (unlike the next section on the mysteries).

γεγηράκοσι καταλείψατε: the insistence on the "oldness" of Greek cults and the exhortation to turn away from them link these sections of the *refutatio* (cf. also 2.37.2-3) with the *exordium* (cf. 1.1.3).

Σεσίγηται...διελήκεγκται... διήγεσαι: the silence of the oracles and the fountains contrasts with the song and the voice of the Logos praised in chapter I. But together with the "refuting" and the "showing", the silence of oracles inaugurates the judicial metaphor against Greek cults which dominates chapter II.

τέθνηκε νάματα μαντικά: Steneker, 20, shows the effective alliteration of dental and nasal consonants produced by the combination of these three words.

11.2: μαντικῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ μανικῆς: this word-play is based on Plat. *Phaedr*. 244c 2-5 (cf. Butterworth 199), but contrary to Plato's understanding of the term, μανία has a very negative sense along the whole *Protrepticus* (e. g. 10.99.1, 12.122.2). Christians understand it a "madness", and as such it has arrived to our days as a kind of illness, instead of the ecstatic frenzy it meant for the Greeks.

ἄχρηστα χρηστήρια: this phonetic word-play with two different verbal roots ("to use" and "to utter oracles") is presented by Clement as a kind of oxymoron, as if they were etymologically linked. Cf. Steneker 15. It is exactly the opposite phonetic word-play than will be made in 12.123.1 with the name of Christ (Χριστός).

τὸν Ἀπόλλω: the collocation of this word is disputed. P has it between Amphiaraus and Amphilocus, but it is obviously asymmetrical to these two other oracles. Marcovich and others make it a juxtaposition to Claros and others deleted it as a glose. Yet Clement is accumulting names more worried about the rhythm of his *refutatio* than its contents, and after three sanctuaries the string of three names seem adequate. Suggestions of substitution by more concrete names (Trophonios, Mopsos) are atractive bur hazardous.

ἀνέρου: the need of a verb (an imperative very coherent with the context of accusation: "ask") justifies the emendation of the "unholy" (ἀνιέρου) of P, a clear *lectio facilior.*

σοφιστήρια... κυβευτήρια: homoioteleuton complements both rhythmic prose and word-plays or etymology, both much used in this section. Cf. Steneker 18ff.

γοήτειας: the last sentence (same theme in Tert. *Apolog.* 23.1), an apparently anticlimactic addition to the conclusion of the previous sentence, links through the concept of *goeteia* the divination with the mysteries, whose denunciation begins also with this word. Cf. 1.3.1, 1.7.4.

The condemnation of Greek mysteries

The *refutatio* of Paganism continues with the unmasking of Greek mysteries. The information offered in this section has been a main source on Greek cults for modern scholars (cf. P. Scarpi, *Le religioni dei misteri I: Eleusi, dionisismo, orfismo*, Firenze, 2001, pp. 55, 59, 73, 141, 147, 187, 285, 379, 389, 407, 413 and commentaries *ad loc*). Eusebius' statement (*PE* 2.2.64) that Clement had been initiated in the mysteries and therefore spoke from direct knowledge is not to be trusted, since it responds to a *topos* of the conversion theme and there are clear traces of a bookish source: cf. Riedweg, 117-123; N. Robertson, *GRBS* 37 (1996), 365-375; and M. Herrero, *Emerita* 75.1 (2007), 37-51. Greek mysteries are described in alphabetical order (Aphrodite, Deo, Demeter, Dionysos, Korybantes, Pherephatta) and their description is systematically structured in aetiological myth followed by *symbola, hagia* and /or *synthemata* of each cult. A handbook on Greek *teletai* of Hellenistic age must have been Clement's source in this section. Since the mythical episodes also seem to follow a theogonical order (Aphrodite is born from Ouranos, Zeus is born from Deo, from incest with his mother begets Persephone and from incest with his daughter begets Dionysus, who is murdered by the Titans, while Persephone is taken by Aidoneus), it is very probable that the main source of this handbook was one (or several) Orphic poem(s), since these episodes have an undoubtedly Orphic ring (cf. *OF* 300-333 Bernabé). There are some traces of verse under the prose paraphrase (cf. 18.1). Under Clement's description, therefore, lies an Orphic theogony which can be dated at least to early Hellenistic age because of the striking correspondences of this section with *P. Gurob*, dated in 275 BC (edited by J. Hordern, *ZPE* 129, 131-140): they mention in the same order the same deities, ritual formulas and technical words (cf. comments to 16.2 and 17.2, and M. Herrero, *Emerita* 75.1 (2007), pp. 23-26).

These passages were the direct and only source of inspiration of many other references to the mysteries of other Christian and Byzantine writers (Epiph. *Expos. fidei* 10 (510.10 Holl-Dummer), Greg. Naz. Or. 5.31, 39.4; Thdt. *Affect.* 1.22 (109.4 Canivet), *Schol. Plat. Gorg.* 497c = 160 Greene; Psel. *Quaenam sunt Graecorum opiniones de daemonibus*, 3 = *PG* 122, c 878D 3-4 Migne), whose information, therefore, lacks any value to reconstruct Greek cults. The Latin writer Arnobius (*Adv. Nat.* 5.19-26) translates quite freely Clement's text, though he adds details either from other sources or from his own knowledge of the mysteries: E. Rapisarda's

demonstration (*Clemente Fonte di Arnobio*, Torino 1939) that Clement is Arnobius' main source is still valid, in spite of F. Mora's recent attempt (*Arnobio e i culti de mistero*, Roma, 1994) to show the contrary (cf. introd. p. 36 n. 102).

12.1 καταλέγοιμι τὰ μυστήρια**:** the "catalogue" (of myths, cults, passages) is a typical form of apologetic attack against Paganism which most often springs from a written source, like in this case (cf. the preceding observations).

οὐκ ἐξορχήσομαι: The prevention that telling the myths and the *symbola* is not profanation could perhaps spring from the treatise on the mysteries which Clement uses as source. The reference to Alcibiades gives it a cultivated tone appropriate for a scholarly book on religion, which would thus prevent any accusation of impiety (cf. Athenag. *Leg*. 4.1: Diagoras was accused of unveiling the *orphikos logos*). Clement profits from that editorial precaution to refute Paganism as a ridiculous superstition. Accepting the possibility of profanating would give mysteries some sacral importance. Cf. Riedweg, *Mysterienterminologie,* 58 n. 144. But perhaps he is just preparing the following metaphor of a trial by saying that he will not "dance" the mysteries as Alcibiades had done. The rhetoric of profanation in 2.14.1, 2.22.4 seems to point at this.

ἀπογυμνώσω... τὴν γοητείαν τὴν ἐγκεκρυμμένην**:** the exposition of the mysteries takes the form of a judicial accusation which will reveal hidden crimes. Magic (γοητεία, cf. 1.3.1, 1.7.4) was a possible charge at the time (e. g. Apuleius' defended himself against it in *De magia*) and Clement turns it against the mysteries.

τοὺς καλουμένους ὑμῶν θεούς**:** Clement refuses to concede titles like God, truth or religion to the Pagan side, but he had no other way to refer to them, so he uses despective expressions like "so-called". Cf. 1.3.1, 2.23.1

ἐπὶ σκηνῆς... ἐγκυκλήσω θεαταῖς**:** the judicial image leads to the recuperation of the theatrical metaphor used in 1.2.3. Clement refers to the ἐγκύκλημα, a theatrical engine which carried to the scene what was hidden in the backstage. The scene of a judgement is similar to a theatre and the fusion of both images is simple. It leads to have in mind Euripides' *Bacchai* in the following sentence.

12.2 Διόνυσον μαινόλην ὀργιάζουσι Βάκχοι ὠμοφαγία: Clement accomplishes here another of the fusions of different Greek traditions within the "Pagan conglomerate" (1.2.1). The word *bacchoi* was hitherto strictly limited to the initiates of Bacchic mysteries (cf. R. Turcan, in *L'association Dionysiaque dans les societés anciennes*, Roma 1986, 227-246). By attributing to them the archetypical behaviour of

the maenads, i. e. eating raw flesh and wearing crowns of snakes, two separate fields of Dionysiac cult (A. Henrichs, *OCD*, 1996) are fused as if all Bacchic mysteries had maenadic behaviour. The masculine *bacchoi* refered hitherto exclusively to the initiates in Bachic mysteries, and here it is transferred to the *bacchai*, who were essentially female. The blurring of the gender separation collaborates in this fusion (cf. also 16.2). Arnobius *Adv. Nat.* 5.19, when (freely) translating this passage, distinguishes neatly both types of Dionysiac cult: *Bacchanalia inmania quae nomen Omophagiis graecum est... sed et illa desistimus Bacchanalia altera praedicare, in quibus arcana et tacenda res proditur insinuaturque sacratis*. Clement, as Firmicus Maternus (*De err.* 6) or his own scholiast (cf. 112.2) has the typical external view of Dionysus as an enemy, which tends to put all Bacchic manifestations in the same basket (cf. Roman opposition to the Dionysiac cult in 169BC, described by Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 39.8.3ff).

ἐπολολύζοντες Εὐάν, Εὔαν ἐκείνην: this apparently absurd etymology is seriously believed by Clement, who combines freely allegory and etymology since both give the true sense of words (Steneker, 19; Treu, *Stud Pat* 4 (1959), 198). The allusion to Aramaic pronounciation proves that he considered it true. It collaborates in the effort to link Biblical and Greek tradition. The origin of the Bacchic cry (probably onomatopoietic) was matter of many speculations which also talked of "the first moment": Pausanias (4.31.4) etymologizes the Messenian mountain Εὔα from the ἐπίφθεγμα βακχικόν which would have first been cried there. Arignote (*apud* Harpocrat. *s. v.* εὖοι σάβοι *cf.* Tresp, *Die Griechischen Kultschriftsteller*, Berlin 1903, 173) made it come from the cry of εὖ which celebrated the discovery of the mirror. Cf. Ovid. *Met*. 4.5. Clement inserts his apologetics in an older tradition which wanted etymology to reveal a deep truth rather than linguistic accuracy. He offers another etymology of Eve in *Strom*. 3.80. Cf. also Theoph. *Autol*.1.28.6, Epiph. *De fide* 10.7. For other examples of Christianization of Pagan etymologies, cf. I. Opelt, *RAC* 2 (1959) 70-85; *RAC* 6 (1966), 41-48. On other examples of apologetic philology like *Strom*. 5.14.122.2, 6.2.17.1ff. and Ps. Iust. *Cohort*. 17.1, cf. Herrero 182-192.

ὄφις ἐστὶ τετελεσμένος: snakes were prominent in mystery cults as chthonic symbol (W. Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults*, Cambridge Mass., 1987, 94). Clement does not miss the opportunity to associate those snakes with that of the Genesis which Christians identified with Satan (Steneker 12) and to point out all possible snakes in mystery cults.

δρᾶμα ἤδη ἐγενέσθην μυστικόν: this sentence was taken as evidence that the mysteries of Eleusis included a theatrical performance of Demeter's myth. Wilamowitz (*Der Glaube der Hellenen* II, Berlin 1931, 371, 481) dismissed this idea as wrongly deduced from the purely metaphorical references to theatre some lines earlier. It is not evident that this sentence still hangs on the metaphor and Clement will insist in the representation of the Eleusinian myth (2.17.1), but since he does not seem to have been initiated in Eleusis, his text loses strength as evidence. Cf. Riedweg 121 n.26, with other bibliography. Other independent Christian and Pagan texts talk of a representation of Kore's rape in Eleusis (Tert. *Ad Nat.* 2.7, Lact. *Ep.* 23, Arist. *Eleus.* 19 p. 422 Dindorf, Lucian *Katapl.* 22). It was probably a symbolical representation of Demeter's search, cf. C. Sourvinou-Inwood in Cosmopoulos (ed.): *The Greek Mysteries*, London 2003, 25-49, based on Hipp. *Ref.* 5.8.39-40. Clement's metaphor and the fusion with Dionysiac festivals (cf. 1.2.3) transforms it into a theatrical drama.

13.1. ἐτυμολογεῖν: the etymologies of ὄργια from the wrath (ὀργή) of Demeter and of μυστήρια from the offense (μύσους) to Dionysus may well spring from the handbook on the mysteries since they are completely consistent with the myths told later (Deo's rape in 15.1 and Dionysus' salying in 17.2), and they could serve as introduction to the narration in Clement's source as they are in Clement's text. Cf. Steneker, 18 and commentary to 2.12.2 on etymology.

ἀπὸ Μυοῦντος... ὃν ᾽Απολλόδωρος λέγει: this quotation of Apollodorus (*FGH* II B 244 F103) does not probably come from the handbook on the mysteries, since it breaks the symmetry of the two earlier etymologies. It is probably inserted by Clement, who again quotes Apollodorus Περὶ θεῶν in *Protr.* 2.29.16.

13.2 ἐπιτυμβίῳ τιμῇ: cf. 2.19.2 and 2.34.1-2 insisting in the same identification of mystery cults with celebrations of tombs and crimes.

μυθήριά σοι... τὰ μυστήρια: another homoioteleuton which is profitted to identify both concepts, as if all mysteries were as false as all myths. *Et. Magn.* 395.48 μυστήρια μυθήρια must derive from Clement's text. The word "mystery" takes in this section a very negative meaning which will be reinversed in the final part of the work (cf. 11.111.2).

Θρᾳκῶν... Φρυγῶν... ῾Ελλήνων... Clement includes foreign and Greek mysteries in the Pagan conglomerate. "Greek" will end up meaning "Pagan".

13.3-5 ὁ τῆσδε ἄρξας τῆς ἀπάτης: the dispute around a founder (πρῶτος εὑρετής) was always around a "cultural hero" who brings civilization (A. Kleingünther, *Πρῶτος εὑρετής*, Leipzig 1933; M. Thraede, *RAC* 5 (1962), 1191-1278). Clement inverts the argument, making them the fathers of error. With the exception of Cyniras, the list of founders follows alphabetical order (Dardanos, Eetion, Midas, Melampos). Since the Euhemeristic story of Aphrodite as Cinyras' lover in 2.14.2 seems an insertion of Clement in the mythological narration of his source, it is probable that the alphabetical list of founders belonged to the handbook on mysteries and the reference to Cinyras (cf.2.14.2) –which breaks the enumeration with εἴτε... εἴτε... εἴτε...– was inserted by Clement himself from an Euhemeristic source (2.14.2).

Μίδας: Ovid (*Met*.11.92) and Cono (*OF* 527) make also the Phrygian king a disciple of Orpheus, who reappears again as proto-founder and transmitter of mysteries.

Μελάμποδα ἐξ Αἰγύπτου: the Egyptian origin of Eleusinian cults was a popular idea in ancient times which Christians assumed (cf. Herrero 206-210 and commentary to 6.70.1). Apart from Melampous, Orpheus and Musaeus were other possible transmitters. Cf. F. Graf, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit*, Berlin -New York, 1974.

ἀρχεκάκους... πατέρας... ἐγκαταφυτεύσαντας: the founders are "starters of evil, fathers of disgrace, growers of the seed of evil and corruption". Clement follows a biological model within a generative framework of the history of ideas. Cf. 2.22.3-4.

14.1: ἤδη the etymologies and founders have introduced some "suspense" and now the formal accusation announced in 2.12.1 starts, as if it was a judicial discourse, with the verb ἐξελέγξω (to accuse): cf. 2.15.3, 2.16.3

ἀγορεύω δὲ ἀναφανδόν: this sentence has a touch of profanatory provocation, which makes clear what he meant in 2.12.1 when he said: "I will not dance but will bring to scene".

14.2 ἀφρογενής... ἐξεφαάνθη: these allusions to verses may come from Hesiod (*Theog*. 195-200). The birth of Aphrodite, however, was also told in Orphic poems: *OF* 189 tells Aphrodite's birth from Ouranos' castration and *OF* 260 alludes obscurely to a second one born through foam. It cannot be discarded, therefore that these poetic words come from the Orphic theogony from where other Orphic lines in this section spring, since it is the basis of the myths which Clement's handbok on the mysteries narrates (cf. *supra* introduction to this section).

ἡ Κινύρᾳ φίλη: the Euhemeristic version of Aphrodite's cult seems incompatible with the mythical narration of her springing from Uranos genitals. The reference to Cinyras comes from an euhemeristic source, though not Euhemeros himelf, cf. M. Winiarkzyck, *Euhemeri Messenii Reliquiae*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1991, 50-52; *Euhemeros von Messene,* München- Leipzig, 2002, 16-17. It is probably an addition of Clement himself to the information of his handbook, given the absence of Euhemerism in the rest of the section (cf. also Cinyras breaking of the alphabetical order in the list of founders in 13.4). He acknowledges familiarity with Euhemeristic works in 2.24.2. On Euhemeristic tradition in Christian writers, cf. F. Zucker, *Philologus* 64 (1905), 465-472.

τεκμήριον τῆς γονῆς: Clement follows the structure of his treatise. He tells the myth and then the *symbola / synthemata* of the cult. Cf. 2.22.5. The salt and the phallus refer to the mythical birth from Uranus, the coin refers to the euhemeristic story of Cinyras.

ἑταίρᾳ ἐρασταί: the paragraph finishes with the alliteration producd by the combination of these two homophonic words (Steneker, 20).

15.1: Δηοῦς δὲ μυστήρια. the epiclesis Deo shows that these myths were initially told in an (Orphic) poem (a theogony or, if Clement's source used several poems, perhaps a hymnic poem). The Phrygian Mother and Demeter are united under this name. This fusion between both divinities, which really belong to the same type of the Mother-Goddess, is already present in *P. Derveni*, col. XXII.7 (*OF* 398). Steneker, 25, remarks the phonetic effect caused by the succession of this clause with the next one (Δηοῦς-Διός, μυστέριαμητέρα, Δήμήτρα). It gives an idea of the way Clement summarized his source, aiming to the highest rhetorical effects.

Διὸς πρὸς μητέρα Δήμητρα ἀφροδίσιοι συμπλοκαί: Zeus' incest with his mother is one of the most specific Orphic myths, from the Derveni theogony to the *Rhapsodies* (*OF* 18, 88, 206). Christian apologists find in this incest and that with Kore one of their favourite targets to attack Greek myth, rejecting the allegorical interpretations that philosophers would make of it (cf. 2.16.1).

μῆνις τῆς Δηοῦς: this is the only testimony of the wrath of Demeter due to Zeus' incest, since traditionally it is mentioned in reference to Kore's kidnapping. It is unclear to which of the two episodes refers with the same word *OF* 386 (μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Δημήτερος ἀγλαοκάρου), quoted by Ps. Iust. *Cohort*. 17.1.

ἱκετηρίαι Διὸς καὶ πόμα χολῆς καὶ καρδιουλκίαι καὶ ἀρρητουργίαι: Clement enumerates (cf.2.17.1) some obscure ritual actions belonging to the Greek cult of the Mother which probably had a correlative episode in the myth. The supplication has parallels in the Thurii gold leaves (*OF* 477-480) to appease the grief of the goddess; the "drinking" must be related to the *symbolon* of this cult (2.15.2); and the "taking of the heart", to the special place that the heart has in rituals of sacrifice (2.17.2).

15.2: ταὐτὰ οἱ Φρύγες τελίσκουσιν: the Greek cult of the Mother is equated to the Phrygian cult of Cybele. This is a constant feature of the treatise which Clement follows, i. e. to draw equivalences between different cults. Maybe the Orphic theogony had already this syncretistic tendency (cf. *OF* 398 and *P. Gurob*, where different divinities are invoked in the same *teleté*). In any case it is welcome by Clement for his purpose of construing one Paganism a as opposed to true religion.

ἀποσπάσας ὁ Ζεὺς τοῦ κριοῦ τοὺς διδύμους: this is the only evidence for this myth which is probably the aitiology of ritual castration in the cult of the Mother. Cf. W. Burkert, *Homo Necans*, Cambridge Mass. 1983, 283.

τὰ σύμβολα τῆς μυήσεως: the *symbola* were short sentences or small objects which recalled initiation. Cf. W. Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults*, Cambridge Mass. 1987, 40, 45-47. Later Christians called *symbolon* their Credo, since self-definition as a Christian comes from believing rather than from ritual action. Clement's derision of Pagan *symbola* springs from this fundamental difference.

ἐκ τυμπάνου ἔφαγον: the *symbolon* of the cult of Cybele is modelled on that of Eleusis (2.21.2), and it is as obscure as its model (Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults*, 98). It collaborates to the fusion between different mysteries intended by the Orphic poet who composed the theogony, by the author of the handbook on mysteries and by Clement himself.

16.1: κυεῖ μὲν ἡ Δημήτηρ.. μίγνυται δ' αὖθις ὁ γεννήσας: Kore's birth from the incest between Demeter and Zeus, and the new incest of Zeus with his daughter, is also an episode of Orphic theogonies (*OF* 89, 280, 283). It seems logical that it was also in the Derveni theogony as continuation of Zeus' first incest, though the papyrus with an allegorical commentary of the poem finishes a few lines after mentioning Zeus' desire for Demeter. Christians dwell repeatedly on both incests taking them literally and rejecting their allegory: Athenag. *Leg.* 20.1-3, 32.1, Tat. *Or.* 8.6, 10.1, Tert. *Apol.* 21.7-9, Arn. *Adv. Nat.* 5.20-22.

τῇ Φερεφάττῃ: this name of Kore has been alleged (Riedweg, *Mysterienterminologie*, 119) as evidence for the Athenian origin of Clement's source. But Pherephatta could also have turned, from a local designation, a mystic or poetic name of Kore (cf. Athena's mystic name Athela in Athenag.*Leg*.20.1).

16.2: δράκων γενόμενος, ὃς ἦν ἐλεγχθείς: Zeus showed he really was Satan by appearing as a snake. Cf. Steneker, 12, and 1.7.4, 2.12.2 on snakes (ὄφις).

Σαβαζίων γοῦν μυστηρίων σύμβολον: the mysteries of Sabazius are alluded to as the last appendix to the mysteries of Deo, with the same structure of myth + *symbolon.*

ὁ διὰ κόλπου θεός: cf. *P. Gurob* 24 (*OF* 578): θεὸς διὰ κόλπου. The papyrus is dated in the 275 BC, and it preserves instructions and verses for a *teleté* (perhaps a *hieros logos* such as those demanded by Ptolemy Philopator's edict (*OF* 44) around 217 BC). On its relation with Clement's text, cf. introduction to this section and commentry to 17.2.

παῖδα ταυρόμορφον: the name of the offspring is omitted, though Dionysus is the obvious option. Cf. *OF* 280-283. It is unclear whether he would have been mentioned in the Derveni theogony (cf. G. Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus*, Cambridge 2004). Cf. also Nonn. *Dion*.6.169-173 the only other Orphic coloured passage where Dionysus has the form of a bull (though in the moment of his death).

ἀμέλει, φησί τις ποιητὴς εἰδωλικός: Arnobius (*Adv. Nat*.5.21) translates these obscure and unmetrical (ἀμέλει) verses referring to these transformations for *taurus draconem genuit et taurum draco* and attributes them to "a Tarentine poet". It is one of the clearest points where Arnobius gives more information than Clement, taking it either from his general culture or from a source related to Clement's. Clement is not sure how to interpret the verses (οἶμαι).

ἀναστέφουσιν οἱ βάκχοι: cf. 2.12.2 on the masculine used for maenadic behaviour, which collaborates to the apologetic construction of one "Dionysism"

17.1 τὰ Φερεφάττης ἀνθολόγια: the myth of Persephone is anticipated here, and will be continued in 2.2.20 after telling the myths of Dionysus and the Korybantes. Perhaps his source followed the same narrative order, or maybe it is an innovation of Clement. Since the last myth told in 2.16 had Phersephone and her son as characters, the narrator must choose to tell in order their respective myths. The solution of starting with Kore, turning to Dionysus and going back to Kore collaborates into amalgamating all

the mysteries together in one single discourse. Some difficulties, however, remain unsolved (cf. γάρ in 2.17.2). On the women festivals alluded here to commemorate Persephone's rape (Thesmophoria, Skirophoria, Arrephoria), cf. G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Misteri e culti mistici di Demetra*, Roma 1986.

καὶ τὸν κάλαθον... καὶ τὰς ὗς: the swift enumeration of the elements of the myth creates the impression that they are well-known both by the audience and by Clement, who spends no time in explaining them. Sometimes this technique may hide ignorance of what these elements mean (cf. 2.15.1). It also collaborates to present all the mysteries as a single entity composed of several similar (senseless) elements. Cf. 2.19.2.

ταῖν θεαῖν: Clement mistakes the couple of mother-daughter with the couple of Kore and Hades. This is one of the clearest examples of his lack of personal knowledge of the mysteries, which makes him misunderstand sometimes his bookish sources.

ποικίλως κατὰ πόλιν: rather than a locative "in the city" (Athens), it is preferable to take the expresion as distributive "in different ways in each city". Riedweg 119 took it in the former sense, but he has now changed his opinion (verbally) to the second interpretation.

Ἀρρητοφόρια: this name (made out from ἄρρητον, "unspeakable") instead of the usual Arrephoria, links Clement's text with *Schol. Luc. Dial. Meretr.* 275.23 Rabe (= *OF* 390 III) which clearly comes from the same source (E. Rohde, *Rhein. Mus.* 25 (1870), 548ff; and Riedweg 117ff.). It tells the myth of Eubuleus' pigs, which went down with Persephone when she was kidnapped, an aitiology of the ritual burying of pigs in the Athenian festival.

πολυτρόπως: along with the previous ποικίλως κατὰ πόλιν, the text underlines that the myth of Persephone is not just celebrated in Athens, but in many other Greek cities. In 2.20. Clement will insist that from Athens it sprang to the whole Greek world. It can be taken as a proof of an Athenian origin of Clement's source (Riedweg *Mysterienterminologie*, 119) or, *sensu contrario*, as an indication that the Athenian myth could be celebrated elsewhere like in Alexandrian Eleusis.

17.2: τὰ γάρ: the conjuction lacks apparent sense, since there is no causal relation with the previous episode. Marcovich's emendation δέ solves the problem, but leaves the γάρ unexplained. Since in 2.17.1 Clement anticipates Pherephatta's rape, which will be told in 2.21.1, it could be thought that this γάρ is a rest of his initial

redaction of the text, in which this episode would follow immediately Dionysus' birth from Persephone.

Διονύσου μυστήρια: this is the most complete narration offered by an ancient source of the myth of the Titans, who tear apart and eat Dionysus, a crime for which they are struck by Zeus' thunderbolt. This myth is thought to be the cornerstone of Orphic anthropology, although the question is not uncontroversial. There is a possible continuation of the myth (of which there are no traces in Clement's text), according to which from the soot of the Titans mankind was born, and the soul would expiate in her bodily prison that primordial fault comitted by her ancestors. Skeptics argue that this is a late Christianising interpretation of the myth, but diverse allusions to it make easier to think that it existed from Classical times (A. Bernabé, *RHR* 219 (2002), 401-433).

ὁ τῆς τελετῆς ποιητὴς Ὀρφεύς φησιν ὁ Θράκιος: the quotation of two Orphic verses (*OF* 306) is introduced by a sentence about Orpheus which is an hexameter itself (Steneker 47f points out other cases where the poetic citation impregnates with its metric the prose context). These verses on the toys of Dionysus appear (without attribution) in the *Gurob Papyrus* (*OF* 578).

18.1: τὰ ἄχρεια σύμβολα οὐκ ἀχρεῖον: the repetition of a concept is typical of Clement's style (Steneker 18). Not only the word "useless", but also the symbola themselves are similar to the Orphic lines quoted just before. But the *symbola* coincide only partially with the toys mentioned by the verses, which is a typical example of the incomplete overlapping of Orphic poems and rites (cf. R. Parker, in Powell (ed.) *The Greek World*, London, 1995). On Dionysus' toys, cf. O. Levaniouk, *HSCP* 103 (2007).

Παλλὰς ἐκ τοῦ πάλλειν: this etymology appears also in *OF* 316 (ἐξ οὗπερ Σώτειρ' ἐπεκλήθη Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη) and is transmitted by several neo-Platonists (who are obviously inspired also by Plat. Crat. 406AB). The heart has a special role in Lollianos' novel which plays with this episode (A. Henrichs, *Die Phoinikika des Lollianos,* Berkeley, 1972, 35f). Clement includes this etymology, doubtlessly present in his source, because of his love of the etymological method (cf. Treu, *Stud Pat* 4 (1959), 199-211; Steneker 18f).

καθήψουν πρότερον· ἔπειτα: the cooking order described by Clement (i.e. boiling and roasting) does not follow the usual sacrificial procedure, i. e. first roasting the entrails, then boiling the meat (cf. e. g. *Il.*2.410-431). Cf. Ps-Aristot. *Problemata* 3.43 Bussemaker. M. Detienne, *Dionysos mis a mort*, Paris, 1977, saw in this sacrificial

strange order the condemnation of sacrifice as cannibalism by the "Orphics", who would have turned to vegetarianism. However, the inversion is not exactly symmetrical (Parker in Powell (ed.) *The Greek World*, London, 1995, 609 n.93), since here the meat is first boiled and then roasted: this unusual order probably alludes to the perversion of sacrifice commited by the Titans in their crime.

18.1-2: περιπείραντες «ὑπείρεχον Ἡφαίστοιο»: Clement alludes with this metonymy to *Il*. 2.426-428. When Eusebius copied the text he wrote ἀμπείραντες to adequate it to Homer. A sacrificial Homeric expression is echoed as well, though with a clear ironical ring, in the next sentence (γέρας λαχεῖν = *Il*.4.49). These references to Homer might be due to Clement's literary style and wish to mock the solemnity of Pagan sacrifice, but they (at least in the allusion to *Il*.2.426-428 in which no apologetic intention can be detected) could also be a rest of the Orphic theogony which underlies his source. An Orphic poet with interest in sacrifice would have echoed Homeric passages, as is the case in the following sentence.

Ζεὺς δὲ ὕστερον ἐπιφανείς: in M. Herrero, *RHR* 223.4 (2006a), 389-416, i have proposed that this swift coming of Zeus without any mention of the eating of Dionysus after its cooking is due to theophagy being an *arreton*. Clement follows the silence of his source and does not dwell on the eating of Dionysus for a different reason: he cannot critisize theophagy because Christians were accused of cannibalism because of the Eucharist (A. Henrichs in *Festschrift Quasten I*, Münster 1970, 18-35). Comp. his silence with 2.36.5 when the victim is not a god (ἐνεφορεῖτο).

ὃ δέ, οὐ γὰρ ἠπείθησε Διί: the last sentence clearly paraphrases the epic formula ὣς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἄρα πατρὸς ἀνηκούστησεν Ἀπόλλων, used precisely when Apollo has to bury another son of Zeus, Sarpedon (*Il*.16.676). The passage of Sarpedon's burial, which serves as *aition* of his Lycian cult, may be taken as a model of the Orphic tale of the burial of Dionysus, which is also an *aition* of his cult (cf. Robertson, "Orphic myth", for its Delphic connection). Formulas as *Il*.16.666 (καὶ τότ' Ἀπόλλωνα προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς· εἰ δ' ἄγε νῦν φίλε Φοῖβε) were used in the Orphic poem, either by imitation of Homer or by follwing a common pattern of poems devoted to hero-cult.

19.1: Κορυβάντων: the mysteries of the Korybantes follow the alphabetical order after those of Dionysus, though the genealogical connection is lost. They were probably described in the handbook which Clement uses as source, but not in the

Orphic poem (there are no traces of verses in the paragraph about them). The thematic connections with other mysteries (death and castration fo Dionysus, mystical baskets) are underlined to emphasize the unity of all mysteries.

ὄργια: the *orgia* are not the mysteries but the ritual instruments, a favourite target of Clement's disclosing of secrets. Therefore the verb used is ἐποπτεῦσαι in an ironical sense, since it is the verb for mystic contemplation in Eleusis.

19.2-3: συνελόντι φάναι, φόνοι καὶ τάφοι: "slayings and tombs" is the essence of the mysteries for Clement. He underlines the violent episodes to reinforce that impression, as he does also with the sexual elements. His biased *Aussenperspektive* touches, however, a core of ancient Greek ritual: W. Burkert chose this sentence as motto of his *Homo Necans*.

σέλινον... τῆς ῥοιᾶς τοὺς κόκκους: this digression on eating taboos (celery and pomegranate) could well be thought a gloss inserted in to the text were it not for its clear purpose of linking through them the mystery cult of the Korybantes with the aforementioned Thesmophoriai and the slaying of Dionysus.

ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Διονύσου αἵματος σταγόνων: the connection with the sacrifice of Dionysus is implicit. In no other way could he be castrated. The castration also draws a thematic link with Aphrodite's birth from Uranus (2.14.2) and Zeus' simulate castration (2.15.2).

19.4: καὶ τελετὴν Καβειρικήν: the alliteration of occlusives, specially the /k/ (Steneker *Peithous demiourgia*, 23) gives a certain tone of mockery and underlines the identification of the Korybants witht the Kabeiroi, consistent with the syncretitic tendencies of the text (cf. 2.15.2).

τὴν κίστην... ἐν ᾗ τὸ αἰδοῖον: the mention of the baskets carrying genitals links once again this mystey cult to the Thesmophoriai (cf. also 22.5).

τὸν Διόνυσόν τινες "Αττιν προσαγορεύεσθαι: the identification of Dionysus with Attis, following the general tendency, is easy through the castration theme (cf. 2.15.2). Cf. Burkert *Homo Necans*, 271ff.

20.1: ὅπου γε Ἀθηναίοις καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ Ἑλλάδι: cf. 2.21.1, 2.22.1

ἡ περὶ τὴν Δηὼ μυθολογία: this is the Orphic version of the myth of Demeter, anticipated in 17.1. It may have come from the same theogonic poem than the other Orphic fragments of this section or from another Orphic poem about Demeter which the handbook also used as source. But this poem would not have been the only

one with an Orphic version of the Eleusinian myth. Other Orphic fragments (*OF* 379-402) show that there were other Eleusinian Orphic poems (N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford, 1976; L. L. Albinus, *The House of Hades*, Aarhus, 2000; F. Graf, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit*, Berlin -New York, 1974). This Orphic version differs from the canonical version of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* mainly in the presence of Baubo in the place of Yambe. Her obscene gesture makes Demeter laugh. It is debatable whether this is a later version or a more ancient one which has been raffinated in the *Homeric Hymn* (cf. Richardson *ad loc.*). This debate is linked to that of the place where the Orphic myth would be celebrated, either in Attica (Graf, *Orphische Dichtung*) or in Alexandria (G. E. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Princeton, 1961).

τῆς Ἀττικῆς δέ ἐστι τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον: this explanation shows that, wherever his source may come from, Clement is writing for an Alexandrian audience who may not have clear where Eleusis was. Cf. 2.22.1.

20.2: οἱ γηγενεῖς: the "natives". The Eleusinian characters are different from those of the Homeric version. The most particular Orphic character is Baubo, on which cf. C. Picard, *RHR* 95 (1927), 220-255; M. Olender, *RHR* 102 (1985), 3-55; and D. M. O'Higgins in Lardinois - McClure, *Making Silence Speak*, Princeton 2001, 137-160. Triptolemus, Eumolpus and Eubuleus (this name also appears in *P.Gurob*) founders and patrons of the cult, appear here as shepherds. Rather than an Orphic innovation, it may have been an earlier version preserved by Orphic tradition. Cf. G. Sfameni Gasparro, *Misteri e culti di Demetra*, Roma 1986.

20.3: ὀρέγει κυκεῶνα: Clement does not stop to explain the well-known details, like what the *kykeon* is (cf. *Hom. Hymn. Cer*. 375ss with Richardson ad loc.), but goes as quick as possible to the scandalous part.

ἀναστέλλεται τὰ αἰδοῖα: this ritual gesture (*anasyrma*) has no known parallel in Greece but is mentioned by Herodotus (2.59-60) as practiced by the Egyptian women of Bubastis, which supports an Alexandrian placement of the cult. Statuettes in Alexandria and Priene which fuse the head and female genitals (cf. *LIMC s. v.* Baubo) seem to refer to that gesture.

21.1: τῶν Ἀθηναίων μυστήρια: cf. 2.22.1

Ὀρφέως τὰ ἔπη: Arnobius' Latin translation of these postclassical verses (Graf *Orphische Dichtung*, 165) is quite different from Clement's text, which leads to

different possible solutions. Either he changed or misunderstood Clement (Graf); either he used a corrupt text of Clement (M. Marcovich, *Vig Christ* 40 (1986), 294-301); either he used a different source than Clement (Mora, *Arnobio e i culti di mistero*, Roma 1994, though cf. introd. n. 102). Gregory of Nazianzus quotes a slightly different Orphic verse about the same episode (*Or.* 4.115 = *OF* 395 III). It proves the multiplicity and flexibility of Orphic versions, due to their not being canonical.

21.2: τὸ σύνθημα: cf. σύμβολον in 2.15.2. Both words probably had a complementary relation, as if the *synthema* was the answer to the *symbolon*. Yet they must have often be used as synonyms, as in this text.

θεάματα: on the theatrical metaphor which perhaps reflects a true representation, cf. 2.12.2.

22.1. «μεγαλήτορος» (μᾶλλον δὲ ματαιόφρονος): Clement changes the Homeric formula for the Athenians (*Il.* 2.547) with a pejorative epithet, in a similar way to 11.2, but here the phonetic difference makes it less effective (cf. Steneker, 19).

Ἐρεχθειδῶν δήμου, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων. this insistence on the Athenian origin of the myth of Baubo (also in 2.20.1, 2.21.1), from which it was extended to other Greek cities, may be interpreted either as confirmation of the Athenian origin of Clement's source and the placement of the cult in Athens, or precisely as the proof that, though the myth takes place in Attica, it may be celebrated elsewhere (cf. 2.17.1: ποικίλως κατὰ πόλιν).

22.2. τίσι δὴ μαντεύεται Ἡρακλείτος: Heraclitus is used by Clement to illustrate his condemnation of the mysteries (cf. H. Wiese, *Heraklit bei Klemens von Alexandrien*, Kiel, 1963; P. Valentin, *Rech Sc Rel* 46 (1958), 27-59). He probably profits from a critical attitude of the Ephesian towards the mistaken understanding of some mysteries (cf. Plat. *Resp.* 364e, *P. Derv.* col. XX) to insert two fragments in his total denunciation.

«μένει τελευτήσαντας ἄσσα οὐδὲ ἔλπονται»: fr B 27 DK. Cf. *Strom.* 4.144.3 and Thdt. *Cur.* 8.41, where the same fragment is quoted.

«νυκτιπόλοις, μάγοις, βάκχοις, λήναις, μύσταις»: fr B 14a DK. The indirect form of the quotation (an answer to "for whom does Heraclitus of Ephesus prophesise?") has raised doubts on the authenticity and form of this fragment. D. Babut, *REA* 77 (1975), 27-62, and M. Marcovich, *Heraclitus*, Sankt Agustin 2001 *ad loc* reject it; W. Burkert *Da Omero ai Magi*, Venezia 1999, 94, and J. Bremmer *The Rise and Fall*

of the Afterlife, London-New York, 2002, 19, accept it as authentic. The latter position seems preferable: the appearance of the *magoi* in *P. Derv*. (cols. I-VII) has made that word less anachronistic in Heraclitus, and the linguistic doubts have been solved by M. Conche, *Héraclite*, Paris 1986, 167 who makes "night-wanderers" a general category which would start a typically Heraclitean nominal phrase: « errants dans la nuit : mages, bacchants, bacchantes, initiés». The dative is of course added by Clement – maybe with other minor changes – to adapt the quotation to his prose. Other arguments in M. Herrero, *Rev phil anc* 24.2 (2005), 55-74.

τούτοις μαντεύεται τὸ πῦρ: the reference to fire is surely a Clementine addition to the fragment profiting from its importance in Heraclitus (where it is not an element of punishment). Cf. the same technique in 2.22.6-7 making Eleusinian fire the symbol of condemnation.

«τὰ γὰρ νομιζόμενα κατὰ ἀνθρώπους μυστήρια ἀνιερωστὶ μυοῦνται» fr. B 14b DK. Heraclitus criticized the form of celebration of traditional mysteries. Clement takes it as an attack against their essence, taking ἀνιερωστί in a radical sense (not "unholy" but "impious").

22.3: ἀμυήτους ὄντως μυήσεις: this oxymoron, as the whole paragraph, is inspired in Philo (*Cher*. 94), and it is immediately linked to the quotation of Heraclitus prolonging the interruption of the description of mysteries. Van Winden, 211, tranlates this ὄντως as a quotation mark: "as it has been said correctly".

νόμος: the attack to the Greek *nomos* as opposed to the Biblical one follows from the previous Heraclitean attack to tradition (νομιζόμενα). Cf. 1.3.1, 10.89.1.

τοῦ δράκοντος τὰ μυστήρια: cf. 1.7.3, 2.12.2,

εὐσεβείᾳ νόθῳ: the mysteries hide a "bastard" piety (and an empty *nomos*) an illegitimate copy of the legitimate one (cf. 1.2.3 on γνήσιος). The theory of the copy is much extended among Christian apologists to explain similarities of Greek religion and Christianity. Cf. Herrero 236, and *Actas del XI Congreso de la SEEC I*, Madrid 2005, 637-646.

22.4: αἱ κίσται μυστικαί: this list of ritual objects seems to follow from the section of Pherephatta's (Eleusinian) mysteries in Clement's source after the interruption of Heraclitus' fragment. It is a logical continuation of the baskets which appear mentioned in the Eleusinian *symbola*.

ἀπογυμνῶσαι τὰ ἅγια αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ἄρρητα ἐξειπεῖν: Clement tries to avoid the monotony of a mere transcription of a handbook by inserting sentences which recall the judicial metaphor and the intention of profanating.

πόπανα πολυόμφαλα: cakes for offering are often designated depending on their number of *omphala*: τριόμφαλα, τετραόμφαλα, etc. The one time the abstract πολυόμφαλα is found apart from this text is *P. Derveni* col. VI.1 (cf. A. Henrichs, *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*, Napoli 1984, II, 261). A common source need not be posited. Both the commentator of Derveni and Clement's source describe from an *Aussenperspektive* which uses this kind of generalising words.

22.5: τῆς Θέμιδος: this is the lesson of P and Eusebius' quotation of this passage. Wilamowitz corrected the passage to Γῆς Θέμιδος (*Commentariolum Grammaticum* II, 1880, 11) and his emendation has been generally accepted (except by Mondésert), and some theories have even been built on it: G. Casadio *Vie gnostiche all'immortalità*, Brescia 1997, 19-66, puts this Ge-Themis who would receive cult in Phlya and the figure of Baubo in relationship with Hippol. *Ref.* 5.20.4. U. Pestalozza, *Religione mediterranea*, Milano 1951, 217-234; 229-233 spec. 231, makes Ge-Themis an equivalent of Demeter-Kore. But as pointed out by P. Boyancé, *Le culte des Muses chez les philosophes grecs*, Paris 1936 (1072[2]), 36, 53f, and *REG* 75 (1962), 480ff., the publication of column III from the "Nichomachean sacrificial calendar" (cf. now S. Lambert, *ABSA* 97 (2002), 353-399) established the prominent presence of Themis in the rituals of the mysteries of Eleusis at the end of the 5th century BC, since she receives the first of the nineteen sacrifices performed by the Eumolpids in the Eleusinia of Boedromion. The text of P is to be kept, therefore, and no constructions on Ge-Themis can be based on Wilamowitz's emendation. On the cult of Themis, cf. E. Stafford, *Worshipping Virtues*, Swansea, 2001, 52-56.

22.6-7: ἐλέγχει: this verb, repeated three times, recalls the ubiquitous judicial metaphor (cf. 12.1). It is also the axis of a highly rhetorical imprecation based on Eleusinian imagery. Three syntactically parallel periods, remarked by *homoioteleuton* (σιωπωμένη... λαλουμένη) and anaphora of the verb in the final clauses, make use of the fire, the night, the δᾳδοῦχος, the hierophant, and Iacchos to launch the final attack on Greek mysteries, taking Eleusis as representant of all them. It is purely rhetoric and no new information is given (no *hieros gamos* is to be deduced from it, *pace* P. Foucaurt, *Les mystères d'Eleusis*, Paris 1914, 480). Personification helps to elevate the

tone: the night used to be silent and now speaks, the fire will denounce the passions. Ch. Riedweg, *Ill. Class. Stud.* 13.1 (1988), 127-133, points out parallel texts which make the same use of Eleusinian imagery (*Pap. della Univ. Milano* 1937, n. 20 col. I p.276f; Hermogen. Περὶ στάσεων 4.37, Luc. *Salt.* 15, Pisc. 33, Arist. 11; Epict. 3.21.13), showing that Clement also practices "thematic Atticism". His use of this rhetoric tradition has Christian particularities: The purifying Biblical fire which "accuses and punishes" (cf. 2.22.2) and the opposition night-light which symbolizes God's victory over evil (11.113.2).

Greek atheism

23.1: ταῦτα τῶν ἀθέων τὰ μυστήρια: the transition from the mysteries to atheism is skilfully accomplished through a summary of the two most scandalous and famous episodes told in the mysteries: Dionysus' *sparagmos* (17.2-18.1) and Baubo's *anasyrma* (20.1-3).

διττῇ ἐνεσχημένοι τῇ ἀθεότητι: the idea that error is worse than just ignorance since it is double distance from the truth is an extended topic in the ancient world adapted now by Clement to religious conversion.

τὸν ὄντα ὄντως... τοὺς οὐκ ὄντως ὄντας: cf. 1.3.1, 2.12.1 for the insistence on differentiating the Christian and Pagan concepts when they share the same names. "Pagan gods" have that name (2.12.1) but they do not exist, hence the atheism of their cults. There is not any hint of truth in them, even if they seem to imitate it. Thus any possibility of syncretism is avoided. Cf. Klibengajtis, *Eph Theol Lov* 80 (2004), 330. The opposition of God's "being" instead of the "not being" of Pagan gods is an apologetic commonplace rooted in Biblical tradition (cf. *Gal* 4.8): Athenag. *Leg*. 19.1, Theoph. *Autol*. 2.10, Ps.-Iust. *Cohort*. 21.2.

23.2: ὁ ἀπόστολος διελέγει: the quotation of *Eph*. 2.12 confirms the invective against atheism, links Clement's judicial metaphor to the *NT*, and brings in the topic of Pagans as "strangers", which will be developed in 9.82ff.

24.1: τῷ τῶν Σκυθῶν βασιλεῖ: the well-known story of Anacharsis (told by Herodotus 4.76, DL 1.102: his name here is considered a gloss) was used as an example of holding national customs in Flav. Ios. *contra Ap*. 2.269 (along with the Athenian accusations against Diagoras). Clement turns the tale in a positive rejection of Greek

mysteries. He tries to link Christianity to Barbarian anti-Greek tradition in religious matters (cf. G. Stroumsa, *Barbarian Philosophy*, Tübingen 1999).

24.2: ἀθέους ἐπικεκλήκασιν: this catalogue of Greek atheists (Euhemeros, Nicanor, Diagoras, Hippon and Theodoros of Messene) is frequent in Christian and Pagan writers (Aet. *Plac.* 1.7.1, Cic. *ND* 1.2, 1.63, 1.117, 3.89, D. S. 13.6.7, Athenag. *Leg.* 4.1, Tat. *Orat.* 27.1; Arn. *Adv. Nat.* 4.29; Min. Fel. *Oct.* 8.2.), so Clement probably takes it from the common repertoire. Yet he changes the usual Christian approach by praising them: the true atheists are those who believe in Greek cults, not these people who saw their falsehood. Cf. M. Winiarczyk's editions of Euhemeros (1991) and Diagoras and Theodoros (1981).

24.3: ἀναφύεται σπέρμα: cf. 13.5, 22.3; similar images in *Strom.* 1.18.1, 1.57.3, 6.59.2. On these generative metaphors in the *Stromata*, cf. Buell. The sentence on Egyptian gods has been traditionally attributed to Xenophanes (A 13 DK), but M. Marcovich argues convincingly that the anonymous author is Heraclitus (cf. fr. 119 of his own edition and B 127 DK). Relevant parallels in Plutarch (*Iside* 379B, *Superst.* 171 DE, *Amat.* 763 c, *Apophth. Lac.* 228 DE) and Epiph. *Ancor.* 104.1. A similar thought is coined by Clement himself in 4.50.5.

24.4: ὁ δέ: Clement, like other Christians, echoes the most famous anecdote of Diagoras (T 63 Winiarczyk, with fr. 4 *dubium*). Parallel accounts in Athenag. *Leg.* 4.1, Epiph. *Ancorat.* 103.8, *Theos. Tub.* 70, and scholia and some gnomologiae (cf. T 27-33 Winiarczyk). Clement's only innovation, making it happening in Diagoras' own house, seems a banal addition. Latest bibliography on this fragment and on Diagoras in R. Janko, *CP* 2001, 6-15.

οἴκοι, οἷα εἰκός: alliteration (strenghtened by iotacism) reinforces the tone of mockery.

25.1-2: ἀκρότητες ἄρα ἀμαθίας ἀθεότης: atheism and superstition are the extremes from which one has to keep away. This middle way is a typically philosophical principle, from Aristotle onwards, which Clement adapts to religion. The first part of the sentence has a clear dental alliteration (Steneker, 23).

τὸν ἱεροφάντην τῆς ἀληθείας Μώσεα: Moses is called hierophant recuperating mystery terminology, cf. Riedweg, 97. His truth is here an allegory of *Deut.* 23.1, taken over from Philo (*Mig.* 68, *Mutuat nom.* 205, *Confus. ling.* 144). Cf. *Strom.* 1.9.4, 3.99.4, 5.73.4. It pursues the generative conceptual frame exploited above

all in chapter 9 but present in the whole work (cf. 2.22.3, 9.82.1). Atheism is interpreted as castration, and superstition as a bastard child, which is coherent with the main metaphor of illegitimate descendence of "bastard" Greek cults. Cf. Herrero, *Actas del XI Congreso de la SEEC I*, Madrid 2005, 637-646.

The heavenly origin of fallen man

25.3-4: ἀρχαία πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀνθρώποις κοινωνία: the community of men and gods in a past Gold Age is a theme already known by Hesiod (*Op.* 109-120). Cf. Cic. *ND* 2.62 for a philosophical treatment of what must have already been a commonplace. Heavenly as a synonym of divine is also usual (Plat. *Tim.* 90a5): The Orphic gold leaves present the soul claiming to be of a heavenly lineage. Gnosticism also played with the concept. Clement and other apologists adapt it to Christian theology: *Strom.* 7.52.1, Iust. *Dial.* 4.2, Iust. *Apol.* 1.58.3, Tat. *Orat.* 20, Hippol. *Ref.* 4.48.12. Three quotations follow which underline the heavenly aspects of God and men: two from Euripides (attributed to the "sons of the poets") and one from Plato. These quotations from Pagan authors show that this is again a Hellenic construction with which Clement wants to insert Christianity in Greek moulds.

Eur. fr. 941, 1-2 Kannicht: this fragment is quoted by Clement in *Strom.* 5.114.1 with one verse more (τοῦτον νόμιζε Ζῆνα, τόνδ᾽ ἡγοῦ θεόν) which is omitted here. Instead, the second part of that line will be recalled in 74.2-3. This partition comes out of the rhetorical needs of apologetics: to avoid mentioning Zeus (cf. chapters VI-VII), who is under heavy attack in this chapter. In the *Stromata* there is not so much diatribe against Greek gods and Zeus can be taken as a Greek intuition of the true God. These three lines probably come, like the following quotation, from some Stoic or Epicurean source, since both schools used this text either to prove either the omnipresence of God, either his detachment of human affaires (Zeegers 46, 164-173). From these approaches, other Christian (Athenag. *Leg.* 5.1) and Pagan authors also quote these lines (Heracl. *Alleg. Hom.* 23.7, Luc. *Iupp. trag.* 41, Cic. *ND* 2.65).

Eur. *Troad.* 884f: these two lines (also singing an impersonal god which sustains the cosmos) are also quoted by Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 1.288, 7.128 (with the same variant of εἰσιδεῖν for the Euripidean εἰδέναι). The two following lines (886f) are also frequently quoted in theological discussions (cf. Zeegers 91), yet omitted by Clement because Zeus is mentioned.

Plat. *Tim.* 90a 6: also quoted in 10.100.3; cf. Hipp. *Ref.* 4.48.12.

ἐχετάνυσαν ἐπὶ γῆς: a modernized version of *Il*. 17.58 (ἐχετάνυσσ' ἐπὶ γαίῃ), which confirms the Greek overtone of the fall of men from heaven to earth. It will be recovered (after a break to critisize idolatry) in 27.1-3 to exhort men to run back to Heaven. Cf. 1.3.2, 10.100.3.

The seven ways of idolatry

26.1-6: the paradoxographer Aetius (*Plac*. 1.6.10-15, Diels *Paradox*. 295f) mentions seven ways of perceiving the gods (πόθεν ἔννοιαν θεῶν). Clement follows a parallel order and has in common with Aetius some lexicon and some examples. But Clement's version of the origin of ἔννοια (apart from his apologetic tone) is much less abridged and his expanded explanations seem too detailed to come purely out of his rhetoric or general culture. Therefore, some common source must be postulated, rather than Clement's sorce being Aetius himself. Cf. Wendland in *Arch. Gesch. Phil*. 1 (1888), 200-210. Similar concepts appear, though in different sistematization, in Cic. *ND* 2.59ff.

Clement turns the ἔννοίαι in seven types of things which men mistakenly deify: the movement of astral bodies, the growing of fruits, punishments, feelings, facts, poetic images, and benefices. Locations and instances (India for the sun, Phrygia for the moon, Athens for Demeter, Thebes for Dionysus) are generally banal. Only some specific examples are commented here.

26.1: θεοὺς ἐκ τοῦ θεῖν: an etymological word-play stemming from Plato (*Crat*. 397 d2), which was probably in Clement's source, since it is in Aet. 1.6.11. Cf. also in *Strom*. 4.149.8 and Theoph. *Autol*. 1.4. R. E. Witt, *CQ* 25 (1931), 203 n. 4 mentions other passages which would indicate its provenance from Poseidonius. U. Treu, *Stud Pat* 4 (1959), 193, points out that in *Strom*. 1.182.2 he links θεός with θέσις.

26.4: Ἐπιμενίδης: T 14 Bernabé (*OF* vol III). This information about the Cretan Epimenides (ὁ παλαιός aims to differenciate him from the homonymous historian) is not in Aetius, so it may come from a different source. It is recorded in Cic. *De leg*. 2.11.28. The common source may be Theophrastus' Περὶ Νόμων, which reported that in Athens there were altars to Hybris and Anaideia (Zenob. 4.36 (*Paroem. Gr*. I 94)).

26.6: θεογονίαν Ἡσίοδος ᾄδει... θεολογεῖ Ὅμηρος: when talking about the gods made up by the poets, the reference to Hesiod and Homer as those who created them is topical (cf. Hdt. 2.53). Aetius quotes Hesiod, not Homer. Clement underlines

the distinction between theogony (birth of gods) and theology (tales about gods). Cf. 6.72.1 for that distinction in another sense.

26.7: σωτῆρας... ἀλεξίκακον... ἰατρόν: Aetius mentions also Dionysus among the gods which are made up through divinization of benefits (Dioscuri, Heracles, Asclepios, with their respecitve cult epithets which emphasize their benefits), but Clement has already mentioned him among the second category (fruits), so he omits him in the seventh section.

Exhortation to run back to Heaven

27.1: ὁποῖοί τινες καὶ εἴ τινες: this kind of argumentation comes from the rhetorical tradition adapted by Christians: cf. Plat. *Resp.* 391d3, Ps.-Iust. *Cohort.* 2.5 (cf. Riedweg *ad loc* p. 224), Tert. *Adv. Nat.* 2.7.18, Arnob. *Adv. nat.* 4.28. Clement announces a new attack on the Greek gods to show men the way back to Heaven and away from error. But he delays it with some exhortations based on Pagan quotations.

παλινδρομήσητε: this is a favourite verb of Clement (coherent with the spacial conception of conversion) to designate the coming back to Heaven of the fallen man: *Paed.* 3.4, *Strom.* 2.13, 7.16. Cf. Hipp. *Ref.* 10.34. It became popular after him among Christian Fathers (cf. Lampe *s. v*).

27.2: ἀγάπην, ἣν ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς: this quotation of Eph.2-3-5 is an example that Clement does not correct the Biblical style: it is a typical feature the insistence on the same lexical root in the verb and the object (e.g. "to die a death"). Not only he quotes the Scripture in passages like this one not absolutely linked to the context, but he also imitates its style: cf. 1.2 and 77.2 (ᾖδον ᾠδήν), 49.1, 98.2. Cf. Steneker, 17.

συνταφεὶς Χριστῷ συνυψοῦται θεῷ: a typical *slogan* easy to memorize with pregnant theological content: Rom 6.4, Col. 2.12.

τέκνα ὀργῆς: the quotation from *Eph.* 2.3-5 is recuperated to draw another distinction between Christians and Pagans based on metaphorical genealogy (children of lawlessness vs. God's children). Cf. Galloni 93ff and the commentary to 9.82ff. Clement purposefully takes out the φύσει in the text of the Epistle, which would weaken the generative metaphor.

27.3: ὑμέτερος ποιητής: Emped. B 145 DK: This is the only quotation of Empedocles in the *Protrepticus* (there are many others in the *Stromata*) and the unique attestation of this fragment. Cf. fr. 123 Wright for its coherence with the other

framgents of the *Katharmoi*. Empedocles is absent from the critique of philosophers in Chapter V, while he is included here as a poet, which indicates that Clement's doxographical sources considered him a poet rather than a philosopher.

27.4-5: προφητικὴ... καὶ ποιητικὴ Σίβυλλα: after quoting *Orac. Sib*. 1.23-25 (also in Theoph. *Autol*. 2.36, though Clement is independent from him, cf. Zeegers 141), the lines are attibuted to the Sibyll (the chiastic way of quoting increases the suspense, since they could be thought to be Empedoclean). Zeegers, 204 n. 3, points out that he does not say that she is a Jewish prophetess (as he does elsewhere, cf. 6.70-71), so that she may seem Greek. The Sibyll is the Pagan prophet most respected by Christian apologists (e. gr. Iust. *Cohort*. 36.4: cf. G. J. M. Bartelink in den Boeft – Hilhorst (eds.), *Early Christian Poetry*, Leiden, 1993, 23-33; G. Sfameni Gasparro, in Chirassi Colombo – Seppilli (eds.), *Sibille e linguaggi oracolari,* Pisa-Roma, 1998, 505-553). Her popularity is due to the fact that the Sibylline Oracles are Jewish compositions, with prophetic contents in traditional epic style, like these four lines, which apostrophe men in a style similar to other revelatory literature (cf. 11.115.2). The idea of the wrong way in the first three lines is adequate to the subject of the return to Heaven (a similar notion in *Or. Sib.* 3.721-3, quoted in Ps.-Iust. *Cohort*. 16.1), and the last line draws the opposition light vs. darkness, much present in the work (11.113.2).

συνωνυμίαις... διελέγχουσα: characteristically (cf. 5.2) Clement attributes to the Sibyll the condemnation of homonymous gods, which she does not do in those lines, but he can in this way start easily his new topic. The verb παρεγγυᾷ repeted twice allows the transition from the fragment, and the participles γυμνοῦσα... διελέγχουσα recall the judicial metaphor (2.12.1).

The multiplicity of homonymous gods

28-29.1: this section on homonymous gods has clear parallels in other Pagan texts (Cic. *ND* 3.53-59; Arn. *Adv. Nat.* 4.14-16, Amp. 9), as well as in other Christian apologists (Arn. 4.14, Firm. Mat. *De err.* 16; Theoph. *Autol*. 1.10; Epiph. *Ancor*. 106, Orig *CC* 5.29, 5.34, 5.37; Lyd. 4.71). All these lists probably come from a learned source of the 3nd century BC, (perhaps the *Theogony* of Aristocles of Rhodes?). Cf. A. S. Pease's commentary on Cicero's passage, R. Turcan's on Firmicus' and R. Philippson (*Hermes* 55 (1920), 225-278) on Philodemus. The mentions to Aristoteles and Didymus (fr. 6 Schmidt), coordinated with μέν...δέ... probably come from the same

source. Cf. Riedweg 118 n.9, detects alphabetical order in this list (obviously taken from a handbook-like source, cf. 2.14-22 and 2.36.2) with the exception of Zeus, who as most important god is placed at the head of the list which follows: Ἀθενᾶ, Ἀπόλλων, Ἀσκληπιός, Ἑρμῆς, Ἥφαιστος.

29.1: τὶ δ'εἴ σοι...; rhetorical questions and swift enumeration with the pretext of not boring the audience are typical techniques of the diatribe. Cf. 2.12.1. He closes the section with allusions to three gods (Asclepios, Hermes and Hephaistus), whose many names he denounces but does not stop to offer. The plural is descriptive and despective enough: cf. Herrero, *Rev phil anc* 24.2 (2005), 55-74.

Human features of the gods

ἀνθρώπους γεγονότας: different human features (births, lives, professions, tombs) show that gods are deified human beings. All this section (29-31), of a strong Euhemeristic flavour, is taken over by Arnob. 4.25 and Cyr. *CI* I (*PG* 76, 544 A).

29.2: Ἄρες: the critique of the war god begins with *Il.* 5.31 = 5.455. This line is also quoted by Athenag. *Leg.* 21.2, Theoph. *Autol.* 1.9, Plut. *Amat.* 757 B, Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 1.101.

ἀλλοπρόσαλλος: this epithet (Hom. *Il.* 5.831) is allegorized by Heracl. *All. hom.* 31.4. Focusing the critique in an epithet which has nothing negative is justified because it was used by Clement's contemporaries to give a deep theological meaning to the god. Then bookish references (not quotations) of Epicharmus (fr. 165 Kassel - Austin = 240 Rodríguez Noriega) and Soph. *Ant.* 970 are used to denounce Ares' various geographical origins. Cf. 7.75.1 on Clement's use of comic poets.

29.3: Hom. *Il.* 5.385-387: These Homeric lines which show the god Ares in an "all too human" position were typical object both of critique (Ael. Arist. *Or.* 46.33; Ios. *C. Ap.* 2.34, 247; Min. Fel. *Oct.* 23.3; Tert. *Apol.* 14.3; *Ad Nat.* 1.10, 39; Firm. Mat. *Err.* 12.8; Athenag. *Leg.* 21.3, *Cohort.* 2.4) and of allegorical interpretation as a defense (Heracl. *All. hom.* 32, 1-6; schol. B *ad. Il.* 5.385, *Pap Mag Gr* P-H 1.830).

29.4: A short digression is inserted about ridiculous sacrifices (dogs to Ares in Caria and asses to Apollo in Scythia). These informations must come from Apollodorus' *On the gods* (*FGH* II B 244) who quotes Callimachus (fr. 492 and 186.10 Pfeiffer): critique also in Arn. *Adv. Nat.* 4.25 (from Clement) and allusion (from Apollodorus) in schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 10.49.

29.5: *Il*. 1.591 on Hephaestus' being thrown away receives both critique (Plat. *Resp*. 2.378d, Ael. Arist. *Or*. 46.33, Luc. *Dial. deor*. 8, *Sacr*. 6) and allegory (Celsu *apud* Orig. *CC* 6.42, Heracl. *All. hom*. 26.2, 27.3; Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math*. 1.291; Corn. *Theol. gr*. 19.3-6, Phil. *De prov*. 2.37). *Il*. 18.411 is also echoed in Tat. *Orat*. 8.3.

30.1-2: Pind. *Pyth*. 3.96-98, 100-105: This quotation of Pindar on Asclepios is also found in Athenag. *Leg*. 29.1, but the slight textual variations (ἀμπνοάς for ἀμπνοάν and ἔσκηψε for ἐνέσκηψε; Athenagoras agrees with Pindar's MSS) make Zeegers 71f suppose that Clement does not depend on Athenagoras. Eus. *PE* 3.13.19 and Cyr. *CI* 76.808 A must come from Clement.

Eur. *Alc*. 3-4: line 3 in Philod. *De piet*. 45b.14-16 and 3-4 in Cyr. *CI* 6.808 A 9-10 (Cyrill quotes in the same order as Clement, his obvious source).

30.3: Direct quotation of Philocorus (*FGH* III B 328 F 175) on Poseidon. The fact that he is honoured as physician is the link (through μέν... δέ...) with the previous attacks on Asclepios, who dies in the Kynousiris Mountains (cf. Cic. *ND* 3.57). Since Philochorus also says that Cronos is buried, the subject-matter turns from divine professions to divine deaths. Though the cataloguic form is unavoidable, Clement takes care to make it as fluid as possible.

30.4-5: ἔν τισι τραγῳδίαις: F. G. Welcker (*Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus geordnet* III, Bonn 1841, 979) corrected the MSS τρισί, which was an error influenced by the system of trilogy (cf. Arn. 4.25.4 does not give any number when he mentions Patroclos). This piece of news on the Dioscures is *TGF* fr. 2 of Patroclos from Thurii and fr. 1 of Sophocles the Younger.

ἀξιοπιστότερος: Clement quotes the *Cypria* (fr. 8 Bernabé, attested only in this passage) to deny their truth against Homer's (*Il*. 3.243) more trustworthy version of the mortality of both Dioscuri (Zeegers 109). The weight of Aristarchean criticism, which valued Homer against the *kyklos*, had imposed its views in the 2nd century AD.

30.6-7: εἴδωλον: The "image of Heracles" seen by Odysseus in Hades in *Od*. 11.602 (a line much subject to philosophical and philological discussion, cf. e. g. Plut. *De facie* 944 F) is used by Clement to say that Homer called Heracles an "idol". Like with *daimon* (41.3) the Greek term is interpreted according to the Biblical tradition (Zeegers 85f). Cf. the critique of idols in 1.7.5, 4.47.1, 4.48.1, 51.6, 55.4, 57.2-6; 60.1-4; *Paed*. 2.8.73; Iust. *Apol*. 1.64.1, 2.12.5; Athenag. *Leg*. 23.1, 26-27; Orig. *CC* 8.41.

Od. 21.5, used to show the human nature of Heracles, is also quoted with this sense in Iren. *Adv. Haer*. 1.9.4.

θνητὸν ἄνθρωπον: Descriptions of Heracles' body are attributed to the philosopher Hieronymus (fr. 34 Hiller), and Dicearchus (fr. 54 Wehrli). In *Strom*. 1.105.3-5 Clement transmits as Apollodorus' *On the gods* the news on Heracles' age and place of death.

31.1-4: Ἀλκμάν: Alcman fr. 81 Calame on the Muses is due to a good emendation of Bergk of the MSS ἄλκμανδρος (Alcmander would be an otherwise unknown poet, while this piece of news on Alcman is confirmed by D. S. 4.7.1).

Μούσας... Μύσας: The Euhemerist story on the origin of the Muses (also in Arn. *Adv. Nat*. 4.24.) is explicitly attributed to Myrsilus of Lesbos (*FGH* III B 477 F7). It is based on the homophony caused by iotacism (from the 4th cent. BC onwards) between the words *Mysai* (Mysian ladies) and *Moisai* (Aeolic word for the Muses). Clement tells the story in detail because, apart from illustrating his main point, the story of Megaklo and Makar comes back to the theme of the soothing power of poetry and music, with which his work began (cf. Chapter I).

Immorality of Greek gods

32.1: ἀκούετε... κάλει μοι..: the expressions which recall the judicial metaphorical frame of the whole *refutatio*.

δεσμὰ καὶ γέλωτας καὶ μάχας: Enumeration of negative concepts coordinated by καί is typical of the critique of Greek deities (cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 2.19.1-2), and also creates a contraposition to the eulogies of God in hymnic style. It is repeated in the following cataloguic paragraphs (cf. also 55.3.

32.2-3: This catalogue of love affairs of Poseidon and Apollo is commented by U. von Wilamowitz, *Commentariolum Grammaticum* II, 1880, 11-16 (= *Kleine Schriften* IV, 608ff). Like in the previous section, this one is taken over by Arn. *Adv. Nat*. 4.26, Firm. Mat. *Err*. 12.3, Cyr. *CI* 76.800 B. Zeegers 72ff, concludes that in spite of the parallels with other texts, notably Athenagoras, most of these Homeric citations are traditional material rather than springing from a common source.

32.4: Ζεὺς πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε: this frequent title of Zeus (e. g. *Il*. 1.544), representative of his dignity and superiority, is mocked by Christian Fathers. Cf. Iust. *Apol*.1.22.1, Min. Fel. *Oct*. 19.1, Athenag. *Leg*. 21.1, Ps.-Iust. *Cohort*. 2.1, Orig.

CC 3.23, 4.48 (in the variant of A, cf. Herrero, 157-161), Greg. Naz. *Or.* 4.115, 31.16; Thdt. *Affect.* 2.29. In this case the rejection of Zeus' fatherhood will have its correspondence in the theorization of God's true fatherhood in 9.82ff.

ἐπιθυμεῖν πάσων: Zeus' lust is underlined through repetition of πάσας ἐπιθυμίαν connected and comparison with the goat of Thmouites (cf. Pind fr. 201 Maehler, Hdt. 2.46, Plut, *Brut. anim.* 989A, Strab. 17.1.19, Hieron. *Adv. Iov.* 2.7).

33.1-3: ὦ Ὅμηρε: The ridiculous image of the goat contrasts with Zeus' majestic nodding in *Il.* 1.528-530, which was the alleged model of Pheidias' statue in Olympia (Plut. *Aem.* 28.2, Strab. 8.3.30, Dion Chrys. *Or.* 12.26). Same critique in Arn. *Adv. Nat.* 4.21. The invocation to Homer in the vocative before and after the quotation underlines the difference between the Olympian ideal gods and their image in the myths.

κεστόν: Clement alludes to *Iliad* 14.214-21 (fully quoted by Ps.-Iust. *Cohort.* 2.3), using Homer to contradict Homer. This apologetic technique is exact counterpart of Alexandrian philology under Aristarchus: "to explain Homer from Homer". Jewish and Christian apologetics derives some of its techniques from philology (cf. Herrero, 174-187, 210).

33.3: ἀλεξίκακος: A sarcastic reference to Alcmena (Arn. 4.26, Cyr. *CI* 6.800A) is used to link Zeus with the next god under attack, Heracles. The mention of his cult epithet (like in 26.7) shows him as a popular deity. Clement profits from bookish sources to attack living cults.

33.4: Διὸν υἱὸς Ἡρακλῆς ὡς ἀληθῶς: the long night with Alcmena is used to mock Heracles' filiation. The "sons of Zeus" like Heracles, Asclepios or Dionysus were specially attacked by Christians to differenciate them from Christ: Iust. *Apol.* 1.21; Tert. *Apol.* 21-7-9; Orig. *CC* 3.22-43: cf. H. Y. Gamble, *Vig. Christ.* 23 (1979), 12-29.

δώδεκα... πεντήκοντα: In parallel contrast with πολλῷ χρόνῳ... νυκτί μιᾷ. Mockery of Heracles' deflowering of the fifty daughters of Thestis (cf. Paus .9.27.7, Apoll. *Bibl.* 2.4.10, Athen. 13.556 F) is an apologetic *topos*: Arn. 4.26, Tat. *Orat.* 21.3, Epiph. *Ancor.* 106.8.

σχέτλιον καὶ αἰσυλοεργόν: Clement quotes Hom. *Il.* 5.403 agreeing with Aristarchus' emendation (αἰσυλοεργός instead of ὀβριμοεργός). It cannot be discarded that he echoes also Panyassis' *Heracleis*, quoted below, since he says "the poets".

33.5: Heracles leads the list which serves as proof of the accusation of pederasty: Hylos was seduced by him, Iacinth by Apollo, Pelops by Poseidon, Chrysippus by Laios, Ganymedes by Zeus (a Nestorian ordination, where the main gods open and close the list). Cf. Arn. 4.26, Firm. *Err.* 12.2, Athen. 13.602 F.

33.6. γυναῖκες: Clement's invective gives an insight into his purported public: men with wifes and children, who would be the main devotees of Pagan religious cult. It is a typically rhetorical device (cf. Ps.-Iust. *Orat.* 4.3-6, Epiph. *Ancor.* 104.7), which shows, however, that the cult of these gods was transmitted celebrated in a family context.

ὅμοιοι τοῖς θεοῖς: Greek gods are the antithesis to God, and so is also relation to them the antithesis of the ὁμοίωσις θεῷ promised to the Christian (cf. 12.122.4). A similar irony is perceivable in the venerable word "image" (εἴκονα), in this case of adultery (πορνείας). It will be used for the Logos with more respectable genitives (9.84.6).

33.7-9: The critique of goddesses starts with an original use of a line from the love episode between Ares and Aphrodite, much used both in the critique (cf. Athenag. 21.1) and the allegoresis of the gods (Zeegers 55). Clement seems to quote *Od.* 8.324, contraposing their modesty to the lust of male gods. But he will show with a strong μέν... δέ... that on the contrary, goddesses are even more lusty.

The list of female goddesses with human lovers comes from the last section of Hesiod's *Theogony* (969f, 984, 1003-1009), and it culminates with Aphrodite (cf. 13.4, 14.2, 45.4), a favourite target for apologists (Iust. *Apol.* 1.25.1, Arn. 4.27, Firm. Mat. *Err.* 10.1). The reference to Paris' judgement (probably out of general culture rather than from a direct knowledge of the *Cypria*) made Jackson and Marcovich supplement the mention of Hera (τῇ βοώπιδι) with another one to Athene (καὶ τῇ γλαυκώπιδι). Clement is allusive rather than exhaustive, so the supplement does not seem necessary.

34.1: ἐν βραχεῖ: this kind of expressions enlighten the monotony of the lists and justify the swift passing over names. Cf. Riedweg 120 n.18.

ἐπιτυμβίους: Clement argues that games are founded on funerals (Melicertes, Archemoros, Pelops). This accusation to the four great games (Pythian, Isthmian, Nemean, Olympian) is taken over by Eus *PE* 2.6.10. It links the games to the mysteries (2.13.1, 2.19.2, cf. Riedweg 132). The same association causes the emphasis on the serpent of Delphi (δράκων, ὄφεως, cf. 2.12.2, 2.16.2).

ὦ Πανέλληνες: the attack on Olympia carries a sarcastic reference to an illustrious Greek title. The remark on the Zeus of Phidias (cf. 4.47.2) attacks also an icon of Hellenicity. The fundamental identity of games with mysteries, since they are all founded on funerals allows going back on mysteries which remain exclusively Athenian (and yet worldly known for their shamelessness).

34.2-4: οὐκ ἀμισθί: the emphasis on the word μισθός is not only a satyric pun against Dionysus' homosexuality, but should be contrasted to the the price asked by God for the salvation he offers (10.107.1, 11.114.4-115.1). The obscene story of Dionysus and Prosymnos, which combines a tale of *katabasis* with an aetiology of phallic rituals in Agra and Alimous, is also told by Paus. 2.37.5, Hyg. *Astron.* 2.5.2 (both call him Polymnos). Cf. U. von Wilamowitz, *Commentariolum Grammaticum* II, 1880, 15f. (= *Kleine Schriften* IV, 611). Both Ch. Picard, *RHR* 95 (1927), 220-255, and F. Jourdan, *RHR* 2006 (3), 265-282, link it to the section on the mysteries (2.12-23), since Dionysus is the main character of an obscene episode. Probably this tale is alluded by Justin, *Apol.* 1.25.1: "the shameful thing he [Dionysus] did for love of men". Steneker 45, analyses the rhythm of these paragraph to show that the prose style of the expression of indignation has the same rhythmic intensity, albeit obtained through different means, as the expression of enthusiasm in the first and last paragraphs of the *Protrepticus*.

34.5: Heraclitus B 15 DK = 50 Marcovich. The sequence of a mythical narration from the mysteries followed by a critical quotation of Heraclitus is the same as in 2.22.3. It confirms that Clement inherits Heraclitus' critique of Greek mysteries.

Slavery of the gods

35.1: δοῦλοι παθῶν: the story of Prosymnos suggests that gods are "slaves of their passions", which is naturally followed by episodes in which gods act as servants of human beings. It was a common motif in Pagan and Christian literature, with the same episodes being commented time and again: Philod. *De Piet.* 63.1-5, 13-21; Plut. *Amat.* 17.761e; Luc. *Iup. conf.* 8, *Sacr.* 4; Long. *Daphn.* 4.14.2; Ios. *c. Ap.* 2.34.247; Tat. *Orat.* 21.2. Athenag. *Leg.* 21.4-5, Arn. 4.25. The instances are the usual ones, Apollo under Admetos, Heracles under Omphale, Poseidon and Apollo under Laomedon. Clement adds the following remarks to the usual topics.

δούλειον ζυγόν: The "yoke of slavery" is an Aeschylean expression, *Agam.* 1226, *Pers.* 50, *Sept.* 471, 793. In *Strom.* 2.22.5 Clement atributes it to "the poets", so it may perhaps spring from epic poetry telling these stories. The following quotations have a philological odour which suggests some learned source with literary interests.

35.2: The references to *Od.* 19.34 (Athena carrying a lamp) and *Il.* 3.424f (Aphrodite inviting Helen to go and meet Paris) echo an old philosophical and philological debate: a scholion to the Iliadic line (Schol. *Il.* 423a Erbse I p. 433) reports that Zenodotus athetized the Iliadic line judging disguise improper of a deity, and alleges the Odysseic line as counter-argument; Heraclitus *All. hom.* 28.4-5 allegorizes the Iliadic scene; Ael. Arist. *Or.* 45.2 criticizes the Odyssean scene, and Schol. B. Q. *ad Od.* 19.34 adds a ὡς to make Athena walk "as if she carried a lamp". Clement is heir of the critics which thought the Homeric line incompatible with a divinity.

35.3: τλῆ μὲν... τλῆ δέ...: Panyassis, *Heracleia* fr. 3 Bernabé. This is the only testimony of this text, which suits perfectly Clement's mocking purposes, since the anaphora of "stood (slavery)" five times in three verses corresponds to Clement's repetitive and insistent tone. The sentence καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις suggests that Clement knew more lines (cf. 33.4), but he may have selected just these for that stylistic reason.

Human passions in the gods

36.1: παθητικούς : the new subject, which follows naturally from the previous one, is introduced by a sentence "for they all had mortal skin" (καὶ γάρ θην κείνοις θνητός χρώς), which seems a reminiscence of Hom. *Il.* 21.568f (καὶ γάρ θην τούτῳ τρωτὸς χρώς ὀξέϊ χάλκῳ) or a quotation from another unknown poet (perhaps Panyassis, often quoted in these sections).

The list begins with some typical Homeric references: Diomedes (*Il.* 5.343) blessing Aphrodite and Ares (*Il.* 5.858) go often together, in Pagan, Jewish and Christian texts: Plat. *Resp.* 3.378c-e; Heracl. *All. hom.* 30.1, 30.4; Phil. *Prov.* 2.73; Ios. *C. Ap.* 2.34.243; Athenag. *Leg.* 21.2; Theoph. *Autol.* 1.9; Ps-Iust. *Cohort.* 2.4.

36.2: the previous topical quotations on injured gods are followed by a few more rare ones, which must come from some specific scholarly source. The fragments quoted correspond to other testimonies listed here: Polemo of Ilios (*FGH* III fr. 24, p. 122); *Il.* 5.395ff (cf. Heracl. *All. hom.* 34.5-6); Panyassis fr. 21 Bernabé (cf. *schol. ad Protr.* 36.8, Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.7.2, Arn. 4.25); Panyassis fr. 24 Bernabé (cf. A. R. 4.96,

Hesych. s. v. ζυγία); Sosibius *FGH* II fr. 15 p. 628 (cf. D. S. 4.33.5, Arn. 4.25, Alcman fr. 1 Calame). Riedweg 118 n.9 *in fine* finds here alphabetical order (cf. 2.14-22, 2.28-29) in the listing of the gods (Ἀθηνᾶ, Αἰδωνεύς, Ἥλιος, Ἥρα, Ἡρακλῆς), which would spring from a handbook on θεῶν τραύματα.

36.3: ἰχώρ: this substitute of blood among gods (Hom. *Il*. 5.340) was a common topic of discussion (Plut. *Reg. apophth.* 16.180E, *Alex. fort.* 9.381B, *Alex.* 18.681B, *Sept. conv.* 16.160A; Cels. *apud* Orig *CC* 1.66, 2.36, D. L. 9.60, Ath. 6.251A, Max. Tyr. Diss. 13.6). Clement's opinion that ichor is the sepsis of blood is not attested anywhere else.

τραύματα... αἵματα: Themes are linked by easy associations, both phonetic (homoioteleuton) and semantic: from blood to medicines to the need of food for the gods.

36.4-5: ἀνθρωπ<ίν>οις: This is the unanimously accepted elegant correction of Reinkens for ἀνθρώποις in P, easily explained paleographically and much better syntactically, and which collaborates to the word-play of the following lines.

τραπέζης ἀνθρωπίνης: The reference to the banquet of the gods with the Aethiopians (*Il*. 1.423f) is linked to anthropophagy, which is a tradition only witnesed also by Eustathius *ad loc* (p. 128.40 van der Valk).

ἀπανθρώπου: apart from the word-play with ἀνθρωπίνοις, ἀνθρωπίνης, and ἀνθρωπείων in the same sentence, this word was used to describe the myth of Dionysus and the Titans (17.2), with which Lycaon's myth has obvious similarities (cf. W. Burkert *Homo Necans*, Cambridge Mass. 1983, 89-212). The story is also told by Paus. 8.2.3, Apollod. *Bibl*. 3.8.1, Nonn. *Dion*. 18.20ff, *Schol. Lycophr*. 481.

ἐνεφορεῖτο: the explicit mention that Zeus "satiated himself" is found only in Christian sources which emphasize the "eating". Pagan sources omit the grousy details of the meal, and if the tale makes unavoidable that flesh is eaten, it is just "tasted", since eating is an *arreton*. Cf. M. Herrero, *RHR* 223.4 (2006a), 389-416 and commentary to 2.18.2.

37.1-3: Καλός γε ὁ Ζεὺς... μᾶλλον δὲ ὁ ἄδικος...: the sarcastic ring of the solemn traditional epithets for Zeus is followed by another string of negative epithets, most of them with privative *alpha*. It creates a sensation of hymn and anti-hymn, as an anti-apophatic theology.

γεγηρακέναι... οὐκέτι: Clement insists on the "oldness" of Greek myth (1.2.2, 2.11.1). Even Zeus' faults are past. Swift allusions to his mating transformations and other well-known myths (Leda, Semele, Ganymedes) and a series of rhetorical questions with the topical *ubi sunt*? complete the attack on Zeus. And then Clement insists: γεγήρακε... ἀπέθανεν. Zeus is so old that he has died from age (Lact. *DI* 1.16.10, Tat. *Orat*. 21.4, Theoph. *Ad autol*. 2.3). This is the link to the next quotation on Zeus' death.

ζητεῖς σου τὸν Δία;: the verb ζητέω ("to search") is used in all four Gospels in the question addressed to the first wittnesses of Jesus' resurrection (Mt 28.5, Mc 16.6, Lc 24.15, Jn 20.15). Its ironical use here may hide an (unconscious?) comparison between Zeus' death and Christ's.

37.4. Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* 8-9 on his tomb is a topical apologetic reference: Athenag. *Leg*. 30.2; Tat. *Orat*. 27.1; Orig. *CC* 3.43; Epiph. *Panar*. 42.12.3, *Refut*. 21. and allusions without citation in Theoph. *Autol*. 1.10; Min. Fel. *Oct*. 23.13; Tert. *Apol*. 10.4, 25.7, *Ad nat*. 2.17.3, Arnob. 4.25, Greg. Naz. *Or*. 5.32. Pagan references to the subject in Luc. *Timon* 6; *Sacr*. 10; *Iup. trag*. 45; *Deor. conc*. 6; *Philops*. 3; Cic. *ND* 1.119, 3.21.53; Ennius *apud* Lact. *DI* 1.11.46.

ὡς δράκων: the final reference to the snake echoes Zeus' union with Persephone, which has been told much earlier (16.2) than the ones in this section. Clement associates the decaying of myths with the defeat of the Devil (represented as a snake, cf. 1.7.4). His position as the last makes him the most meaningful of Zeus' deaths.

Divinization of men

38.1: ἄκοντες μέν, ὅμως δ' οὖν συνιέντες: This is a first hint of the truth that sometimes is found in Greek authors, a theme that will be developed in chapters VI–VII. The expression shows the ambiguity of Clement towards the explanation these "emanations" should receive (cf. 6.68.2).

Od. 19.163 is a famous proverbial expresion also in Hes. *Theog*. 35: cf. C. López Ruiz in R. Olmos et al., *Paraíso cerrado, jardín abierto*, Madrid, 2005, 103-124. Its quotation along with *Od*. 4.63 is found already in Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math*. 11.161. That means that Clement takes the combination of the two Odyssean lines from some anthology (Zeegers 81f), but he inserts it in a polemical context and goes on to talk about statues of wood and stone, who in fact represent human beings.

38.2-4: The next paragraphs are lists of local cults with ridiculous or strange epithets of the Olympian gods. Some names of authors are transmitted, probably stemming all of them from the same scholarly source (cf. 2.39.1).

Δία: Staphilus FGH IV fr. 10 p. 506; cf. Athenag. *Leg*. 1.1; Lycophr. *Alex*. 335, 1124f, 1369f.

Ἀφροδίτης: Phanocles fr. 5 Powell. L. Alfonsi, *Hermes* 81 (1953), 379-383, defends that the title of the work is just Ἔρωτες and the explanation ἢ Καλοῖς (also in *Strom*. 6.23.7, which caused the ancient correction of τῖε in P: now, however, Marcovich's ἤτοι keeps the same sense and is paleographically better) would be Clement's addition. That would rather be an addition of his source, sine there is no apologetic intention. The theme of Agamemnon and Arginno is also mentioned in Athen. 13.603D; Propert. 3.7.21-22; Plut. *Brut. Anim*. 990d.

Ἄρτεμιν: Callimachus fr. 187 Pfeiffer (cf. Paus. 8.23.6-7, without reference to Callimachus); Sosibius FGH II fr. 14 p. 628.

Κεχηνότος Ἀπόλλωνος: Polemo *FGH* III fr. 71 p. 135); cf. Athen. 8.346b. L. Preller in his edition of Polemo (1838), Th. Bergk (*Opuscula Philologica*, 1886, II, 497) and Marcovich correct the text to Διονύσου (open-mouth Dionysus, mentioned by Ael. *HA* 7.48; Plin. *NH* 8.58) instead of Apollo. The error would be easily explained by the next mention of Apollo Opsophagos, also in genitive: but it is Clement's error in transcribing his source (or perhaps his source was already mistaken), not a copyist's, as πάλιν shows. The correction can be edited, therefore, in Polemo's text, but the mistaken Apollo must stay in Clement's text.

38.4: Ἀπομυίῳ: For Heracles, Paus. 5.14.1; Plin. *NH* 10.79. For Zeus, Ael. *HA* 5.17, 11.8. Cf. *Protr*. 38.4.

Πυρετῷ καὶ Φόβῳ: Cic. *Leg*. 2.28, *ND* 3.63; Plin, *NH* 2.16; Val. Max. 2.5.6; Liv. 1.27.7; Min. Fel. *Oct*. 25.8; Cypr. *Quod idola* 4; Lact. *DI* 1.20.11, 1.20.17; August. *CD* 2.14, 3.12, 3.25, 4.15, 4.23, 6.10.

Τυμβωρύχον: cf. Plut. *Quaest. rom*. 269 B, on Aphrodite Ἐπιτυμβία. Cf. L. Farnell, *The Cults of Greek States* II (1896), 652.

Χελύτιδα: Marcovich compares it with *Hymn. Hom*. 5.19, which connects Artemis with gutural cries (*ololygai*). Cf. Farnell, *Cults* II, 472.

39.1: τοὺς σοὺς συγγραφεῖς: All the precedent authors, whom Clement knw aknowledges he has used, probably come from one mythographical source. These

Greek authors are specially important witnesses, according to the ever-present judicial metaphor (μάρτυρας καλῶ).

ἀβίωτον ὄντως βίον: The same word-play in Plat. *Polit*. 299 e7, Lys. *Or*. 6.31, Aristoph. *Plut*. 969. It may have been a topic of the genre.

ἐμπεπληκότες: I see no need to change the MSS reading to ἐμπεπληκότας (Stählin and Marcovich) since it can have the nominative of "you wretched" (δείλαιοι) instead of the accusative of μάρτυρας. Clement calls these authors as witnesses, not as responsible for atheism. The Greek is however strange and forced, hence the lacune suspected by Wilamowitz.

39.2-3: This list of different denominations of Zeus, Aphrodite, and Dionysus probably springs from Apollodorus' *On the gods*, which dwells on their names. Cf. *FGH* II B 244 F 112 on Aphrodite Περιβασός and Ἑταίρα; Cercidas (under the name "the Siracusans") fr. 14 Powell and Nicander *Europia* fr. 23 Schneider on καλλίπυγος and καλλίγλουτος. Dionysus Χοιροψάλης is obviously related to the name χοῖρον for the female *pudenda*, as the scholion to this passage says (cf. also Polem. FGH III fr. 72 135 and *Schol. ad Aesch. Pers*. 1054).

Theriomorphic gods

This section is studied by M. Wellmann, *Hermes* 51 (1916), pp. 27-32, who shows its sriking parallels with Aelian, *Historia Animalium*, and other works of erudition (Plutarch, Athenaeus, Pollux, Antoninus Liberalis). He shows that both Clemens and Aelian draw from a common source, an Alexandrian grammarian writing on animals who drew from works of previous ones like Didymus. The scholia to the *Protrepticus* pay much attention to this section, full of peculiar news.

39.4-5: πόσῳ βελτίους Αἰγύπτιοι: Egyptian gods were popular in Late Paganism, and Apologists often attack their theriomorphic nature (cf. Arist. *Apol*. 12.1, 12.7, Athenag. *Leg*. 1.1). Since Clement is writing to an Alexandrian audience, it is natural that he gives some special place to Egyptian gods and cults. On Clement and Egypt, cf. A. Deiber, *Clément d'Alexandrie et l'Égypte*, Le Caire, IFAO, 1904. Some of these local theriomorphic cults are mentioned in scattered references by Aelian, *HA* (9-11); Strabo (17.1); Plutarch, *De Is. et Osir*., and Herodotus (2-3).

39.6: ὑμεῖς... ἀμείνους Αἰγυπτίων: The Egyptian excurse gives place to new attacks against Greek local cults, now in relation to theriomorphism. Clement begins by

profiting from Greek traditional rivalry with Egypt to turn Greek mockeries against themselves. It is clear that he is addressing an audience which feels to be Greek, not Egyptian. Yet he is following his Alexandrian source, which already compared Egyptian theriomorphic and Greek cults (Ael. *HA* 12.5, cf. Wellmann, *Hermes* 51 (1916), 27). He accuses Thessalians of adoring storks (Plut. *De Is.* 380F), Thebans of adoring weasels (schol. *ad loc.*, schol. ad *Il*. 19.119 (= Istros *FGH* 334 fr. 72), Ov. *Met*. 9.306ff, Ael. *HA* 12.5), and Thessalians again of adoring ants (schol. *ad loc*; Serv. *In Aen* 2.7 quoting Eratosthenes; Arn. *Adv. nat*. 4.26).

39.7-9: Three sources are quoted explicitly about theriomorphic cults, though they come to Clement through his compilative doxographical source. Polemo (*FGH* III, fr. 31, p. 124) on Apollo's traditional epithet Σμίνθιος (already in Homer, *Il*.1.39); cf. Ael. *HA* 12-5, Strab. 13.1.48 (= Heracl. Pont. fr. 154 Wehrli); Heraclides Ponticus, *On the Building of Temples in Acarnania* (fr. 153 Wehrli), on a sacrifice to the flies on the Apolline temple of Aktion (cf. Ael. *HA* 11.8); Euphorion 121 Van Groningen on the Samians (cf. Ael. *HA* 12.40).

οὐδέ γε τῶν... Σύρων: The section closes with the Syrian cults in Phoenicia, which are alluded without indication of the source (cf. Xenoph. *Anab*. 1.4.9, D. S. 2.4, Luc. *De dea Syria* 14; 45; Ael. *HA* 12.2). their cult is compared to the veneration of Zeus in Elis, alluded to in 38.4: the reason must be that Clement's source repeated the mention of Zeus Apomyus in this section (or that he was using two different sources, both of which mentioned the Elidean cult; cf. Wellmann, *Hermes* 51 (1916), 31), and Clement recalls it without describing it.

Gods are daemons

40.1: δαίμονες: Clement fights now the theory and cult of daemons, second-rank gods which have the power to benefit or harm. Their cult is local, but the theories to find their place in the divine world were as old as Hesiod (*Op*. 122f, *Theog*. 991, Plat. *Ap*. 27d, *Crat*. 398c). Plutarch elaborated a complex demonology which shows the force of daemons in contemporary Paganism. Clement alludes to such Pagan attempts to theorize daemons when he examines if they are "in a second rank (of deities), as you say". Clement's attack follows an apologetic tendence: Tat. *Orat*. 12.5, Athenag. *Leg*. 26.1, *Paed*. 2.15.4, calling them λίχνοι. The latent idea (not explicit here, unlike in 4.55.4, 92.3, 99.2) is to identify the daemons with the Biblical devils. Cf. also 42.8-9, 53.1. As Steneker, 10 n.4, points out, F. Andres, *Röm. Quartalschr*. 34 (1926), 13-27,

129-140, 307-329, fails to aknowledge this fundamental ambiguity. On daemons in general, cf. W. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, London 1985, 179-181 (and now pp 243-246 in the most updated Spanish version, Madrid 2006).

40.2: κατὰ πόλεις δαίμονας ἐπιχωρίους: on these local daemons (Menedemus, etc.), cf. Hdt 6.95, Paus. 3.16.9. As J. Geffcken, *Hermes* 25 (1890), 94f. shows (following a suggestion of Wilamowitz) these news come indirectly from Callimachus' *Aitia* (frr. 733, 188, 663, 664 Pfeiffer). Other allusions like Ovid's *Ibis*, and the scholia to the *Ibis*, to Lycophron (ad 570) and to this passage, also come directly from Callimachus.

κατὰ πρύμναν ἥρως: Again a quotation from Callimachus (fr. 103 Pfeiffer). The hero alluded is Androgeos (cf. Paus. 1.1.2-4 and scholion to this passage).

The Plateaean daemons invoked before the battle against the Persians are alluded also by Plut. *Aristid.* 11.3. Cf. Hdt. 9.25, Thuc. 3.24.1.

41.1-2: φύλακες: Clement quotes Hesiod (*Op.* 252f), as in 10.103.2. These lines contain a popular interpretation of *daimones* and were also quoted in theological interpretations by Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 9.86, Max. Tyr. *Diss.* 8.8, and Oenomaus *apud* Eus. *PE* 5.36.2. Even more popular are *Op.* 122f. The traditional sense of "guardians" is mocked by Clement by identifying the *daimones* with the immoral Olympian gods (cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.222, quoted in 4.55.4) who could not be guardians of morality. The following line completes the mockery.

πατήρ ἀνουθέτητος παῖδα νουθετεῖ: Since this saying is an iambic trimetre and it is not attested elsewhere (not even as a proverb) it was ascribed by Kock to comedy (*Com. Adesp.* fr. 1257). Kassel and Austin have not accepted it. Some emendations have been proposed, none of which is convincing: Wilamowitz's ἀνουθέτητος for ἀνουθέτητα deprives it of any irony, and παῖδα for υἱόν or moving πατήρ to the end of the sentence (Marcovich) are not necessary. The antithesis to the useless corrections of Pagan gods, is preached in 9.82.2 of God Father, who corrects his children (i.e. mankind) to save them.

41.3: εὐνοίᾳ: according to Butterworth 200, this passage is distantly related to Plat. *Phaedr.* 241c, where this word appears to qualify the lover who loves for what he could get, while daemons pretend to be saviours, being in fact destroyers of mankind, in order to get the benefit of sacrifice.

καπνῷ: the burlesque reference to the smoke of sacrifice as sign of gluttony (γαστριμαργία) of the gods is frequent in Christian literature critical with sacrifice, along with the quotation of *Il.* 4.49 about the γέρας of the gods (already alluded in 2.18.1). Cf. also 51.2 and Iust. *Apol.* 1.12.5, 2.5.4; Tert. *Apolog.* 22.6, 23.14.

41.4: οὐδὲ ὀνομάτων ὑμῖν πενία: Clement ends up with a diatribe against Pagan theology, both Egyptian and Greek, dismissing as nonsense all its subtle distinctions to organize the polytheistic tradition in a coherent system. The image of daemons or demi-gods as demi-asses (hybrid of horse and donkey) is already in Plat. *Apol.* 27e. Clement may be creating, or at least expanding, an apologetic *topos*, the stupidity of the efforts to defend polytheism or *polyonymia*. Cf. Epiph. *Affect.* 1.22 (after a paragraph on the mysteries which depends on *Protr.* 2.12-22): "you are abundant in names of gods, not in the facts that underlie them".

Chapter III

Following up on the *refutatio* of chapter II, this brief chapter develops the sentence of 2.19.2 "these are, to sum up, Greek cults: murders and tombs". It is divided in four sections. The first two (transcribed by Eusebius, *PE* 4.16.12-13) turn around a new opposition, *daimones* vs. men: it serves both to condemn Greek gods as daemons which lead men to death and condemnation, and to make God an ally of men, in a double level. In the first place, as the saviour of mankind. In the second place, because unlike Greek gods, some men like Solon were able to speak words of true wisdom. This is a philo-Hellenic theme which will be developed in later chapters (VI, VII). The third and fourth sections of Chapter III consist mainly in citations around the foundation of sancturaries. Though most of them probably come from anthologies, Clement is able to build up two arguments around them: the beginning of superstition and the fact that Greek cults are built on acts of killing.

Greek gods demand human death

42.1: δαίμονες: this word marks the transition with the previous chapter. Gods are equated with daemons in its most pejorative sense, i. e. the Biblical devils.

ἀπάνθρωποι: the frequent accusation against Greek gods of being inhuman (cf. 17.2, 36.4-5) is underlined here through the repetition (five times) of words with the root ἀνθρωπ-. It builds the opposition between Greek gods and men which dominates the following paragraphs. The proof of their thirst for human blood is threefold: duels in the stadium (cf. Lugaresi, *Adamantius* 9 (2003), 10-29, on the Christian negative consideration of these games), wars, and above all, human sacrifices. The examples which follow concentrate just in the last type.

42.2. ἀπέσφαξεν: Aristomenes' mass hekatomb was well-known (Paus. 4.19.3, Plut. *Rom.* 25.4, *Sept. saep. conv.* 159 E; *Quaest. conv.* 660 F; Polyaen. *Strat.* 2.31.2; Plin. *HN* 11.185), so a specific written source need not to be thought for this instance (*pace* Hiller, *Hermes* 21 (1886), 131). It was told also by Thdt. *Affect.* 7.43, and Cyr. *CI* IV (PG 76, coll. 696 D-697A), probably inspired in this passage. It is a typical example of Christian critique of Pagan sacrifice.

42.3. ταύτας σοι τὰς θυσίας: the tradition of sacrificing foreigners among the Taurians was also part of the general mythical background, due to Herodotus (4.103)

and above all to Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*. Clement alludes to him as a means to associate the Taurians and the Greeks with the dative pronoun (σοι) in their sacrifice.

42.4: τὸ ἀ<ρ>χαῖον: Fruechtel's emendation of the MSS reading ἀχαιόν is justified by the reading τὸ παλαιὸν in one of Eusebius' manuscripts (A). The sacrifice of an Aechean would have no explanation. The sense is adverbial. But the fact that both Peleus and Chiron were characteristically old could give some place to the possibility that an adjective ἀρχαῖον was written to mean "to sacrifice an old man", though this sense of the word is extremely awkward. (cf. *LSJ s. v.* II.2).

42.4-7: if the first two instances in the previous paragraphs were taken out from general culture, they are now followed by a list of human sacrifices clearly taken from a written source (same structure as in 2.12). They are all historians (Monimus *FGH* IV fr. 1, p. 454; Anticlides *FGH* I B 140 fr. 7; Dosiades *FGH* III 458 fr. 7, Pythocles *FGH* III C 833 fr. 2; Demaratos *FGH* I 42 fr. 4; Dorotheus *FGH* 145 fr.2). Clement's written source must have been some mythographical anthology on human sacrifice, typical of Alexandrian doxography, which drew from earlier historians. Cf. E. Hiller, *Hermes* 21 (1886), 126-133, argues for the likely probability that his miscellaneous source (perhaps the same from which other informations of books II, III and IV spring) uses Ps-Plut. *Parall. min.* 20 AB (p.310 D). Stob. *Flor.* 3.39.33 possibly also draws on ps.-Plutarch. Instead, Cyr. Alex. *CI* 697 AB is clearly inspired in this passage when alluding to the human sacrifices of the Lesbians and of Erechtheus. Lyd. *De mens.* 4.147 might come from any of both lines of transmission of these news.

τὰς αὑτῶν ἐθυσάτην θυγατέρας: Marius and Erechtheus are the climax of this list, since not only they sacrificed human beings, but their own daughters. Therefore they are mentioned at the end, together, in the dual, and the sources are specified afterwards. Clement changes his cataloguic sources to reach some rethorical effects which avoid monotony.

42.8: δαίμονες... δεισιδαίμονες: homoioteleuton (which is in this case close to etymological play) causes parallelism, reinforced by the distributive οἱ μέν... οἱ δέ... and the repetition of σωτηρία, between the gods and their devotees.

42.9: ἱερὸν ἱερεῖον ἐπιφημίσας: this sentence has tempted the scholars to correct the text transmitted by the MSS. Wilamowitz (followed by Stählin and Marcovich) deleted the first word, Potter the second. Marcovich adds the article (τό ἱερεῖον). Yet I see no reason to change a perfectly understandable text: "in the altars

and the paths one sacrifices a man, calling him sacred victim". The repetition of ἱερὸν ἱερεῖον is not a scribal error, but another example of the rhetorical use of etymology (in this case Clement mocks the sanctity of the terminology of sacrifice).

Φόνος ἐστι καὶ ἀνδροκτασία ἡ τοιαύτη θυσία: this refutation of human sacrifice as murder is a *topos* of Christian apologetics, and shows the struggle for etiquettes as the rhetorical cornerstone of Christian and Pagan polemics. Human sacrifice had disappeared from Greek religion long before classical times, but it continued to be present in myth and as taken as such by Christians as a living practice. Correspondigly, they were accused also of ritual crimes (cf. 2.18.2). Cf. A. Henrichs, in *Festschrift J. Quasten* I, Münster, 1970, 18-35; and in *Le Sacrifice dans l'Antiquité*, Entretiens Hardt 27, Vandœuvres-Genève 1981. The rhetoric struggle for etiquettes in the mutual accusation of murder is typical of religious polemics (cf. the modern religious debates around contraception in the Third World and abortion).

43.1: περιφεύγωμεν... ἐκτρεπόμεθα... οὐκ ἐτρέπεσθε οὐδὲ ἀποστρέφεσθε: this section finishes with a return to exhortative tone, with an invocation to men, which immediately brings back the terminology of conversion as a spacial movement (cf. 1.3.1 and introduction).

δράκοντα ἰδών: the exhortation is ellegantly ornated with a Homeric quotation (*Il*. 3.33-5): the Homeric simile on how man turns away from a snake agrees both with the exhortation to turn away from daemons as from wild animals. The association of Satan with the snake, and therefore with Greek daemons, is made explicit (cf. 1.7.4).

Greek men are better than Greek gods

43.2: βελτίονα τὸν ἄνθρωπον: the superiority of Greek men over Greek gods is a cornerstone of Clement's philohellenism. The *Protrepticus* makes no concessions in the condemnation of all Greek cults as superstition, but lets the door open to some intuitions of truth in Greek philosophes and poets (chapters VI and VII). The sentence "Cyrus and Solon are better than Apollo" summarizes this attitude, which attacks at the same time Greek religion while admiring Greek wisdom. Clement will explain now this case.

43.3: προΰδοκεν τὸν Κροῖσον: the famous story of Cresus' misunderstanding of the ambiguous Delphic oracle is told by Herodotus (1.30-33, 45-46, 85-88). Clement uses it to show the superiority of Solon, who had predicted the futility of Cresus'

superficial happiness, and of Cyrus, who ordered to turn down the flames of the pyre where he was going to be burnt, over Apollo, who betrayed him with a doleful oracle.

τοῦ μισθοῦ ἐκλαθόμενος: the accusation against Apollo is that he "forgot the price he had received". This insistence on the price required by the gods (cf. also 2.34.3) aims at a comparison with the price required by God (cf. 11.114.4)

φιλόδολος: Marcovich's emendation (based in *Acta Thomae* 159, 271.16 Bonnet) for the reading of P φιλόδοξος is paleographcally valid and suits better the context than the generally accepted φιλόλοξος (first proposed by I. Toup, *Emendationes in Suidam et Hesychium* I, 1760, 370): Clement's attack is about Apollo's disloyalty to Croesus rather than about ambiguity (in spite of the λοξά in the end of the section). The story aims to mock the lack of love of *daimones* for men with heavy insistence on the word *philos* (the root *phil-* is repeated six times in 42.3).

ὁδηγοῦσιν εἰς τὸ πῦρ: the connexion of the fire in the story with the eternal flames of condemnation in Hell insists on the image of 2.22. The following rhetorical invocation to the characters of the story have also parallels in 2.22.5 ("turn down the fire, o hierophant!") and in 12.122 (Tiresias).

43.4: τῷ πάθει μεταμαθών: the link between *pathein* and *mathein* was proverbial, a typical sentence of Greek traditional wisdom (Aesch. *Agam.* 164, 177, 250) and is accepted here by Christian tradition (already in *Hebr.* 5.8). As Steneker, 21 detects, the expression is emphasized by the phonetic effect.

τέλος ὅρα: The MSS have τέλος ἄρα, but P[2] adds ὅρα in the margin (perhaps an ancient conjecture which is right, bringing in a new fragment from Solon: the whole paragraph is Test. 87 Martina). Cf. Diog. *Paroem.* 8.51. This is the true and unambiguous oracle, against Apollo's doleful one.

τὸν χρησμόν: instead of "the oracle" Marcovich proposes "the oracle-monger" (τὸν χρησμῳδόν). Both could be "tested on the fire", so there is no need to change the text of the MSS.

The beginning of superstition

44.1: οἱ πρῶτοι πεπλανημένοι: the question of the origin of superstition is frequently alluded, and it is usually attributed to the founders of cults (cf. Orpheus in 1.3.1, the ἀρχεκάκοι in 2.13.3-5). It explains the origin of evil within human terms, in coherence with the conception of religious truth or falsehood as a genetic descendance from the original legitimate or illegitimate seeds (cf. 9.82). As a link to the previous

paragraphs, those who were said to sacrifice for the first time, Phoroneus or Merops or somebody else (ἄλλος τις: Arnobius, *Adv. nat.* 6.3 when echoing this reference calls this innominate third candidate Aegyptios). *Strom.* 1.102.6 also mentions Phoroneus as the first man on the authority of Acusilaos and the poem *Phoronis*. Paus. 2.15.5 says that the Phoroneus was the first to gather human beings into a community (in the argive city of Phoronikon), which shows the social nature of sacrifice. Merops is the name of several mythological figures (most prominently the king of Aethiopia), non of which is reported as the first to sacrifice is not reported elsewhere. Making him a primordial man must come from his name, since μέροπες was a traditional epithet of men (Hom. *Il.* 1.250). These news are not linked to the next section, so they probably come from Clement's general culture on these mythological primordial figures (cf. 10.108.4 as legislator of Argos like Solon in Athens) rather than from a written source, whence the imprecison of the reference.

44.2: τὸν Ἔρωτα τοῦτον: *This* Eros is that of the *Phaedrus*, according to Butterworth 200, which is now deprecated to be praised in a Christianized version in 11.117.2. Its mention here aims to reinforce the case by alluding to another contradiction of Greek religion (turned artificially into a dogmatic system of belief by Christian perspective). Eros, a god present in the first stages of theogonic tradition (Hes. *Theog.* 120, Parmen. B 13, Plat. *Symp.* 178a-c, 180b), is identified with the son of Aphrodite, who was first given cult by Charmos (confirmed by Paus. 1.130.1 and Athen. 13.609d).

44.3: Πᾶνα: The god Pan receives a prayer at the end of the Phaedrus, and here is attacked just after Eros (Butterworth, "Clement and the Phaedrus", 200). For Philippides as founder fo the cult of Pan in Athens, cf. Hdt. 6.105, Paus. 1.28.4.

ἀρχήν ποθεν... πηγή: the terminology reflects the insistence in finding the origins of evil (cf. 2.13.3). It is found in superstition (δεισιδαιμονία), which is the subject of the whole sentence as agent of evil. Eusebius transcribed (*PE* 2.6.1-7) this attack on supersition and the following paragraphs until the end of the chapter.

δημιουργός: The use of this word for δεισιδαιμονία solves the problem of the origin of *daimones* and evil, which could lead to a dualistic solution. To make superstition the agent creator of *daimones* makes in the end man responsible for them, not any evil counter-god. Yet "superstition" is objectivized for the sake of the

conversion scheme (cf. 1.3), and it becomes therefore something that can act and can be left behind and forgotten (ἐκλάθεσθε).

44.4: οὐδὲ σιωπήσομαι... ἐξελέγξω: Clement comes back to the rhetorical frame of a formal trial against Greek cults (2.12.1). The specific proofs against them come in the next point, where sanctuaries are accused of being tombs in reality. Cyrill (*CI* X, PG 76, 1028c-129a) transcribed this passage from this point to 45.4. And Arnobius made free use of the following informations (*Adv. nat.* 6.6).

Sanctuaries are Tombs

45.1-4: This catalogue of tombs which have become cult-places probably stems from an anthological source of Euhemeristic tone, which takes examples from different authors. Antiochus (*FGH* 29 fr. 2) probably is not only the source of the news on the tomb of Acrisius in the Acropolis. Acrisius begins a list of dead people in different sanctuaries which has strict alphabetical order until the next source (Leandrios, cf. *infra*) is quoted: Acrisius-Erichtonius-Immaradus-Keleos' daughters (Κέλευου θυγατέρες), wifes of the Hyperboreans (Ὑπερβόρεων γυναίκας). A handbook probably systematized alphabetically the news from each author.

Ἰμμαράδος: the MSS transmit ἴμμαρος (ἴσμαρος in some MSS of Eusebius). But the correction is justified because Immarados is mentioned by Pausanias (1.5.2, 27.4, 38.3), and Cyrill gives the correct text when he transcribes the passage (*CI* X, PG 76, 1028C), which shows that he read a non corrupt text..

Κλέοχον: Leandrios *FGH* III B 491 fr. 10: C. Wendel, *Hermes* 70 (1935), 357f, according to whom all this section probably derives from Apollodorus, shows that this piece of news comes from Leandrios' *Milesiaka*. Cleochon, father of Areia, wih whom Apollo engendered Miletos, is mentioned by Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.1.2, which allows to change the Κλέαρχον in P, Eusebius and Cyrill (while now it is Arnobius who read a better text, cf. *Adv. Nat.* 6.6: Cleochum).

Ζήνωνι τῷ Μυνδίῳ: Neither Stählin nor Marcovich make any mention of Zeno of Myndos, a grammatist of disputed dating, probably under Tiberius' reign (*RE* 19.2 (1972), 143f). Cf. U. von Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 30 (1895), 184, who shows that the female name of the buried woman alluded by Zeno, Leukophrys, comes from the name of a homonymous city. Cf. Thdt. *Cur.* 8.30, Arn. *Adv. nat.* 6.6.

Κινύραν: Cyniras is also mentioned in 13.14-17, 14.5-6; 33, 34. Perhaps Ptolomaeus of Megalopolis (this is *FGH* 161 fr. 1) could be the source of all these

scattered mentions, but the figure of Cyniras is quite well-known, so these references could well be product of Clement's general culture. Cf. echoes in Arn. *Adv. nat.* 6. 6.

45.5: οὐδ' ὁ πᾶς ἂν ἀρκέσαι χρόνος: Clement closes the section with a proverbial sentence (considered, since it is a verse, as an unknown tragic fragment (*adesp*. fr. 109a Kannicht-Snell). But probably it versified a popular expression (Demosth. *De cor*. 296, Cic. *ND* 3.81 (with Pease ad loc), Heb.11.32, Athenag. *Leg.* 14.1), which rings familiar also to Christian ears (Jn 21.25). It cannot be discarded either that it started being a famous poetic line and then a popular expression.

ἆ δειλοί: the quotation of *Od.* 20.351f is particularly appropiate to close a section for its imprecatory style which is very adequate to the protreptic style, which inherits the revelatory style of ancient poetry. Cf. introd. n. 40 and commentary to 1.2.2, 11.115.3. Cf. also P. Mitsis-J. Strauss Clay (eds.), *Il destinatario nell'epos didascalico. The Addressee in Didactic Epic*, Materiali e discussioni 31, Pisa 1994, and M. Herrero, *Rev Phil Anc* 24.2 (2006), 55-74.

Chapter IV

This chapter is dedicated to the refutation of the cult of images and statues which was one of the main features of Greek religion. The Biblical tradition of criticism of idolatry which derived in iconoclasm is the ideological basis of the attack against statues, to which Clement adds some details of his own. Like in the previous chapters describing cults and sacrifices, he mantions many specific cases which he takes from written sources. Therefore his informations are similar to those offered by contemporaneous authors who describe local cults, like Pausanias or Philostratos. In the section dedicated to animals, there are significant parallels with Aelian.

The theme of the impiety and absurdity of adoring matter is traditionally Christian (cf. *Protr.* 1.3, *Strom.* 7.4.3, *Ep. ad Diogn.* 2.2-4, Iust. *Apol.* 9.2., Athenag. *Leg.* 17.2, Theoph. *Autol.* 2.2; Phil. *de vit. contempl.* 7, Tertull. *Apolog.* 12.2 (Mayor ad loc.). In front of this argumentation, among the Pagan rows there was a certain revalutation of the cult of images which was seen as positive to renew piety in traditional religion (Porphyry, Iamblichus). The bookish attacks, therefore, respond to a living religious reality. Besides, the cult of images offered a broad field for syncretism, against which Clement tries to draw firm boundaries.

A variety of that theme of statue veneration is the cult to other human beings, i. e. to sovereigns. This cult was very popular in Imperial times (Cf. L. Cerfaux – J. Tondriau: *Un concurrent du christianisme. Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine*, Lournai 1957) and rejecting it was a main cause of the prosecution against Christians.

The specific attack on Egypt, with a section focusing on Sarapis and Antinous, is particularly adequate not only because of Clement's setting and audience, but also because Egypt was progressively upgraded by theorisers of Paganism as the land where ancient religious wisdom came from (e. g. Iamblichus).

As in other chapters, along with the *refutatio* there are some pieces of building his own case and defining Christianity by contrast, which offers some precedents of the *argumentatio* and *peroratio* which will come later. The conclusive passages exhorting to conversion at the end are the most clear cases of this positive message within the diatribe-like general context.

Statues

46.1: λῆρον συνήθειαν: cf. 6.62, 7.72, 7.75, 10.89, 10.99, 10.101, 10.103, 10.109, 12.118. Cf. Lugaresi, *Adamantius* 9 (2003), 10-29.

ἔργα χειρῶν: the theme of the chapter is clearly delimited with the quotation of Ps. 113.2 (115.4). Cf. *Ep. ad Diogn.* 2.3, Theoph. *Autol.* 1.1, 1.10, 2.34.

46.2: πάλαι: the news on phantastic barbarian cults of ancient times were commonplaces of ethnographic literature. These news are attested elsewhere: on Scythians, cf. Luc. *Iupp. trag.* 42; on Arabians, cf. Max. Tyr, *Philos.* 2.8c; on Persians, cf. Hdt. 1.138.2. The same passage is used by Arn. *Adv. Nat.* 6.11.

ξόανα ποσηγορεύετο: the etymology of *xoana* is similar to other phonetic word-plays and false etymologies (12.2, 17.2, cf. Steneker 19). This name was given to ξύλα and κίονας because of the ἀπεξέσθαι needed to make them. *Xoana* would come from the confluence of the three words. Lack of rigour was not a problem for Clement when using these etymological methods (cf. 46.3).

46.3: Aethlius (FGH III B 536 fr. 3) is dated in the 5th cent BC. These news (cf. Call. *Aet.* fr. 100 Pfeiffer; Plut. fr. 158 Sandbach *apud* Eus. *PE* 3.8.1) come from the same source than those on statues which will follow shortly starting precisely with Samos. Cf. 4.47.2

βρέτη: A new apologetic etymology, βρέτας (wooden image) from βροτός (mortal) which shows that *xoana* (similarly etymologized in the previous paragraph) are perishable and antropomorphic. U. Treu, *Stud Pat* 4 (1959), 194, thinks that these two etymologies may come from a "lexicalische Quelle", but they could well be Clement's own invention.

46.4: δόρυ: this piece of news on Ares' xoanon being a spear is expressly attributed to Varro (*Ant. rerum. div.* 16, fr. 34 Agahd. (= 254 Cardauns). Cf. Arn. 6.11. Plut. *Rom.* 29.1, confirms this information, and must also spring from Varro, whose ideas on the original aniconic nature of primitive Roman gods furnished arguments to Christians like Clement and, above all, Augustin. Cf. B. Cardauns, *ARNW* II 16.1 (1978), 80-103. A similar practice among the Scythians is reported in 5.64.5.

ἤνθησεν ἡ τέχνη, ηὔξησεν ἡ πλάνη: the parallelistic construction underlines the negative sense of τέχνη, which leads to error (κακοτεχνία and τεχνίται are mentioned just before). The distrust of τέχνη is a clear Platonic inheritance.

47.1: συνελόντι φάναι: An expression used by Clement to sum up his point in one sentence, after some examples and before others to illuminate them: cf. 2.18.2. If the precedent examples would suffice, he will bring more proofs of the accusation in the following paragraphs, with some classical examples.

εὐσέβειαν... ἀλήθειαν: the paradoxical contraposition is half-conceptual, half-phonetic. Clement uses the term εὐσέβεια for the false piety of the Greeks, keeping θεοσέβεια for Christian religion.

47.2-8: παντί που σαφές: The cases of Pheidian Zeus and Athena need no authority as witness, since they were generally known. But some examples of other statues will follow with precise reference to authors as proof of their veracity. They obviously come all from the same written source, an erudite treatise on statues:

Σμίλιδι: The attribution to Smilis of Hera's statue at Samos goes back expressly to the Samian historian Olympicus (*FGH* III 537 fr. 1), and is confirmed by Paus. 7.4.4 and Athenag. *Leg*. 17.3 (perhaps from the same source than Clement). But Callim. *Dieg*. 4.25 talks of Scelmis and Pliny (*N.H.* 36.90) dates Smilis as a contemporary of the architects of the Heraion. Either both Callimachus and Pliny are mistaken (A. Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, 1990, 104f, 241f) or it is a mistake going back to Olympichus for Scelmis (Ch. Picard *apud* Mondésert *ad loc*.). The second possibility seems likelier.

Κάλως: Polemo (*FGH* III 127 fr. 41). Schol. Aesch. *Adv. Tim.* 188 (38.20 Dindorf) attributes the statue of the goddess in the middle to Calamis, which shows that the attribution in the text to Calos is an error (G. Osann, *Annali dell'ist. di corr. arch* (1830), 149). According to Marcovich it was Clement himself who misread his source, though it cannot be discarded that it was a copyist. There is no need to change αὐταῖν into αὐτῶν as Marcovich does, since dual is common in this section.

ὁπότερον αὐτοῖν βούλει ἐπίγραφε: contrary to the rest of the section, Clement does not give a name as authority for the news on the statues of Zeus and Apollo at Patara in Lycia. It is because he knows two different attributions, to Pheidias or to Bryaxis). However, for Clement's point, i.e. that they are made up by a sculptor, the specific authorship does not matter.

A cataloguic series of statues with their correspondent sculptor and the historian who transmits it follows: Philochoros *FGH* III B 328 fr. 176; Demetrius *FGH* III B 304 fr. 1; Dionysius *FGH* 15 fr. 3; Apellas *FGH* III A 266 fr. 1; Polemo FGH III fr. 73 p. 136. Echoes of this passage in Arn. *Adv. nat*. 4.25, Firm. Mat. *Err*. 15.1.

Σκύλλις καὶ Δίποινος: both sculptors, mentioned by Pausanias 2.15.1, 2.22.5, close the section without a specific reference which indicates where Clement is taking them from.

Egypt: Sarapis and Antinoos

48.1: μεγαλοδαίμονα: this was a typical epithet of Sarapis (cf. Vidman, *Syll. Inscript. rel. Isiac. et Sarap.* 111, 246, 417, 537), which is welcome by Clement since he gives *daimon* a negative sense: "the greatest daemon" becomes not laudatory but offensive. Clement's special attention to the Egyptian deity Sarapis is justified by his Alexandrian environment.

ἀχειροποίητον: The word χειροποιητός was frequent, but it meant "artificial" as opposed to αὐτοφυής, "natural". This word, meaning "not made by human hand" seems specifically Christian (cf. Mc. 14.58, 2 Cor 5.1, Col. 2.11; Ign. Ant. *Philad.* 6.2). Clement himself uses it in *Strom.* 3.5.43.3, 4.26.166.2. But he is probably transmitting an epithet actually used for Serapis, since the only time it appears in Pagan context is reporting Alexander's words of praise to the Nile in his visit to Memphis (*Vit. Alex.* 1.34). Cf. also Schol. Ael. Arist. *Pan.* 96.7. Cf. also the contrast with the Sibylline verses quoted by Clement in 4.50.1.

48.2-3: οἱ μέν... ἄλλοι δέ: The first version of the origin of Serapis is told with slight differences by Plut. *De Is.* 28, 261F-362A (cf. Griffiths ad loc.) and Tac. *Hist.* 4.83; Cyr. *CI* I (*PG* 76, col. 521 CD) probably springs from Clement's passage. The second version on the Pontic origin of Sarapis is not documented anywhere else.

Ἰσίδωρος μόνος: Neglected by Stählin and Marcovich, this is probably Isidorus of Charax (FGrHist 781) dated in the 1st BC (cf. *RE s. v.*) and wrote descriptions of Parthia and of the world.

48.4-6: οὐκ' οἶδα ὅτῳ περιέπεσεν: When giving a fourth version of the origin of Serapis, that of Athenodorus of Tarsus (*FGH* III G 746 fr. 4), Clement candidly acknowledges that he does not know who the historian is refuting when he tries to prove Sarapis' antiquity (ἀρχαίζειν: cf. 1.6.4, 5.65.3). This reveals his method of drawing from abridged handbooks which excerpt the original sources.

Βρυάξις: Clement explains that this Bryaxis is not the homonymous sculptor of Athens that has just been quoted in 4.47.4. Cf. Gu. Amelung, *Rev. Arch.* IV.2 (1903), 177-204. Contrary to 4.47.4, where he did not care about the accuracy of the authorship

as long as his point was proved, now he cares to be rigorous precisely when an Alexandrian sculptor is involved. He counted perhaps on the chauvinism of his Alexandrian audience.

Ὀσίραπις: The etymology of Sarapis as deriving from a confluence of Osiris and Apis is in coherence with other easy etymologies used by Clement (cf. Treu, Steneker 18f) which tend to bring home the apologetic point. In this case, the relation of Pagan gods with tombs and funerals. Cf. Plut. *De Is.* 28ff.

49.1: Antinous, the young lover of Hadran whom he decided to honour as a god when he died, was a favourite target of Christians apologists against Pagan gods, because it showed both the artificial creation of their cults and their immoral behaviour: Iust. *Apol.* 1.29.4, Tat. *Orat.* 10.3, Athenag. *Leg.* 30.2, Theophil. *Autol.* 3.8, Tertull. *Ad nat.* 2.7.6, 1.10.1; *Apolog.* 13.9; *De corona* 13.6; *Adv. Marc.* 1.18.4; *Orac. Sibyll.* 8.57; Orig. *CC* 3.36-38; 5.64; 8.9; Athanas. *C. gentes* 9; Epiph. *Ancor.* 106.9; Theodor. *Cur.* 8.28. Eusebius (*PE* 2.6.8-9) reproduces this paragraph.

καινόν: this epithet, applied to the Logos in chapter I, is now thrown against Antinous. Clement accuses this Pagan cult of the same that Pagans accused Christianity, i.e. divinizing a man (cf. Celsus *apud* Orig. *CC* 3.22-43). "Newness" would be a proof of it (cf. 48.2 on a failed attempt to make Sarapis older).

ὀλίγου δεῖν καὶ παρ᾽Ἕλλησι: Antinous was honoured mainly in Egypt, where he had died, but Cass. Dio 69.11 and Paus. 8.9.7 show that he received some cult also in Greece, as Clement implies.

ὡς Γανυμήδην ὁ Ζεύς: The iconography of Hadrian and Antinous was clearly inspired in the previous representations of Zeus and Ganymedes (cf. H. Meyer, *Antinoos*, München 1991). Yet Clement is the only literary testimony to make the comparison explicit. Perhaps it is the same trasposition to literature of an iconographic association which he had done in chapter I with Orpheus, David and Christ.

ἐπιθυμία φόβον οὐκ ἔχουσα: Clement profits from the condemnation of Antinous to moralize. Fear as the way to discipline passion is a topos of ethical teaching. Christians link it with in the *timor Dei*, theorized in 1.8.2-3, 9.87.3., 9.88.1, 10.95.1. This sentence is repeated by John Damascenus *Sacr. Parall.* fr. 184 Holl.

νυκτὰς ἱεράς: the insistence on the nocturnal character of Pagan cults (cf. 2.22.5) is consistent with the metaphor of light vs. darkness which dominates the whole

work. But here it takes a mocking twist which abounds on the scandalous rites which would have been performed at night.

49.2: καθαρόν, ἵνα ᾖ καλόν**: Christian critique of homoerotic relations goes back to Paul (Cor 6.2), inherited from Judaism. Now Clement gives it Hellenic overtones, profitting from the subject of Antinous. Against the false love for beauty, true beauty comes from the Logos. Clement insists in linking true beauty to purity, and uses the two following images.

βασιλεύς τοῦ κάλλους... μὴ τύραννος**: the classical opposition of political theory between king and tyrant (Aristot. *Pol.* 1295a, 1310b) is adapted here to the condemnation of homeroticism (cf. another use in 10.92.2). The title of *basileus* hold by the Roman Emperor, and the colloquial use of the verb *tyrannein*, to "rape" (from "dominate") make it particularly appropiate to the case of Hadrian.

προσκυνήσω... ἀληθινόν ἀρχέτυπον ἐστι τῶν καλῶν: Platonic terminology had been adapted to Biblical theology by Philo (cf. Plat. *Symp*. 211ab, Phil. *Leg. alleg*. 1.90, 2.4). The expression "adoring beauty" also has a literal meaning, mocking the many statues of Antinous which were considered paradigmatic of beauty.

49.3: ναοί τῶν νεκρῶν: Steneker, 21f., 71, points out that the Doric word for temple is chosen instead of the preceding Attic form νεώς (used according to the usage of neo-Atticism) to make up a phonetic parallelism with τάφοι τῶν θεῶν.

πυραμίδες καὶ μαυσώλεια καὶ λαβύρινθοι: the critique of old Egyptian monuments, which rose admiration then as today, assimilates them to these "new" cults founded over tombs. Clement speaks through indirect knowledge (οἶμαι), and prudently does not extend much in a subject he does not know. On Clement's knowledge of Egypt, cf. A. Deiber, *Clément d'Aléxandrie et l'Egypte*, Cairo 1904. These words were taken over by Eusebius *PE* 2.6.9.

The Sibyll and Heraclitus against statues

50.1: Σίβυλλαν: after the previous cataloguic section, Clement now begins his invective against the cult of statues with some quotations of authoritative figures who also attacked it: the Sibyll makes her fist appearance, since she has specific prophecies against Isis and Serapis. But since this is one of her first appearances in the *Protrepticus* (after a more neutral one in 2.27.4) and her figure and literature is very controversial, he quotes first of all some lines which present her and state her authority.

Sib. Orac. 4.4-7: the contraposition of God's Sibyll with Apollo's underlines the firm boundaries between the Christian God and Pagan deities, with which the *Protrepticus* leaves no room for syncretism or assimilation (cf. chapter I with Orpheus and Christ). These lines also insist on the fact that God is not made by human hands, unlike the idols (cf. 4.48.1).

50.2: *Sib. Orac.* 5.294 and 296-297: since the Sibyll is going to announce the destruction of the temples of Isis and Sarapis, which were not yet destroyed at that time, the fulfillen prophecy of the destruction of Artemis' temple is obviously a way to earn authority as a prophet.

50.3: *Sib. Orac.* 5.484f, 487f. Clement is clearly excerpting directly from the *Oracles*, since he omits a line (486, perhaps to keep the symmetry and allow the chiasm with τριτάλαινα) and he interprets the sense correctly, though these lines do not expressly announce the destruction of the temples of Isis and Sarapis.

50.4: εἰ μὴ προφητίδος... τοῦ γε σοῦ φιλοσόφου: Clement was conscious of the doubts the forged lines of the Sibyll could arise in Greek minds. Therefore he does not demand acceptance, but complements the apologetic tradition with his personal taste for philosophy, quoting fr. 5 DK of Heraclitus (86 Marcovich), against statues (also quoted, probably from this passage, by Orig. *CC* 1.5, 7.62, and *Theosoph. Tub.* 68 (184 Erbse). Cf. introd. n. 56 and commentary to 2.22.2.

Statues are insensible

50.5: εἰ γὰρ ὡς ἀναισθήτους... θυρωρούς: this criticism is modeled on Heraclitus' sentence in 2.24.3. Clement exploits the contradiction on the supposed apotropaic power of Hermes' statues with a parallelistic construction both sinctactic and phonetic (θεούς / θυρωρούς). There is a clear reference also (ὑβρίζουσιν) to the scandal of the Hermokopidai (alluded to in 2.12.1).

51.1: τὰ μέγιστα κατορθώματα... ἀνατίθεντες: the Roman veneration of the highest (μεγίστη) goddess Fortuna contrasts with the habit of placing (ἀνέθηκαν) her statue by the latrine. Clement culminates his ironies calling it "an appropiate temple". His statement may come from an unknown written source or from his direct or indirect knowlege of such practice among the Romans in Athens or Alexandria. In any case, it has been confirmed by archeology in Ostia (cf. L. Wickert, *Inscript. Latii vet. Latinae, Suppl. Ostiense*, Berlin 1930, 3, nr. 4281.2; F. Noack, *Die Antike* 2 (1926), 218-219).

51.2: οὐδὲ τιμῆς: honouring the gods through bloody sacrifice was criticized in chapters II and III with other arguments, i.e. gluttony of the gods, violence, etc. Now the same elements (smoke, blood) are criticized for being useless before lifeles statues. Clement, like other apologists, accumulates all kind of criticisms from the apologetic tradition, regardless of their internal consistency.

51.3-5: τινα τῶν ζῴων: even the most insensible animals are better than statues. Nicander, *Theriaca* 815f., is the typical example of a purely decorative quotation. The following lines on passive small creatures, with the example of ostreys, may be a remisicence of some Stoic treatise which put their relation to the moon as instance of *natura rerum contagio* (Cic. *De div*. 2.33, Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math*. 9.79, Aug. *CD* 5.6). These animals are opposed to the useless *xoana* (κωφά: cf. Hab. 2.18, *Ep. ad Diogn*. 2.4, Ps.Clem. *Hom*. 10.7.3, *Recogn*. 5.15.1).

ἀγάλματα ἀργά, ἄπρακτα, ἀναίσθητα: the accumulation of negative epithets, making a kind of anti-hymn is also in 2.37.1. It is followed by a parallel succession of eight verbs in third passive person (with a purposeful homoioteleuton in -ται) which end up the paragraph with great effect.

51.6: κωφὴν μὲν δὴ γαῖαν ἀεικίζουσιν: there is a playful allusion to *Iliad* 24.54 (κωφὴν γὰρ δὴ γαῖαν ἀεικίζει μενεαίνων: quoted by Ps.- Iust. *Cohort*. 30.4, who interprets it *more epicureo* as proof of the insensivity of matter, cf. Zeegers, 243-244, 246 n.2 and Riedweg *ad loc*). Clement inherits the same tradition, but he adapts the line with a μέν to the discourse (instead of Homer's γάρ), to connect with δέ two lines later.

ἐξιστάντες φύσεως ὑπὸ τῆς τέχνης: as all along this chapter, τέχνη has got a negative sense. In this case, Clement profites from the classical contraposition φύσις / τέχνη (Pind. *Ol*. 2) and makes it the opposite of φύσις οἰκεία, which would be the adoration of the true God. Two lines later Pagans are said to adore not "gods nor daemons" but "earth and art" (γῆν καὶ τέχνην).

νοητόν, οὐκ αἰσθητόν: the definition of the Christian God through opposition to Pagan categories is clear in this case, where the terminology is clearly Platonic. Cf. 10.98.3 for the praising of man as God's living statue. Wilamowiz's deletion of τὸ ἄγαλμα makes the text much more elegant, with a final clause ὁ μόνως ὄντως θεός which sounds as the chorus of Clement's song.

Greeks themselves do not trust statues

52.1: δεισιδαίμονες... ὑπὸ δεισιδαιμονίας...: This section will deal with the cases in which, carried by necessity, the devotees of statues will show that they do not really believe in their power. Time and again the same key words ("superstition") are repeated as if to win the case through accumulation. The metaphor of the trial is also recalled (ἐλέγχονται).

52.2-3: Διονύσιος μέν: the irreverent anecdote about Dionysius the Young, tyrant of Siracuse, is told also by Aristot. *Oecon*. B 1353b 20-27; Cic. *ND* 3.83 (Pease *ad loc.*), Val. Max. 1.1, Ael. *VH* 1.20, Lact. *DI* 2.4.17, Arn. *Adv. nat*. 6.21.

᾽Αντίοχος δέ: Antiochus 9th, Philopator, Seleucid king of Syria. This anecdote is told only by Clement (and drawing on him Arn. *Adv. nat*. 6.21). Both anecdotes are modelled on the same pattern, and they probably come from the same source, like similar tales in chapter 2 (24.4).

52.4: κατεξερῶσιν: Four of the most famous statues in the Greek world (Zeus in Olympia, Asclepios in Epidauros, Athena in the Parthenon, Sarapis) receive bird excrements from birds, another proof of their insensibility. Cf. Arn. *Adv. nat.* 6.16.

52.5-6: κακοῦργοι τινες ἢ πολέμιοι: men also prove that statues can be freely destroyed. Yet when he gives two instances of these evil-doers, Cambises (Hdt. 3.29, Epiph. *Ancor*. 104.4) or Dareius, Clement applauds them as bringing testimony against Pagan gods, yet he condemns (ἀγανακτῶ) their act of avarice: he might be moralizing, and at the same time appealing to Greek chauvinism against their ancestral enemies, whom he would not want as his allies in his exhortation. Perhaps Clement, an Athenian who has been welcome in Alexandria is not being just diplomatic when condemning the historical enemies of Greece and Egypt, but he may be expressing his sincere feelings. The μαινόμενοι with which he features them goes back to Herodotus and Aeschylus condemning the *ate* of the Persians. Cf. next paragraph.

Fire

53.1: οὐχί... ἔλεγχον νομίζων: This section begins with the rhetorical renunciation to prosecute interrogating the last witness, those who sacked temples because of avarice. Apart from the aforementioned reasons and the obvious strengthening of the "impartial" testimony of fire, praising incivil behaviour would be against the civic ethics defended by Christianity and could be a cause of persecution.

181

τὸ πῦρ καὶ οἱ σεισμοί: two new testimonies are presented (against tw enemies, for love of symmetry) with a beautiful simile "they are as fearless before the daemons and statues as the waves before the pebbles in the beach".

53.2-3: ἐλεγκτικόν καὶ ἰατικόν: in a first level, he alludes to the power of fire as witness, and it is also consistent with the metaphor of light vs. darkness (φωταγωγήσει; cf. 2.22.6, 11.113.2). But it also connects with the advantages which Clement sees in threatening (with the eternal fire) as a method of persuading: cf. 1.8.2-3, 9.87.3., 9.88.1, 10.95.1. On the virtues of fire, cf. also Hippol. *Refut*. 9.10.7; Orig. *De orat*. 29.15.

All these instances are true and documented elsewhere: the fire in the temple (of Hera) in Argos in Thuc. 4.133, Paus. 2.17.7; on the first temple of Ephesus dedicated by the Amazons, cf. Paus. 7.2.7; on the fire in Sarapis' temple, cf. *Act. Sanct. Oct.* 9 p. 546 Musurillo (cf. M. Puijula, *Körper und christliche Lebensweise*, Berlin 2006, 31, on the possibility that Clement had known the fire himself); on the temple of Dionysus in Athens, cf. Paus. 1.2.5; and on that of Apollo in Delphi, cf. Hdt. 2.180 and Paus. 10.5.13.

πῦρ σωφρονοῦν: This epithet (also used in *Paed*. 3.44.2, *Strom*. 7.34.4, *Ecl. Proph*. 25.4) personifies fire as discerning which temples it should destroy and is rhetorically very convenient for Clement, who says these destructions would be just a προοίμιον of what fire promises (cf. previous paragraph). But it is rooted in Greek tradition: it derives directly from Stoic philosophy, which used to call fire φρόνιμος. Cf. G. Kirk, *Heraclitus*, Cambridge 1954, pp. 352ff.

Artists

53.4-6: δημιουργοὶ οὐ δυσωποῦσιν;: this brief section (taken over by Arn. *Adv. nat*. 6.13.) brings in new witnesses. The artists themselves, who are the first to behave irrespectfully towards their statues. The anecdote (surely spurious) about Pheidias inscribing his lover's name in Zeus' finger, is told by Paus. 5.11.3 (cf. Cook, *Zeus* III, 1940, 955 n.7). The story of Praxiteles' Aphrodite is expressly attributed to Poseidippus (*FGH* IV 447 fr. 1). And the episode of Phryne is much more well known (Paus. 9.27.5; 10.15.1; Plinius *NH* 34.70; Plut. *Amat*. 753 EF; Athen, 13.591 B; Ael. *VH* 9.32: it was a favourite tale of apologists: Iust. *Apol*. 1.9.4; Tat. *Orat*. 33.7). The order seems to be ascending, and the climax is reached in the final story about Alcibiades, a most useful character for the apologists for his proverbial lack of respect for the gods.

τοὺς Ἑρμᾶς Ἀθήνησι πρὸς Ἀλκιβιάδην ἀπείκαζον: In a cataloguic section on statues, Plinius (*NH* 36.28) says that Alcibiades was the model for some sculpture of Eros. Clement turns it into Hermes, no doubt to play with the arch-famous scandal of the Hermocopids, which he had already referred to in 2.12.1 (and indirectly in 4.50.5).

τῆς σῆς κρίσεως: the threatening allusion to the Final Judgement (cf. 12.121.3) is made out from the judgement of Phryne.

Deified men

54.1: οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ παλαιοί: the idea that ancient kings called themselves "gods", which would show their lack of respect for myths, is very much related to the Euhemeristic theories of 2.37.4ff. The focus here is on names rather than in cults, but the principle is the same, i. e. that historical personalities lie behind myths.

Κῆυξ: on Ceix and Alcione, cf. Hesiod fr. 15 M-W. *Schol. Il.* 9.562, Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.7.4. The mythical example precedes the cults of historical people, which allows Clement to apply to them the same Euhemeristic principles that are applied to myths.

54.2: Διόνυσος ἐκαλεῖτο: the cases of Ptolemaios Philopator and Mitridates Ponticus aiming at identification with Dionysus are well known, and not the only ones (e. g. Marcus Antonius). As Clement sees, these Hellenistic sovereigns follow the example set by Alexander, who declared himself son of Ammon (*Vit. Alex.* 1.34).

54.3-4: καὶ ἰδιῶται: not only kings, but also private citizens: the physician Menecrates being called Zeus is mentioned by Plut. *Agesil.* 21., *Regum apophth.* 191a, *Apophth. lac.* 213a; Ael. VH 12.51; Athen. 7.289ab (cf. M. Puijula, *Körper und christliche Lebensweise*, Berlin 2006, 165); the story of the grammarian Alexarchus (Aristo *FGH* II B 143 fr. 4) is also in Athen. 3.98e: according to Cobet, *Mnem* 11 (1862), 392, Clement's text would not say Helios but Apollo, but it is not necessary that Clement agrees with Athenaeus literally; Nicagoras' tale is attributed to Baton (below).

Βάτων μαρτυρεῖ: Marcovich accepts Stählin's conjecture on the grounds of Athen.7.289 (= Baton *FGH* III A 268 fr. 2), which speaks specifically of his work *On the tyrants of Ephesus*, and Schol. *Pind.* I 4, 104g, which speaks of Βάτος. Accepting P's reading αὐτός would leave us with a fragment of an otherwise unknown work of Nicagoras speaking about himself.

54.5: ὅλα ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις αὔτανδοι: the succession of disbelievers covers the whole range of possible people: after kings and private citizens, now the entire

cities. It was a typical way of accusing everybody both in a particular and in a general way (cf. Plat. *Resp*. 364e, *P. Derv*. col. XX). Now the focus is on sovereigns who were acclaimed as gods by the polis, rather than proclaiming themselves.

ἐν Κυνοσάργει: The long discussion on the accuracy of this passage was solved by H. S. Versnel, *Mnemosyne* 26.4 (1973), 273-279 (supplementary arguments by J. Bremmer, *Mnemosyne* 30.4 (1977), 369-374). He argues for taking Clement's information seriously, since Kynosarges was already a place which awoke mockery, and it was therefore a good place to locate the statue of the enemy of Athens. Athenian mockery against their unwanted dominator is profitted by Clement. Christians receive and expand against Greek religion all the internal critical traditions of the Greeks. On divine honours for Philip II, including a discussion of this text, cf. E. A. Friedricksmeyer, *TAPA* 109 (1979), 39-61.

τὴν κλεῖν... ὀφθαλμόν: Clement quotes literally some offensive remarks from Demosthenes (*De corona* 67) against Philippos, which he had obviously read in his own rhetorical education and which gave a perfect patina of Hellenism to his criticisms against the statue of the Macedonian king.

54.6: Καταιβάτου: on the temple of Demetrius Cataibates cf. Plut. *Demetr*. 10.4. This epithet "descending" (which theoretically refers to his descending from the horse) is linked to the cult of Dionysus, with whom Demetrius, like other Hellenistic kings (cf. 4.54.2) would try to be associated (cf. Athen. 6.233 DF in which Demetrius is honoured with an itiphallic Dionysiac hymn). The epithet belongs to Dionysus because of his descent to the Underworld to look for Semele.

τῇ παλαιᾷ παρθένῳ... τῆς νέας... ἑταίρας: these critiques appeal to the old Greek traditionalism and probably come from a Greek Pagan source. It shows with a clear contraposition how recent innovations in cult dishonour the ancient deities. On Demetrius' sacrilege, cf. Plut. *Demetr*. 23.3, 26.3. Perhaps to this episode which mocks a *hieros gamos* is alluding Theoph. *Autol*. 1.14.6.

55.1-2: οὐδὲ Ἵππωνι: Hippo fr. 2 DK (cf. Alex. Aphrod. *In Metaph*. 27.3 Hayduck). This should belong to the second part about deification of private citizens (4.54.3-4) but Clement leaves it for the end of the section because it allows a strong ending. Hippo was mentioned in 2.24.2 as one of the few Greek atheists, and Clement, trusting that his audience knows that fact, is ironical about the lack of disciples that Hippo would have had in life, when he spoke the truth. Instead men have believed his

aspiration to divinization. Clement seems to believe that the dystic was purposefully intended to reinforce disbelief in gods. The paradox of a prototypical "atheist" reinforces the argument that gods are men who wanted to be deified. That is Hippo's oracle (χρησμόν), which he comments in the following lines.

55.2-3: ὁ μῦθος καὶ ὁ χρόνος: This thought on the effect of time an myth on the idealization of past things is commonplace: cf. Thuc. 1.21.1. It also rings back to the rejection of "ancient myths" in chapter I. Now Clement turns this idea into an explanation of divinization of dead men. The theme of death is the link with the next topic, which abandons the argument about deification of men to start a loose criticism on different aspects of Greek deities.

Against Greek gods

55.3: ὑμῶν τὰ μυστήρια: Clement goes back to the arguments of chapter II which make death the centre of Greek cults (2.13.5, 19.4-5). It was a traditional criticism of Greek religion, also from the Pagan side: Cic. *ND* 1.38, *Tusc.* 1.29.

The lines on Sarpedon's death (*Il.* 16.433f) are an apologetic commonplace, for they show Zeus impotent against destiny (Athenag. *Leg.* 21.1, Ps.-Iust. *Cohort.* 2.2). Cf. 2.32.1 and Zeegers 54. They had also been subject of philosophical discussion: Plat. *Resp.* 3.388c, Max. Tyr. *Philos.* 5.5c, 18.5c.

55.4: εἴδωλα... καὶ δαίμονας... κεκλήκατε: the archaic sense of *daimones*, as in Hom. *Il.* 1.221f, was "gods". Christians used this kind of passages to show that Pagan gods were really daemons. Cf. Zeegers 83ff. On "idols" cf. next paragraph. In this section Clement is patching apologetic *topoi* without caring much about their logical link. The relation with the previous quotation is just an attack against gods quoting Homer.

55.5: κάτω βρίθοντα: the explanation of why the "idols" are equally evil is given now with a quotation from Plato's *Phaedo* 81bc, who argues that the εἴδωλα are heavy and therefore stay near the tomb. As Homer before, the sense of Plato's text is distorted, since he is speaking about souls, not about *daimones* (comp. Orig. *CC* 7.5 where the discussion is on the weight of the soul). Clement identifies these εἴδωλα with the Biblical meaning of "idols" and equates them to the *daimones*, probably taking inspiration in the Platonic passage. Cf. also 2.30.6, 7.74.3, and Steneker 11. The whole passage is a refutation of the efforts of middle-Platonic theology (e. g. Plutarch) to find

a system where daemons and other minor divine entities could coexist. Clement throws them all to the pack of devils.

56.1: Λιταί: Zeus, as protector of suppliants, is the father of Supplications, who are given in the *Iliad* (9.502f) the miserable physical appearance of suppliants. Cf. Heracl. *Alleg. hom.* 37.1, Cornut. *Theol. gr.* 12. Clement's ironical comparison to Thersites shows his Homeric culture to his Greek audience.

Bion of Borysthenses fr. 29 Kindstrand is quoted with appreciation, as other Greek Cynics who show their scepticism about traditional religion (cf. 2.24.3-4).

56.2-5: οἴμοι τῆς ἀθεότητος: after a cataloguic section full of examples, some paragraphs follow with more rhetorical contents. Clement addresses the Greeks with rhetorical demands about their abandon of the true God for the cult of idols. He establishes a binary opposition around some central concepts: οὐσία (philosophical terminology, in 56.2); γέρα (poetic terminology, in 56.3); and earth / heaven (religious terminology, in 56.4). The last one is extended to the Fall of Man with a reference to Plat. *Phaidr.* 247c when talking about τὸν ὑπερουράνιον τόπον.

πάλιν γὰρ δὴ ἐπαναλήψομαι: insistence and repetition are a purposeful device which Clement uses frequently, in alternation with other expressions of not willing to bore his audience (cf. e. g. 5.64.1).

56.6: γῆ ἐστιν, ἐὰν ἄνωθεν νοήσῃς: he insists on the materiality of statues, whose value is purely material because their form is given by *techne* (cf.4.46.4, 4.51.6). They can all be reduced to earth (both a sign of materiality and opposed to heaven).

ἐγὼ... μεμελέτηκα: In the expression "I worried about walking over earth, not about adoring it" one can detect the echo of *Gn.* 1.28. it could also have some autobiographic ring, because Clement had travelled around the Mediterranean before settling in Alexandria (cf. intr. §1) and he could drop the allusion to show his cosmopolitism. The next sentence, with the expression οὐ μοι θέμις keeps that personal ring to make a similar word-play (τοῖς ἀψύχοις τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς ἐλπίδας).

Art can deceive

57.1-2: ἰτέον... ἐλέγχεται: he addresses the audience as if they were a jury examining the witnesses and the accused in a trial. Cf. 2.12.1.

γνωριεῖ: Clement mentions the iconographic signs by which (still today) the statues of the gods are recognized. There is nothing particularly shameful about them,

so the intention seems more a display of general artistic culture to avoid being accused of attacking what he ignores. The last quotation about "golden Aphrodite" (*Od.* 4.14) would have the same function. Her naked figure is mentioned in the last place to connect with the following paragraph.

57.3: The story of Pigmalion is told by Philostephanos (FGH III fr. 13 p. 31 *On Cyprus*) and the parallel case of an anonymous character, by Poseidippus (FGH III B 447 fr. 2 *On Cnido*). The second one is also told by Philostr. *V. Apoll.* 6.40, where the young man is instead cured of his love by Apollonius.

τέχνη προαγωγὸς ἀνθρώποις ἐρωτικοῖς: art is the enemy in this chapter and it is personified, as superstition was in chapter 2 or philosophy in chapter 5. The "desiderative" men are opposed to the rational men in the next paragraph.

57.4-5: δραστήσιος μὲν... ζωγραφίας μὲν...: Two consecutive cases of μέν *solitarium* are extremely rare, and make this passage hightly suspicious of corruption. The rational men (τοὺς κατὰ λόγον βεβιωκότας) opposed to the "desiderative" ones in the previous paragraph are mentioned as impossible to deceive, but then examples of irrational beings and men follow, which also points to some syntactic corruption.

ἵπποις... ἵπποι: cf. Paus. 5.27.3, Ael. *VH* 2.3 as parallels of this chiastic sentence which shows that to be misled by art belongs to animals rather than to rational men.The sources of all this section are not clear, but they must be similar those of Philostratus (*V. Apoll.* 6.40). Some cases are alluded which have already been told, and some other new ones are added.

σωφρωνῶν...ὑμᾶς δέ...: this contraposition between sensible men and Pagans continues the previous one between "desiderative" and "rational" men.

ἄλλῃ γοητείᾳ ἀπατᾳ ἡ τέχνη: art has here the same misleading role than the song of Orpheus (representing both myths and myteries) had in chapter I, and it is described with the same words. Cf. 1.3.1.

57.6: ἐπαινείσθω: Clement is favourable to art (against more iconoclastic tendencies within Christianity, specially regarding Pagan art), but he is against its being used to deceive people. Pigeons and horses have already been mentioned, and a new case is added , that of Pasiphae who deceived a bull hiding on a cow made by Daedalus, (cf. Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.14; DS 4.77.1, Phil. *Spec.* 3.44). The tale closes the section forcefully and serves to associate the Pagan with wild animals (cf. 1.3.1).

58.1-2: πιθήκουϛ... ἀπατᾷ οὐδέν: that men are even worse than animals is illustrated by the example of monkeys. I have found no parallel for this piece of news about the impossibility to deceive monkeys. On the contrast of men with animals, cf. 1.3.1 and 12.120.3.

ἀθυρμάτων: the theme of deceiving with toys reminds of Dionysus' sacrifice. The fact that the list of examples begins with Dionysiac figures as Satyres and Panes seems to indicate that Clement has the Dionysiac myth in the back of his mind.

Immorality of Greek gods and their images

58.3: μάγοι: the claim of magic to be able to make obedient the supernatural beings is a novelty after the traditional claim that it enslaves men (cf. 1.3.2, Iust. *Apol.* 1.14.1). Modern distinctions between magic and religion depart precisely from this notion of dominating the divine world, which would belong to magic, while religion would try to propitiate the divinity, which remains independent: cf. R. Fowler, *Ill. Class. Stud.* 20 (1995), 1-22. The word μάγοι stands in purposeful phonetic correspondence with the beginning of the next paragraph (Steneker 20).

γάμοι τε: this euphonic series of plural substantives recalling all the vices mentioned in the last three chapters introduces a perorative section whose climax is an exclamation frequent in Clement (οἴμοι τῆϛ ἀθεότητοϛ): 4.6.6, *Strom.* 3.27.4.

58.4: σκηνὴν... δρᾶμα... κεκωμῳδήκατε... σατυρίζαντεϛ: the theatrical metaphor comes back to frame all the episodes mentioned in the last three chapters, i. e. the whole of Greek religion. Cf. 1.2.2, 2.12.1. The metaphor was imitated by Firm. Mat. *De err.* 12.7. Precedents in Varr. *ap.* Aug. *CD* 6.5, Sen. *De superst.* fr. 31 and 38 Haase. Cf. 1.2.3 with bibliography on the theatrical metaphor, and Herrero 239-245.

θεοσέβειαν δεισιδαιμονίᾳ: the fundamental opposition of the *Protrepticus* between religion and superstition appears above all in these perorative sections, which put together all that has been said before. Cf. D. B. Martin, *Inventing Superstition from the Hippocratics to the Christians*, Cambridge Mass. 2004.

59.1: ᾆσον ἡμῖν, Ὅμηρε: the double invocation to Homer, to order him a song and to interrupt him, is very effective, since it subordinates the voice of Homer to that of Clement. So is the collocation of the first invocation after the first line. The quotation of *Odyssey* 8.266-270 about the adultery of Ares and Aphrodite is a commonplace among the critics of the morality of Greek gods. Cf. Heracl. *Alleg. Hom.* 69.4, Plat.

Resp. 3.390c, Phil. *De Provid*. 2.39, Ios. *Contra Apionem* 2.246. Christian apologists took good profit from it: Aristid. *Apol*. 10.7, Tat. *Orat*. 34.4, Athenag. *Leg*. 21.1, Ps.-Iust. *Mon*. 6, Firm Mat. *Err*. 12.8. Cf. Zeegers 55.

59.2: ἡμεῖς: The unusual first person of the plural, which marks Christian self-definition, is used (1.4, 41.2, 82.7, 88.1, 116.3, 121.3) precisely when talking about the moral purity of the Christians in the sexual sphere. Chastity and fidelity were distinctive practical signs of Christian self-definition in the ancient world (cf. P. Brown, *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley 1982). Christians are contrasted with a Pagan audience that is delighted to hear epic tales about divine adulteries (implying that Pagans have no moral objections).

εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ: *Gn* 1.26 defines man as an image of God. Clement turns it (cf. *Paed*. 2.83.2, *Strom*. 2.102.2) into a definition of the body, which is defined as "statue of God", and then is characterized through six epithets with the preverb συν- (σύνοικον, σύμβουλον, etc), to express the communion between soul and body in Christian anthropology. Steneker, 23, remarks the anaphoric effect of the repeated prefix, which is connected at the end with another phonetic chain in which the prefix disappears and alliteration takes its place (συμπαθῆ, ὑπερπαθῆ· ἀνάθημα).

59.3: ἀνάθημα: from being "image" man is defined as "dedication to God through Christ". Four New Testament quotations (cf. 4.61.3) complete this sentence: 1P 2.9f., Jn. 8.23, Jn. 3.31, Rm. 6.4.

60.1: οἱ πολλοί: Clement inherits the philosophical attitude of select minority agains the ὄχλος (cf. 3.45.5). The critique is not now against the gods, but against their use in artistic decoration (like mythological paintings). The immorality of the gods reflects that of their devotees.

60.2: σφραγῖδι: the swan must have been a sign of the rings. Clement gives special importance to the *sphragides* as way of differentating neatly Pagans from Christians. Cf. *Paed*. 3.11.59 and L. Eizenhofer, *JAC* 3 (1960), 51-69.

61.1-2: ταῦτα ὑμῶν... τὰ ἀρχέτυπα: The same expression was used after ending the section on mysteries (2.23.1). It is a transitional way to pass from a descriptive to a perorative section. The asyndeton with the next sentences, which give synonymes of these acts of impiety with αὗται, gives a special emphasis to the deictic accusation.

τὸν Ἀθηναῖον ῥήτορα: Demosthenes, *Olinthiacae* 3.19 serves as the voice of the accusation, which blames Pagans for the faults of their gods. The tone is similar to the *Paedagogus*, condemning small objects which represent mythological scenes which were no doubt still owned by many newly converted Christians. On Philainis, who composed erotic poems, cf. Athen. 8.335b-e, *P. Oxy* 2891, Iust. *Apol.* 2.15.3.

61.3-4: τῆς ὄψεως καὶ τῆς ἀκοῆς: the owners of these objects of art and spectators of these scandalous stories are condemned as followers of the examples of their gods. The condemnation follows closely 2 P 2.14, Mt. 5.28. The Biblical quotations begin to be more and more present (cf. 4.59.3), preparing their great flowing in in the second part of the work.

ἀρετῆς μὲν θεαταί, κακίας δὲ ἀγωνισταί: this contraposition underlned by homoioteleuton is the end of a rhythmic series of μέν... δέ... constructions (πιστεύετε... ἀπιστεῖτε, κρείττω μεμισήκατε... ἥττω τετιμήκατε). The theatrical metaphor is recuperated (cf. 4.58.4), but it is slightly changed to make the Pagans participate sinfully of the ethical faults of their gods: they are both spectators of the truth (God) and actors of evil deeds (the Pagan vices).

Exhortation to adore God instead of his works

62.1-2: the *Sibylline Oracle* 4.24, 27-30, 3.29 is quoted to end up the condemnation of statues and sanctuaries. The lines, also quoted by Ps.-Iust. *Cohort.* 16.2 with some variation (cf. Riedweg *ad loc*), ring of Empedoclean condemnation of sacrifice (fr. 137 DK: αἵματι ἐμψύχῳ μεμιασμένα καὶ θυσίαισι). Cf. Zeegers 189f, 201-205. The Sibylline verses are complemented with two Biblical quotations against images: Ex. 20.4, Dt. 5.8.

62.3: the final invective against idolatry mentions some of the most illustrious statues and artists like Praxiteles, Lysippus or Apelles. These statues are also mentioned by Hdt. 8.65.4, Paus.1.2.4. The images mentioned are Demeter, Kore and Iacchos, which are inevitably linked to the mystery cults attacked in 2.12-22.

ὅπως... μὴ ὅμοιοι: Clement warns that the devotees become similar to their gods. He profits from the theme of images to link it to the Orpheus metaphor of 1.3.1 (men = stones or wood), to connect with the ethical preoccupation of the *Paedagogus* and to depict the reverse of the ὁμοίωσις θεῷ (12.122.3). The reflexion on the similarity of images was a philosophical commonplace which each one adapted:

Diogenes Laertius (2.33) reports a similar sentence attributed to Socrates "he marveled that people thought about how similar the images were to the gods, and they did not care about how different to the stone they were".

62.4: ὁ προφητικὸς ἐλέγχει τὴν συνήθειαν λόγος: one single quotation (*Ps*. 95.5) summarizes (ἐμφανῶς καὶ συντόμως) the core of the chapter: "all the gods of the nations are idols of daemons". In passing two central themes of future chapters are announces: the Logos speaking through the prophets, cf. chapter 8; and synetheia as object of attack in chapter 10. The verb "to accuse" reminds of the judicial metaphor which frames the *refutatio*. And to complete the pregnancy of the paragraph, the second part of the quotation celebrates God the Creator of astral bodies, which is the link with the next paragraph (and announces the next two chapters).

63.1-2: θείαν τέχνην: from the discussion of human art we turn to divine art, i. e. the creation of astral bodies, defined with classical words: "choir of stars" (1 *Ep. Clem*. 20.3, Ign. *Ad Eph*. 19.2, Max. Tyr. *Philos*. 16.6d, *Orac. Sibyll*. 8.450, Himer. *Or*. 21.6) and "organs of Time" (Plat. *Tim*. 42d5). Cf. M. L. Amerio, *Inv Luc* 2 (1980), 189f. After these two classical expressions, a Biblical sentence completes the paragraph (*Ps*. 32.6) to show their dependence on the Creator. Afterwards, an enumeration of God's works, with an allusion to Ps. 8.4, underlines the superiority of divine works over the works of men which have been attacked along the chapter.

63.3: τὸ βούλημα κοσμοποιία: the act of creation through God's will is a Jewish-Christian idea (as shown by the following quotation of *Ps*. 32.9 and *Gn* 1.3) as opposed to the *Deus faber* of the Platonic *Timeus* or to a generative model like the theogonies. The insistence on μόνος (three times) show that there is no place for an independent matter or generative partner. The ideas of creation *ex nihilo* and creation through the word are derived from this fundamental notion. Cf. G. May, *Creatio ex Nihilo*, Edinburgh, 1994.

63.4: φιλοσόφων παρατρέπεται χορός: the last paragraphs of chapter IV prepare the following one, which will dwell on the refutation of philosophical opinions on divine nature. The allusion to the contemplative nature of man refers to a commonplace of Greek philosophy: Cic *ND* 2.140, Ov. *Metam*. 1.85-86, Anaxag. *apud* DL 2.10, Aristot. fr. 11 Ross. Clement contrasts it to idolatry: in this way he puts the best tradition of Greek philosophy in his side against idolatry. Cf. 10.100.3.

63.5: ἀνθρώποις δεδημιούργηται: Clement also appropiates this anthropocentric cosmology, which also has philosophical roots. Cf. Cic. *ND* 2.154, Aristot. *Polit*. A 8, 1256 b21, Orig. *CC* 4.74.

ἐπὶ τὰς σωτερίους θύρας: the expression "gates of salvation" has on the one hand the Biblical precedent of the "gates of paradise", and on the other hand the gates at the end of the wisdom journey in Greek tradition, with Parmenides (fr. 1) as the most famous instance (cf. 1.10.3). The fact that Divine Wisdom (σοφία θεϊκή, cf. 1.5.4) is the only way (καταφυγή) to reach them reminds of the goddesses who takes Parmenides to the gates from where he sees all. Besides, Butterworth 200f sees a reflection of the "gates of poetry" in Plat. *Phaedr*. 245a.

Chapter V

After the long and fierce attack on Greek cults in Chapters II, III and IV, Clement turns to philosophy, preparing the way to a more positive consideration of Pagan culture, which will be developed in Chapter VI. Yet before dwelling on the positive sides of Greek philosophy he makes a rather conventional attack on how they missed the point even when talking about one divinity. He seems to follow some brief handbook on the history of philosophy. Cicero in *De Natura Deorum* (1.33-35) transmits very similar doxographic information. H. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, Berlin 1969[4], 129-132, makes a full comparison between both texts (with references to other doxographists like Aëtius, *Placita* and ps.-Plutarch's *Placita*) and concludes that they stem from a similar source of Epicurean colour (perhaps he even used Aetius, *Plac.* 1.3 and 1.7, given the striking similarities). In Clement's hands, the systematic history of philosophy of his source is turned into a catalogue of idolatry, from more to less evident one. Cf. a much shorter "history of philosophy" with similar contents in Tert. *Adv. Marc.* 1.13, and Ps.-Iust. *Cohort.* 3.2-4.1 and Riedweg *ad loc.* As Riedweg points out commenting on Ps. Justin (pp.109, 449), Clement does not use the argument of the self-contradiction of Greek philosophy, which was a *topos* among Christian apologists. Perhaps it is due to his love for philosophy, which he feels obliged to attack in this brief chapter to look afterwards for the hidden truth in it.

Philosophers deified elements

64.1: ἐπιδράμωμεν: Clement is conscious of the monotony of these chapters stemming from bookish cataloguic sources, and he tries to go as swiftly a possible, which also helps him to select only the details upon which he wants to shed light.

ὀνειρώττουσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν: The first paragraph announces the ambiguous treatment of Greek philosophy which Clement maintains in this work and in the *Stromata*. Contrary to the absolute refusal of any glimpse of truth in Greek cults, in philosophy he admits some unconscious intuition, like in a dream. It is a common middle-Platonic notion, which Clement Christianizes: according to Plutarch *De Isid.* 382 that is as far as philosophy can get in the knowledge of God.

ἀνειδωλοποιοῦσαν τὴν ὕλην: This chapter focuses in criticism, mainly because philosophy makes the ἀρχή of the universe some material element: in Clement's view,

that meand that it divinizes matter. This kind of critique to Paganism had been developed previously above all by Athenagoras in his *Legatio* (17-22). The following paragraphs show, in a cataloguic chronological way, how different elements were postulated by philosophers as ἀρχή.

64.2: The references to Thales, Anaximenes and Diogenes of Apollonia are completely topical (cf. also *Strom.* 1.52.4). The news that Parmenides deified "fire and earth" places in Clement's argument the same ideas on Parmenides' opinions on fire and the Earth which abound in the doxographical tradition (Arist. *Metaph.* A 5 986 b 33, Diog. Laert. 9.21, Simpl. *In Phys.* 25.15 Diels). Empedocles, instead, is criticized for not being even a monist.

64.3: σοφία ἀσόφῳ: Clement likes to create this kind of oxymoron (cf. 10.99.2), but in this case it is a topical one: cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 395, and Hor. *Carm.* 1.34.2. Greg. Naz. *Contr. Iul.* 1.3 could be influenced by Clement.

64.4: ἐκ τῆς πόσεως: Usually Christians deny the possibility of allegorizing Greek gods and take their myths literally to make an easier critique. But now Clement does the inverse: attacking philosophers for divinizing elements, he equates their postulating elements as ἀρχή to venerating gods, and thus identifies water with Poseidon. This etimology from πόσις (drinking) is well-known: Heracl. *All. hom.* 7.15, Diog. Laert. 7.147, Cornut. *N. D.* 4. It is so easy that it must stem from Apollodorus' *On the gods*, where divine names were systematically etymologized, or from the Stoic Chrysippus (cf. the following paragraph).

64.5-6: Ἄρης ἀπὸ τῆς ἄρσεως: this etymology was proposed by the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus (*SVF* II, 1094), *apud* Plut. *Amat.* 757 B. It is also mentioned in *Strom.* 7.52.3 and Cornut. *ND* 21.

ξίφος**:** The news on the adoration of a sword by the Scythes are given more authority through explicit attribution to Eudoxios (fr. 16 Brandes) and Hikesios (*FGH* IV 429 fr. 1). Cf. 4.46.4 on the Roman veneration on Ares as a spear.

64.6-65.2: τὸ πῦρ ὡς ἀρχέγονον: The attack on the divinization of fire holds together very different people: Heracliteans and allegorizers of Hephaistos are the Greek fire-venerators. These are so well-known that no author is needed as authority. Then, references are made to Persian *magoi* and Macedonians *apud* Diogenes (*FGH* III C 692 fr. 1), sauromatai *apud* Nymphodorus (*FGH* II fr. 14 p.379), Persians, Medians

and μάγοι (cf. 2.22.2, 4.58.3) *apud* Dinon (*FGH* III C 690 fr. 28), as devotees of water and fire (a clear deformation of Persian religion) who sacrifice in open air.

πῦρ τε καὶ ὕδωρ ὡς φιλοσόφοι: the sacrifices to natural elements of the Persians are told by Herodotus (1.131.1), and this passage is aduced by Celsus (*apud* Orig. *CC* 7.62) to show the lack of originality of the Christians when they refuse to adore statues. Origen does not deny the similarity but says that the Christian spirit is completely different. Clement makes another use of the Herodotean description. Persians are equated to philosophers, sine they refuse the cult of image but fall "into another deception". The link made by Clement between these two types of idolatry is a topic of history of philosophy since the Derveni Papyrus, were the μάγοι were quoted in connection with Heraclitus and a cosmology based on fire (col V-VIII, cf. G. Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus*, 2004). Cf. 5.65.4 below.

65.3: Berosus, *FGH* III C 680 fr. 11. Artaxerxes son of Dareios Ocos was Artaxerxes II (404-358). Clement insists that he was the first (πρῶτος) to introduce the cult of gods with human form (cf. 1.6.4). For Aphrodite Anaitis, cf. Beros. *FGH* III C 680 fr. 12, Plut. *Artax*. 27.4. It is the old Greek way of Hellenizing foreign divinities since Herodotus (cf. F. Hartog, *Le miroir d'Hérodote*, Paris 1981).

65.4: τοὺς διδασκάλους τοὺς σφῶν: the link between Persians and philosophers was (and is) usually thought of as dependence of the latter on the former (cf. Orig. *CC* 4.17, M. L. West, *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient*, Oxford 1974, and W. Burkert, *Da Omero ai Magi*, Venezia 2001). In Christian hands the dependence turned into an accusation against the Greeks that their proclaimed wisdom is not even theirs (even in this case, where the wisdom is atheism, Clement keeps the terminology of diatribe, asking the philosophers to recognize their dependence: ὁμολογούντων).

ἀρχῶν: Clement profits the refutation of adoration of elements to proclaim the Christian God. The insistence on the root of *arché* (4 times in a sentence) underlines, in a typically Clementine way of playing with a lexical stem, that God is more than a material principle (ἄναρχων) and at the same time rules over material principles (ἄρχοντα καὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν δημιουργόν). Cf. Steneker 13f. The attributes of ποιητής and δημιουργός have a clear Platonic undertone (*Tim*. 28c 3-4) and were soon adapted to God (cf. 6.68.1, 6.70.1).

ἣ φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος: Clement finishes this section on the philosophers who worshipped elements with a quotation of Gal. 4.9, which critizises the Galatians for

turning back to them. The *argumentatio* in favour of Christianity begins to creep in, with a quotation of the "apostle" (1.7.2, 2.23.2, 7.81.2).

66.1: τι ὑψελότερον καὶ περιττότερον: criticism goes from foreign to Greek philosophy. Now the philosophers who posited as *arché* an immaterial entity, which could be thought closer to the Christian God. In fact, there are no attacks to them, though they are in a chapter conceived as a list of errors. Anaximander, Anaxagoras and Archelaos are almost praised for having celebrated (καθύμνησαν, giving a religious tone to their philosophical speculations), "something more elevate and important", the *apeiron* and the *nous*. Leucippos and Metrodoros posited fullness and vacuum (τὸ πλῆρες καὶ τὸ κενόν) as the two principles.

66.2: προσέθηκε... τὰ εἴδωλα: Democritos departed from the two principles of Leucippos and "added images": this is a manipulation of concepts typical of Christian apologetics. Democritus uses that concept profusely in his theories of perception and he even wrote a treatise Περὶ εἰδωλῶν. But using the word to talk about the theology of philosophers, Clement seems to take it as meaning "idols" which he would have introduced in the pre-Socratic speculations (cf. *Strom.* 5.87.3) as if to find their weak point.

τοὺς ἀστέρας: idolatry seems more evident with the development of philosophy, with an increasing devotion to matter. The Pythagorean Alcmeon is accused of having divinized astral bodies and also the Platonic Xenocrates (cf. fr. 17 Heinze = Isnardi Parente, Cic. *ND* 1.27).

οὐ σιωπήσομαι: After the intuitions of some philosophers, criticism of materialism comes back, and after the pre-Socratics comes the criticism of the philosophical schools. The rhetorical device is similar to the attack on the mysteries in 2.12: "I will not be silent". That allows him to go swiftly through all schools except Epicurus, the most despicable of philosophers who deserves precisely silence rather than accusation because of his atheism.

66.3: διὰ πάσης ὕλης: the Stoa is attacked as the extreme representative of a materialistic idea of God, which is even "in the least honourable matter" (cf. Zen. fr. 47 Pearson, Chrysipp. fr. 1039 Arnim). Christians inherited the Platonic criticism (Plut. *De Stoic. Rep.* 1051f, *De Def. or.* 426bc) against Stoic immanentist conception of divinity which sometimes turned to pantheism. The Logos is for them creator (cf. 1.7.3) and therefore cannot be confued with his creation. Cf. *Strom.* 1.51.1, 2.14.3, 5.89.2-3, and

Iust. *Apol*. 2.7, Athenag. *Leg*. 6.5, 22.2, Tat. *Orat*. 3.1, 4.3, Theoph. Autol.2.4, Greg. Naz. *Or*. 35.1. Cf. Lilla, 48, and Herrero 289-295.

66.4: πατήρ... πατέρα: the rhetoric of the paragraph against Aristoteles is important for its contents: it is ornated with ironical word-plays which aim to demystify the reputed master of logic: the *father* of the school does not recognize the *Father* of all (Steneker 15), and he contradicts himself (αὐτὸς αὐτῷ περιπείρεται) and is finally mistaken (περιτρέπεται), which seem mocking allusions to the title of the school (Περίπατος). Yet the doctrines he condemns, God as the anima mundi whose providence reaches the moon, have been doubted to be Aristotelean, since they are best expressed (with reference also to the Homeric epithet ὕπατος alluded here) in the treatise *De mundo* (6.397b 24-27, 30-32; 2.392a 29-30) which most scholars consider a pseudo-Aristotelean a Stoicizing later work. But A. P. Bos, *CQ* 43 (1993), 177-188 convincingly interprets the paragraph as proceding from a doxographic tradition ultimately descending from Theophrastus and which reflects the doctrines of the lost works, specially *De philosophia*, and puts forward some arguments in favour of the authenticity of the *De mundo* as one of these works which would be reflected here. The limits of providence in the moon is a theme of this treatise (cf. also Diog. Laert. 5.32) which became a *topos* of Christian apologetics: it is also critisized in *Strom*. 5.90.3, Tat. *Orat*. 2.1, Athenag. *Leg*. 25.2, Hippol. *Refut*. 1.20.6, 7.19.2, 7.24.3; Orig. *CC* 1.21, 3.75; Eus. *PE* 15.5.1, Greg. Naz. *Or*. 27.10, Epiph. *De fide* 9.35, Theod. *Affect*. 5.47, 6.7). Cf. Lilla 47 n.1.

66.5: πῆ μὲν οὐρανόν, πῆ δὲ πνεῦμα: the theology of Aristotle's disciple Theophrastus is also mentioned (fr. 252B Fortenbaugh) with an expression which potrays it as inconsistent ("God is partly heaven, partly spirit"). Cicero (*ND* 1.35) defended him against that accusation with a similar expression (*modo menti divini tribuit principatum, modo caelo*). The similarity of expression is so clear that a common source for both seems necessary (H. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, 132, rightly discards direct knowledge of Cicero).

Ἐπικούρου μὲν... τί δὲ Ἡρακλείδης;: the two final references of this attack on philosophers are coordinated with a μέν... δέ sentence which gives some strength to the end (Marcovich emendation of a γάρ for a δέ seems right here, unlike in 2.17.2, where no μέν supports it). Epicurus (fr. 368 Usener) is ignored for thinking that God does not care (cf. *Strom*. 1.50.6, 2.16.3, cf. Lilla 45f). It was a common medio-Platonic criticism

(Plut. *De Stoic. Rep.* 1052B), appropiated enthusiastically by Christians (Iust. *Apol.* 1.28, Eus. *PE* 15.5.6-11).

κατασύρεται εἴδωλα: Heraclides Ponticus (fr. 123 Wehrli = 65 Voss) is presented as heir of Democritus "idols" (cf. 5.66.2). This word alone, charged with the Biblical negative sense, is enough to dismiss him. These last two references abridge the description of two philosophical schools which in his source were doubtlessly much more developed (H. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci,* 131).

Chapter VI

After the *refutatio* of Paganism in chapters II, III, IV and V, this chapter begins the *argumentatio*, i. e. the positive proposal of Christianity as the true Logos. Clement has shown through invective and quotations how mistaken Greek poets and philosophers were when they proclaimed other gods, and in the following three chapters he will prove that some Greek authors and, above all, the Biblical prophets, had announced the true God. Following the rhetorical rule of *Ringkomposition*, in which issues (rings) will be closed in inverse order to their opening, Clement begins with the pieces of truth found in Greek philosophy, just after having critisized its mistakes. In fact, he begins this chapter in praise of philosophy repeating the criticism against it. Clement was defending a philo-Hellenic position which thought that Greek philosophy and culture could be partly integrated in the Christian message, but he must make these equilibriums and counterweight praise with criticism to avoid confusing the two contrasted worlds (Paganism and Christianity) on whose opposition stands the whole construction of this work. Van Winden 212, says that both chapters form in fact one single section. But it would be better to say that both are the axis where the tone of the book changes from the negative part to the positive one.

R. E. Witt pointed out long ago that Ammonius Saccas, and apostate Christian who became one of the pioneers of neo-Platonism, and whose lectures were attended both by Origen and Plotinus, was contemporary to Clement and probably coincident also geographically at Alexandria (perhaps in the catechetical school). He begins with this biographical note a study of the equivalent features between the *Stromata* and the *Enneads*. However, he makes some initial notes in the *Protrepticus* to prove that in his first work Clement already distinguished Plato from the other philosophers and knew him by heart. On Christian acceptance of Pagan philosophers (above all Plato) as forerunners of Christianity, cf. D. Ridings, *The Attic Moses*, Goteborg 1995, and Herrero, 206-227. Cf. other related bibliography in the introduction, 26ff.

Like the fragments from poets and prophets of the next two chapters, much of this material from philosophers will reappear in *Stromata* V. Clement uses the same apologetic sources containing material useful to prove the presence of Revelation among the Greeks, but he distributes them differently in the *Protrepticus*. For a full treatment of the subject, cf. introduction to chapter VIII.

Critique of philosophy

67.1: ἐπιρρεῖ τοιοῦτος ὄχλος: this is a clear allusion to Plat. *Phaedr.* 229d7, where a multitude of Gorgons and Pegasi comes over Plato (cf. Butterworth). The change of attitude between chapter V, where the errors of philosophy are denounced, and chapter VI, where its intuitions are displayed, seems to need some kind of transition. These two paragraphs summarize the criticisms of the previous chapter and serve as precaution before using philosophy as an aid in the quest for truth. In a way, it warns that even if they were right in some points, philosophers are not in possession of the truth (cf. the explicit argument in Aug. *CD* 18.14, *Faust.* 13.2).

ὕθλῳ γραικῷ: this popular expression is also a topic of philosophical literature: cf. Plat. *Theaet.*176b 7, Zenob. 3.5, Diogen. 3.79.

δοκησισόφων: Potter's plausible conjecture (for δοκήσει σοφῶν in P), though rejected by Stählin, is accepted by Marcovich. A similar expression in Plat. *Phaedr.* 275b2: cf. G. J. De Vries *Mnemosyne* 11 (1958), 253-254.

67.2: φθορᾷ: this is the reading in P, defended by Van Winden 212f, against Stählin (and Marcovich, who ignores his work), who followed Muenzel's emendation φορᾷ. Against the parallel in Thphr. *De igne* 54, Van Winden discovers a direct influence of Phil. *Somn.* 2.2.58 (a few lines later, in 6.69.2, Clement will follow *Somn.* 2.193).

δειναῖς τε καὶ ἀτάκτοις: Van Winden 213, sees no reason to change this reading in P for δίναις, as Stählin does following Heyse. His convincing suggestion implies, therefore, that the καί should not be deleted (in fact, a τε καί is much more common in Imperial prose than an enclitic τε as coordinating particle).

τοὺς πλανήτας τοῖς ὄντως πεπλανημένοις: this word-play (Steneker 15) is based on the root of the verb "to wander". Astral bodies do wander (hence their name "planets"), but the true wanderers without any direction are men who adore them.

θεὸν ἐπιζητῶ, οὐ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ: this formulation echoes Rom 1.25. Cf. 8.81.2 with a similar thought. Steneker 50, analyses the rhythm of this last sentence, a catalectic iambic, which gives it a clear hymnic tone.

Plato helps in the quest for truth

68.1. συνεργόν: Plato, here chosen as if he were a random example, was in fact the favourite Greek philosopher for the Christians, who found in his doctrines the

closest ideas to Biblical revelation, and the way to formulate it in Greek categories. Therefore he becomes "helper" of the quest for truth. He was also prestigious among Pagans: the neo-Pythagorean philosopher Numenius of Apamea (fr. 10) called him Μωσῆς ἀττικίζων. Cf. D. Ridings, *The Attic Moses*, Goteborg 1995. The following quotations may come from an anthology, but they are extremely well-known, and Clement clearly was familiar with Plato (cf. Lilla 42). Contrary, therefore, to other quotations of poets or philosophers, a florilegium needs not to be posited as his main source.

πατέρα καὶ ποιητήν: this sentence of the *Timaeus* (28 c 3-5) is probably the most famous formulation of Platonic theology. Clement uses it in *Strom.* 5.78.1, 5.92.3 to show Plato's dependence on the Bible, following a long tradition before and after him in Christian apologetics. Iust. *Apol.* 2.10.6, Athenag. *Leg.* 6.3, Orig. *CC* 7.42, Tertull. *De an.* 4.1, *Apolog.* 46.4, Min. Fel. *Oct.* 19.14, Ps.-Clem. *Recogn.* 8.20, Ps.-Iust. *Cohort.* 38.2 (cf. Riedweg *ad loc*, p. 529 and 93ff), Lact. *De ira* 11.11, *DI* 1.8.1, Eus. *PE* 11.29.3-4, Thdt. *Affect.* 2.42, Cyr. *CI* 1 (*PG* 76, 548D). But the Platonic sentence was also famous among Jewish apologetics (Ios. *Apion.* 2.224) and Pagans: Cic. *ND* 1.30, Apul. *De Plat.* 1.5, *De deo Socr.* 3, Procl. *In Tim* I p.347 Diehl. It was the most obvious quotation for Clement to begin with. Cf. Andresen, *Logos and Nomos*, 1955, 159; Daniélou 105.

ῥητὸν γὰρ οὐδαμῶς ἐστιν: the quotation from the *Timaeus* is followed by another famous Platonic passage from the *Seventh Letter* (*Ep.* 7.341 c5) also expressing the ineffability of God (cf. *Strom.* 5.77.1, 78.1, where it is also linked to the passage of the *Timaeus*, as in Thdt. *Affect.* 2.42, 4.38). The reading ῥητέον in P kept by Stählin would suggest that Clement adapts Plato's text. But the previous ἀδύνατον. and the following μὴ ἀποκάμῃς suggest rather impossibility of expression rather than obligation of silence, and in *Strom.* 5.78.1 the text is quoted literally. Therefore the text may be changed with Dindorf and Marcovich to adequate it to Plato.

ξύν μοι λαβοῦ: Clement uses this imaginary exhortations to the figures of Paganism, like Teiresias in 12.119. But he is also echoing the *Phaedrus* (237a 9), to which there are various references in this chapter dedicated to the quest for truth.

68.2: ἀπόρροια θεϊκή: the expression "divine emanation" is attributed in *Strom.* 5.88.2 to the Platonists (cf. A. Le Boulluec *ad loc.* and R. E. Witt *CQ* 25 (1931) 201, nn. 4-9). It belongs to the Platonic tradition (*Phaedr.* 251b, Max. Tyr. 4.7, Plut. 375b, 930e,

Plot. *Enn*. 2.1.7-8, 3.4.3e, 6.7.22: also under the name ἀπορροή), whence it reaches Aleandrian Judaism (*Sap*. 7.25, the passage which gives Biblical authority to the expression; Phil. *Aet*. 88), Christianity (apart from Clement, cf. Origen, *CC* 1.48, 7.30, 9.2; *De oratione*, 23.5, 24.4) and Gnosticism (Hipp. *Ref*. 5.15.2; cf. A. Dieterich, *Abraxas*, Leipzig 1891, 196). It is also present in Stoic texts probably through Poseidonios' influence (Marc. Aur. 2.4, 12.2, Sen. *Ep*. 120.14, and among Christianity Athenag. *Leg*. 10.24). It seems a variant of the "spark of truth" (cf. 7.74.7, and also 10.104.1-2) as an image to express the view that every man can have some knowledge of the true God which is wholly revealed in the Christian Logos. Its rational nature explains why the people who dedicate themselves to reasons (*logoi*), i.e. philosophers, can specially develop this knowledge. The influence of Justin's σπερματικός λόγος is probably in the background of this doctrine (cf. Riedweg, *Ad Graecos*, 124 n. 524), which Photius (cf. text in Stählin III 210.1.10) suspected of heterodoxy.

68.3: καὶ ἄκοντες: they reached the truth "unconsciously", rather then "unwillingly". This precision allows praising the Greek intuitions and at the same time criticizing them for their mistakes. Cf. 1.1.3, 2.38.1.

God is heavenly and unseeable

ἀνώλεθρον καὶ ἀγένητον: Parm. fr. B 8.3 DK, Plat. *Tim*. 52a. Clement uses the "unconscious" terminology of the Greek philosophers to define God in philosophical terms. This "negative theology" of defining God for what it is not will be developed in the *Stromata*, (cf. H. F. Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the beginning of Christian apophaticism*, Oxford 2006). The theory of the divine "scent" in Greek texts becomes a strategy to adapt Christianity to the Greek intellectual world. Cf. 12.120.6.

ἄνω που: these lines situating God's home in heaven also use Platonic terminology (*Phaedr*. 245d3, 247b7: περὶ τὰ νῶτα; *Polit*. 272e: περιωπῇ).

Εὐριπίδης λέγει: this way of revealing the source of the quotation after making it increases its integration in the discourse. In fact, the fragment (Eurip. 1129 Nauck, *adesp*. 622 Kannicht) underlines the same ideas about God of the Platonic quotations, i. e. heavenly residence from which he can see everything, and inaccesibility either with the mind or the eye. The coincidence is so exact that the authenticity of the fragment has been doubted (Kannicht *ad loc.*). It is also used in Ps.-Iust. *De mon*. 2.3, so it must come from the same anthological source (with the banal variant νομιστέον for νοητέον, cf. Zeegers 208; Riedweg, *Ad graecos*, 355).

68.4: Ἥλιε: The three previous quotations serve as basis to refute a sentence from Menander (fr. 678 Koerte) which must have been used for Heliocentric theology, increasingly popular in Late Antiquity (cf. W. Fauth, *Helios Megistos*, Leiden-Boston, 1995). The reason to refute an otherwise unknown fragment from Menander (cf. 7.75.1) in this section dedicated to the sparks of truth among the Greeks must be that this sentence was used in apologetic circles, perhaps also in the apologetic anthology that Clement is using for his quotations (*pace* Zeegers 208) to defend monotheism (cf. other Heliocentric fragment in Ps.-Iust. *Cohort.* 15.2). Clement refuses to accept this immanent theology which identifies the Sun with God. The Sun fulfills the first condition which the previous quotations have established, he sees everything from above, but it does not account for the second one, i. e. it is knowledgeable through the bodily eyes, instead of through the rational mind. Clement, therefore, is refuting the apologetic use of some material from his source.

ὑγιής: this epithet for the Logos is new in the *Protrepticus* (also used in *Strom.*1.42.2). Perhaps it can be explained as an attribute of the Sun, following the constant strategy of proclaiming that the Logos is superior to the false versions of Greek myth and cult, and at the same time using the Greek forms to proclaim it.

ἥλιος ψυχῆς: Clement appropriates the Platonic image (*Resp.* 6, 508c), which described the human soul in terms equivalent to the cosmos. The Logos sets light in the "eye of the soul" (Plat. *Resp.* 7.519b, 533d, 540a). The imagery of the Logos as light will be developed in chapters X and XI (110.12-13, 113.15), and in other works of Clement (*Paed.* 1.28.1, 1.77.2, 2.1.3, 2.81.1; *Strom.* 1.10.4, 5.73.2). In the adaptation of Plato's solar imagery to describe the action of the Logos in the human soul, Clement follows closely the methods of Philo (*Migr.* 39, *Sacrif.* 36, *Somn.* 1.164; 2.160; *Opif. mund.* 71).

68.5: τῶν λογίων ἀνθρώπων ὀλίγους: Democritus fr. 30 DK: as in *Strom.* 5.102.1, Clement praises Democritus' insight in spotting "some few among the men of reason" who identified Zeus with the air, and called him "everything" and "king". On the style of this fragment, cf. E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, Stuttgart 1924, 164. The traditional interpretation of this fragment (W. Jaeger, *The Theology of Early Greek Philosophers*, Cambridge Mass., 1947, 196-197) is that Democritus is pointing at the origins of religion. Yet after the discovery of the Derveni papyrus, the addressees of the Democritean praise can be probably said to be the Orphic poets (or their comentators)

who called Zeus king, aither (which prose commentators identified with *aer*) and universal king (*OF* 12-106 B). On the Orphic theogony of the Derveni papyrus, cf. A. Bernabé, *HSCP* 104 (2007), 99-133.

διαμυθεῖσθαι: since Heinse's edition in 1606 the reading of the MSS has been separated as Δία μυθεῖσθαι. This is doubtlessly what Democritus meant, but it is not sure to be a scribal mistake. It is possible that Clement turned purposefully the expression into one verb to take out Zeus from the quotation which he is praising. This is coherent with his attitude in chapter VII of avoiding the identification of Zeus with God (cf. introduction to ch. VII), it makes unecessary the emendations of the text inserting a lost verb (as Marcovich does), and also leaves a trace in the following sentence about Plato (διανοούμενος τὸν θεὸν αἰνίττεται). In *Strom.* 5.102.1, which quotes the same fragment to argue for symbolism, such precautions are abandoned and Zeus is mentioned in direct style (πάντα Ζεὺς μυθέεται).

περὶ τῶν πάντων βασιλέα: Plato's *Second Epistle* is considered a neo-Pythagorean composition of ca. 1st cent BC. Clement quotes here an abbreviated form of *Ep.* 2.312e to insist on God's kingship. The longer formula was, however, much quoted by Pagans (Plot. *Ennead.* 5.1.8, Celsus *apud* Orig. *CC* 6.18, Procl. *In Plat. Parm.* 6.87 Cousin) and Christians, who saw in it a prefiguration of the Trinity, like Clement in *Strom.* 5.103.1. Cf. Iust. *Apol.* 1.60.6-7 (cf. Daniélou 106-107), Athenag. *Leg.* 23.3, Hippol. *Refut.* 6.37.2, Eus. *PE* 11.20.2, 13.13.29, Thdt. *Affect.* 2.78; Cyr. *CI* 1 (PG 76, 553). Like other philosophical quotations, it was probably part of Christian anthologies on Pagan monotheism.

God is the true measure

69.1-2: τῆς τῶν ὄντων ἀληθείας τὸ μέτρον: The expression echoes Plato's anti-Protagoric sentence that makes Zeus the "measure of all things" (*Leg.* 4.716c). The new insistence on "truth" is typical of Christian dogma, in contrast to the philosophical musing (the Platonic sentence has the verb in optative, while this is an answer to the question "who is the king of all?"). The juxtaposition of the Platonic "measure" with Dt. 25.13-15 to show that he is "truly saint" (ὄντως ἱερός, cf. 2.23.2) is taken from Philo *Somn.* 2.193-194, who already allegorized that passage to make God the true measure against the measure of men, while Clement opposes God's measure against that of the idols (Van Winden 210). Cf. Riedweg, *Ad graecos*, 418-420.

69.3: ἴσος**:** The divine immutability proclaimed in Plat. *Phaed*. 78d is adapted to the metaphor of the measure and the balance to describe God. Through this equilibrium he both grants cosmic order (συνέχων φύσιν) and justice (οἱόνεὶ τρυτάνη τῆ δικαιοσύνη). This double dimension is illustrated by the following Platonic quotation.

69.4: παλαιός λόγος**:** Plato uses this expression in *Leg*. 4.715e-716a to quote the Orphic theogony which is commented in the Derveni papyrus (*OF* 14): God, on the one hand, is said to be beginning, middle and end of the universe, and on the other hand he is said to be accompained by Justice. Cf. A. Bernabé, in G. Sfameni Gasparro (ed.), *Destino e salvezza tra culti Pagani e gnosi cristiana*, Cosenza, 1998, 33-93, and *HSCP* 104 (2007), 99-133. Plato's sentence was much quoted among Christians: *Strom*. 2.132.2, 7.100.3; 401b, Iren. *Adv. haer*. 3.25.5, Hippol. *Refut*. 1.19.6, Orig. *CC* 6.15, ps.-Iust. *Cohort*.20.1, 25.4 (who says explicitly that Moses was the author of the *palaios logos* (thus identifying it with the Bible, cf. Riedweg *ad loc*. and p. 128 n. 540), followed by Euseb. *PE* 11.13.5, Thdt. *Affect*. 6.26, Suda, s. v. Πλάτων.

Plato depends from Hebraic wisdom

70.1 πόθεν**:** Clement profits from the previous quotation to identify Plato's *palaios logos* with the Bible as his source of inspiration. He does not explictly say, as Ps.-Justin (cf. previous paragraph) that Moses is the author of the *palaios logos*, but the deduction is implicit. The direct dependence of Plato from Biblical Relevation (cf. Ridings, *Attic Moses*) coexists in Clement with the theory of the sparks of the truth among philosophers. Cf. 6.68.2, 10.104.1-2.

βαρβάρων τὰ γένη**:** his paragraph clearly shows that the theme of dependence of Greek wisdom from the Bible was supported above all by the claims, traditionally upheld, that the Greeks had taken their knowledge from other Oriental peoples (Egyptian, Babylonian, Thracian, Assyrian). To include the Hebrews in this list was not too difficult for Jewish apologists, from whom Christians inherit the argument. The theory of dependence, though it sounds extravagant today, was in agreement with the ideological and historical ideas of the time. Cf. Orig. *CC* 1.16-18, where Origen accuses Celsus of having excluded Moses from the traditional list of Oriental wise men like Zoroaster and Ostanes: cf. Lilla, 38-42, on Celsus and Origen (42 n.4 on this theme in the *Stromata*). On the theme of dependence as a tool to integrate Judaism and then Christianity in Hellenistic patterns of thought, cf. E. S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, Berkeley 1998; A. J. Droge, *Homer or Moses?,* Tübingen 1989; Herrero, ch. V.

70.2. *Orac. Syb*. 3.586-588, 590-594. Clement omits line 589, which expands the description of the idols. There seems to be no purpose behind the omission, so it may be due to his mistake, the absence of the line in his source, or a possible clue to consider the line a later addition.

Other philosophers had intuitions of the truth

71.1. ἐπίπνοια: the invocation to philosophy goes on asking for others than Plato who had "intuition" of God (whether this comes or not from Jewish wisdom, as it was said from Plato, is not explicited). There is a rhetorical contraposition between Plato, the One Philosopher (ἕνα τοῦτον Πλάτωνα) and the One God (τὸν ἕνα ὄντως μόνον θεόν), probably hinted ironically at the hyper-reverence of Plato in Pagan circles, and as counterweight to his previous praises to Plato.

71.2-3: The fragments of Antisthenes and Xenophon which start the list are also quoted in *Strom*.5.108.4, from where they are taken by Cyr. *CI* I, *PG* 76, 552A (cf. L. Früchtel, *ZNTW* 36 (1937), 89). They are also quoted, independently of Clement, by Thdt. *Affect*. 1.75. Both Theodoretus and Clement seem to quote these fragments not directly but from a florilegium, probably used for apologetic purposes.

Σωκράτους δε ἅτε γνώριμος: Antisth. fr. 40 Decleva = VA 181 Giannantoni (ascribed to the work *Physikos*, quoted by Cic. *ND* 1.13.32, cf. Giannantoni n. 25). Given the bad reputation of Cynics as religious thinkers, Clement felt the need to justify the quotation because Antisthenes would be speaking as disciple of Socrates, who was a popular Greek figure among the Christians (G. M. A. Hanfmann, *HSCP* 60 (1951), 205-233).

εἰ μὴ τὸ Σωκράτους ἐδεδίει φάρμακον: Xenophon is also expressly related to Socrates as explanation of his intuition of truth. The explanation of his lack of precision is fear from condemnation (φάρμακον in the same negative sense in 10.103.1). Cf. Ps.-Iust. *Cohort*. 20.1, 22.1, 25.1 (with Riedweg *ad loc*.), Eus. *PE* 13.14.13, Cyr. Alex. *CI* 1.48 (PG 76, 556 A) on this theme of fear as cause for obscuring truth. The quotation of *Memorab*. 4.3.14 presents a quite different text from Xenophon's though the meaning is the same, which was used by W. Christ, *Philologische Studien zu Clemens Alexandrinus*, München, 1900, 25 to prove that Clement is taking it from an anthology (cf. Le Boulluec *ad Strom*. 5.108.4).

71.4. πόθεν: The comparison of God with the sun which cannot be seen because it blinds was aimed at showing Xenophon's dependence from the *Sibylline Oracle* 1.10-13 (inspired in *Dt.* 5.26, where God's vision is said to cause harm). Yet Le Boulluec points out (*ad Strom.* 5.108.6, where both texts are also quoted in continuation) that the Sibylline verses could even be directly inspired in Xenophon's well-known passage. Theoph. *Autol.* 2.36 also quotes these lines, which Clement takes from his anthological source (Zeegers 141).

72.1-2: Πηδασεύς: Clement says Cleanthes is from Pedasos instead of Assos, probably by his own mistake or an error of his source (or, less probably, a scribal error).

οὐ θεογονίαν ποιητικήν, θεολογίαν δὲ ἀληθινήν: with one of his usual paralellistic constructions, Clement contraposes theogony vs. theology (and secondarily, poetry vs. truth). This is a specifically Christian approach to Greek religious literature (cf. 2.26.6). When it dwells on the divine nature it is accepted as theology, but when it dwells on the birth of the gods it is rejected. Therefore, the contents and style of hymns will be adapted to celebrations of the true God, but theogonical poetry, which is essentially polytheist will be condemned.

τἀγαθόν: Cleanthes of Assos, frags. 557 and 560 von Arnim. These lines are not addressed to God, but to the definition of the supreme Good. But since the hymnic style is the same than the celebrations of divinities (e.g. *Orphic Hymns*), Cleanthes' philosophical poem is easily adapted as theology. The same lines are quoted in *Strom.* 5.110.2-3, 111.1, and Eus. *PE* 13.13.37. É. Des Places, *Biblica* 57 (1976), 414-419, points out the similarities with the attributes of God's wisdom, like the fact that they can be understood in an active or passive sense. Rather than influence they can probably be attributed to the similar spiritual environment of both texts.

72.3. ἡ δόξα ἡ κοινή καὶ ἡ συνήθεια: Attack on tradition is repated (cf.2.23.2) and custom is now assimilated to "opinion" (δόξα), which in this philosophical context has obviously a very negative sense.

72.4: *Pyth. Gnom.* 35 Mullach. From Clement or (rather) from a common source, the fragment is also quoted by Ps.-Iust. *Cohort.* 19.2 (from which Cyr. Alex. *CI* 1, *PG* 76, 548 CD takes it, cf. Riedweg *ad loc*, 364-368). On this pseudo-Pythagorean literature, cf. W. Burkert, *Philologus* 105 (1961),16-43, 226-246, and H. Thelsleff *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period*, Åbo, 1961, as well as the *Entretiens Hardt* of 1964 in which both participated. The fragment proclaims an

immanent divinity which sustains the whole cosmos. There is a discussion, therefore, on its being of Jewish origin or not. Riedweg (*Ad Graecos*, 365) demonstrates that it is not a Jewish composition, *pace* N. Walter, in W. G. Kümmel (ed.) *Jüdische schriften aus hellenisticher-römischer Zeit,* Gütersloh 1983, 257.

ὅλος ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κύκλῳ: Witt 196, compares it with Cic. *ND* 1.27, and Ammonios Saccas *apud* Nemes. *N. Hom.* 58, Plot. *Enn.* 5.1.2, 6.4.5 to show Clement's vicinity to neo-Platonism, and points out that the sentence κρᾶσις τῶν ὅλων αἰώνων, in spite of its Stoic ring, is not understood as hylotheism, which has just been censured.

72.5: εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν θεοῦ ἐπίπνοια θεοῦ: another paralellism shows the final explanation of these cases of "intuition of God". It is through "inspiration of God" himself (repeating the word of 6.71.1). This inspiration can be either through influence (as was said of Plato and Xenophon quoting the Sibyll as proof) or just some difuse kind of influence. Clement takes his material from a source specifically dedicated to prove the plagiarism of the Greeks (cf. Zeegers), which he will use in *Stromata* 5. But he does not seem to want to press that point here, perhaps because he was conscious of his little strength as argument for the Greeks. He will leave the prophetic material for chapter VIII and quote here only the Sibyll, on whose literary prestige he could count. Therefore, in spite of his occasional adhesions to the theory of dependence (6.70.1), he prefers to spot (or to force) the parallels rather than giving a consistent explantion of them.

πρὸς αὐτῶν μὲν ἀναγεγραμμένα, πρὸς δὲ ἡμῶν ἐξειλεγμένα: this sentence, typically parallelistic and homoteleutic, indicates that he is excerpting all previous passages from an anthology of "monotheistic" passages of Pagan philosophers, probably made up by a Jewish or Christian apologist. The passages follow the same order than in *Stromata* V, though in the latter work the selection is broader and they are mixed with other texts (cf. introduction to Chapter VIII for a complete explanation of the parallels with *Stromata* V).

Chapter VII

After reviewing the truth contained in Greek philosophers, Clement carries on his review of the divine sparks in Paganism with the poets. Chapter VII has two parts: in the first one the Greek poets proclaim the One God. Authentic verses like Aratus' are mixed up with Jewish compositions the Sibyll or Orpheus in the proclamation of one deity. The name of Zeus or of any other god is carefully avoided, since there is no place for syncretism or equivalence. In the second part of the chapter the poetic fragments mock (or are made to mock) the Pagan gods. Most of the poetic quotations of this chapter come from anthologies which are also used by other Jewish and Christian apologists. Their common sources have been thoroughly studied by N. Zeegers, *Les citations paiennes dans les apologistes grecs du II siècle*, Louvain 1972. The traditional theme of "poetry and truth" takes a new direction in the works of those apologists who are more inclined to integrate Christianity with the achievements of Greek culture. This philo-Hellenic attitude prone to find intuitions of the truth in Pagan literature (which they will explain in different ways, cf. 6.70.1) is not incompatible with the fiercest attacks on the same poets for presenting corrupt gods. Chapter VII is the reverse of Chapters II in many aspects (also in the mention of Orpheus, who had previously sung the mysteries and now converts, cf. 7.74.3-6), and both close with a very similar tone. Closing internal rings is characteristic of *Ringkomposition*.

Some Pagan poets have sung the truth

73.1: τὴν μυθώδη παρέκβασιν: myth was interpreted through allegory by the people who wanted to save traditional religion as if it hid some kind of truth (from Theagenes of Rhegion in the 5th cent. BC to late neo-Platonists in 5th cent. AD; cf. J. Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie*, Paris, 1976; P. T. Struck, *Birth of the Symbol*, Princeton 2004). Clement dedicates the 5th chapter of the *Stromata* to justify this symbolic interpretation of Pagan poetry, which must have had many opponents among the most "Tertullianist" contemporaries.

73.2: Arat. *Phaen*. 13-15. Aratus is a favourite poet of Christian authors because of the strong monistic tone of the hymn to Zeus which opens his *Phaenomena*. He is quoted already by Paul in his discourse to the Athenians in the Areopagus (*Act*. 17.28), and his presence in anthologies like Clement's source in this section was frequent (e. g.

Theoph. *Autol*. 2.8; cf. Zeegers 182, 187). These three lines are selected because of their similarities to Christian invocations to God. Firstly, the vocative "father"; secondly, the expression "first and last": an image which, though it stems from an Orphic origin and was used in pantheistic poems, was soon accepted by Christianity to reflect God's omnipresence (cf. the citation of Plat. *Leg*. 4.715e7 in 6.69.4). At the same time, the name of Zeus is not present in these lines, which allows to transfer them to the Christian God (cf. 6.68.5 on avoiding Zeus' name). When Eusebius (*PE* 13.12.6-7) quotes the hymn he changes Zeus by θεός. Both Clement and Eusebius may be following a usage started by Aristobulus (cf. N. Walter, *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos*, Berlin 1964, 107). In *Strom*. 5.101.2-4 Clement quotes *Phaen*. 1-15, and in *Protr*. 111.114.4 lines 6-7 are quoted. Here he begins in the middle of line 13 because just before there is an invocation on the Horai, which could be understood as Pagan deities. In the 5th book of the *Stromata* he is aiming to justify symbolic interpretation of Pagan poets, so neither Zeus nor the *Horai* bother him. But in the *Protrepticus* he is directly exhorting to conversion, without stopping in lengthy interpretation, and leaves no space for syncretism with Pagan gods, so he omits all references to them. A similar strategy is followed in the selection from the T*estament of Orpheus* (cf. 7.74.3).

73.3: Hesiod fr. 308 M-W is also quoted in *Strom*. 5.112.3 (with the verb φησι instead of the more cautious αἰνίσσεται used here). As the following fragment, it must have belonged to the "anthology of plagiarism"..

74.1: Euripides fr. 941 Kannicht was already quoted fully in *Protr*. 2.25.3 (cf. comm. *ad loc*). The fragment is a *locus classicus* of this kind of apologetic argument (*Strom*. 5.114.1, Athenag. *Leg*. 5.1). It also belonged to the "anthology of plagiarism" researched by Zeegers, 163.

74.2. These lines attibuted to Sophocles by Clement and many other Christian authors (ps.-Iust. *Cohort* 18.1, *De mon*. 2.2; Cyr. Alex. *CI* 1, PG 76, 549D; Athenag. *Leg*. 5.2 quotes only lines 4-5; Eus. *PE* 13.13.40 and Theod. *Affect*. 7.46 take the whole passage from Clement) are with all probability an apocryphal fragment. Kannicht-Snell edit it as *Adesp*. 618. Clement quotes it also in *Strom*. 5.113.1-2 and says it is also quoted in the work *On Abraham and the Egyptians* by (Pseudo-) Hecataeus of Abdera. Probably it is not his direct source, but they would share a common source, a gnomologium of 1st cent AD (Le Boulluec *ad loc*, Zeegers 119-201, N. Walter, *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos*, Berlin 1964, 179-184, 195-198; Riedweg, *Ad graecos*, 356).

The different authors which quote the fragment makes that some of its lines have different variants (cf. *apparatus criticus* in the editions of Stählin and Marcovich). Yet these texts which soon found place in anthologies circulated often in different versions, and the authors would also suit them to their tastes or necessities. Therefore, the text of P needs not be heavily altered.

74.3-6: ὁ δὲ Θράκιος ἱεροφάντης καὶ ποιητὴς ἄμα: Clement offers now the clearest example of conversion. Orpheus, attacked in the *exordium* and the *refutatio* as hierophant and poet of the mysteries (1.3.1, 2.17.2), converts to the truth. The proof is a famous Jewish imitation of an Orphic poem in which Orpheus rejects his previous polytheism and preaches the God of the Bible. Many Christian authors quote this poem, known as the *Testament of Orpheus* (refs. in *OF* 377 and 378 Bernabé). Ch. Riedweg, *Jüdisch-hellenistiche Imitation eines orphischen Hieros Logos*, München, 1993 shows that there are two versions, the original one (*OF* 377) and a longer one (*OF* 378) which comes from the reelaboration of the poem (by Aristobulus) to make the Biblical elements more explicit. Clement quotes *OF* 377 here and both versions in the *Stromata*. Cf. C. R. Holladay, *Festschrift Hengel I*, Tübingen 1996, 159-180, with some disagreements with Riedweg's construction (mainly the defense of an independent recension quoted by Clement).

παλινῳδία: since Stesichorus' famous palinode to absolve Helen from responsibility (cf. Plat. *Phaedr.* 243a5, *Epist.* 3.319e3) this is the technical word for poetic retractation.

τὸν ἱερὸν ὄντως λόγον: *hieros logos* is a typical name for religious writings, cf. A. Henrichs, *HSCP* 101 (2003), 207-266, and therefore also for *Orphica*. The *Testament* is opposed to previous Orphic *hieroi logoi* which were not "truly sacred". On this use of ὄντως, cf. 2.23.1. Jews and Christians also use the term for the Bible.

Φθέγξομαι... ὁρᾶται: Clement quotes the beginning of the *Testament* (*OF* 377.1-7a, 8-10) to prove Orpheus' conversion, omitting the rest of the poem which dwells on God's qualities. The only textual problem regards line 7 (ἀθάνατον. παλαιὸς δὲ λόγος περὶ τόδε φαείνει), which Clement only quotes in its first word. He then says "later he goes on adding with precision" and quotes lines 8-10. Assuming, with Riedweg, that Clement is quoting *OF* 377, there must be a reason for his omitting most of line 7, which alludes to a *palaios logos*. He probably wants to omit the reference to an "ancient tale" because he has just said that Orpheus converts at the end of his life,

and he constantly gives the adjective παλαιός (common to designate Orphic tradition, like in Plat. *Epist.* 7.335, *Leg.* 715e) a negative sense, as a feature of Pagan error (cf. 1.6.1). Holladay maintains that this line was not in Clement's recension. That his text was corrupt cannot be discarded either.

πεπλανημένος: the quotation ends with the phrase "thus Orpheus understood with time his mistake", which sums up the doctrines of 2.12-22 *strictu sensu* and of the whole refutatio *lato sensu*. It is followed by two verses on retractation which belong to a *Sibylline Oracle* (3.624f Geffcken). The lack of a link or of a mention to the Sibyll has made that these two verses are hesitatingly attributed to Orpheus (*OF* 844 Bernabé). There are cases of overlapping between Sibylline Oracles and *Orphica* (e. g. *OF* 661) since both were at this time representants of Greek theology for Pagans and Christians alike. But Clement likes these swift transitions and sometimes quotes without saying the name of the author, so probably these verses were always attributed to the Sibylle and never to Orpheus.

74.7: ἐναύσματα τινα τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θείου: "some sparks from the divine Logos" is a typical expression of Clement to describe the inspiration of Pagan poets which can bear elements of the Revelation. Cf. 6.68.2 on ἀπόρροια, and *Paed.* 2.1.7.1, 2.1.18.1, *Strom.* 6.17.150.1. Cf. Lilla 17f.

σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐλέγχουσιν: far from the reflexive tone of the *Stromata*, the literary frame of a "trial against Paganism" (cf. also προσμαρτυροῦσι) gives even this philo-Hellenic passages the form of an accusation. Pagans would have been unable to grasp the truth even when it was offered to them. This hostile tone, counterweighing the praises made to the intuitions of the poets, introduces the second part of the chapter.

Greek poets bring also testimony against the gods

75.1: the second part of chapter VII uses Greek poets to attack Pagan gods, as in chapter II. The quoted fragments also come from an anthology, studied by Zeegers 88ff, which is used by some other apologists, specially the author of the Jewish treatise *De monarchia* attributed to Justin.

χωρὶς βάσεως βαδίζειν: though it seems a popular expression, "to walk without feet" is not used anywhere else in the preserved Greek literature, so it could be Clement's own metaphor to describe the necessity of the Logos to say or do something true. Its tone is adequate to the comic fragments quoted afterwards.

κωμῳδοῦσι: The comic quotations of Clement seem to come all from anthologies, which is in agreement with his condemnation of these spectacles in the *Paedagogus*. On his knowledge of comic poets, though he focuses on the *Paedagogus*, cf. A. Bregliozzi, *SMSR* 19,2 (1995) 327-347.

75.2-4: Menand. fr. 178 Koerte, also in *De mon.* 5.1. P has μητρογύρτης after the three verses (kept by Stählin), but it is absent from the quotation of the *De monarchia* and it seems an inserted gloss (Marcovich following Dindorf). Clement explains it in continuation (which he would not need to do if it was explicit in these three verses). The words μετὰ γράος could be a slight pseudo-etymological mockery by Menander.

Antisth. fr. 161 Decleva (= V A 186 Giannantoni, who ascribes it to the *Physikos* like the sentence quoted in 6.71.2). Mockery and criticism of the μητραγύρται, the itinerant priests of the Mother of the Gods, was a classical *topos* much expanded in comedy and philosophy (e.g. Plat. *Resp.* 364d-e and the tale of 2.24.1). Christians received enthusiastically this tradition for their criticism of Pagan religion (e. g. *Paed.* 3.28.2), though they were criticized by their Pagan rivals exactly with the same *topoi*, as can easily be seen in the polemics between Celsus and Origen (*CC* 7.9.11). Cf. Herrero 207-220. Same theme in 10.91.1.

Menand. fr. 210 Koerte, also quoted in *De mon.* 5.2, is said to accuse custom (συνήθειαν διελέγχειν), thus insisting in two central themes of the *Protrepticus*: the trial against Paganism and the attack of custom.

76.1-2: After the comic poets Clement adds some quotations from Homer and Euripides to go on denunciating (διελέγχουσιν) the weaknesses of Pagan gods. These quotations have a close similarity to the second part of chapter II. After mocking the epithets of Athena and Hephaistos, Clement quotes a line from Homer (*Il.* 3.407) which is not quoted by other apologists. The Homeric lines which come afterwards, *Il.*6.132-134, are also alleged by Theoph. *Ad Autol.* 1.9, Firm. Mat. *De err.* 6.8. Perhaps these Homeric quotations are inserted by Clement himself in the list of dramatic quotations taken from a source which he has in common with *De monarchia* (where these Homeric quotations do not appear, unlike the precedent Menandrean ones and the following Euripidean ones). Cf. Zeegers 89.

76.3-4: ἄξιος ὡς ἀληθῶς Σωκρατικῆς διατριβῆς: cf. 71.2 for the Christian acceptance of the figure of Socrates. To be his follower is a praise for Euripides, quoted

in some lines which accuse (διελέγχων) Apollon (*Orest*. 591-592 to introduce the god, skillfully associated with *Orest*. 594-596 and *Orest*. 417 spoken by Orestes). *Orest*. 591-592 are also in Ps.-Iust. *De mon*. 5.4 (from their common anthology), but not the rest of the lines, which may be Clement's own addition to the apologetic store.Clement is here, paradoxically, a predecessor of Nietzsche in establishing this link between Socrates and Euripides as underminers of traditional Greek religion.

76.5: after alluding to Heracles' madness and lack of contention, described in *Hercules Furens* and *Alcestis* (cf. 755-60), Clement illustrates his barbarous appetite by quoting fr. 907 Kannicht (perhaps from the lost work *Syleo*).

76.6: γυμνῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ**:** the expression, opposed to "enigmatically", is used in Plat. *Phaedr*. 243b6, whence Clement probably takes it. The quotation of Eur. *Ion* 442-447 is also in Ps.-Iust. *De mon*. 5.5, so it can be traced back to the "anthology of plagiarism" studied by Zeegers.

Chapter VIII

After showing the intuitions of truth contained in Greek philosophy and poetry, Clement, who is gradually approaching the positive and exhortative tone of the last chapters, displays the unveiled truth revealed in Biblical prophecies. No allegory is needed to interpret them, because God himself speaks directly through the mouths of the prophets. This chapter is, therefore, the culmination of the first part of the *argumentatio* formed by Chapters VI, VII and VIII: the annunciation of truth.

It is most interesting the selection of prophecies made by Clement, because their content is remarkably similar to the poetic pieces quoted in the previous chapter. Furthermore, most of these prophecies will be used again in *Stromata* V in explicit comparison with the poetic and philosophical fragments of previous chapters. There are two possible explanations for this coincidence: either Clement in *Stromata* V recovered the Biblical material of the *Protrepticus* and made himself the comparisons; or, in the contrary, in the *Protrepticus* he is reshuffling and separating into different chapters the Greek and Biblical materials which his apologetic source presented in mutual correspondence. In spite of N. Walter, *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos*, Berlin 1964, who argues that the apologetic source would have no Biblical texts since they are absent from the treatise *De monarchia*, the second explanation is obviously preferable for two reasons: Clement shares much of the material with other apologists (e. g. Theophilus), who do not depend on him but use it in the sense of *Stromata* V, i.e. to compare the Greeks with the prophets; the similarities between the prophetic and the Greek material show that the prophecies were selected because they resembled the Greek poets and philosophers, i. e. with an intention similar to that of *Stromata* V of showing their dependence on the Bible: in fact, some of these Biblical pasages may well be the direct inspiration of some forgeries like the *Testament of Orpheus* or *Sibylline Oracles*). In the *Protrepticus*, therefore, Clement uses the material from a source dedicated to "Greek plagiarism", and turns it into a gradual approaching to truth: philosophers-poets-prophets. The appropiateness of this reelaboration is original and effective.

The source material is integrated into the general plan of the *Protrepticus* not only through the ordination of its contents, but also due to its stylistic appropiateness. Contrary to most of the Greek fragments quoted before, which needed exegesis, many prophecies appeal directly (in second person of the plural) to the audience and exhort

conversion, so that Clement can give the turn of speech to the prophets without mediation or transition, just integrating them into his protreptic discourse.

Finally, the presentation of the prophecies keeps some tags which link them to one of the main metaphors of the work, the song of truth, which is developed in Chapter I and is never completely abandoned. "Song" (77.2), "choir" (79.2), "voice" (79.3), "melody" (81.1), make the prophecies of this chapter part of the Song of the Logos.

Biblical prophecies lead to truth

77.1: ὥρα**:** it is a usual rhetoric device to introduce changes of subject-matter. Cf. Riedweg, *Ad graecos*, 489.

σύντομοι σωτερίας ὁδοί: to describe prophecy (as also in *Paed*. 1.9.4) Clement adapts a Cynic expression which defines philosophy (σύντομος ὁδὸς εἰς ἀρετήν, cf. G. Giannantoni, *Socraticorum reliquiae*, Napoli 1985, fr. V 136 and note 50: it may also have been a way Stoics referred to Cynics). Cf. Plut. *Amator*. 759D, DL 7.121, Luc. *Vit. auct.* 11, Iul. *Or.* 7.225. Cf. E. Norden, *Jahrbuch für classischen Philologie* (1982), 313; and V. Emeljanow, *Mnemosyne* 18 (1965), 182-184.

τῆς ἐκτὸς καλλιφωνίας**:** on the simplicity of Biblical style, criticized by Pagans like Celsus, as a virtue, cf. Riedweg *Ad graecos* 490, with parallels. Steneker, 75f, points out the (not intended) irony that this praise of simplicity is expressed in a highly rhetorical style (e.g. the preposition between the article and the substantive, a literary ornament, which would disappear with Marcovich's correction, following Arcerius, of ἐκτὸς τῆς). The paradox shows the fusion, somewhat contradictory this time, of Christian traditional topics with neo-Attic form.

77.2: τὸ ᾆσμα τὸ σωτήριον: Clement goes back to the initial metaphor by associating the song of the Sbyll to that of the Logos described in Chapter I. He quotes *Or. Sib.* fr. 1 vv. 28-35. The same lines are quoted in Thph. *Autol.* 2.36, and line 15 in *Strom.* 5.115.5, as *pendant* of *Deut.* 6.4 and 6.13 (which is here quoted in 8.80.4). Clement is redistributing the same material he will use in in *Strom.* V (cf. introduction).

The Sibylline verses are very similar to the *Testament of Orpheus* (*OF* 377, quoted in 7.74.4) in the conception of God who brings good and evil alike. But even more striking are the similarities of form and content with *OF* 545, two lines of an Orphic *Hymn to the Sun* quoted by Ps.-Justin's *Cohortatio ad Graecos*. Apart from the use of solar terminology, the expressions εἷς θεός... τί δὴ καθ' ἕν ἐξαγορεύω; are practically identical to the line quoted only by Ps.-Justin after another line which is also

transmitted by Macrobius. The similarity supports the idea that the second line of *OF* 545 is an apologetic addition by Ps.-Justin, perhaps taking as model this Sibylline Orale which he would know from the anthologies. This seems more likely than the other possibility, i. e. that the Sibylline Oracle had been composed using the Orphic poem as model.

77.3: ἐνθέως: the Sibyll precedes the other prophets because of her chronological priority according to the traditional dating which made her the most ancient of Pagan poets and Biblical prophets (cf. 2.27.4-5). Commenting her verses Clement is able to allude to the two main ideas which will occupy the last part of his work: that one must choose between good and evil (described with the light / darkness metaphor, cf. 84.6, cf. *Strom.* 5.78.3) and that this choice implies always an ethical behaviour (cf. 11.115, 11.117, introduction p. 13). "Only through the practice of truth (χρήσει τῆς ἀληθείας) falsehood is forced to flee".

78.1-2: ἐν Ἰερεμίᾳ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα: this explicit statement of the inspiration of the prophets through the Holy Spirit, emphasized through a rhetorical rectification ("Jeremiah, or, better, the Holy Spirit through him) aims at distinguishing the indirect inspiration of the Greeks in previous chapters (cf. 7.70.1)

ἐπιδείκνυσι τὸν θεόν: these first three prophetic quotations talk about God's greatness. *Jr* 23.23-24: in this context the quotation proclaims God's omnipotence as in *Strom.* 5.119.3 (and Iren. *Haer.* 4.19.2, Eus. *PE* 7.11.5.): elsewhere Clement uses it to justify allegorical interpretation, since God sees all hidden things (*Strom.* 2.5.4-5, 5.64.3). *Is* 40.12 is quoted in *Strom.* 5.125.1 as *pendant* of *OF* 691 (cf. Herrero 174f); and *Is* 64.1-2, 66.1 is also in *Strom.* 5.124.2, as *pendant* of *OF* 378. The order of the three last quotations in the *Protrepticus* is inverse in the *Stromata*.

78.3-4: περὶ τῶν εἰδώλων: after the prophecies concerning God's power, the turn is for the condemnation of idols, which have been denounced by Clement himself in the previous chapters: animals, and natural elements, and the cosmos itself. Clement's swift style confuses quotations from Isaiah, Jeremiah and the NT: in 78.3, Jr. 8.2, 34.20, 4.26 (not Isaiah, as the expression "this prophet" seems to imply, probably by mistake). And in 78.4, three prophetic expressions of very similar content are mixed: Is. 51.6, Is. 40.8 and Mt. 24.35.

79.1-2: δεικνύναι ὁ θεὸς βουληθῇ διὰ Μωυσέως: Moses entries now as prophet by whom God speaks. There is an ascendent gradation from the Sibyll, to this

climax with the clearest revelation given by God himself. Not only was Moses considered the author of the *Pentateuch*, but the passage quoted (*Dt.* 32.39, also in *Strom.* 5.126.4) is the revelation of God to him in the burning bush.

συνθιασώτας τοῦ Μωϋσέως: the "prophetic choir" is also mentioned in 1.2.2, 1.8.2, 9.88.3, and 12.119.2. Cf. also *Strom.* 7.78.6, 7.80.2, 7.87.3, and precedents in Ign. *Eph.* 4.2, *Rom.* 2.2. The image of the thiasos, also present in the latter text, is taken from Philo (*Sacr.* 7, *De conf. ling.* 44). It anticipates the Bacchic metaphors of the *peroratio*, and at the same time highlights the centrality of Moses among the prophets. As a thiasos or a choir has its guide in the middle, so some prophetic quotations preceded Moses, and others follow him.

διὰ Ὠσηέ: under the name of Oseas Clement links different prophecies: *Am.* 4.13 is literally the sentence in the LXX, but then it is followed by a mixture of *Os.* 13.4 and *Is.* 48.13. The same mixture appears in *Strom.* 5.126.5.

79.3-4: φωνή: the voice (recalling chapter I) which sounds now is again Isaiah (45.19-20 and 25.21-23). The only sentence omitted (with the locution εἶθ᾽ ὑποβάς instead) would deviate the subject (it dwells on the rightness of oracles), and Clement maintains a fix purpose while quoting these lines: the words of Isaiah are a direct exhortation to conversion, and Clement just gives the word to him.

79.5-6: εἰδωλολάτραις δυσχεραίνει: like in 78.3-4, the proclamation of the One God is followed by the critique of idols: three more quotations of Isaiah threat with the destructions of idols (*Is* 40.18-19, also quoted in *Strom.* 5.117.3-4, *Is* 10.10-11 and 10.14, also quoted in *Strom.*5.127.3). Clement warns sarcastically that idolatric people will suffer the punishments and not the idols themselves, "for matter is without sensation". In the *Protrepticus*, punishments for those who do not convert are always superficially mentioned, since the work focuses on salvation, but their existence is constantly reminded (e.g. 2.22.2.).

80.1-2: τί <δ᾽ εἰ> σοι: P has τί σοι, which has a possible but awkward sense ("why do I proclaim?"), and lacks the usual Greek particle in second position. I think this conjecture a better option than Marcovich's τι <δ᾽ οὐ> σοι or Stählin's <ἔ>τι σοι, for it is more consistent with the τί δὲ ὅταν of 79.1 and is a typically Clementine expression (cf. 2.12.1).

σοφίας ἀναγγέλλω μυστήρια καὶ ῥήσεις: "the wise son of the Hebrew" is Salomon, the alleged author of the following sentences from the *Book of Proverbs*,

traditionally attributed to him (*Prov*. 8.22, 2.6, 6.9, 6.11). Calling them "mysteries" means that through the metaphorical use of the word it has turned to have a positive meaning (cf. 11.111.2). Here it prepares the great metaphors of Chapter XII. Clement comments the quotations with some light-imagery (λυχνός, ἐπάγων τὸ φῶς) which has Biblical roots (*Prov*. 20.27, *Ps*. 118.105), and is as usual associated to the mystery references (*Protr*. 2.22.6-7, 12.118-120).

80.3. ἀνορθοῖ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν: *Jer* 10.12: also quoted in *Strom*. 5.127.3 (as proof of the Biblical inspiration of OF 377), and by Theoph. *Autol*.2.35. Clement's interpretation of the passage again makes the equivalence between the cosmos and man, and the "straighting up" (ἀνώρθωσεν) of the universe is taken as the "straighting up" men from the deviated ways of the idols to that of truth.

80.4: αὕτη πρώτη τοῦ παραπτώματος ἀνάστασις: the subject is still "the wisdom". "This is the first resurrection" is a quotation from Ap. Joh. 20.5, which Clement adapts to mean ascent from the Fall of Man (from an apocalyptic model to a "Gnostic" one). In the frame of the *Protrepticus*, it is conversion to truth out of idolatry, which implicitly means there will be a second resurrection which will bring us out of other consequences of the Fall (e. g. flesh and mortality).

The quotations of *Dt*. 6.4 and 6.13 are joint together in *Strom*.5.115.5 as source of Timaeus of Locri's affirmation of the unity of the divine (Test. 7 Marg) and just before *Syb. Or*. 1.28.31 quoted in *Protr*. 8.77.2. Here Clement focuses in the second part of the quotation, reject of idolatry. The fact that the *Stromata* join two quotations which here appear separate prove that the redistribution is by no means mechanic.

80.5: ψαλμῳδὸν... Δαβίδ: the series of Old Testament quotations closes with David and his Psalms. *Ps*. 2.12 is also partially quoted in *Strom*. 5.85.1. Here it is a longer quotation, which again exhorts to have faith in God with promises of blessing (μακάριοι..) and threats of condamnation (μὴ ἀπολεῖσθε ἐξ ὁδοῦ). The latter sentence collaborates to the metaphor of the journey which is the axis of the concept of conversion (cf. introduction p. 9).

81.1: σωτήριον... μέλος: the epithet "saviour" had been applied to the song (ᾆσμα) in 6.3 and 77.2. Now the word changes within the same metaphor to "melody", perhaps because it is more adequate to be compared to a rhythmic war-march (ἐμβατήριον ῥυθμόν). The comparison may come from the vocative of Ps. 4.3, which does remind the traditional beginning of exhortative poems and discourses.

81.2: Clement cedes the word to Paul ("the Apostle" cf. 2.23.2, 5.65.4) quoting *Rom* 1.21, 23, 25, to dwell on the topic of chapter IV-V, i.e. the deification of images and elements. Cf. *Strom.* 6.149.1.

81.3: ἐν ἀρχῇ: Clement uses *Genesis* 1.1 to contrast God's creation of Heaven with the adoration of Heaven itself. He does not refer to the Uranos of the theogonies, but to the philosophical allegories which identified the gods with natural elements. He is recalling the topics of chapter V and profits from the philosophical connotations of *arché*. He quotes *Gn*.1.1 in other contexts (*Strom.* 5.93.4, 6.58.1, *Ecl. proph.* 3.1) for other purposes, more theological and less apologetic.

81.4: αὗται γὰρ αἱ προφητικαὶ φωναί: the theme of Heaven is followed with the quotation from "the prophet". According to A. Resch, *Agrapha : aussercanonische Schriftfragmente*, Leipzig 1906, 327f, followed by Stählin, this quotation comes from a "christlich interpolierte Ezechiel" which would have entered in the *Apocalypsis Petri*. But the text seems a fusion of diverse *Old Testament* prophecies (*Is*.3.10, *Ez.* 32.7, *Mt.* 24.29, *Is.* 34.4, *Ps.* 103.2, *Joel* 2.10). Steneker, 96, agrees with Mondésert *ad loc* in calling this "un vrai pot-pourri" which he attributes to a (mis)quotation by heart, like in 78.2, 78.3, 78.4 or 92.3. Perhaps the explanation in plural, "these are the prophetic voices", aknowledges the plurality of sources in this passage and at the same time, justifies its apocalyptic tone.

Chapter IX

After the quotations from Pagan philosophers (VI) and poets (VII), and of the Biblical prophets (VIII) announcing the Christian God, this chapter inaugurates the last part of the *Protrepticus*, and starts the exhortative tone which is characteristic of the *refutatio* which will culminate in chapter XII. The beginning of the final part can be perceived in the presence of some elements present in Chapter I (84.1-2, 88.2-3), a sign of the *Ringkomposition* which marks the closure of the circle.

At the same time, there is a certain continuity with the previous chapter, because this one is composed mainly of a row of quotations from the *NT*, as chapter VIII was built on quotations of the *OT*. There are three main themes: the fatherhood of God over men, which makes Christians his legitimate children; threat of punishment as a valid way of obtaining conversion, as a good father educates his children through a variety of ways including threat; and an exhortation to piety. The first two are based on the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, and the last part is built over the *Epistle of Timotheos*. There are also some scattered references to the words of Jesus in the Gospels (which are quoted as the Lord himself speaking, instead of his interpreter "the Apostle", cf. 87.3-4) and to the Psalms. But these quotations are integrated in the exegesis of the two Epistles which is the backbone of the chapter, which sometimes even takes the form of a commentary: citation followed by explanation. If the quotations of the previous chapters seemed to derive mainly from anthologies, this exegesis of Pauline letters is no doubt Clement's own original work. In his line of presenting Christianity to educated Pagans, he mixes along his Scriptural exegesis some Greek images and famous sentences, from Homer, Plato and Pythagorean philosophy.

The chapter can be divided in three parts: God's fatherhood, the convenience of his threat of punishment, and his gift of θεοσέβεια. The tone of the chapter is positive and encouraging. References to Paganism are already few and vague at this stage of the work, and the focus is on the Logos and the salvation he brings. Even when talking about punishment, Clement stresses more the fact that God can save from punishment than the actual threat posed by it.

The legitimate children of God

82.1: μυρίας ἂν ἔχοιμί σοι γραφάς: the infinite books that could be alleged as proof is a Biblical commonplace: cf. *Jn* 21.25. It is combined with the quotation of *Lc*. 16.17 (or *Mt*. 5.18) adducing their eternal validity: cf. Clem. fr. 58 (Stählin III, p. 227.7). Two other quotations follow to reinforce the idea: *Is*.1.20, Prov. 3.11 (also in *Paed*. 1.78.4, *Strom*. 1.32.2). This introduction is valid both for the second chapter and for this one, both dedicated to Scriptural exegesis.

82.2: πατὴρ δὲ ὡς ἤπιος: the Homeric expression (*Od*. 2.47, 234; 5.12) was a classical quotation to praise paternal virtue (Ps-Plut. *Vit. Hom*. 182, Stob. *Flor*. 4.7.8). Clement contraposes it, not unsurprisingly, to the behaviour of a teacher (διδάσκαλος), a landlord (κύριος) and a god (θεός: i. e. a Pagan god, since there is no definite article). These three are titles which he applies elsewhere to the Christian God. It is an example of how the rhetorical tone changes the meaning of words in Clement's work. It is the exact antithesis to 2.41.1 where Pagan gods were pointed at as unable to correct men because of their own scandalous behaviour.

82.3: Clement uses the attitude before the Logos to contrapose Moses (*Dt*. 9.19, *Hbr*. 12-21) and his reader (addressed with a forceful σὺ δέ..., cf. introduction n. 40). The repetition of questions with οὐ and the succession of participles which end up with a final clause give a very emphatic tone to the contraposition of the two fundamental concepts of this last part: χάρις and κρίσις (cf. 12.123.2) The exhortative tone is progresively rising, marking a clear difference with the monotony of previous chapters.

82.4: ὦ νεολαία ἡ ἐμή: by calling his audience "youths" Clement is taking the role of an aged teacher of young men. It does not point so much to the real situation – since Clement was not old when he wrote this work and we have no clue about the age of his audience– than to his continuation of the philosophical tradition of the protreptic discourse, addressed by philosophers to young men to persuade them to join their school. He connects this Greek tradition with the following Christian theme:

ὄντως ὄντα πατέρα: cf. 2.23.1 on this kind of expression. Through the quotation of *Mt*.18.3 (fused with *Jn*.3.5) he introduces the subject of men as children of God, and God's fatherhood. And he links this becoming like children to baptism with the verb ἀναγεννηθῆτε (to be reborn), as in *Strom*. 3.88.1.

82.5: τῷ ξένῳ... πολιτευθῇ: the Pagan is a foreigner and through baptism he becomes a citizen of the Kingdom of Heaven. Clement profits from that expression in the last quotation (Mt.18.3) to introduce a new metaphor, that of citizenship (cf. *Philipp.* 3.20 and 10.92.3, 10.108.4). It is immediately linked to the family metaphor which comes just next. The link is easy through the extended analogy between state and family, and even easier when it is the kingdom of God the Father.

τῷ γνησίῳ: to become citizen is the same than to join the legitimate son. For the metaphors of legitimacy and bastardy in this passage cf. A.-J. Festugière, *RSPhTh* 20 (1931), 482 and Galloni 95. Cf also 2.22.3, and generally on the kinship metaphors in Clement, Buell and Herrero, *Actas del XI Congreso de la SEEC I*, Madrid 2005, 637-646. The supplement <υἱῷ> proposed by Marcovich seems unnecessary, since γνήσιος in this context, along with the citation of *Mt.* 3.17, clearly points to the "legitimate son". Cf. 98.4 and *Strom.* 5.84.2.

82.6-7: πρωτότοκος ἐκκλησία: though the wording is somewhat different, the passage is clearly patterned on Hb.12.22-23. The mixing (already present in the Epistle) of two images, that of legitimacy and of being first-born, results in being "legitimate friends of the first-born" (τοῦ πρωτοτόκου γνήσιοι φίλοι). Yet through assimilation with the Son, just as he is called "the legitimate", all Christians are also "first-born" (and also the Church, adds Clement turning into a nominative epithet the genitive of the Epistle). The reason is that they are "the first" to turn out from the Devil and approach God. In spite of the apparent accumulation of concepts and the swift style, thee images have perfect internal consistence.

83.1-2: ἐκ δούλων υἱοὺς ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι: after a chiastic contraposition of men and God (ἀθεώτεροι... φιλανθρωπότερος ὁ θεός) Clement calls the Pagans "slaves" (cf. 1.3.1). He ends up the generative metaphor by opposing "slaves" (as foreigners and bastards before) to "children". Thus he connects the previous images with a more classic one, from St. Paul (2. Cor.7.10).

εἰς θάνατον ὑποφέρεσθε: the series of oppositions is freedom / slavery, salvation / death, life / punishment. The ordination of the last four seems chiastic. This stenghtens the case Stählin's resolution of the abbreviation in P ανον, i. e., θάνατον, preferable to the resolution ἄνθρωπον of A. J. Festugière (*RScPhTh* 20 (1931), 476-82), followed by Galloni 100 n. 30. It shows an expressive contrast of the philological and rhetorical analysis against a theological one (cf. Mondésert *ad loc.*: "la correction e

Stählin ou celle de Sylburg sont conformes au vocabulaire de Clément et, dans leur plus grande banalité, défendables"). Both resolutions can be easily explained paleographically, so they are in any case superior to Sylburg's ἀπώλειαν (based on the parallel with 10.101.1).

ὑμεῖς δέ τὴν κόλασιν: Clement underlines the free choice of Pagans, who consciously take the second option when they are offered the first one, and recalls the fire prepared for the Devil and his angels (*Mt.* 25.41). This is the link to the next theme.

The threat of punishment

83.3: the lengthy quotation of *Eph*. 4.17-19 is a favourite passage of Clement, who also quotes it in *Strom.* 1.88.3, 2.75-1, 7.12.5, 7.39.5, to refer to the error of Pagans. Its exhortative tone in 2nd person plural, and the initial verb μαρτύρομαι (cf. next point) make it easily adaptable to Clement' discourse.

84.1-2: μάρτυρος ἐλέγχοντος: the ubiquitous judicial metaphor comes up again (cf. 2.12.1) inevitably when punishment of sin is going to be the main subject. Yet the following lines stress the fact that God makes all possible efforts to save men. Cf. very similar expressions in 1.6.2, 10.94.1.

τοῦ σκότους: the image of light vs. obscurity reappears in relation to Christ's power to save from death (*Eph*. 5-14, cf. A. Resch, *Agrapha*, Leipzig 1906, 32-34, who ascribes it to a "urchristlichen Jeremias-Buch"). He is again assimilated to the sun (cf. 11.119.8), and the quotation of *Ps*. 109.3, which in 1.6.3 was used to stress the chronological priority of the Logos over any other thing, is now used to underline the superiority of his life-giver shining (10.90.3, 10.117.4) over anything else.

84.3-4: που: the quotation of Ps. 94.8-11 is probably taken from *Hbr*. 3.7-11, which is quoted extensively in this section, though the verbal tag shows that Clement is conscious that the *Epistle* is quoting some OT passage. From this point to the end of 85.2 the passage is freely reproduced in the Byzantine *Catena* of *Hbr*. 4.10.

84.5: χάριν εἰς ὀργὴν μεταλλάσσομεν: as exegesis of the last passages, Clement exhorts his audience (after a forceful anaphora with ὁρᾶτε) appealing to the common sense of not "changing grace into wrath". The verb expresses his optimistic view: Grace is the natural disposition of God, who will try all means, including threat, to avoid turning it into wrath against the sinners.

ἐὰν σήμερον τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσωμεν: the conditional reminds that salvation cannot be automatic. The mention of the voice of the Logos recalls the musical images of chapter I, and the "today" connects with the next sentence.

σήμερον: Clement quotes freely Hbr. 3.13 (ἄχρις οὗ σήμερον καλεῖται), but in his exegesis he includes the word αὔξεται, which gives a much more optimistic tone to the threat. The "today" and the learning (μάθησις) stay until the end of times (μέχρι συντέλειας), when (τότε) the "true today" (ὄντως, cf. 2.23.2) comes. So there is time to be saved. But this eschatological interpretation of God's today is overtaken by a more general one, according to which God's today is eternal, and therefore is not only future but also present. Conversion has to be "now" because God's "today" is always (τοῖς αἰῶσι). This exegesis comes directly from Philo, who comments in similar terms *Gn.* 35.4 (*Leg. alleg.* 3.25, *De fuga et inv.* 57).

84.6: ἀΐδιος· αἰών<ων>: this is the plausible solution of Jackson, accepted by Stählin, to the MSS reading (also in the *Catena*) ἀΐδιος αἰών ἐστιν εἰκών, which coordinates too many nominatives. It is paleographically superior to the old solution of Arcerius, accepted by Marcovich: ἀϊδίου αἰῶν<ος>.

ὑπακούωμεν: the quotation of Hbr.3.15 had ἀκούω, but with the prefix Clement keeps the musical metaphor of "listening to the Logos' voice" while loading it with a more imperative sense "to obey". Cf. 8.77.3, 11.13.5.

φῶς: the "today" (σήμερον) is turned into the day (ἡμέρα), two concepts which are close both conceptually, etymologically and phonetically, and thus is connected with the image of light again. Philo in *Leg. Alleg.* 3.167, on which this passage is obviously inspired, has similar a similar expression: "the day is symbol of light, the light is education of the soul".

85.1: ὑπακούουσιν: the theme of obedience gives the entry to insist one more time the right of God to threat the disobedient. The Pauline quotations continue (1 *Tm* 1.14, *Hebr.* 3.10), and then a typically Clementine associative excurse about John the Baptist, through the theme of the paths of the Lord (cf. 9.9). The allusion is to *Mt.* 3.3, but instead of the text of the Gospel ἑτοιμάζειν, Clement uses εὐτρεπίζειν. For Steneker 22, it is not a misquotation, but Clement's purposeful replacement to make a phonetic effect with εὐθείας ποιεῖν.

85.2: διαδόχῳ: The commentary to the *Epistle to the Hebrews* ends up with the remembrance of the fulfillment of the threat against the unfaithful Hebrews in the desert

(*Nu.* 14.21-24, which is also recalled in *Hbr*.3.19). The succesor of Moses was Josuah (Ἰησοῦς), who led Israel into the promised land. Yet Clement, playing with the homonymy, seems to imply that the successor of Moses who can save is really Jesus (called with this name only in 12.120 and 12.122), which is also the message of the Epistle. That is why he says that what happened to the Hebrews in the desert was "symbolical" (αἰνιγματωτῶς).

The Logos brings *theosebeia*

85.3: παρακαλεῖ..παράκλητον: the etymological game is obvious (Steneker, 15), yet Clement profits from it to underline the role of the Holy Spirit which brings knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις, cf. 1 *Tm.*2.4).

θεοσέβεια: the key concept of Clement's proposal (cf. introduction p. 9), is now given the authority of a Pauline definition (1 *Tm* 4.8).

85.4-86.1: ὠνήσασθαι: this is the lesson of the MSS, kept by Marcovich, instead of changing like Jackson and Stählin to ὠνήσασθε (a very easy scribal mistake). In the original lesson the verb depends on ὁμολογήσατε ("how much would you agree, oh men, to sell it for?") while the emendation makes both verbs independent ("how much (come to an agreement, oh men) woul you sell it for?"). Stylistically perhaps the latter is somewhat superior, but it does not seem enough ground to change the text.

Πακτωλόν: on this famous Lydian river which brought gold-dust from mount Tmolos, cf. Hdt. 5.101, Nonn. *Dion*. 11.17. Rather than Clement's own original comparison, it might have been a popular expression.

μισθός: the price for life (= salvation) needs not to be gained elsewhere, it is an inner treasure, love and faith. The theme of "buying" one's salvation (with a τιμή) is a traditional theme in Biblical tradition (Mt. 16.26) and in Greek religion (e. g. the Pelinna leaf, *OF* 480). Here it could be framed in Clement's appeal to common sense: salvation is a great deal. Cf. 11.115, where the theme is developed. The quotation of 1 *Tm*. 4.10 aims to show God's good will to save men.

86.2: περιπεφυκότες τῷ κόσμῳ οἷα φυκία τινα ἐνάλοις πέτραις: the expressive image to describe the non-believers as growing in the world like seaweed on a rock is inspired from Plat. *Resp*. 10.611d. But Clement strengthens it through a complex phonetic play (Steneker, 22) of chiastic structure (φυκότες... φυκία, ἄλλοι... ἐνάλοις, περι... πέτραις).

ὁ Ἰθακήσιος γέρων: the following line refers to *Od*. 1.57-59. Odysseus is called "old man" (the same unusual expression in Method. *De autexusio* 1.1) in reference to the moment when he has spent seven years with Calypso and would die to see the smoke of his own land (θανέειν ἱμείρεται). Clement contraposes his death and his smoke to the light and life of the true heavenly land. I have found no parallels for this interpretation.

ἐξομοιοῦσα τῷ θεῷ κατὰ τὸν δυνατόν: the idea of the "assimilation to God" (ὁμοίωσις θεῷ) appears here for the first time, with the limitation ("as far as this is possible") which keeps the distinction between divine and human nature, and which echoes exactly Plat. *Theet*. 176b1. In later references to the concept (cf. 12.122.4 with other references to the *Stromata*) that precaution will be abandoned, perhaps because Clement considers it self-evident. Cf. M. L. Amerio, *Inv Luc* 1 (1979), 7-37.

διδάσκαλον: God as teacher of θεοσέβεια is the theme of the next paragraphs. Coming back to θεοσέβεια after the images of buying salvation and of Odysseus helps to keep straight the line of the argument.

87.1-2: σὺ δέ, ὦ Τιμόθεε: the citation of 2 *Tm*. 3.15-17, brought in as proof of the sanctity of Scriptures, includes the vocative Timotheos (not in our NT) firstly to specify the source, but also because Clement, a great admirer of the possibilities of etymology (cf. 2.12.1) wants to profit from the literal meaning of the name ("that who honours God"). Between the first versicle and the other two of the quotation, Clement makes a rhetorical amplification of the sanctifying and divinizing power of Scripture.

87.3-4: τῶν ἄλλων ἁγίων: "saints" is a usual denomination of Christians in the *NT*: *Act*. 9.13, 32, 41; *Rm*. 1.7, 1*Cor* 1.2, 16.1.

ἔργον μόνον: "He has no other task than to save man". This is a favourite expression of Clement (cf. *Paed*. 1.81.3, *Strom*.6.46.1).

ἔγγικεν: the quotation of Mt. 4.17, as the following one of *Phil*. 4.5, aim to convert, as Clement aknowledges, through menace (φόβῳ, cf. 9.84.1, 10.95).

εὐλαβεῖσθε μὴ καταληφθῶμεν κενοί: this sentence is not found in the *Epistle to the Philippians*, in spite of the continuity with the quotation of *Phil*. 4.5. Nor can it be found in the rest of the *NT*. Similar thoughts in *Mt* 25.28-29, *Lc* 19.24-26, 1*Cor* 15.58. Cf. A. Resch, *Agrapha*, Leipzig 1906, 291. Perhaps Clement knew an unusual text of the *Epistle to the Philippians*, which would explain his unusual specification that "the Apostle is addressing the Macedonians".

ἀδεεῖς, μᾶλλον δὲ ἄπιστοι: fear is equated along this chapter with faith, since the *timor Dei* is seen as positive. Cf. the commentary to the previous sentence.

88.1: εἰσάξει... διδάξει... παιδαγωγήσει: Casey 58, puts forward this sentence as representative of Clement's attitude towards the Scripture: "faith will lead the way, experience will teach, Scripture will instruct". It is also the same thought which inspires Clement's trilogy (cf. introduction p. 4.). Three quotations from *Psalm* 33 (vv. 9, 12, 13) are commented by Clement in a psalmodic way, with these parallelistic constructions helped by phonetic correspondences (also προσκυνεταί... ζηλωταί). The praising of the *timor Dei* is the link with the previous paragraph.

88.2: ἀκούσατε... ἐπιλάμπει: the Logos is to be both heard and seen. Voice and light are the two main images of the whole work. The proverbial expression of *Is*. 57.19 (=Eph. 2.17) expresses the universality of God's salvation, inteded for everybody.

Κιμμέριος: reference to *Od*.11.14ff, where Cimmerians are said to live in perpetual night. Their obscurity was proverbial: Plutarch (*Superst*. 10) says that they deny the existence of the sun. Christians took it as image of Pagan blindness (Lact. *DI* 5.3.23).

παλιγγενεσίαν: this word meant usually "reincarnation" but the "new birth" for Clement means conversion, as he has explained in 9.82.4. He uses it also in *Strom*. 2.147.2, *QDS* 42.15. The word also introduces the Pythagorean terminology of the next sentences.

ἀγάπην: the word for "love" seems here to have already turned to mean "banquet" out of the brotherly meetings of the first Christians. Cf Lampe, *s. v.*, and *Jd* 12, Ign. *Ep. ad Rom.* 7.3, *Ep. ad Smyrn.* 8.2. The banquet of the blessed was a classical image for salvation, specially in Orphic-Pythagorean contexts (cf. Plat. *Resp.* 363c, Emp. fr. 147 DK). Pythagorean tone starts to impregnate this last paragraph. Stählin makes also a conjecture, ἀγέλην (herd), supported by the parallels in 12.116.1, *Paed.* 2.25.3, *Strom.* 1.156.3, 1.169.2, which would refer to Jn 10.16. Cf. also comment on μόναδα below on the implications of ἀγάπην.

οἱ πολλοί: this term is classically disdainful to mean the crowd as opposed to the few select. Clement uses it in contraposition to the unity in God, expressed insistently in these two sentences. Christians use frequently this kind of disdainful plurals to refer to Pagans: cf. M. Herrero, *Rev phil anc* 24.2 (2005), 55-74.

μόναδα: this word culminates the row of terminology referring to unity (μίαν, μοναδικῆς, ἕνωσιν, ἑνότητα). Galloni 115 shows that the "one love acording to the union of the only substance" is a veiled reference to the Trinity. Though the unity of Christians in God had Biblical roots (cf. Jn 17.21-23), Clement is introducing philosophical terminology into the Christian formulation of this unity. Though Neoplatonists will also use it, this was a classical Pythagorean theme. Pythagoreans had established the superiority of the unity over the multiple (Arist. *Met.* A5 486a 22 (DK 58 b5)). Clement will follow this trend enthusiastically (*Paed.* 1.71.1, *Strom.* 6.87.2). On Pythagoreanism in Clement, cf. M. Tardieu, *Vig. Christ.* 28 (1974), 241-247.

88.3: ἐκ πολυφφωνίας... ἁρμονίαν: musical images (συμφωνία also) to express unity fit both the Pythagorean flavour of these last paragraphs and the musical metaphors of Chapter I, which are recurrently reminded throughout the whole work.

χορηγῷ: Jackson's conjecture is clearly superior to the reading in P χορευτῇ, though the latter would syntactically make sense: the expression χορηγός καὶ διδασκάλος applied to the Logos (also in *Strom.* 5.7.8) reunites both the musical images and the didactic role of the Word which has been explained in this chapter. It gives perfect sense to the following ἀναπαυομένη as if the chorus rested after the performance. Cf. also 8.79.2.

Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ: this may have been a formula used in the Alexandrian Christian community to invoke God: cf. M. L. Amerio, *AugR* 16 (1976), 291-316. The reminding of this classical Christian expression to call God "Father" (*Mc* 14.36, *Rm* 8.15, *Gal* 4.6; also in *Ecl. Proph.*19.2; *Strom.* 3.11.78.4-5) links the end of the chapter repeating the procreative images at the beginning which insisted on God's fatherhood (82-83: cf. Galloni 102). Thus Clement achieves an internal circular composition.

Chapter X

This is the longest chapter in the *Protrepticus* and probably the richest in content. It holds together most of the subject-matters of the work, calling back some points that have already been treated, developing many other ones which will be kept until the end of the work. It is the culmination of the argumentative part. The emphatic tone is growing, since the *peroratio* is approaching, and some of the themes in the *exordium* reappear announcing the closing of the work (*Ringkomposition*). The vocatives and direct adresses to his audience rise in a considerable proportion (Steneker 125f.). The number of quotations is still high, mostly from the NT; there are also Psalms and prophecies, Greek philosophers (specially Plato) and some from Greek poets with a purely ornamental function. Metaphors and similes, be them developments of earlier ones or new images, are abundant and forceful. The large influence of Platonic themes is clearly perceivable here.

The chapter begins with a harsh attack on custom, seen as the root of all problems, since it holds man in the idolatry which previous chapters have demonstrated as false (89-90). Since it is related to the themes of chapter I, the attack is also followed by the proclamation of God's ability to liberate man (91-92) and an exhortation to conversion (93-96.3). Then Clement launches a new attack against the idols (96.4-99.2), after which he exhorts again to stop adoring things belonging to matter and turn to contemplation of the heavenly world (99.3-100.4). The theme goes on into an exhortation to wake up from sleep (101.1-2), which is followed by an attack against the divinization of concepts (102), the contraposition of the true knowledge (of God) against ignorance (103-106), and a final proclamation of the true life (i.e. salvation) given by God (107-110). There is, therefore, a clear alternating of criticism, proposal, and exhortation. That technique not only avoids monotony. It also turns this chapter into a summary of the whole work.

Diatribe against custom

89.1: παραδεδομένον ἔθος: Clement attacks the core of Greek religion: ancestral tradition. Respect of tradition was a commonplace among practitioners (the expression τὰ παραδεδομένα, "the transmitted things", is ubiquitous in ritual inscriptions) and amont theorists of Paganism (e. g. Isocr. *Aeropag*. 7.30; Cic. *ND* 3.5).

Therefore Clement can well address his audience with "you say" (φατε), which is an argument for his addressing some Pagan theorist like Celsus. Cf. S. E. Alcock *et al.*, *Pausanias*, Oxford 2001, for the valutation of custom in 2ⁿᵈ cent. Paganism and, for Clement's attack to it, L. Lugaresi*, Adamantius* 9 (2003), 10-29. Other apologetic criticisms against custom in Iust. *Apol*.1.49.6, Ps.-Iust. *Cohort*. 1.1, 35.2; Min. Fel. *Oct*. 6.1; Arn. *Adv. Nat*. 2.66; Eus. *PE* 2.2.2; Lact. *DI* 2.6.7. L. Alfonsi, *VigChr* 18 (1964) 32-36, argues that the attack on custom is typical of the genre, be it directly Aristotelean, be it through Stoic and Poseidonian mediation (cf. Cic. *Hort*. 64, 65, 66; Seneca *De ira*, 2.19-22).

καὶ τί δή...: as refutation to the Pagan defence of custom Clement makes three rhetorical questions. The second one on paternal heritage being broadened is a classical idea (Plat. *Resp*. 1.330ab, Eurip. fr. 282.6 Kannicht) used by Christians (Iust. *Apol*. 1.12.7; Ps.-Melit. *Apol*. 12). But this classical reference is surrounded by two images of a child sucking maternal milk and doing childish things, which seem Clement's own invention (cf. Buell on his frequent use of this kind of images). Perhaps he was influenced by passages like 1 *Cor* 13.11, which speak of the immaturity of the child as a previous state to mature faith.

89.2: παρεκβάσεις: the same image to depict Pagan cults is used in 2.27.1. It gives absolute sense to the emendation πάτων (Casel) or πλόων instead of παθῶν in P (defended by Galloni, p. 98 n.20, who translates "deviazione dovute alle passioni").

τὸν ὄντως ὄντα πατέρα: God's fatherhood (theorized in 9.82.4 with the same words) prevails over biological filiation if they come to be opposed, just as God prevails over Greek gods (the expression to assert his paternity is the same, cf.2.23.2). On this theme of the prevailing parternity, cf. Buell 104.

89.3: ἐμισήθη: this verb used metaphorically, with θεοσέβεια as subject, has a clear Christian flavour. Cf. Mt. 10.22, 24.9, *Ep. ad Diogn*. 5.11-17, Iust. *Apol*. 1.1.1, Tertull. *Apolog*. 1.4, 2.3, 4.1.

οὐ μείζων: Clement characterizes θεοσέβεια in the same way that Plato features philosophy (*Tim*. 47b1), as the greatest gift of god to men. Similar expressions in Cic. *Tusc*. 1.64, Sen. *Ep*. 90.1.

τοὺς χαλινοὺς ἐνδακόντες: the same expression in Plat. *Phaedr*. 254d7. It links the theme of being deaf (cf. 10.106.1) with that of the rider of the horse, a Platonic image adapted by Clement (cf. 12.121.3). Here the adaptation is even more radical,

since the opposition ὑμεῖς / ἡμεῖς (instead of rational mind / the irrational part of the soul) makes the Christians the riders of the Pagans to drive them along the right path.

90.1: ὑμῖν: Clement uses Soph. fr. 949 Radt (= 863 Nauck) to insult Pagans for their choice (ἐκλογῆς) of evil. Stobaeus also quotes the fragment (4.50.64), and the preceding line shows that it was not an imprecation, but a list of evils. But Clement seems to turn it into an expression similar to Epimen. fr. 1 DK, Hes. *Theog.* 26ss , which he also follows in 11.115.3.

οἱ ἀγαθοί: the side of "the good" is stressed through the repetition of the word three times in one sentence, while οἱ πονηροί will receive their punishment, which has fallen even to the King of Evil (τῷ γε ἄρχοντι τῆς κακίας). Othere allusions to Satan without naming him in 1.7.4-6, 1.8.1.

90.2-3: ἐκλεξάμενος: the quotation of *Zach.* 3.2 (cf. Iust. *Dial.* 79.4, 116.3) serves Clement to insist again on the free election of Pagans (10.95.1-2) of their own condemnation, described again with the threatening fire (cf. 2.22.5).

κατὰ τὸν θεόν, οὐ κατὰ τὸ ἔθος: the phonetic contraposition *ethos* / *theos*, typically Clementine (cf. 12.119.1), corresponds to the semantic opposition between δεισιδαιμονία and θεοσέβεια and death / life. The obvious reasonable choice between them is illuminated by the citation of Hes. *Op.* 218, in a similar tone to the last paragraph of the *Protrepticus* (12.123.2).

μετάνοιαν κενήν: He refers to the repentance after death, which would be useless for those who have deserved condemnation. On this theme of late repentance, cf. Iust. *Apol.* 1.52.9, *Dial.* 28.2 and Ps.-Iust. *Cohort* 35.2 (with Riedweg *ad loc*.).

The Lord offers salvation from human vices

91.1: τοὺς παρὰ τοῖς εἰδώλοις λατρεύοντας: the text needs no emendation (*pace* Heyse or Marcovich) because the construction λατρεύω παρά τινι is attested (Apollod. 2.6.3). The description which follows is prototypical of the ambulant priests, specially those of the Mother who castrated themselves. The features of these miserable *telestai* were topical since classical times (cf. 7.75.1). Clement follows this *topos* and criticizes their dirtiness, though in *Paed.* 3.47.4 he will advocate the Christians a moderate use of the bath. Cf. Luijuda 215.

τάφους τινὰς ἢ δεσμωτήρια: sanctuaries are defined as the mysteries were in 2.19.2. The contrapositions πενθεῖν / θρησκεύειν and ἔλεος / θεοσέβεια follow the

same direction of identifying Greek cults with death of those who receive cult (and by association, of those who adore them and are doomed to condemnation).

πενθεῖν... πεπονθότες: the etymological word-play with the same root is translated with another word-play by Mondésert ("menent une vie plus digne de pitié que digne de la vraie pieté") and Butterworth ("their condition provokes pity rather than piety"). Cf. Steneker 14.

91.2: δεσπότην τῶν πάντων: Clement adds this title to the usual κύριος. perhaps it is due to the image of fleeing from prison with which he is exhorting to conversion now. It follows the pattern of converting as changing from one patron to a new one, analysed by Z. Crook, *Reconceptualizing Conversion,* New York, 2004. The prisoner who was set free belonged to his liberator, who had bought him, perhaps due to a sense of piety (ἔλεος) or humanity (φιλανθρωπία).

91.3: ἡ μήτηρ ὄρνις: this beautiful comparison to illuminate God's love as a mother for his child has both a Biblical root (Is. 49.14) and classical form: the citation of *Il*. 2.315 turns it into a bird-mother, which allows for the opposition with the snake (θηρίον ἑρπηστικόν, cf. 1.7.4) and the moral lesson, since the bird (God) does not simply put the new-born back in the nest, but helps him to do it by himself (ἀναπτῆναι παρορμῶν). Cf. Orig. *CC* 4.91 with a similar expression. In *QDS* 37 God is also attributed motherly love. Buell 115f compares the passage with *Paed.* 1.21.1-2, 1.42.2, 1.49.4, 3.99.1.

92.1: κύνες... καὶ ἵπποι: after the image of the bird, Clement turns to comparisons with domestic animals (helped by a quotation of *Is*. 1.3), through which he insists in presenting God as δεσπότης (10.91.2). Cf. *Paed.* 1.77.3, 2.73.6, *Strom.* 5.54.1.

92.2: ἑτέρῳ δουλεύειν δεσπότῃ: the expression has Biblical roots (cf. Lc. 16.13) and it is the conclusion of the previous images, in accord with the notion of conversion studied by Crook (cf. 91.2) and with the ideas of 9.83.1-2, which opposed slaves against the creatures of God (with the Platonic word ἐπιγεγονότας, Plat. *Phaedr.* 245a5, cf. Butterworth, 205 n. 1). The contraposition βασιλεύς / τύραννος (cf. 4.49.2) comes out from classical political theory (Aristot. *Pol.* 1295a, 1310b).

92.3: τίς δέ: four anaphoric rhetorical questions draw dual oppositions which summarize previous themes: good / evil, God / daemons, son / slave, Heaven / Hell. It culminates in the prolamation of the heavenly citizen, also previously theorized (9.82.5,

cf. also *Philip*. 3.20, *Paed*. 1.45.2, 3.9.1, *Strom*. 3.95.2, 4.12.6), which is described here in Paradeisiac terms (*Gn* 2.15) with influence from the Platonic *Phaedrus* (246b7). The fountain is also in Jn 4.14 (cf. *Paed*. 1.83.3). The cloud and the rain of Elijah are mentioned in 1*Rg* 18.44-45 (cf. also Mt. 17.5). On this image of Clement from various sources (Mondésert *ad loc*: "galimatias"), cf. M. H. C. Puech, *RHR* 128 (1944), 166f.

92.4: βορβόρους: mud is linked to the image of pigs and the fragment of Heraclitus which follows, but also to the place for sinners in the eschatological tradition inherited by Christians (*Ap. Petr.* 8.23) from Orphism and Plato (*Phaed.* 69c, Plot. *Enn.* 1.6.6.5). Cf. M. Abineau, *Rev. Sc. Rel*. 47 (1959), 185-214.

ἀνονήτους καὶ ἀνοήτους: a typical phonetic word-play, cf. Steneker, 20.

ὑώδεις: pigs as symbol of lust is a commonplace, and its presence here is clearly linked to the comparisons of men and animals in chapter I (1.4.1, cf. *Paed*. 3.75.5, *Strom.* 1.2.2, 2.68.3, 5.51.3). The quoted fragments from Heraclitus fr. 13 DK (36 Marcovich) and Democritus (fr. 147 DK) were perhaps derivations from popular expressions (cf. 2 Pt 2.22). Stoics took pigs as symbol of vice (Cic. *ND* 2.160, Plut. *Symp*. 5.10.3). Cf. the bibliography on animals in Clement offered in 10.106.1.

92.5: τέκνα φωτὸς γνήσια... μὴ νόθους: Clement adds the epithet "legitimate" to the quotation of Eph. 5.8 to reinforce the opposition with the "bastards" who cannot look to the sun (as Aelian *NA* 2.26, 9.3 confirms the belief that the eagle does it to test the legitimacy of its offspring). On this theme, cf. 2.22.3, 9.82.1ff.

Exhortation to conversion

93.1: μεταστῶμεν ἐξ ἀμαθίας εἰς ἐπιστήμην: the sentence, with its two verbs with the preverb μετα- and its five complements with a parallel structure "from... to..." clearly shows the concept of conversion as a spacial movement from A to B. Cf. 1.2.1, 12.119.3 and introduction p. 10f.

93.2: καλὸς ὁ κίνδυνος: This famous sentence comes from Plato (*Phaedo* 114d6). It has been much imitated (cf. Hor. *Carm*. 3.25.18-19, also in religious context). The verb αὐτομολεῖν (cf. previous paragraph on the spatial movement), insists on the autonomy of the choice for God. The recompense for the right choice is illustrated by a quotation of Isaiah (54.7) which will be commented in the next lines (κληρονομία).

93.3: τὰ τῆς γῆς: these words are before λῃστής in P. Stählin deletes them, but Markland's transposition (followed by Marcovich and Mondésert) before ἔνθα

makes sense of "earth" as the place both where thieves can enter and where material things come from. The alliteration of the η is clear. The "heavenly treasure" is a Gospel image (Mt. 6.19-20, cf. *Strom.* 3.56.2, 3.86.3, 4.33.4).

φιλολόγους: F. Storelli, *Nicolaus* 8 (1980), 65-71 sees this expression as culmination of the journey from ignorance to wisdom: cf. Lampe *s. v.*

τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας πτερῷ: on the image of wings, cf. 10.106.3 (with Plat. *Phaedr.* 246e2, like in *Strom.* 5.83.1). Tat. *Orat.* 20.1.

94.1: κληρονομίαν: the word "inheritance" is repeated for the third time in few lines and followed by similar ones ("gift", "testament"). The paragraph insists in God's fatherhood with a well-known expression (9.82.1, 9.89.2). It culminates with a quotation of Is. 54.17 and 55.1, which introduce, as an advice from God, the theme of "drinking without money", developed in the next paragraphs.

94.2-3: λουτρόν: the previous quotations allow an allusion to baptism calling it salvation and φωτισμόν (cf. 11.113.5 φωταγωγείς).

ἀμισθεί: U. Neymeyr, *Die christlichen Lehrer nach Klemens von Alexandrien*, 1989, 95, sees this passage as evidence for the habit of gratuitous lessons of Christian religion. it is not very probable (rightly skeptical Pujiula 108) since it refers to the gratuitous salvation worth acquiring, which is repeated several times (11.115.1).

οὐ καπηλεύεται: cf. 2 *Cor* 2.17 and *Paed.* 3.79.2. The quotation of *Gn.* 1.28 underlines the gratuity of God's gift of nature. The theme of buying with money introduces again the difference between the legitimate son and the bastard (γνήσιος / νόθος). The bastard is defined with quotations from *Jn* 17.12, *Mt.* 6.24 (= *Lc.* 16.13). The legitimate son is portrayed through *Jn.* 5.17 and *Lv.* 25.23. Cf. Phil. *Cher.* 108, 119 and commentary to 2.22.3 and 9.82.5.

94.4: ἡ γραφὴ εὐαγγελίζεται**:** according to A. Resch, *Agrapha*, Leipzig 1906, 110-11 the verb indicated that the quotation would come from some Gospel. The quotation is similar to 1 Co 2.7 and 1 Co. 2.9, which are combined also in *Constit. Apost.* 7.32.5, and the Syriac work *Testamentum Jesu Christi* 11.16-20. Mondésert *ad loc.* adduces Orig. *Comm. in Matth.* 27.9 to suggest the *Apocalypse of Elijah*. The same theme of the novelty of Heaven for the eyes in 12.118.4. Cf. *Paed.* 1.37.1, 2.19.4, 3.86.2; *Strom.* 2.15.3, 4.114.1, 4.135.3; 5.40.1, 6.68.1. In any case, the final ἀμήν gives it the solemnity of an oration, linking it to some other passages of hymnic tone (e.g. 11.113.4).

95.1-2: φόβῳ καὶ χάριτι: threat of punishment and hope for salvation are the two ways of guiding to salvation defended by Clement (cf. *Strom*. 7.44.8). The same idea in 1.8.3 and 9.87.4.

τί δὲ οὐχ αἰρούμεθα: similarly to 93.2, a series of anaphorical rhetorical question emphasize the choice between both extremes. Clement insists in addressing a *homo optans* (cf. 10.90.2-3, 12.123.2) whose options are clear and self-evident, and can be summarized in life vs. death (hence the quotation of Dt. 30.15). This appealing to election is a resource typical of a deliberative discourse: cf. Lys. *Or*. 21.12, Dem. *Ol*. 1.1, *Or*. 18.190, 18.130; Ps.-Iust. *Cohort* 1.1, 35.1.

χάρις... κρίσις: this opposition, reminded in the last sentence of the *Protrepticus*, is drawn along with that of obedience /disobedience, using the quotation of *Is*. 1.19-20 as guideline. Cf. *Paed*. 3.86.2 and *Strom*. 1.90.1, 6.49.1.

νόμος ἀληθείας λόγος: the equation of nomos and logos goes back to 1.2.3.

95.3: σύμβουλος: the title Clement gives to himself is in clear conection with the συμβουλεύει of the previous paragraph, which shows that God tries by all means to save man. Therefore Clement is an agent of God's efforts to save people.

ἔμφυτον ἐπάγεσθαι πίστιν: The "natural law" which is inside men (αὐτόθεν οἴκοθεν) was a common philosophical concept (cf. Cic. *ND* 2.12, Sen. *Ep*. 117.6, Sext. Emp. *Adv. math*. 9.33, 9.61; Plut. *Stoic. rep*. 1041E; Dion Chrysost. *Or*. 12.39) which the Christians adapted calling it "faith" (Iust. *Apol*. 2.6.3, Tertull. *Apolog*. 17-4-6, Arnob. *Adv. Nat*. 2.3). Butterworth 201 spots a direct reference to Plat. *Phaedr*. 237c, talking about the natural instinct (ἔμφυτος ἐπιθυμία).

95.4: μεθύστεον... ὑβρίστεον: Clement follows up the argument of the obviousness of the election between good and evil. Drunkenness or anger are followed without reflexion, while one hesitates and calculates whether to follow God, when it should be the opposite. Apart from the intellectual reinforcement of the decision to convert, the paragraph contains a moral repproach of such behaviours. Cf. 10.101.1 on a metaphorical usage of drunkenness and sleep.

96.1: εἰ δὲ <μὴ> πείθεσθαι: Clement insists repeating the root of "faith" (πιστεύσατε, πίστις, πείθεσθαι), which he links ironically to the previous paragraph. I prefer Potter's emendation of the text (instead of P καί) to later proposals. The paleographic change is easily explainable, a negative sentence is logical with the beginning εἰ δέ, and it allows to keep intact two words in next line which in other

interpretations should be changed to introduce a mystery metaphor which does not fit the sense ("if you want to believe contemplating the clear faith of mysteries"): ἀρετῶν for ἀρρήτων (the ε for η is not usual) and ἐποπτεύσαντες for ὑποπτεύσαντες. (defended by Potter himself, though his first change does not make it necessary). Marcovich adds μητέρα arguing with the parallel expression (mother of the virtues) of *Strom*.2.23.5. But, though it would make a perfect round sense, it is too central a word to have fallen unjustifiably. It can be translated as "if you do not want to believe, being suspicious of faith, prominent among virtues, let me convince you".

96.2: τοῦ ὀνόματος αἰσχύνη: Clement warns against shame of Christ's name with a quotation of *Il.* 24.45 (= Hes. *Op*. 318), referred to αἰδώς. The tone is revelatory. The name is probably "Christian" (as in Strom.7.1.1, where he accuses the Pagans of persecuting "the name"), which is disclosed in 12.122.4 (cf. comm. *ad loc*.).

96.3: ἀποδυσάμενοι... ἀγωνιζώμεθα: salvation as a combat is traditional in Christian literature, cf. *Sir* 4.28, *Eph*. 6.10-17, 1*Cor* 4.9, 9.25, 1 *Tm* 6.12, *Ep. Clem.* 7.1-5. It was specially developed as an image for martyrdom who were awarded the crown (Tertull. *Ad martyras* 3). In 1.2.3 the Logos was the ἀγωνιστής, now He is the arbiter (βραβεύοντος) of the fight of the Christian against sin (also in *Strom.* 2.60.6, 7.20.3-4, 7.74.6, *Ecl*. 28.2, *QDS* 3.6). The emphasis is now in the Christian rather than in the Logos. Cf. in a non-metaphorical level 2.42.1, criticizing the statues in the stadion.

γνησίως: a typical feature of the "noble" fight was to fight "openly", περιφανῶς. The adjective also reminds that the Christian is legitimate (γνήσιος) unlike his bastard enemies (cf. 2.22.3, 9.82.1, 10.92.5).

Attack against idols

96.4: ἀγορεύουσι... ἀγοραῖοι: Clement interrumpts the exhortation to go back to attack of idolatry. The phonetic correspondence of these two words, detected by Steneker 15, is lost if Jackson's unnecessary emendation ἀγορεύ<σ>ουσι is accepted, as Marcovich does in his edition.

ἀνοίᾳ καὶ παρανοίᾳ: a typical etymological-homoioteleutic effect which underlines the madness of the choir (cf. 1.2.2) of ποιηταὶ καὶ λιθων προσκυνηταί (also a homoioteleuton which summarizes previous themes). For the abyss (βάραθρον) cf. 109.1, 118.1.

Ἀλέξανδρον: on the divinization of Alexander the Great, cf. Ael. *VH* 5.12, Athen. 6.251b, Luc. *Dial. mort.* 13.2, Stob. 4.34.70, and other testimonies in E. Badian in *Macedonian Studies*, Thessaloniki 1981, 27-71. For another Christian criticism, cf. Cyr. Alex. *CI* 6 (*PG* 76.813A). Clement makes an ironical quotation of *Orac. Sibyll*. 5.6 (= 12.6), which alludes to his death at Babylon.

97.1: τὸν Χῖον σοφιστήν **:** the mention of Alexander gives place to quote an anecdote from Theocritus of Chios (*FGH* II p. 86-87; cf. 760 T1). Χῖον is a right emendation of Cobet (*Mnemosyne* 11 (1862), 391) for θεῖον in P. In *Paed*. 2.110.1 he quotes him as τὸν Κεῖον σοφιστήν.

δόξας κενάς: the word *doxa* has in the philosophical tradition from Parmenides a common negative sense, which is here underlined by the epithet "empty": cf. 98.4.

97.2: τῶν δαιμόνων ἀθλιώτερος: Clement insists in tranferring the faults of the Pagan gods to their devotees. The proof is a quotation on God's justice from Plat. *Theet*. 176b8-c3 (similar ones in *Tim*. 89d, *Phaid*. 64a-70b).

97.3: βᾶτ' εἰς ὁδὸν: Soph. fr. 844 Radt (=760 Nauck). This text alluding to Athena is quoted also by Plutarch (*De fort*. 99A, *Praec. reipubl. ger*. 802B). Here it is used to call (with the initial imperative corresponding to the following paragraph ἡκόντων) the artists and adorers of statues (as Clement clarifies with one additional sentence with a phonetic word play ἠλίθιοι τῶν λίθων, cf. 103.4).

98.1: γήινοι γῆς ἐργάται: the most famous sculptors come from earth, like all men, and work with it, therefore their gods are equally earthly (cf. 98.4). Criticism of sculptors in 4.47.

τις προφητεία: the oracle that things will decay when people believe in statues is unknown, but its apocalyptic tone suggests a kind of poetry similar to the *Sibylline Oracles*. Since Clement is apparently quoting some prophecy, Marcovich's addition ἄνθρωποι is not necessary.

98.2: τίς**:** these imprecations praising the uniqueness of God's creation are taken from *Job* 10.11. The anaphora of the interrogative pronoun heightens the tone as in oratorial discourses (10.92.3, 10.95.1). So does the phonetic similarity ἔτεξε... ἔπεξε. The question referring to the creation of the human soul through his breath (ἐνεφύησε ψυχήν) is taken from *Gn*. 2.7. The questions about justice and immortality are Clement's own addition, in a typical insertion of the Bible in his own discourse.

98.3: ἀριστοτέχνας πατήρ: it is a quotation from Pindar fr. 57 Maehler (cf. *Strom*. 5.102.2, Dion Chrysost. *Or*. 12.81) which Clement uses to proclaim man God's living statue (ἄγαλμα ἔμψυχον) which contrasts inevitably with the dead statues criticized in chapter IV. Cf. R. P. Casey, *HThR* 18 (1925), 88. Cf. also *Strom*.7.52.2.

εἰκόνος εἰκών: the Olympian Zeus made by Phidias was criticized in 4.47.2. He is now called "image of an image" because of his anthropomorphism (cf. next paragraph). Perhaps Zeus was precisely the "father best of artists" praised by Pindar in the unpreserved part of the poem where fr. 57 Maehler comes from.

98.4: εἰκὼν... τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ Λόγος: The quotation of 2 *Cor* 4.4 (or *Col*. 1.15) contraposes the Logos with Olympian Zeus in the previous paragraph, and precedes the man as image of the Logos (εἰκών τοῦ Λόγου ὁ ἄνθρωπος), a notion based on Gn. 1.26 (also 5.4, 97.2). The notion was developed by Philo, *Rer. div. heres* 230-231. Cf. 12.120.4 and *Paed*. 1.97.2, 1.98.2-3, *Strom*. 4.30.2, 5.94.4-5, 6.72.2, 7.16.6. Cf. R. P. Casey, *JThSt* 25 (1924), 43-56, esp. 46.

φωτός ἀρχήτυπον φῶς: this image to illustrate the affinity between God and the Logos, very close to that of the Nicene Creed, has been taken by Witt, 196f, as a proof of Clement's vicinity to neo-Platonism. Cf. Plot. *Enn*. 4.3.17, 6.4.9. Cf. Herm. Trism. *apud* Cyr. *CI* 1(*PG* 556B). Cf. also *Sap. Sal*. 7.25. It would first have entered philosophy through Posidonius: cf. R. E. Witt, *CQ* 24 (1930), 198-207.

ὁ νοῦς ὁ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ: God is identified with the *nous*, to express his presence within man (*Strom*. 4.155.2, 4.162.5, 5.8.7). Alfonsi *Vig Christ* 7 (1953), 135-137 sees in this passage a clear instance of Clementine adaptation of philosophical Platonism.

τοῦ γηγενοῦς γήινος εἰκών: Clement calls again statues "image of an image". The passage is inspired in the Platonic theory of art, in which successive copies are progressively far from the ideal model (*Resp*. 597a-c). The insistence on a material element, earth (cf. 98.1), both in the model and in the copy, recalls the general idea – highly developed by Gnosticism– that spirit was in the higher levels and that the more matter intervened, the lower the level was.

99.1-2: before exhorting to conversion in the next section, Clement recapitulates some of the criticisms he has made along chapter X: adoration of matter, enslaving custom, illegitimate habits (with the etymological oxymoron νόμιμων ἀνόμων, cf. 5.64.3), critique of idols and daemons, threat of punishment of death.

Exhortation to ascend to Heaven

99.3: ὕδωρ λογικόν**:** this line seems primarily metaphorical: drops of truth will purify from custom.. But it can also be encouraging baptism, like in 11.116.2 (cf. *Paed.* 1.29.5). It would support Von Stockhausen's idea that the *Protrepticus* was intended to non-baptized newly converts (cf. introduction n. 51).

καθαροὺς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναβῆναι: the ascent to Heaven is metaphorical, since it still refers to the purification of custom, which attached men to matter through the cult of idols (10.98.4).

κοινότατον... ἰδιαίτατον: these two features of man, human being and son, meet exactly the two dimensions of God, demiurge and father (cf. Plat. *Tim.* 28c).

99.4: προαίρεσιν: Clement exhorts men to accept God's offer (*Mt* 5.3, 5.10, *Lc* 6.20) and turn their προαίρεσις (will, choice) to him. This is a central concept of Aristotelean ethics, and therefore it is very much at place in the protreptic genre. On the precise meaning of the term, cf. Ch. Chamberlain*, TAPA* 114 (1984), 114-157, though Clement uses it more loosely, cf. 11.117.2.

μετανοίᾳ γνησίῳ: instead of this legitimate (cf. 96.3 on the resonance of the epithet) repentance, cf. the useless one in 90.3. The tale of the Niniveh (*Jon* 3.5) is also told by Justin (*Dial.* 107.2).

100.1: ὁδὸς... στενή: Clement profits from the image of ascent to Heaven to dwell on the road to it combining and interpreting some quotations from the Gospels. It is the Lord (*Jn* 14.6, cf. *QDS* 16.2) so it comes from Heaven (*Jn* 3.13 and 3.31) and it is narrow, though in Heaven it will be spacious (*Mt.* 7.13 reinterpreted, cf. *Strom.* 2.67-68, 4.138.4, 5.31.1). The theme of the road to truth was a Greek commonplace since Parmenides (cf. also Xenoph. *Mem.* 2.1.21-31 using the tale of Heracles in the crossroad), which was soon Christianized (cf. *Ep. Barn.* 18-20). Cf. M. Simon, *Hercule et le christianisme,* Paris 1955. But in Clement's version of the theme there is only one road, since his model of conversion is a different one (cf. introduction).

100.2: ὁ μὲν ἄπυστος: The doctrine of salvation of the unwilful sinner will be applied to the salvation of the pre-Christian virtuous men. But in this case it would just apply to those who are unable to understand a rational discourse, since it is opposed to those who make the wrong reasoning against the natural tendency of their mind.

πέφυκε οἰκείως ἔχειν πρὸς θεόν: According to Galloni 96 in this sentence "siamo al culmine del pensiero clementino". Cf. Plat. *Resp.* I 353bc. L. Alfonsi , *Vig Christ* 7 (1953), 129-152. The next paragraphs will develop this theme.

100.3: ἐπὶ τὴν οὐρανοῦ γενόμενον θέαν: Clement insists in the idea expressed in 4.63.4 with the same words (cf. Cic. *ND* 2.140), and repeats the quotation of Plato about man's heavenly nature (φυτὸν οὐράνιον: Plat. *Tim.* 90a6, quoted in 2.25.4). Now he will expand the subject that in these earlier passages he has hinted at.

ἰδιωματικὸν παρὰ τὰ ἄλλα ζῷα: in some precedent passages (10.91-94) Clement has compared men to animals. Now he distinguishes men from animals by their natural tendency to search for God.

ἐφόδιον: for the image of the *viaticum*, cf. D. L. 1.88 and in Clement, *Paed.* 1.7.3, 3.7.39.1, *Strom.* 1.1.4.3. Here it defines θεοσέβεια, in coherence with the image of the journey to Heaven.

100.4: θεόν γεωργόν: Marcovich's correction for γεωργῶν in P leaves the text in perfect triadic parallelism and in consistence with other passages in the work (cf. 1.9.4). In agreement with the general idea that every man has in his nature the knowledge of God, the farmer knows God as farmer, the sailor as a pilot, the soldier as a general. It is a Christian vision of Xenophanes' opinion that every people shaped the gods according to their own categories (frr. 15 and 16 DK, transmitted precisely by Clement in *Strom.* 5.109.3 and 7.22). Interestingly, all these images are also applied to God's action over man (farmer in 11.114.15, pilot in 12.118.4). According to Pujiula, *Körper*, 97, 100, this sentence opens a window to the scenes of Alexandrine real life.

Wake up from sleep

101.1: κάρῳ καὶ μέθῃ... ἀνανήψατε: a sinful life as sleep is a common Platonic theme turned into a philosophical commonplace (*Corp. Herm. Poimandr.* 27) and developed also by Philo (*Somn.* 2.292). In connection with drunkenness and with the word for "torpor" it suggests connection with the accusations in 1.3.2, 95.4-96.1, 12.118.5 implying that Paganism (represented by Dionysus) involved heavy drinking. The verb is used in 1 *Cor* 15.34 just after an allusion to drinking (cf. also 95.4, 103.2 and *Paed.* 2.80.1, 3.85.3).

τῆς ματαίας... ἐλπίδος: this kind of expressions to design the futility of aspects of Paganism apparently similar to Christian ones (cf. 10.90.3. μετάνοιαν

κενήν, 2.22.3 εὐσεβείᾳ νόθῳ) are the inverse of those tags like ὄντως to refer to Christian concepts which have an equivalent term in Paganism, in an effort to fix boundaries between both.

τῆς ἐσχάτης ἀναπνοῆς: the uncommon expression "until the last breath" is used by historiographers and then by Christians as a prose equivalent for the poetic "his soul went off to Hades". The Christian preoccupation with the last moment of life as representative of it all is seen here in the negative side and in 11.117.3 in a positive sense, each one leading to condemnation or salvation. Cf. also 10.108.3.

101.2: the quotation of *Jn* 3.19 insists on the ubiquitous opposition light / darkness, though it is now tainted by the image of sleep which dominates the paragraph. Clement makes the text say "men prefer not to wake up".

τὸν πλοῦτον: the quotation of *Od*. 13.203f (cf. Porph. *Antr. nymph*. 34 and Zeegers, 266, 270) reinforces the exhortation to leave aside material richness if it is an obstacle for salvation –a typical Christian theme fully treated in *QDS*.

Ψευδεῖς ὄνειροι: the quotation of Eurip. *IT* 569 (also in Plut. *Virt. Prof*. 75E) closes the subject of sleep by calling συνήθεια a "false dream". Cf. Zeegers 270.

Against divinization of concepts

102.1: Τύχωνα: Hermes Tychon and Amyeton are attested by Hesychius (s. v. Τύχων and Ἑρμῆς), which justifies the old emendation of P τυφῶνα. That reference could come from this passage or his source, but cf. O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maenander,* Berlin 1900, n. 203, and *RE* VII A (1948), 1699.16. On that of Andocides, cf. Plut. *Nic*. 13.3, Andoc. *Myst*. 62. They are all reduced to one Hermes which is just stone. This is the only concrete deity in this section dedicated to deified abstractions. Perhaps Clement began by criticizing Tychon as personification of Fortune and then extended his attack on Hermes.

οὐκ ἔστι θεός: meteorological phenomena, time measures and astral bodies are denied divine nature, as in chapter 5. Cf. Aet. *Plat*. 3.18.1, Hippol. *Ref*. 1.7.8, Ps. Arist. *De mundo* 4, 395a32.

102.2-3: τίς ἂν... ὑπολάβοι θεούς: this is a typical expression of philosophical discussion on religion (cf. Cic *ND* 3.41, Plat. *Leg*. 1.631c5). Abstract concepts like correction, justice, city, richness, etc. have been used along the *Protrepticus* in the argumentation, and Clement dedicates one paragraph to refute their divinization as

philosophical religion held with no little seriousness and success (cf. E. Stafford, *Worshipping Virtues*, Swansea, 2001). Cf. *Paed.* 3.10.2, *Strom.* 4.24.1. Some other concepts are deities in the poetic tradition, like Aidos (Hes. *Op*. 200), Sleep and Death (*Il*.16.672, also criticized by Athenag. *Leg*. 12.2).

102.4: Clement ends up this section insisting that neither abstract concepts (war) nor their personifications (Ares or Enius) are gods; that some natural phenomena are just a state (πάθος) of elements, which are not gods either; and that Tyche is not a deity. Many of these deities and deified concepts have been attacked in chapters II-V as figures of cult (e.g. Tyche in 4.51.1). Now his argument, more in matter-of-fact way, is that it would require divinization of every aspect of the cosmos or human activity.

Knowledge of the true God against ignorance

103.1: ὄντως μόνος... μόνος ὄντως: instead of the previous abstractions, Clement raises the divine providence (πρόνοια) and ends up with this monotheistic chiastic formula which recalls other ones in the work (2.23.2).

μανδράγοραν ἤ τι ἄλλο φάρμακον: This expression is taken out from Demosthenes *Contra Philippum* 4.6. It goes back to the theme of sleep just treated in 10.101.1. But the reference to the φάρμακον also portrays the opposite effect to the "drink of immortality" offered by God (10.106.2).

103.2: ἀνάψῆσαι δοίη: this paragraph summarizes the last sections. Men should wake up, stop adoring matter and divinizing concepts. The lines on thirty thousand *daimones* by Hes. *Op*. 252f were already quoted in 4.41.1. He now quotes only half of the second line to refute the second epithet (ἀθάνατοι): they are neither inmortal neither mortal, because they are just insensible matter (a pun shared with (and perhaps taken from) Oenomaus fr. 13 Mullach *apud* Eus. *PE* 5.36.2). And he ends up with an attack against the mother of all this enslaving idolatry, i. e. συνήθεια (10.89.1ff).

103.3: καταλείπετε τὴν γῆν τὴν ἐμήν: the paragraph starts with a quotation of 1 *Cor* 10.26 (*Ps*. 23.1 = 49.12), also in *Strom.* 4.54.3, 4.98.1, 6.89.2, 6.160.2. The next sentence in which God speaks, expelling people from his land, seems also a quotation, but it has no clear source, so it could be either from a lost text or a literary invention from Clement.

ἐπίγνωθι σου τὸν δεσπότην: the theme of the land of the Lord is linked to many parables in the Gospel and also to the image of a cult as a patronage (cf. 10.91.2). The fact that God has made man makes him his propriety (οἰκεῖον). Cf. also 11.115.1.

103.4: μυστικώτερον πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀποφθέγξομαι: Clement compares the Pagans to Niobe and then to Lot's wife. Niobe turned into a rock (*Il.* 24.617, Ov. *Met.* 300ff) and Lot's wife turned into salt, according to *Gn.* 19.26 (recalled in *Lc* 17.32 and Phil. *Somn.* 1.247f as prototype of conversion backwards: cf. P. Aubin, *Le problème de la conversion*, Paris 1961, 70, 118). In *Strom.* 2.61.4 he says she turned into a "rock of salt" (λίθον ἀλατίνην), so it can be deduced that Clement assimilates here both myths purposefully. Through the verb φθέγγω he makes clear that he wants to say it poetically and through the adverb μυστικώτερον he expresses the will to say religious truths (as mysteries do) and to interpret the Sodomitai as atheists (as in *Paed.* 3.44.1-2). This is a clear example of assimilation of Greek and Biblical tradition into a new product (cf. von Stockhausen 81).

104.1: οἷον θεόθεν... φωνάς: Clement proposes his audience to think that the words from Plato *Min.* 319a 5-6 come "from God". The explanation of Plato's inspiration was detailed in 6.70.1, but this is a short formulation which carries it to the extreme. That may be the reason why he gives no author of the sentence. The theme goes back to the sacredness of man against animals and matter (10.100.3). The emphasis on the "voices" helps to follow up with the theme started in chapter I.

104.2: ἐμβοᾶν / σιωπᾶν: the difference between animal and man is illustrated with the ravens, which offer a double possibility. They were used by the ὀνειρομάντεις to know the divine will, and they have a strong and disagreeable voice, which is contrasted rhetorically with the voice of man (οὐ κρώζοντα, οὐ κλώζοντα (insisting with almost homophonic synonyms), φθεγγόμενον δέ, οἶμαι, λογικῶς).

ἀποσφάττειν: "they try to kill" the just man, in spite of the rhetorical tone (φιλανθρώπως ... ἀπανθρώπως) refers to actual prosecution of Christians and consequent martyrdom, which remained a real possibility. The paragraph ends with a recalling of the unaviodable alternative χάρις / κόλασις, cf.12.123.2.

104.3: φιλανθρωπία... ἐπικουρίας: there is a clear homoioteleuton caused by the multiple anding in -ία in this paragraph. The structure is strictly parallelistic: positive concept + negative concept repeated twice, an then a final neutral clause, "the saddest thing is to lack God's help", which is the link to the next subject.

104.4: τῆς ἀκοῆς ἡ κώφωσις: earlier paragraphs (10.94.4) developed the theme of "heavenly vision", and this last one has developed how to "listen to the divine teaching voice. This double sense of the divine is theorized by Plato, *Phaed.* 65b1, 79c3-4; *Tim.* 47a-e. Cf. Phil. *Vit. Mos.* 2.201, *Migr.* 191. Riedweg 101-102.

105.1: ὑμεῖς δέ... ἀνάπηροι καὶ τυφλοί: this imprecation (on its style cf. 11.115.3) recalls the themes of deafness and blindness of mind (cf. Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 371) which have been treated in the last paragraphs. The definition of God, father and demiurge, is given through Plato (*Tim* 28c 3-4) and the will to look for him is called προαίρεσις (cf. 10.94.4): the tone to address the Greeks is wholly Greek.

105.2: οὐδέ τις... εὔχεται: the quotation of *Iliad* 8.534 along with this epic word is coherent with the line of Menander (fr. 533 Koerte) on the excellent man who does not need physical but spiritual weapons. The nobility and virtue of the epic hero has now passed to the wise Christian.

χρηστός: this is the word preserved by Stob. 3.37.6 and is coherent with the context. The MSS have χριστός, which editors have rightly taken for a scribal error. But it cannot be denied that Clement is playing with the phonetic equivalence of both words, like in 12.123.1, and a certain reading would say "Christ is absolutely the Saviour". He also changes πολλαχοῦ into πανταχοῦ, which is more absolute.

105.3: δικαιοῦ ζηλωτής,... ὀλιγοδεής: thejust man is also without needs. The association between both concepts is more phonetical (hrough homoioteleuton) than logical, but it is enough to shift the subject. The rest of the paragraph on the superiority of God over any treasure is inspired in Mt. 6.19-20. Cf. also *Paed.* 3.86.2, *Strom.* 7.43.2.

105.4: ὡμοίωσθε τοῖς ὄφεσιν: the theme of deafness last treated in 105.1 is recuperated with the quotation of Ps. 57.5-6 (cf. *Strom.* 7.102.3.). It also allows to associate pagans with the snakes which represent the enemy (1.7.4). Is is a clear antithesis to the ὁμοίωσις θεῷ promised to the Christian (cf. 122.4) and is linked to the comparisons with animals of 1.4. The comparison is expanded in the next paragraph.

106.1: τὸν ἥμερον καὶ ἡμέτερον λόγον: the phonetic word-play between the two words (Steneker 20) makes unnecessary Marcovich's deletion of καί.

ὡς ἐκείνοις τὸ γῆρας: this paragraph comments on the previous quotation: snakes are used as metaphor of metamorphosis, since they change the old skin as men have to turn into new men (cf. *Paed.* 3.16.3). They are ordered to vomit the poison. And

they are told to listen to the taming voice of the Logos, thus coming back to the metaphors of 1.4. On comparisons with animals in Clement, cf. L. Viscido, *Vet. Chr.* 18 (1981), 383-392. His source for some informations could be the treatise *Physiologus* accoding to R. Riedinger, *Byz. Zeitschr.* 66 (1973).

106.2: φάρμακον τῆς ἀθανασίας: this sentence is found in Antiphanes (fr. 86.6 K.-A.), Euripides (*Phoen.* 893 = *Strom.* 7.61.5), Seneca (*De Provid.* 3.2), Diodorus (1.25.6), Galen (*De antidot.* 2) and in other Christian authors (Ign. *Eph.* 20.2; cf. Firm. Mat. *Err.* 22, referring to the rites of Isis). In Biblical texts there are similar expressions: *Sir.* 6.16, *Sap.* 15.3. Cf. M. G Bianco, in *Morte e immortalità nella catechesi dei Padri del III-IV secolo*, Roma 1985, 63-73; A. López Pego, *Homenaje a Luis Gil*, Madrid 1994, 581-605. Clement seems to draw from all three traditions (Biblical, the mysteries, and the coloquial sense in Antiphanes or Galen), and makes up an image in relation to 1.2.4 and *a sensu contrario* to 10.103.1, where the opposite drink leads men to idolatry.

ἑρπηστικούς: the theme of snakes (cf. 10.105.4) is followed up with quotations from *Gn.* 3.15 (= *Psal.* 55.7), and 2 *Pt* 2.2, preparing the great image which follows.

106.3-4: φρόνιμοι καὶ ἀβλαβεῖς: this allusion to Mt.10.16 ("be prudent like serpents and innocent like doves") must be understood in the context of the identification of Pagans with snakes, taken from the preceding paragraphs. And then it is linked to the previous theme of the ascent to Heaven through the wings (Steneker, 20 detects a phonetic contrast of πτέρναν and πτερόν), which on the one hand recalls the innocence of the dove (ἀπλότητος πτερόν), and on the other hand recalls the winged soul travelling to Heaven in Plato's *Phaedrus* (246-249; cf. Butterworth 201, and Tat. *Orat.* 20). It is a very clear instance of fusion of Biblical and Greek traditions.

ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας μετανοήσωμεν: Clement insists twice in repenting "wholeheartedly", an then quotes Ps. 61.9, which repeats the theme of the heart. The tone of *peroratio*, more emotional than argumentative, is progressively increasing.

πίστευσον, ἄνθρωπε, ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ θεῷ: Clement exhorts to believe in Christ. He defines Christ, without naming him but without any allegory (Galloni 128), in three paradoxical antitheseis: "god-man", "suffering and adored", "alife and dead". The antithetic paradox is the ground to support the shocking reading (at the end of the sentence!) of P τῷ νεκρῷ, instead of less striking alternatives like κυρίῳ (which does not explain the *lectio difficilior* in P).

106.5: ἔχεις τὴν ζωήν: the quotation of Ps. 68.33 which also announces the salvation of the soul (ψυχή) is another excellent instance of fusion of Biblical and Greek tradition. The Hebrew word *nephes* is modernly translated as "life" rather than as "soul", taking into account the unitarian Hebrew anthropology, but the LXX translated it for "soul". And Clement takes ζωή (life) in a metaphysical sense of "aeternal life", which will be the theme developed in the last part of the chapter.

God gives true life

107.1: ζητήσωμεν ἵνα ζήσωμεν: the verb ζῆν is used for "to live" instead of the more usual βιόω to profit from the phonetic similarty with ζητεῖν. Cf. 11.113.1 and Steneker, 20.

μισθός: the due payment to God is developed in 11.114-115.

καλὸς ὕμνος: this is the reading in P. After quoting Ps. 69.5, the sentence "man is a beautiful hymn of God" should sound logical, but that may have been the reason of a change to that word, rejected by some editors. The problem is that the following words (οἰκοδομούμενος... ἐγκεχάρακται... ἐγγράπτεον) seem to demand an architectural image. Therefore scholars have proposed ναός (Markland) and τέμενος (Marcovich) as emendations. The first one has good parallels (1.5.3, 117.4, *Strom.* 4.131.4) and the second one is paleographically superior. Yet they do not seem convincing enough to replace the original reading.

107.2: γραφάς: the image of engraving the natural law in the human soul as in stone comes back to Philo. Wisdom (σοφία) is given a function similar to the vademecum in the journey of life given to θεοσέβεια in 10.100.3.

107.3: ἀγαθοί: this four-membered symmetrical sentence shows the ethical consequences of listening to the Logos. As daemons transmitted their evil snake-like character to their devotees (10.106.1), so does God transmit to the Christians his qualities of good father, son, husband and lord (cf. Tat. *Orat*. 29.3, *Rom* 8.21, *Gal* 5.13).

108.1-2: μακαριώτερα... τὰ θηρία: again the theme that animals are better than men because they lack evil purposeful ignorance (4.41.3-5, 58.1-2). At the same time, they lack reason and therefore they have no way to reach God (νοῆσαι μὴ δύναται). Therefore Pagans are even more irrational (ἀλογωτέρους) than animals (ἀλόγων). The swift mention of the ages of life prepares the following paragraph on old age.

108.3: γῆρας**:** this allusion gives a clue on the potential age of Clement's audience. People who had the cultural background to understand Biblical and classical allusions alike had to be mature, and there would probably be some elder ones.

τέλος... βίου ἀρχὴν... σωτηρίας: the focusing on the last moments of life (cf. 10.101.1) may be due to the old age of some of his audience. Here it is rhetorically contraposed (*arche / telos*) to salvation, i.e. next life.

γηράσατε... νέοι ἀφίκεσθε: the rhetoric of past vs. present (comparable to modern electoral campaigns) is linked to the theme of the oldness of Greek religion (1.2.3), and fused with the old man / new man (*Eph.* 7.22-24), in order to contribute to the fundamental opposition between θεοσέβεια and δεισιδαιμονία..

παῖδας ἀκάκους: Cf. 9.82.1ff. and *Paed.* 3.101.3. Cf. also Mt. 19.14.

108.4-5: οὐρανὸς μέν σοι ἡ πατρίς: the metaphor of heavenly citizenship was developed in 9.82.5. Now it becomes above all a pretext to call God "legislator" (νομοθέτης) in parallel to Solon, Phoroneus and Lycourgos, and to introduce thereby the following discourse on *nomos*.

τίνες... νόμοι;: the precepts given in cataloguic form come from a variety of sources from the *OT* and the *NT*: Ex. 20.13-16, *Ep. Bernab.* 19.4 (on the corruption of children, perhaps influenced by the previous paragraph), Dt. 5.17, 6.5 (= Mt. 32.37), Lv. 19.18 (= Mt 14.19), Lc. 6.29 and Mt. 5.28.

109.1: συνήθεια... ἀλήθεια: the metaphor of sweet and bitter flavours is used to contrapose (also phonetically) custom and truth, as one leading to the abyss (βάραθρον) and the other to Heaven (οὐρανόν). The theory that sweet is bad for health while bitter is good comes from Clement's ascetic anthropology, since the common medical view was that the ideal was an equilibrium between both, as any other opposites (cf. H. W. Miller, *CJ* 44, 1949, 309-318). The quotation of *Od.* 9.27 (Plut. *Gen. Socr.* 583 D in a similar context), alluding to its raising young men (κουρότροφος) gives place to an Odyssean image in the next paragraph. The reading of T. Klibengajtis, *Eph Theol Lov* 80 (2004), 330 who makes them synonymous ("Die Wahrheit ist der Umgang, der uns in den Himmel fahrt") is untenable, since they are contraposed with a μέν... δέ... construction.

109.2-3: σεμνὴ μὲν ἡ γυναικωνῖτις: it alludes to Penelope's chastity in Ithaca (*Od.* 9.21). After two Odyssean references to young men and women the allusion comes to sensible old men (σώφρων γερουσία). Perhaps Clement is trying to cover all the

possible ranges and ages of his audience, all of whom can reach God regardless of their situation and context.

αἰνιττόμενος... Μωϋσῆς: the quotation of Dt. 30.11-14, interpreted as proof that God is in us, points in the same direction than the previous lines, i.e. making God's influence omnicomprehensive. The three parts of the body alluded in the Bible (hands, mouth, heart) are theorized by Philo as an alternative anthropology to Plato's division of the soul, though influenced by it: *Poenit.* 2, *Poster.* 84, *Mutat.* 237, *Somn.* 2.180, *Virt.* 183, *Spec.* 1.301; *Praem.* 80; *Prob.* 68. Clement in *Strom.* 2.98.1 makes the same division between βουλή, πρᾶξις, λόγος. He calls it σύμβολον. Perhaps the conscience that this anthropological tripartition is not the canonical one makes Clement ease the minds of his readers (μηδέ... δείμανε) granting them that it is wisdom, not phantasy.

ἀθύρματα: toys are all along the *Protrepticus* the image of puerility (2.17.2, 4.58.2), which has to be overtaken (cf. Heracl. fr. 70 DK = 92 Marcovich; *Il.* 15.363). It contrasts with the eulogy of childish innocence in other passages (11.111.1).

110.1: ὄψει καταφρονούμενος: it was a common interpretation of Is. 53.3 to imagine Jesus unhandsome in his physical appearance. Cf. *Paed.* 2.2.2, *Strom.* 2.22.8, 3.103.3, 6.151.3; Iust. *Dial.*88, 36. Tert. *De carne Christi* 9; Orig. *CC* 6.75. Here it is rhetorically contraposed to his deeds (ἔργῳ προσκυνούμενος).

καθάρσιος, σωτήριος, μειλίχιος: these epithets were traditionally applied to Zeus (cf. 2.37.1). It is another instance of the substitution of Pagan deities by the Christian God (ὄντως θεός).

110.2: σωτήριον δρᾶμα: Jn 1.1 is the beginning of a brief explanation of incarnation called "drama", opposed to that of Greek mysteries (as in 1.2.3, 12.119.1). It is again the substitution of the old melody for a new one with the same words. The return to themes and expressions of chapter I announces the beginning of the *peroratio* and the closing of the work in *Ringkomposition*.

110.3: γνήσιος ἀγωνιστής: cf. 1.2.3 and 10.96.3 for this title of the Logos, now expanded as συναγωνιστής of his creation (i. e. man). He is also called life-giving source (πηγὴ ζωοποιός : cf. a very similar expression in 10.92.3 with echoes of Jn 4.14. Finally, after the Biblical expression, a Platonic one (πέλαγος... ἀγαθῶν: *Symp.* 210d), justified with a ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν which is similar to other warnings before using Hellenic images or categories (11.117.2, 12.119.1).

Chapter XI

This short chapter marks the definitive end of the argumentative part and the beginning of the final exhortative part (*peroratio*) which will culminate in Chapter XII. The opposition Christianity / Paganism is transformed in another one which has already been drafted in the previous chapter: salvation / condemnation. Clement seems to take for granted now the will of his audience to abandon Paganism and, assuming conversion, makes some references to baptism (113.5, 116.4) and to the ethical consequences that being a Christian implies. The message is very simple: the Logos brings salvation to mankind, and humans should correspond to it. Salvation is described through brilliant images based on binary oppositions (light vs. darkness, heaven vs. earth) which have links to other parts of the *Protrepticus*, specially the *exordium* of chapter I and the culmination of the *peroratio* in the next and last chapter (e. g. mystery terminology). The ethical response which God's grace demands is only explained in general terms, with some original metaphors (11.115.1). Its specific development is purposefully left for the *Paedagogous*. The exhortative tone is increasingly intense and rhetorically inflamed.

The Logos saves man from the slavery of earthly pleasure

111.1: ἄνωθεν ἄθρει τὴν θείαν: the chapter opens with emphatic aliteration of the sound *th / t*.

εὐεργεσίαν: cf. Z. A. Crook, *Reconceptualizing Conversion,* Berlin-New York, 2004, on conversion as changing one patron for a more beneficious one (cf. 10.91.2). It is a type of reasoning (coherent with the basic conceptual metaphor of spacial movement) which Clement uses in this book, underlining benefits from God.

ὑποπίπτων ἡδονῇ: the syntax and parallelism with the previous sentence supports the conjecture of Schwartz against P ὑπέπιπτεν (kept by Marcovich). The Fall of Man has been treated in 2.253ff. The Christian version of this myth reinterprets the story of *Genesis* 3.14: Clement, who in 1.7.4 had no problem in identifying the snake in the Biblical text with the Devil, now allegorizes it as pleasure (following the model of Philo, *Opif. mundi* 157, *Leg. alleg.* 2.72, *Agric.* 97; cf. *Paed.* 2.7.4, *Strom.* 4.100.3). This change may come out of the context: in this book he is not attacking idolatry, but

exhorting to behave according to God's wishes: cf. *Strom.* 2.137.1. Cf. Viscido, *Vet. Chr.* 18 (1981), 383-392; and commentary to 10.92.2.

ἁπλότητα: the simplicity of the child is seen as a virtue of man before sin. Cf. *Mt.* 8.13. Adam as a child in Theoph. *Autol.* 2.25.2, 2.25.44; Iren. *Adv. haer.* 4.38.1-2. The opposition between the child and the serpent is recurrent (cf. Is. 11.8).

111.2-3: μυστήριον θεῖον: mystery terminology enters again (Steneker 143). Now it designs the descent of God to flesh (*kenosis*). Here it is connected, also through syntactic parallelism (in a parenthetic exclamation) to the following τὸ παραδοξότατον, in which the echoes of *Gal.* 5.11 on the "scandal" of the Crucifixion are clear (cf. Galloni 71). This positive use of *mysterion* contrasts, of course, with the condemnations of Pagan mysteries (2.12-22, 4.55.3): cf. H. G. Marsh, *JThS* 37 (1936) 64-80.

τὸν ὄφιν... τὸν θάνατον: the victory over the serpent is identified with that over death. For the opposition of the Saviour to the snake, cf. A. Quacquarelli, *Vet. Christ.* 11 (1974), 17.

ἠπλομέναις: Windhorst's proposal (*RechSR* 19 (1939), 496f), of ἠλομέναις has not found support (not even recognition among the editors, only in Galloni 237), though it is not improbable, for the text of P makes perfect sense.

κέκλιται μὲν ὁ κύριος, ἀνέστη δὲ ἄνθρωπος: in the context of salvation of man from the ties of matter and flesh thanks to the descent and death (the "extended arms" is a subtle reference to the Crucifixion) of a Saviour, the most adequate title is *kyrios*. The superiority of Heaven over Paradise is a Patristic theme in relation to Jn 14.1-7 (e. g. Iren. *Haer.* 5. 36.1.) which Clement transforms into a variant of the theme of *felix culpa*: we are better after the incarnation of the Logos than before the Fall.

The Logos brings true wisdom

112.1: τὸ πᾶν ἤδη Ἀθῆναι καὶ Ἑλλὰς γέγονεν: this is a true universalist cry (12.120.2) which is both Christian and phil-Hellenic, since both take a world wide scope. All the "holy energies" which were sought in Greece come from the Logos. So the Logos fills and encompasses (κατηχεῖ) the Greek intellectual findings. The *Stromateis* will develop this philohellenic thought (*Strom.* 2.6.1, 2.24.1, 5.137, 6.167.5).

δυνάμεσιν: the six energies are distributed in complementary couples: creation / salvation; benefice / legislation; prophecy / doctrine. This doctrine derives from Philo (e.g. *Sacr.* 59-60). Cf. D. Runia, *Vig Christ* 73.3 (2004) 256-276, esp. p. 269.

112.2-3: ἐπιστεύετε... ἀπιστήσετε: the comparison of Christian doctrines with Greek myths is already in 1.2.2. Christian apologists insisted in taking Greek myths as objects of belief, which distorted for rhetorical needs their true nature (P. Veyne, *Les grecs ont-ils cru à leurs mythes?,* Paris 1983).

τὸν Μίνω: in this spirit Clement compares the mythical judge Minos to the historical disciples of Jesus. He quotes the Homeric reference to him (*Od*. 19.179) which deserved different explanations and allegories: cf. [Plat.] *Min*. 319d, Dio Chrys. *Or*. 4.39, 53.11; Plut. *Max. cum princ*. 1.776e, *Thes*. 16.3, 7A; *Dem*. 42.9, 909 E; Plot. *Enn*. 6.9.7. In *Strom*. 2.104.2 he assimilates Minos to Moses, following Ios. *Ap*. 161 (Daniélou, 90). But in the *Protrepticus* Clement prefers contraposition to assimilation.

ἠνίξαντο... ἀνεκήρυξαν: while Greek philosophy must be interpreted to find some truths (cf. 7.70.1), Christ's revelation speaks directly in the Revelation.

καινὸς... ἄνθρωπος: wisdom is not any more Greek, but it belongs to the Logos and to the New Man to whom He sends the Holy Spirit. Clement echoes Pauline sentences (*Gal*. 3.28, 6.15; *Eph*. 4.24; *Col* 3.9-11) as he does in *Strom*. 1.90.2, 3.93.2, 3.95.1, 4.58.3, 4.65.4, 5.30.4; 6.100.3. He insists that this New Man belongs just to the race of men over any previous ethnic boundaries (12.120.2).

113.1: καθολικὴ... προτροπή: just as the Logos encompasses particular manifestations of wisdom, θεοσέβεια is the universal command over particular precepts (ὑποθῆκαι) or counsels (συμβουλαί). In the *Paedagogus* Clement will dwell on private and civic life, as corresponds to a *parainesis* following a protreptic discourse (cf. introduction p. 12f). Here it is enough with the general command of following Christ. With this eulogy of the general exhortation he Christianizes a topical philosophical theme (DL 7.121).

ἵνα ζήσωμεν ἀεί: the emphasis on "living" (insisting on the verb ζῆν instead of the usual βιῶμεν, cf. Steneker, 15) is typical of exhortation to philosophy, but the addition of "always" shows the Christian interpretation. Cf. 1.7.3.

φιλοσοφία δὲ, ᾗ φασιν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι: the sentence gives philosophy a generally positive signification, subordinated to the commandment of the Logos. The contraposition between philosophy and Revelation (in which the latter supersedes and includes the former) expands the previous sentence (the δέ transmitted by the MSS is expressive enough of this continuity, so there is no need of the γάρ proposed by Marcovich). The "older ones" are either Stoics who made the distinction between

particular counsels and longer (πολυχρόνιος) ones (Cataudella, 230 n.2), or Clement's master Pantenus. Philosophy as *propaideia* is a key subject of the 1st book of the *Stromata*: 1.15.3-20.3, 28.1, 30.1, 32.4, 37.1, 80.6, 99.1. Cf. C. Camelot, *Rech. sc. rel.* 21 (1931), 541-569. Yet here philosophy becomes overshadowed by the "refulgent" (τηλαυγής) Logos, which brings in the theme of light with a quotation of *Ps.* 18.9.

The Logos brings light

113.2: ἀπόλαβε: the triple anaphora opens a new theme, explained in a highly inflamed tone. It starts off with a Homeric line (cf. this technique also in 12.120.2) prone to be philosophically interpreted: *Il.* 5.127f, where Athena takes off the mist from Diomedes' eyes so that he may distinguish gods from men in the battle. Cf. Plat. 2 *Alcib.* 150 d7-e2; Luc. *Char.* 7; Max. Tyr. *Diss.* 8.5; Dio Chrys. *Or.* 12.36, Procl. *In Plat. Remp.* 1.18.25-26; Did. Alex. *Trin.* 2.18 (PG 39, 728 a 12). Clement Christianizes the theme of the illumination of the soul of man. Cf. *Paed.* 1.28.1; *Strom.* 1.178.1. The following line (*Il.* 5.128) is alluded in 11.114.1 within the same context. Then the quotation of *Ps.*18.11 follows directly that of Homer, thus establishing a continuity of Greek and Biblical tradition. The following sentences continue the same intertwining.

ἐν σκότει κατορωρυγμένον: the sentence is repeated in 11.114.1, making the salvation of the Logos a combat of light vs. darkness. The sentences in praise of divine light have a clear Platonic undertone when calling the Logos "the light-bearer eye of the soul" (*Resp.* 7.533d2, *Tim* 45 b3).

113.3: κατηυγάσθημεν: a quotation of Heraclitus, fr. 99 DK (= 60 Marc.) serves to oppose the Logos to darkness like the sun vs. the night (in a very similar way to Plutarch *De fortuna* 98c). For the "birds that are eaten" as image of insignificance cf. Philostr. *Vit Apoll.* 4.3, Sen. *Epist.* 122.4.

113.4: χωρήσωμεν: the anaphoric exhortation (three times) underlines the identification of God and the light, a recurrent theme in the *Protrepticus* (cf. 9.84.1, 6,684, 10.94.2, 10.110.3). From the 1st person plural, a quotation of Ps. 21.23 turns the tone to direct invocations to God, which is exceptional in the *Protrepticus*. It has therefore been thought since E. von der Goltz, *Das Gebet in der ältesten Christenheit*, Leipzig 1901, 138, that this paragraph and the next one are part of a hymn used in the ancient Church. But as J. Kroll, *Die christliche Hymnodik bis zu Klemens von Alexandrien*, Königsberg 1921, 12, (supported by Steneker, 50f.) there are not enough

proofs for that hypothesis. It is probably Clement himself who gives his prose a hymnic tone, like in 110.3, 84.2, 84.6, 114.2-4, 117.4, 120.4.

113.5: φωταγωγεῖς: cf. 12.120.1, where baptism is pointed at with this word. The following allusions to Rm 8.17 (συγκληρονόμος, cf. 10.94.1) and Hbr. 2.11 (ἀδελφόν) give concretion to this "bringing to the light" as taking part in God's family (cf. 9.82.1ff).

114.1: ἐποπτεύσωμεν: Eleusinian vocabulary enters discretely among light imagery. Riedweg 146 shows how this Christian *epopteia* stems directly from Plato's. Hom. *Il*. 5.128 is alluded again (cf. 11.113.2).

χαῖρε φῶς: Zeegers 176 takes it as a reference Aesch. *Ag.* 508 (without the genitive, ἡλίου, omitted here because this light is "purer than the sun" = "sweeter than this life). It is particularly adequate to the erring man finding his saviour since it is an exclamation uttered by a soldier absent after many years from his fatherland. But there are no other references to Aeschylus in the whole *Protrepticus*. It can be better explained as a lithurgical acclamation, since an echoing of a ritual utterance is adequate to the hymnic tone of this section. (F. Doelger, *Antike und Christentum* V, 9, points out the probability of a "kirchlichen Brauch", with reference to *Acta Philippi* 124; cf. also "Χαῖρε ἱερὸν φῶς" *Ant. und Christ*. VI, 147-151; and J. M. Tsermoulas, *Die Bildersprache des Klemens von Alexandrien,* Kairo 1934, 29-35.

114.2 ἡ δύσις εἰς ἀνατολὴν περιέστηκεν**:** the triumph of sunrise against sunset could also be read in geographical terms, of Orient against Greece. The text results from the correction of Wilamowitz from the MSS ἡ δύσις ἀνατολὴ πεπίστευκεν (or ἀνατολῇ πεπίστυται, accepted by Marcovich). The idea of waking up (cf. 9.84.1), with the quotation of *Sap.* 7.10 (φῶς ἀκοίμητον) and the repetition of the image in 114.4 (with the verb μετήγαγεν) support Wilamowitz's proposal. Cf. Galloni 72.

114.3: κτίσις καινή: this Pauline expression (cf. 2 *Cor* 5.17, *Gal* 6.15) recalls the novelty of the *exordium* (1.2.4) and opens a series of Biblical allusions on God as "sun of justice": *Mal* 3.20, *Mt*. 5.45. This passage is commented by M. Wallraff, *Christus Verus Sol*, Münster 2001, 48-52, 112.

114.4: τὸν θάνατον εἰς ζωὴν ἀνασταυρώσει: the metaphor of sunrise- sunset is extended to other metamorphosis of one thing into its contrary through crucifixion: death into life, corruption into immortality, earth into heaven. Cf. Galloni 72ff.

ἔργον ἀγαθόν... βιότοιο ἀληθινοῦ. Clement quotes again the *proemium* (6-7) of Aratus' *Phaenomena* (cf. 7.73.2), much quoted by Christians from St. Paul (*Act.* 17.28) onwards. Cf. *Strom.* 5.101.2-3; Hippol, *Ref.* 4.46-48, 5.16; Theoph. *Autol.* 2.8 (and Pagan parallels in Zeegers 116). The link with the previous subject of light is the "waking up" (ἐγείρων). But here he adds two adjectives ("good" works, and "true" life) to give a Christian sense to the verses which introduce a new theme rooted in the parables of the Gospels (cf. *Mt.* 13.3): God as farmer (γεωργός) puts the seed of goodness in man (cf. 10.100.4). These seeds are the laws (*nomoi*) which man must obey. After quoting Aratus, comes as usual a Biblical quotation from the "prophet": *Jer* 31.33-34 (also quoted in *Hb* 8.10-12). The reference to the Laws introduces the ethical aspects of the exhortation.

Exhortation to be worthy of salvation

115.1: δεξώμεθα... πεισθῶμεν... μάθωμεν... ἀποδῶμεν: exhortations in 1st person plural link through coordination the metaphorical and the real level.

μισθόν: the metaphor of renting a house is very original and without clear precedents. It is illustrated by a quotation of *Il.* 6.243. The bad business of Glaucos had become almost a proverb (cf. e. gr. Arist. *EN* 5.11.7, 1136 b10). It is a concession to popular humour rather than a classical quotation (as in Homer it is an anticlimax to the epic tone of the rest of the poem).

εὐπαθείας: "the grateful payment for this well-being". The genitive is an emendation (Mayor, followed by Marcovich) for εὐπάθειαν in P. Heyse's (and Stählin's) εὐπείθειαν (cf. *Strom.* 7.21.1) and Wilamowitz's εὐμάθειαν (cf. Strom. 5.7.3) would fit sintactically, semantically and paleographically. But the emphasis in the passage is not on obedience (only "faith" is demanded), but on God's gratuitous graces.

ἀποικίαν: the metaphor of colonizing Heaven is also extremely original. It is inspired partly in the root of *oikia* used in the previous image (ἐνοίκιον, ἐνοικήσεως, οἰκεῖν), and in a larger context, in the idea of being citizens of Heaven (9.82.5).

ὀλίγης πίστεως μεμίσθωκεν: through the words μισθόν and ἀποικίαν Clement has drawn two original metaphors to illustrate that the response of man, "a

little faith" (repeated twice), is both fair and convenient (cf. 9.86.1). Now the word πίστις will be the link for the next sentence.

115.2: γόησι πεπιστευκότες: a contraposition is drawn between false and true salvation which recalls the attacks of the *exordium* against the evil song of Orpheus (1.3). Against the evil charms and amulets of the *goetes*, those of God do grant salvation. Cf. as a precedent Plat. *Charm.* 157a4, and as a follower Athanasius (PG 26.1320) who proposes the Cross against magical amulets.

θάνατος γὰρ ἀΐδιος ἁμαρτία: nominal sentences were commonly used as ideological *slogans* (cf. e. g. the Orphic *soma sema*). Clement may be echoing or coining one here.

115.3: νωδοὶ καὶ τυφλοί: the concatenation of insults against his audience is not so surprising as it might seem, since it belongs to the conventions of the revelatory style: cf. Hes. *Theog.* 26ss, *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 256s, Epimen. fr. 1 DK, Aristoph. *Av.* 684ss. Cf. M. Herrero, *Rev phil anc* 24.2 (2005), 55-74 and commentary to 3.45.5. The expression "blind like mouses" (4.51.3) is built on a popular proverb (*Diogen.* 8.25). The word νωδοί of P does not need emendation to νωθροί as Marcovich proposes.

115.4: λάμψατω οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀποκεκρυμμένῳ: the quotation of 2 Cor 4.6 "light shone from darkness" reintroduces the theme of light. Eleusinian imagery is again used metaphorically ("the innest part of man"). Though it is frequent in this work, it is not yet an unconscious use of mystery terminology, as the following sentence shows with a clearly purposeful reference to the mysteries.

τιμιώτατον καὶ σεβασμιώτατον... ὄνομα: the knowledge of the real or mystic "name" of the deities was the typical knowledge of initiates in the mysteries, as it was well-known (cf. Athenag. *Leg.* 20). It is a new image of the mysteries adapted to Christianity, where the son gets to know the name of his father, God. Cf. 9.81ff on God's fatherhood.

115.5: πάντα: as in 11.112.1, the statement "all" is explained through a paratactic enumeration, typical of the hymnic style which is abundant in the *Protrepticus* (cf. 1.6.2). In this series there is a combination of present and aorist tenses, the present at the beginning and the end, the aorist in the middle.

116.1: ποιμένα: The image of the shepherd has Biblical (*Ps.* 23.1, *Is.* 40.11, *Jo* 10.11) and Greek precedents (Plat. *Polit.* 266 c11; 268 c1; 295 e6; *Min.* 318 a1); it is

therefore most welcome by Philo (*Mos*. 1.60) and Clement (*Paed*. 1.37.3, 1.53.2, 1.85.2, 1.97.3, 2.25.3, *Strom*. 1.156.3, 1.169.2).

ὑπακούουσιν εὐαγγέλιον, παρακούσασιν κριτήριον: parallelism and homoioteleuton are used to underline another fundamental contraposition on which Clement insists in the last thre chapters of the work (cf. 12.123.2): salvation or condemnation, there is no middle term.

116.2-4: σάλπιγξ μεγαλόκλονος: trumpets come in (accompained by an unusual epithet of epic resonance), through association with the Biblical image of the final judgment which Clement predicts for those who disobey, and it introduces the theme of the *miles Christi*. At the same time the peaceful character of Christ's army and kingdom is underlined: he repeats εἰρενικῶς four times, and makes a powerful antithesis ἀναίμακτον αἵματι ("the bloodless with blood").

ὑδατίναις ἀκμαῖς... βεβαμμέναις: the quotation of Eph. 6.14-17, where spiritual and theological virtues are said to be the weapons of the Christians, is expanded. Clement profits from the image to make a reference to baptism: wet spears (from baptismal water) will defeat fiery arrows.

ἰδοὺ πάρειμι: the end of the paragraph with the quotation of Is. 58.9 is full of effect and recalls the coming of the Lord among the sound of the trumpets.

117.1 συμπολιτεύεται: Clement is the first author to use this verb to express the incarnation (cf. Lampe *s. v.*). It draws on the image of a common citizenship of all men around him (9.82.5, 115.1).

μιμητὴν ὁμοῦ καὶ θεραπευτήν: imitation (μίμησις) and service (θεραπεία) are dimensions of piety (θεοσέβεια). The former refers to the intellectual and mystic level (with possible contrast to Plat. *Phaedr*. 252c-d, cf. Butterworth 201), and the latter to the practical one. Clement insists on equilibrium in the last paragraph.

117.2. οὐράνιος καὶ θεῖος ὄντως ἔρως: this expression, instead of the *NT* ἀγάπη (cf. *Strom*. 6.71.4, 6.104.1) has a clearly Platonic ring (cf. Witt, 196). Eros is "heavenly" (*Symp*. 187 d7) and "godly" (*Leg*. 4. 711 d6), and is the subject of the ubiquitous *Phaedrus*. In 3.44.2 Eros was critisized in its Greek version, and now its Christian counterpart is praised again with Platonic terminology. With the usal adverb twice repeated (ὄντως: cf. 2.23.1) Clement can turn it into a Christian expression.

ὁμοζυγούντων... προαιρήσεως καὶ ζωῆς: will (προαίρεσις) and life are one in the Logos. Clement knows that this is too simple in philosophical terms and introduces a cautiously apologetic "so to speak".

117.3-4: τί δή σε προτρέπω;: this section is composed of shorts and questions, which help to condense (μάθε συντόμως) the exhortation in expressive messages. It is the first self-presentation of the work, once it it almost accomplished, and it leaves behind confrontation with Paganism to point only at "salvation" through Christ. Clement does not hide his own interest in the salvation of the audience, a personal tone which increases in this last part of the work (e. g. 12.119.3, 12.123.1). The new mention of "the last breath" (10.101.1) and the ascension to Heaven clearly locate salvation (and the defeat of death brought by it) in an eschatological level.

οἰκοδομήσας νεών: the reference of this metaphor of the man as temple is both to *Jn*. 2.19-21 and, more likely, to the *agraphon* of 1.5.3. After the praise of the Saviour Logos, the exhortation to "purify the temple" (ἄγνισον τὸν νεών) insists that the saving action of the Lord needs an ethic response of man.

117.5: καρπούς γεώργησον: the reference to the fruits of wisdom echo Plat. *Phaedr*. 276 b-c, and the recollector of fruits to the γεωργός (10.100.4, 11.114.4). The distinction between ephemeeral flowers and the premices of fruits resound of the parables in the Gospel.

οὐκ ἔργον μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ χάρις: all men are a divine work, but being an object of the divine grace depends on everyone's choice. The last sentence expresses with a popular paradox (ἄξιον φανῆναι / κατηξιῶσθαι) the same idea that man's active choice must correspond to the kingly nature (implicitly a synonym of kinship with Christ) with which he has been created by God.

Chapter XII

The last chapter of the *Protrepticus* is the *peroratio* of the discourse, which exhorts to conversion in a very intense and urgent tone. Rhetorical techniques to increase emotion like invocation or anaphora are profusely used. *Ringkomposition* is evident, since many images of chapter I (the *exordium*) are brought back with slight variations: the Pagan music which miselads is not now Orpheus' but that of the Sirens; after the attacks on Greek mysteries which opened the *exordium* (1.1.3) and the *refutatio* (2.12-22), Clement presents the true mysteries of the Logos.

Some of the metaphors (the Sirens, the Bacchai) used by Clement here are justly famous, as those of the exordium, as excellent examples of presentation of Christianity in Greek moulds, and have received detailed treatment by scholars (e. g. Rahner, 445-466; Riedweg, 148-158; Zeegers, 278-285; Steneker, 165ff). At the same time, brief formulations recollect the theological ideas expressed in the previous chapters. In this chapter there are no more demostrations or new messages, just enthusiastic exhortation and coining of images and expressions whih will ceave a powerful impression in the mind of the audience. The central message, on which the *peroratio* insists (as in a standard deliberative discourse), is election, which has been emphasized in the previous chapters (10.95.1-2). Man is given the possibility to choose between good and evil (12.118.4, 12.123.2), and there is no way to escape the alternative. Once this frame is accepted the right decision is clear. The *homo optans* free to choose is also consistent with the idea of conversion which dominates the whole work (cf. introduction).

The dangerous music of the Sirens

118.1: φύγωμεν οὖν τὴν συνήθειαν: the *peroratio* starts coming back to the themes of *exordium* in an exhortative tone. Conversion as a spacial movement (1.8.1) and a negative regard of συνήθεια (1.3.1, 2.22.3, 10.90.2). L. Alfonsi, *Vig Christ* 18 (1964), 34, notes the chiastic and parallel constructions in this paragraph. As he notes, custom ἀποτρέπει, that is, pushes in the opposite sense to the *Protrepticus*. On Clementine attacks to custom, cf. L. Lugaresi *Adamantius* 9 (2003), 10-29, and M. G. Bianco in S. Felici, (ed.), *Crescita dell'uomo nella catechesi dei Padri (età prenicena)*, Roma 1987, 189-202.

Χαρύβδεως ἀπειλὴν ἢ Σειρῆνας μυθικάς: the simile with Carybdis and the Sirens prepares the following images from the *Odyssey*. On this allegorical usage of the

Homeric tale, interpreting the Sirens as mere "pleasure" which leads to corruption, cf. Rahner, 445-466; E. Kaiser, *MH* 21 (1964), 109-136, esp. 125f and 136; P. Courcelle in *Festschrift Wallach*, Stuttgart 1975, 32-48; Zeegers, 278ff, who underlines the Pythagorean tradition of interpreting the episode eschatologically.

λίχνον: proposed by Mayor against the reading of the MSS (λίχνος) as epithet of the abstract κακόν. Yet it is worth considering Cataudella's proposal λίνον (thread, fishing-net), since the three previous words which qualify συνήθεια are also concrete and related to hunting (trap, pit, trench).

κείνου: Homer (*Od.* 12.219-20) has τούτου. Clement adapts the quotation to his perspective, since Odysseus is more distant from his text than from Homer's.

118.2: φεύγωμεν: anaphora underlines the urgent tone of the *peroratio*. But the present is more adequate to the concrete situation of fleeing from the Sirens than the aorist which began the previous paragraph (118.1).

πῦρ ἐρεύγεται: this is a clear case of Christianization of a Classical myth. Homer just speaks of "smoke" in 12.219, but Clement interprets it as fire, i. e. Hell. Cf. 2.22.7, 43.3-4, 53.3, with Steneker, 12f.

μουσικῇ: the Sirens as symbol of pleasure helps to regain the musical metaphors of the *exordium* about the melody which leads to perdition (here presented as carnal pleasure, with the words πορνίδιον and πανδῆμος, associated with Aphrodite). The following quotation of *Od.* 12.184-185 is an instance of the song of the Sirens (also quoted by Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 1.42, Orig. *CC* 2.76).

θειοτέρην: Homer has νοϊτέρην in *Od.* 12.185: it might be an unconscious misquotation, a minor variant, or a purposeul association with the serpent's offer in the tale of *Gn* 3.5 to be divine.

118.3: ἐπαινεῖ σε: Clement unites explanation with exhortation to a fictitious Odysseus: πολύμνητον recalls πολύαινε, and κῦδος is repeated. This insistence reflects a style of preaching based on the commentary of a text, much repeated along the whole *Protrepticus*, specially the last four chapters.

πνεῦμά σοι οὐράνιον βοηθεῖ: the maritime image is used to introduce the divine *pneuma* in the double sense of "wind" which will blow on the sails and "spirit" which helps man to overcome temptation. In 1.5.3-4 the metaphor of the musical instrument was used for the same purpose.

βουκολεῖ: to "tend cattle" has an extended metaphorical meaning of "to cheat". The following quotation from Hesiod (*Op.* 373f) insists on the image of pleasure as a prostitute who deceives.

118.4: ἐὰν ἐθέλῃς μόνον: man is free to choose between good and evil, which means that salvation cannot happen if he does not wish it actively (cf. εἰ βούλει (120.2), ἀμφιβάλλειν (122.2, 123.2).

ξύλῳ: the "wood" is used in the double sense of the post of the ship to which Odysseus is tied and the Cross which brings salvation (the reason why Clement uses this word instead of σταυρός, cf. Steneker 130, n.4). A few lines later (119.3) it will be the Bacchic *thyrsos*. Cf. Rahner, 467-486, and parallels of that use of the Odyssean episode in Iust. *Apol.* 55.3; Tert. *Adv. Marc.* 3.18.4; Hippol. *Refut.* 7.13.2, Min. Fel. *Oct.* 29.8.

κυβερνήσει: this sentence ends up the Odyssean images with the Logos as the pilot and the Holy Spirit as the wind (πνεῦμα) which leds to the heavenly harbours. Cf. Lilla 1971, 97 on other Clementine passages in which the Logos is pilot (10.100.4) or "chariot driver" (12.121.1, 10.89.3): *Paed.* 3.53.2, *Strom.* 2.51.6, *Strom.* 5.52.5, *Strom.* 5.53.1. The explicit mentioning of Christian theological concepts comes frequently after a careful preparation through metaphors and word-plays ith double senses (as in chapter 1 with musical images for the same concepts of Logos and *pneuma*).

τοῖς λιμέσι καθορμίσει τῶν οὐρανῶν: the arrival point of the boat ends up the nautical metaphor (cf. *Paed.* 1.54.3) reminding its heavenly basis (cf. 10.99.3). this arrival point is the immediate link to the next metaphor (τότε...), i. e. the mysteries, helped by the fact that Eleusinian mysteries were celebrated at the end of a percourse from Athens.

The Christian mysteries of the Logos

118.4: μου κατοπτεύσεις τὸν θεόν: mystery terminology (also τελεσθήσῃ μυστηρίοις) is linked to a Biblical sentence (1 Cor 2.9: ἀποκεκρυμμένων, cf. 10.94.4), according to the constant strategy of uniting Pagan and Biblical tradition. The link is introduced by a self-reference with the initial μου which specifies that it is not a philosophical God what Clement announces for Platonic contemplation (Galloni 116, n. 37). Accordingly, the same personal note separates Christian mysteries from the Greek ones (τῶν ἐμοὶ τετηρημένων).

118.5: δύω μὲν ἡλίους: the equilibrium between both Bacchic and Eleusinian is a constant principle of Clement in all his references to Greek mysteries. Therefore, after a sentence dominated by Eleusinian terminology, a Bacchic atmosphere is introduced through a classic line from the *Bacchai* (918f: cf. Plut. *De comm. not* 1083E, Luc. *Pseudol.* 19, Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 7.192) where Pentheus sees double as part of his Dionysiac extasis (*Paed.* 2.24.1; cf. Ov. *Ars* 3762-764, Sen. *Epist.* 83.21). Cf. M. C. Villanueva-Puig in J. Jouanna, *Vin et santé en Grèce ancienne*, Athens 2002, 45-54.

ἀγνοίᾳ μεθύων ἀκράτῳ: the metaphor of ignorance as drunkenness (already used at 1.2.2) is reinforced by calling it "unmixed" as pure wine, consumed only by uncivilized people or drunkards, and by the phonetic parallelism (παροινοῦντα... παρανοοῦντα, cf. *Paed.* 2.54.1).

ἐγὼ δ' αὐτὸν οἰκτείραιμι... παρακαλέσαιμι: Clement as revelator of the mysteries addresses an imaginary Pagan (hypothetically here, directly in the next paragraph). With a Biblical quotation (Ez. 18.23; 33.11) he presents himself as mere transmittor of the mercy of the Lord (ὅτι καὶ κύριος). His position is similar to Orpheus as hierophant of Pagan mysteries (which recalls the *exordium*, cf. 1.2.2, 1.2.4). The sentence is chiastic, and the phonetic parallelisms reinforce its effect (Steneker, 20).

119.1-2: ἧκε, ὦ παραπλήξ: Clement addresses Teiresias urging him with insistent anaphoras (μὴ... μὴ.. ῥίψον... ῥίψον) to leave Bacchic cult and its signs (thyrsos, ivy, mithra, fawskin) and turn to the mysteries of the Logos, which he will "show" (δείξω) in his role of hierophant. Clement expressly declares the purpose of this metaphor: "to follow your image" (κατὰ τὴν σὴν διηγούμενος εἰκόνα).

σωφρόνησον: *sophrosyne* (also χόρον σώφρονα at the end of the paragraph) is the antithesis to Bacchic ecstasy. It is a traditional opposition (e. g. Eur. *Bacch*. 999-1002) which Clement adapts to his paradigm of conversion.

ὄρος ἐστὶ τοῦτο: the contraposition between Sion and Citheron expressly refers back to the *exordium* (cf. 1.2.1). Other terms join in the dualistic opposition between both mountains: tragedies (τραγῳδίαις) vs. theatrical pieces (δράμασιν) of the truth; the maenads (μαινάδες, quotation of *Bacch*. 6, 26) / the daughters of god, the sheep (ἀμνάδες). The latter oppostion is reinforced by phonetic similarity (cf. 10.90.2).

ἄγναις ὕλαις σύσκιον: Butterworth, 202, links this bucolic setting of mount Sion with that established by Plato for his *Phaedrus* (230b: τοῦ τε ἄγνου τὸ ὕψος

καὶ τὸ σύσκιον πάγκαλον). Clement obviously profits from the traditional relation of purity to the chaste-tree (ἁγνός with ἄγνος, cf. *LSJ s. v.*).

αἱ δύσαγνον κρεανομίαν μυούμεναι: maenadic and mysteric imagery are linked like in 2.12.2. A medieval scholiast was misled by this fusion and commented this passage saying "for the initiates in the mysteries of Dionysus ate raw meat, fulfilling thus the example of the dismemberment which Dionysus suffered to the hands of the maenads (ὠμὰ γὰρ ἤσθιον κρέα οἱ μυούμενοι Διονύσῳ, δεῖγμα τοῦτο τελούμενοι τοῦ σπαραγμοῦ, ὃν ὑπέστη Διόνυσος ὑπὸ τῶν Μαινάδων)". This scholion (with Firm. Mat. *De Err.* 6 and Photius, *s. v.* Νεβρίζειν) has been used as proof of the Eucharistic interpretation of maenadic sacrifice defended by J. Harrison and E. R. Dodds among others. But like the other two testimonies it is the mistaken Christian interpretation of a phenomenon ignored by them (as seen by the hoary confusion of Maenads and Titans), and in which there is no explicit identification between the god and the victim. Cf. full discussion in M. Herrero, *RHR* 223.4 (2006a), 389-416.

χορὸν ἀγείρουσαι: the chorus refers initally only to sheep (instead of maenads as in the Euripidean play), and the next sentence expands the image to include angels, prohets and justs as members of the prophetic *thiasos* which runs as in a course (δρόμῳ: cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 135, 1091). Thus Clement links the reference to the *Bacchai* to the musical metaphor which dominated the *exordium* (ᾆσμα... ψάλλουσιν... μουσική, cf. 1.1-5).

οἱ κεκλημένοι: in this context of Bacchic and mysteric resonances, the reference to the "elected" which form the Christian *thiasos* is very appropiate. The Orphic saying "many are *bacchoi*, but a few carry the *thyrsos*" (*OF* 576) was linked by Christians to the Biblical phrase "many are called (κλητοί), but a few are elected (ἐκλεκτοί)" (*Strom.* 1.19.92.3, 5.13.17.4, Thdt. *Affect.* 12.35).

119.3: ἧκε... λιπών... πρὸς ἀλήθειαν: conversion, exemplified now with Teiresias, is again presented as a spatial journey (cf. 1.2.1, 10.93.1). The tone is emphasized through anaphora and with personal pronouns (μοι, σύ) which underline Clement's interest in the last exhortation (11.117.3).

ξύλον: the cross (called "wood" to keep up with the word of 12.118.4) replaces the *thyrsos* in the new mysteries. It is not just a literary metaphor like when it was compared to the wood of the Sirens, but a substitution of the Bacchic symbol by the Christian one (cf. 119 where Teiresias has been told to abandon them).

ἐπιλάμπει φαιδρότερον ἡλίου: Teiresias' vision serves to go back to Eleusinian light imagery applied to Christ (cf. 11.114.1). Similar images, possibly inspired in Clement, in Greg. Naz. *Or.* 5.31, 39.1.

τυφλῶν ἀναβλέπουσιν: a new fusion of Bacchic and Biblical tradition. Eleusinian light and Tiresias' blindness are integrated in the Biblical image of making the blind see (*Is*. 35.5, 42.7), which is given an allegorical sense of contemplating the heavenly truth. "Night, fire and death" also link Eleusinian imagery with Christian eschatology (cf. 2.22.6-7).

120.1: ὦ φωτὸς ἀκηράτου: the mystery metaphor ends up with an invocation to light (the link to the previous lines) in which Eleusinian imagery is applied to Christianity. The previous exhortations to Tiresias turn a general one to the readers to become initiated in the mysteries of the Logos.

σφραγίζεται: this verb belongs to mystery terminology, but it may also have a concrete sacramental sense. The Christian "seal" is baptism (cf. F. J. Dölger, *Sphragis*, Paderborn 1911), where the initiation of Christians would culminate (cf. *Exc. ex. Theod.* 80.3, *Ecl. Proph* .25.1). Cf. Riedweg, 157 n. 135.

δᾳδουχοῦμαι: Clement is δᾳδοῦχος and the Lord is the ἱεροφάντης who presents the initiated to the Father. The distribution of roles corresponds to the effect of the metaphor rather than to Trinitarian subtleties.

120.2: μυστηρίων τὰ βακχεύματα: Bacchic and Eleusinian elements are completely integrated in the fusion of all mytery terminology into one single mystery.

εἰ βούλει, καὶ σὺ μυοῦ: the image of mysteries ends up with an invitation to choice (cf. 21.118.4), an explicit presentation of the "only true God unborn and indestructible" (ὄντως, cf. 2.23.1; ἀγένητον καὶ ἀνώλεθρον: Plat. *Tim.* 52a1, cf. 6.68.3), and of the Logos. The latter appears in an absolute genitive added as an appendix to the sentence, which links it with the next sentence introducing Jesus.

ἀίδιος Ἰησοῦς... ἀρχιερεύς: the name of Jesus, which seldom appears (7.3, 122.4 and indirectly in 9.85.3) in favour of more Hellenic designations as Logos or Christ, is reinforced by an adjective, "eternal" which underlines the divine nature of the man. Perhaps this name is adequate to his assuming a human role as *archiereus*. Jesus as *pontifex maximus* in *Paed.* 2.67.1, *Strom.* 2.45.6. Cf. Galloni 79f. Even if the title has venerable Biblical roots (cf. e.g. *Hebr.* 7.26), the Eleusinian connotation of the term (cf. Hdt 2.37) is still present.

Discourse of Jesus as the Logos

120.2: κέκλυτε, μυρία φῦλα: the quotation of *Il*. 17.220 inaugurates a direct speech from Jesus to the whole race of mankind (πᾶν ἀνθρώπων γένος). The lineage of "reasonable men" or "men of the Logos" (both senses in λογικοί) trascends ethnic barriers as Greeks and barbarians, and has been theorized in 9.82ff. Cf. Buell, 106.

120.3-4: In Jesus' speech there are three parts: self-presentation, promises, and exhortation to conversion. They bring back matters which have been developed in previous chapters. Anaphoric repetitions (ἐθέλω., χαρίζομαι and τοῦτο) collaborate to the persuasiveness and urgence of the exhortation.

ἕνα Λόγον: Jesus' first sentence underlines the unity of God (ἕνα... θεόν) follwed by the unity of his Logos. Clement avoids going deeper than these formulations in Trinitarian theology in the *Protrepticus*. The following self-presentation along two paragraphs is cumulative: He presents himself as "demiurge by will of the Father" (or "will of the Father"), as the Logos of God, as the Son and the Christ. "Symphony" and "harmony of the Father" recall musical metaphors of the *exordium* (1.5.1). "The arm of God" is a Biblical quotation (*Sal*.13.2, Is. 53.2); for the δύναμις τῶν ὅλων cf. 1 Cor 1.24, *Strom*. 6.47.3, 7.9.1.

τῶν ἀλόγων ζῴων: men are contrasted with animals through reason (τῳ λόγῳ) and with mortals (θνητῶν) through immortality (ἀθανασίαν). The rhetorical contraposition and parallelism serve theological purposes. The distinction with animals belongs to the tradition of the protreptic genre (Arist. *Protr*. Fr. 28 During (= Iambl. *Protr*. 35.18 Pistelli) and has been theorized several times along the work (1.4.1. 2.39.4ff, 4.58.1-2, 10.106.1)

τέλειον ἐμαυτόν: the Logos promises immortality, incorruptibility, and the knowledge of God, which is the Logos himself. Promises are thus gradated, from the most usual (immortality) to the most exclusive (participation in the Logos). Men are images (εἰκόνες, cf. 4.59.2) which he will correct (διορθώσασθαι cf. 9.82.2) to make them close to God, their archetype. From the idea of men as images of God there is a conceptual development and, through a final reference to Gn. 1.26 (ὅμοιοι), Clement raises the theme of the ὁμοίωσις θεῷ (cf. 12.122.4).

120.5: χρίσω ὑμᾶς τὸ πίστεως ἀλείμματι: rather than alluding to a ritual unction, the reference to oil has a metaphorical sense. The same happens with the allusion to a "nude form" (γυμνὸν σχῆμα). Ritual terminology collaborates to a new

tripartite gradation of approach to God: unction with faith (πίστις) will show justice (δικαιοσύνη) which will lead to God. It is the same structure implicit in the trilogy *Protrepticus-Paedagogus-Didaskalikos*. The discourse ends up with a lenghty quotation of an exhortation of Jesus in the Gospels (Mt. 11.28-30). The linking with the Gospel legitimates the Hellenic speech of Clement's Logos.

Last exhortations

121.1: σπεύσωμεν... δράμωμεν... ἄρωμεν: Clement exhorts in 1st person plural (cf. 1.8.1, 12.118.1), insisting through anaphora and rhythmic parallelism in the "movement" required by conversion.

θεοείκελα... ἀγάλματα: by addressing men as God-like images (cf. 10.98.3), Clement makes this last exhortation an answer to the previous discourse of the Logos.

ἡνίοχον: cf. 10.89.3, 12.118.4. *Paed.* 3.53.2, *Strom.* 2.51.6, 2.126.1, 5.52.5, 5.53.1. The image of the chariot is Platonic (*Phaedr.* 246b2: cf. Butterworth, 202) though it had earlier precedent as a metaphor of access to knowledge (Parm. fr. 1 DK). Cf. Lilla, 97. The reference to a πῶλον ὑποζύγιον hows it as a Hellenizing allegory of *Mt.* 21.1-7.

νικηφόρος: the victorious Logos was announced in 1.1.3. The next line continues the agonistic image (φιλότιμοι), but instead of gold and silver and glory, the prize will be truth and salvation. F. Dölger, *Antike und Christentum* V, 24, mentions this passage as the first literary testimony precedent of the formula Χριστὸς νικᾷ, though he cautionsly does not consider it its direct source. Cf. Lact. *DI* 7.1.25, Eus. *HE* 5.1.42.

121.2-3: τῶν ἀγαθῶν τὰ μέγιστα: "God" and "life" are given this title of "the greatest good", as "salvation" in 123.2. They are all synonyms. *Peroratio* is not prone to conceptual distinctions, but to enthusiastic overtones, as in hymnic singing in which coordinated epithets apply to God.

αἱρούμεθα: choice and decision are constantly emphasized in these last paragraphs (118.4, 120.2, 122.2, 123.2). To be really able to choose between opposites is the condition of true freedom for Clement, as he expressly states in *Strom.* 4.24.153.1. The mention of δυσσέβεια (only time in this work), the opposite of θεοσέβεια, summarizes with one word the wrong path in this last piece of *refutatio* (cf. next line).

122.1: φιλοσόφων παῖδες: the idea that evil comes out of lack of judgement, which can be called madness, is ascribed vaguely to the "sons of the philosophers". It

was a commonplace of Stoicism (SVF III 657-670; Plut. *De Stoci. repugn.* 1048, DL 7.124, Cic. *Tusc.* 3.10, 4.54). The vagueness of the reference can be due to the extension of the doctrine which was almost a commonplace.

122.2: σωφρονεῖν ἢ μεμηνέναι: the choice between reason and madness (μανία, for Clement, unlike for Plato, lacks any positive dimension, cf. 2.11.2) is so clear that it would be fool to doubt (ἀμφιβάλλειν). The protreptic discourse has to show that the freedom to choice is given actually only one right option: cf. 12.123.2

122.3: κοινὰ τὰ φίλων: this proverb (Plat. *Leg.* 5.739 c2, *Resp.* 424a, 449c, *Phaedr.* 279c6, Arist. *Et. Nic.* 1159b 31, Zenob. 4.79) collaborates to the general theory of possession of everything by God and men, arguing in a similar way to Diogenes *apud* DL 8.10. Bühler, *Zenobii Athoi Proverbia V*, Göttingen 1999, 488-499 y 619-624.

122.4: Χριστιανόν: only at the end of the work does Clement refers to the faithful with this name, as in the 7th Book of the *Stromata* (*Strom.* 7.1.1, 7.3.4, 7.41.3, 7.54.2). Cf. 10.96.2, and T. Klibengajtis, *Vig Christ* 58 (2004), 69ff, on the use of the name. Clement defines the Christian as "pious, rich (cf. *Paed.* 3.34.1), wise and noble" which are the classical virtues of a good citizen and then a good philosopher, which he now applies to the new category proposed to the Greeks.

εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ μεθ' ὁμοιώσεος: the theme of 12.120.4 is recuperated to arrive to assimilation to God (ὁμοίωσις θεῷ), a Platonic concept (*Theet.* 176b) much developed by Christians, which has been hinted at in different previous passages (9.86.2) and is now clearly proclaimed. It is the culmination of the *peroratio*, which announces the last stage which will be the subject-matter of the *Stromata* (1.52.3, 2.80.5-81.1, 2.100.3, 2131.5, 2.133.3, 2.136.6, 3.42.5, 4.139.4, 4.152.3., 4.168.2, 5.95.1, 6.97.1, 6.104.2, 6.150.3, 7.3.6, 7.84.2, 7.86.5; *QDS* 7.3). Cf. the classical work of H. Merki, ΟΜΟΙΩΣΙΣ ΘΕΩΙ, Freiburg 1952, and the last study by J. Zachhuber, in *Ethik in der Alten Kirche*, Leuven 2007.

123.1: ἡμῶν ἐθέλει μόνων κεκλῆσθαι πατήρ: the paragraph begins with a quotation of *Ps.* 81.6 "all (πάντες) of you are gods and sons of the Highest" (also in *Paed.* 1.26.1, *Strom.* 2.125.5, 4.149.8, 6.146.2). But then he restricts this "all of you" to the Christians: the repetition for three times of the 1st person plural pronoun underlines that the grace of being of the divine lineage (cf. 9.82ff) is only for the followers (ὄπαδον: cf. *Phaedr.* 252c) of Christ, not for the non-believers (or not persuaded by his

discourse, since ἀπειθούντων has both senses, cf. 1.2.4, instead of the more usual and unambiguous πεπιστευκόσιν, like in 10.94.4).

οἶαι μὲν αἱ βουλαί, τοῖοι καὶ οἱ λόγοι: this type of correlative sentences belong to the conventions of philosophical literature: cf. Plat. *Resp.* 3.400d; Cic. *Tusc* 5.47; Sen. *Epist.* 114.1; Phil. *De praem.* 81, *Mos.* 1.29, *Quaest in Gen.* 4.7; *Strom.* 3.5.44, 7.16.100. The insistence on ethics as a consequence of decision (πράξεις... ἔργα... βίος) announces the *Paedagogus*.

χρηστός... Χριστόν: another phonetic word-play, helped by the iotacistic pronounciation of η. These short sentences worked well like *slogans* easy to remember. It was a much extended phonetic resource among apologists (Iust. *Apol.* 1.4.4; Theoph. *Autol.* 1.1, Tert. *Ad nat.* 1.39, *Apolog.* 3.5; *Strom.* 2.18.2). Probably Tacitus' famous reference to the followers of Chrestus (*Ann.* 15.44.2) echoes this popular etymology (though cf. the scribal mistake of 10.105.2).

123.2: ἅλις... εἰ καὶ μακροτέρω**:** a last *captatio benevolentiae* apologizing for having been too long is a typical way of closing a discourse (cf. *Strom.* 2.136.6, 3.21.1), similar to other tags to change the subject (cf. 8.77.1). Clement also repeats his personal implication (12.117.3, 12.119.3) in the salvation of his audience. Insistence (οὐδαμῇ οὐδαμῶς) gives the final paragraph a highly emphatic tone, which recalls for the last time (λόγοι ἱεροφαντοῦντες) Clement's favourite image to portray his own work, the revelation of the mysteries.

ὑμῖν... ἔγωγε: the *Protreptic* closes with a contrapositionof 1st person singular / 2nd plural which is typical of revelatory and exhortative style: cf. commentary to 1.2.2, 3.45.5, 11.115.3, and introd. n. 40.

ζωὴν ἀπωλεία: the last words remind a dualistic opposition between two antithetic terms (also ἢ κρίσιν ἢ χάριν, cf. 9.82.3, 10.95.2) presented to man, who must choose (ἑλέσθαι) between both (cf. 11.115, 11.117). The task of the *Protrepticus* is not so much to point at the right choice, which is obvious, but rather to impose a conceptual pattern in which the alternative between these two opposed terms is unavoidable for the *homo optans*.

Select bibliography

L. Alfonsi, "Uno spunto posidoniano in Clemente Alessandrino", *Romanitas et Christianitas. Studia Iano Henrico Waszink oblata*, Amsterdam 1973, 1-3.

- "La consuetudo nei Protrettici"*VigChr* 18 (1964) 32-36

R. Allers, "Microcosmus from Anaximandros to Paracelsus, *Traditio* 2 (1944), 319-407

M. L. Amerio, "Note sulla fortuna di Plato *Tim*. 41e, 42d (in riferimento a Clem. Alex. *Prot*. 63.1)" *Inv Luc* 2 (1980), 189-190.

- "Su due similitudini del *Protrettico* di Clemente Alessandrino (*Prot*. 9.86.2)", *Inv Luc* 1 (1979), 7-37

- "Il nesso ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ in Clemente Alessandrino", AugR 16 (1976), 291-316.

F. Andres, "Die Engel- und Dämonenlehre des Klemens von Alexandrien", *Röm. Quartalschr.* 34 (1926), 13-27, 129-140, 307-329.

P. Aubin, *Le problème de la conversion: Étude sur un terme commun à l'hellenisme et au christianisme des trois premiers siècles*, Paris, 1963.

G. J. M. Bartelink, "Die *Oracula Sibyllina* in den frühchristlichen griechischen Schriften von Justin bis Origenes (150-250 nach Chr.)", J. Den Boeft – A. Hilhorst (eds.), *Early Christian Poetry. A Collection of Essays*, Leiden, 1993, 23-33.

A. Bernabé, "La toile de Penélope: a-t-il existé un mythe orphique sur Dionysos et les Titans?", *RHR* 219 (2002), 401-433).

J. Bernard, *Die apologetische Methode bei Klemens von Alexandrien: Apologetik als Entfaltung der Theologie*, Leipzig, 1968.

M. G. Bianco, "Clemente Alessandrino: il farmaco dell'immortalità (*Protr*. X 106, 2)", in *Morte e immortalità nella catechesi dei Padri del III-IV secolo*, Roma 1985, 63-73

A.P. Bos, "Clement of Alexandria on Aristotle's (cosmo-)theology (Clem. *Protrept*. 5.66.4)" *CQ* 43 (1993).

W. Bousset *Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom: Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenäus*, Göttingen, 1915

R. Van der Broek, "The Christian 'School' of Alexandria in the Second and Third Centuries", in J.W. Drijvers – A.A. McDonald, *Centres of Learning : Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*, Leiden-New York-Köln, 1995, 39-47.

J. A. Brooks, "Clement of Alexandria as a Witness to the Development of the New Testament Canon", *Sec Cent* 9.1 (1992), 41-55

J. Brunschwig, "Aristote et les pirates tyrrhéniens (à propos des fragments 60 Rose du *Protréptique*", *Rev. Phil. de la France et de l'étranger* 88 (1963), 171-190;

D. K. Buell, *Making Christians: Clement of Alexandria and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy,* Princeton, 1999.

- *Why This New Race? Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity*, New York, 2005

G. W. Butterworth, "Clement of Alexandria's *Protrepticus* and the *Phaedrus* of Plato", *CQ* 10 (1916), 198-205.

W. Burkert, *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London, 1983.

- *Ancient Mystery Cults*, Cambridge Mass – London, 1987

C. Camelot: "Clément d'Aléxandrie et l'utiliation de la philosophie grecque", *Rech. sc. rel.* 21 (1931), 541-569.

R. P. Casey "Clement of Alexandria and the beginnings of Christian Platonism", *HThR* 18 (1925).

R. P. Casey, "Clement and the Two Divine Logoi", *JThSt* 25 (1924), 43-56.

Q. Cataudella, *Clemente Alessandrino, Protrettico ai Greci*, Tronio 1940.

H. Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition: Studies in Justin, Clement and Origen*, Oxford, 1966.

W. Christ, „Philologische Untersuchungen zu Clemens von Alexandrien", *Abhandlungen der Kgl. Bayr. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse* 21 (1899), 455-528.

Z. A. Crook, *Reconceptualizing Conversion: patronage, loyalty and conversion in the religions of the ancient Mediterranean*, Berlin-New York, 2004

C. H. Cosgrove, "Clement of Alexandria and early Christian music", *JEChSt* 14 (2006), 255-282.

J. Daniélou, *Message évangelique et culture hellénistique aux IIe et IIIe siècles*, Paris-Tournais – New York – Roma, 1961.

A. Deiber, *Clément d'Alexandrie et l'Egypte*, Cairo 1904.

F. Doelger, "Lumen Christi", *Antike und Christentum* V, 9-19.

- "Χαιρε ἱερὸν φῶς" *Ant. und Christ.* VI, 147-151

- "Sonne und Sonnenstrahl als Gleichnis in der Logostheologie des christlichen Altertums", *Ant. und Christ.* I

A. J. Droge, *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretation on the History of Culture*, Tübingen 1989.

I. Düring, *Aristotle's Protrepticus. An Attempt at a Reconstruction*, Göteborg 1961.

M. J. Edwards, M. Goodman, and S. Price (eds.), *Apologetics in the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1999

L. Eizenhofer, "Die Siegelbildvorschläge des Clemens von Alexandrien", *JAC* 3 (1960) 51-69.

M. Fédou, "La référence à. Homère chez Clément d'Alexandrie et Origène", in L . Perrone (ed.) *Origeniana Octava*, 377-383.

A. J. Festugière, "εἰς ἄνθρωπον ὑποφέρεσθαι" *RScPhTh* 20 (1931), 476-82.

R. Feulner, *Clemens von Alexandrien*, Frankfurt am Main 2006.

M. Fiedrowicz, *Apologie im frühen Christentum*, Paderborn 2001.

M. Galloni, *Cultura, Evangelizzazione e Fede nel Protrettico di Clemente Alessandrino*, Roma, 1986, 63

F. Graf, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit*, Berlin - New York, 1974.

E. S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London, 1998.

T. Halton "Clement's Lyre: a broken String, a New Song", *Sec Cent* 3 (1983), 177-199.

A. Henrichs, "Pagan Ritual and the Alleged Crimes of the Early Christians", en P. Granfield - J. A. Jungmann (eds.), *Kyriakon. Festschrift J. Quasten* I, Münster, 1970, 18-35

- "*Hieroi Logoi* and *Hierai Bibloi*: The (Un)written Margins of the Sacred in Ancient Greece", *HSCP* 101 (2003), 207-266.

J. Hering, *Étude sur la doctrine de la chute et de la préexistence des âmes chez Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1923.

M. Herrero: "Derecho metafórico de familia: la ambigüedad del *nothos* desde la polis clásica a la apologética cristiana", *Actas del XI Congreso de la SEEC I*, Madrid 2005, 637-646.

- "Dionysos mi-cuit : l'étymologie de Mésatis et le festin inachevé des Titans", *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 223.4 (2006), 389-416.

- "Le pluriel de dédain dans la réflexion religieuse des présocratiques", *Revue de philosophie ancienne* 24 (2006), 55-74.

- "Las fuentes de Clem. Alex. *Protr.* 2.12-22: un tratado sobre los misterios y una teogonía órfica", *Emerita* (2007), 1-32.

- *Tradición órfica y cristianismo antiguo*, Madrid 2007.

E. Hiller "Zur Quellenkritik des Clemens Alexandrinus", *Hermes* 21 (1886), 126-133.

A. van der Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and his Use of Philo in the Stromateis*, Leiden, 1988.

- "How Alexandrian was Clement of Alexandria? Reflections on Clement and his Alexandrian Background" *Heythrop Journal* 31 (1990): 179-194

- "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria", *Vig. Chr.* 50 (1996), 223-243.

- "The Catechetical School of Early Christian Alexandria and its Philonic Heritage", *HThR* 90.1 (1997), 59-87

- "Apologetic and Protreptic Discourse in Clement of Alexandria", en *L'apologétique chrétienne gréco-latine à l'époque prénicenienne*, Entr. Hardt 51, 2005, Vandoeuvres-Genève, 69-102

C. R. Holladay, "The Textual Tradition of Pseudo-Orpheus: Walter or Riedweg?" en *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag, I: Judentum*, Tubinga, 1996, 159-180.

E. Irwin, "The song of Orpheus and the New Song of Christ", en J. Warden (ed.) *Orpheus: Metamorphoses of a Myth*, Toronto 1982, 51-62.

A. Jakab, *Ecclesia Alexandrina*, Bern 2001.

F. Jourdan "Dionysos dans le *Protreptique* de Clément d'Alexandrie. Initiations dionysiaques et mystères chrétiens", *RHR* 2006 (3), 265-282.

W. Kinzig, "Der Sitz im Leben der Apologie in der alten Kirche", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 100 (1998), 291-317.

A. Kleingünther, *Πρῶτος εὑρετής* : Der "Erfinder" im Altertum, Leipzig 1933.

T. Klibengajtis, "Die Wahrheit ist wie die Biene": die Wahrheitsmetaphorik des Clemens von Alexandrien", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 80 (2004), 60-75.

H. Kutter, *Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament*, Giessen 1897;

G. Lazzati, *L'Aristotele perduto e gli crittori cristiani*, Milano, 1938, 74-76.

S. R. C. Lilla., *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*, Oxford, 1971.

Le Boulluec, A., *Clement d'Alexandrie Stromate V, edition, traduction et commentaire*, 2 vols., Paris 1981

- *La notion d'héresie dans la litterature grecque IIe-IIIe siècles* Paris, 1985.

- "Aux origines, encore, de l'"école" d'Alexandrie", *Adamantius* 5 (1999), 7-36 (= *Alexandrie Antique et Chrétienne*, Paris 2006, 29-62)

O. Levaniouk, "The toys of Dionysus", *HSCP* 105 (2007).

A. López Pego, "Φάρμακον ἀθανασίας en la literatura cristiana de los primeros siglos", *Homenaje a Luis Gil*, Madrid 1994, 581-605

L. Lugaresi, "Fuggiamo la consuetudine: pratiche sociali cristiane, rappresentazione e spettacoli in Clemente Alessandrino", *Adamantius* 9 (2003), 10-29.

M. Marcovich, *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus*, Leiden 1995.

- "Demeter, Baubo, Iacchus and a Redactor", *Vig.Christ.* 40 (1986), 294-301.

Ch. Markschies « Odysseus und Orpheus christlich gelesen » in R von Haehling (ed.), *Griechische Mythologie und frühes Christentum*, Darmstadt 2005.

D. B. Martin, I*nventing Superstition from the Hippocratics to the Christians*, Cambridge, Mass. 2004.

E. Massaux, *Influence de l'Évangile de Saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant Saint Irenée*, Louvain 1950.

S. van der Meeren, "Le *Protréptique* en philosophie: essaie de definition d'un genre", *Rev. Ét. Gr.* 115 (2002 / 2), 591-621.

M. Mees, *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien*, Bari 1970.

C. Mondésert, *Clément d'Alexandrie: Introduction à l'étude de sa pensée religieuse à partir de l'Écriture*, Paris, 1944

- *Clément d'Alexandrie, Le Protréptique*, Paris 1949.

- "Vocabulaire de Clément d'Alexandrie. Étude sur l'emploi et les significations du mot λογικός chez Clément", *RecSR* 42 (1954), 258-265.

F. Mora, *Arnobio e i culti di mistero*, Roma, 1994.

M. G. Murphy, *Nature Allusions in the works of Clement of Alexandria*, Washington 1941.

M. Naldini, "I miti di Orfeo e di Eracle nell' interpretazione patristica", *CCC* 14 (1993) 331-343.

A. D. Nock, *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo*, Oxford, 1933.

E. Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, Leipzig 1898.

M. Olender "Aspects de Baubo", *RHR* 102 (1985), 3-55

I. Opelt "Christianisierung heidnischer Etymologien", *RAC* 2, Stuttgart 1959, 70-85,

- "Etymologie", *RAC* 6, Stuttgart 1966, 41-48.

E. Osborn, "Clement of Alexandria: A Review of Research, 1958-1982" *Sec Cent*, 3 (1983), 219-244

- *Clement of Alexandria*, Cambridge 2005.

- "One Hundred years of Books on Clement", Vig Christ 60 (2006), 367-388;

P. B. Pade, Λόγος Θεός: Untersuchungen zur Logos-Christologie des Titus Flavius Clemens von Alexandrien, Roma 1939.

R. Parker, "Early Orphism", in Powell (ed.) *The Greek World*, London, 1995,

V. Pavan, "Is. 54,1 (*Laetare sterilis*) nella catechesi dei primi due secoli", *Vet. Christ.* 18 (1981) 341-355.

J. Pépin "La légende orphique du supplice tyrrhénien", A. Cazenave- J. F. Lyotard (eds.), *L'art des confins: Mélanges Gandillac*, Paris 1985, 387-406

Ch. Picard, "L'épisode de Baubo dans les mystères d'Eleusis", *RHR* 95 (1927), 220-255

J. Piquemal, "Sur une métaphore de Clément d'Alexandrie, les dieux, la mort, la mort des dieux", *Revue Philosophique* 153 (1963), 191-198.

B. Pouderon, *Les apologistes chrétiens,* Paris 2005.

B. Pouderon, - J. Doré, (eds.), *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, Paris, 1998.

A. Quacquarelli, "I riflessi di Ps. 90 (91).13 nell'età patristica", *Vet. Christ.* 11 (1974), 17.

E. Rapisarda, *Clemente Fonte di Arnobio*, Torino 1939.

D. Ridings, *The Attic Moses*, Goteborg, 1995.

Ch. Riedweg, *Mysterienterminologie bei Plato, Philo und Klemens von Alexandrien,* Berlin-New York, 1987.

- "Die Mysterien von Eleusis in rhetorisch geprägten Texten des 2/3. Jahrhunderts nach Christius", *Ill. Class. Stud.* 13.1 (1988), 127-133.

- *Jüdisch-hellenistische Imitation eines orphischen Hieros Logos*, Munich, 1993.

- *Ps.-Justin (Markellos von Ancyra?) Ad Graecos de vera religione (bisher Cohortatio ad Graecos): Einleitung und Kommentar*, Basel 1994.

R. Riedinger, "Der Physiologus und Klemens von Alexandrien", *Byz. Zeitschr.* 66 (1973).

M. Rizzi, *Ideologia e retorica negli "exordia" apologetici. Il problema dell''altro'*, Milano 1993.

- "Gli apologisti greci. Teologia in funzione polemica e propositiva" in E. Dal Covolo *Storia della teologia*, Roma-Bologna 1995, pp. 45-62.

- "Cinquant'anni di studi italiani su Clemente Alessandrino", *Adamantius*, 4 (1998), 15-24.

- "Il fondamento epistemologico della mistica in Clemente Alessandrino", in L. F. Pizzolato – M. Rizzi (eds.), *Origene maestro di vita spirituale*, Milano 2001, 91-122.

J.-M. Roessli, "Convergence et divergence dans l'interprétation du mythe d'Orphée", *RHR* 219 (2002), 503-513

E. Rohde, "Unedierte Lucianscholien, die attischen Thesmophorien und Haloen betreffend", *Rhein. Mus.* 25 (1870), 548ff (= *Kleine Schriften* II, 355-369);

D. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, Minneapolis, 1993.

- "Clement of Alexandria and the Philonic Doctrine of the Divine Power", *Vig Christ* 73.3 (2004) 256-276.

R. A. Skeris, *ΧΡΩΜΑ ΘΕΟΥ: On the origin an theological interpretation of the musical imagery used by the ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries, with special reference to the image of Orpheus*, Altötting, 1976.

G. Sfameni Gasparro, G., "La Sibilla voce del Dio per Pagani, ebrei e cristiani : un modulo profetico al crocevia delle fedi" en I. Chirassi Colombo – T. Seppilli (eds.), *Sibille e linguaggi oracolari. Mito, storia, tradizione*, *Atti del Convegno Macerata-Norcia, Settembre 1994*, Pisa-Roma, 1998, 505-553.

S. R. Slings, "Protreptic in Ancient Theories of Philosophical Literature," in J. G. J. Abbenes, S. R. Slings, and I. Sluiter (eds.), *Greek Literary Theory After Aristotle.*, ed. by (Amsterdam 1995),173-192

O. Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus I: Protrepticus und Paedagogus*, Leipzig 1905 (1972[3]).

- *Clemens Alexandrinus und die Septuaginta*, Nüremberg 1901

H. Steneker, *Peithous demiourgia: observations sur la fonction du style dans le protreptique de Clément d'Alexandrie*, Nijmegen, 1967,

H. Stern, "Orphée dans l'art paléochrétien", *Cahiers Archéologiques* 23 (1974), 1-16.

A. von Stockhausen, "Ein "neues Lied"? Der *Protreptikos* des Klemens von Alexandrien", in Ch. Schubert, A. von Stockhausen (eds.), *Ad veram religionem reformare. Frühchristliche Apologetik zwischen Anspruch und Wirklichkeit*, Erlangen 2006, 75-96

F. Storelli, "Itinerario a Dio nel *Protrettico* di Clemente Alessandrino", *Nicolaus* 8 (1980), 3-71.

G. Stroumsa, *Barbarian Philosophy: The Religious Revolution of Early Christianity*, Tübingen, 1999.

W. Telfer, "Bees in Clement of Alexandria", JThS 28 (1927), 167-178.

R. B. Tollinton *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Liberalism*, London, 1914

U. Treu, "Etymologie und Allegorie bei Klemens von Alexandrien", SP IV, 191-211, Oxford 1959.

J. M. Tsermoulas, *Die Bildersprache des Klemens von Alexandrien,* Kairo 1934,

P. Valentin, "Héraclite et Clément d´Alexandrie", *Rech Sc Rel* 46 (1958), 27-59

J. M. Vermander, "De quelques répliques à Celse dans le *Protréptique* de Clément d'Alexandrie", *Rev. Ét. Aug.* 23 (1977), 3-17

H. Versnel, "The Poetics of Magical Charm", in Mirecki-Meyer (eds.): *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, Leiden 1999, 105-156.

P. Vicari, "*Sparagmos*. Orpheus among the Christians", in J. Warden (ed.) *Orpheus: Metamorphoses of a Myth*, Toronto 1982, 63-83)

L. Viscido, "Similitudini tratte dal mondo animale in Clemente Alessandrino", *Vet. Chr.* 18 (1981), 383-392.

W. H. Wagner, "A Father's Fate: Attitudes Towards and Interpretations of Clement of Alexandria", *Journal of Religious History* 7 (1972), 209-231.

H. Wiese, *Heraklit bei Klemens von Alexandrien*, Kiel 1963.

J. C. M. van Winden, "Quotations from Philo in Clement of Alexandria's *Protrepticus*", *Vig Christ* 32 (1978), 208-213.

R. E. Witt, "The Hellenism of Clement of Alexandria", *CQ* 25 (1931)

N. Zeegers-Van der Vorst, *Les citations paiennes dans les apologistes grecs du II siècle*, Louvain 1972..

F. Zucker, "Euhemeros und seine ῾Ιερὰ ἀναγραφή bei den christlichen Schriftstellern" *Philologus* 64 (1905), 465-472.

Analytic index

Greek words

ἀλήθεια: 146, 175, 193, 204, 217, 219, 236f, 249, 265
ἀπόρροια: 201, 212. Cf . s. v. "inspiration"
ἀρχή: 120, 121, 122, 169, 193, 194, 195, 220, 240, 249
γῆ: 115, 144, 148, 180, 186, 235, 239, 244,
γνήσιος: 113, 143, 223, 236, 238, 241, 250
γοητεία: 109, 115, 121, 128, 130, 187, 257
δαίμονες: 119, 162, 163, 165f, 176, 181, 185
δεισιδαιμονία: 14, 17f, 109, 112, 115, 169, 181, 188, 223, 249
δημιουργός: 169, 182, 195,
δρᾶμα: 112, 132, 188, 250, 264.
δράκων (and ὄφις): 121, 122, 131, 136, 143, 155, 159, 167, 246;
ἔθος: 115, 231, 233; cf. συνήθεια
εἴδωλον: 152, 185, 196, 198
εἰκών: 189, 225, 240, 264, 267, 269.
ἐλέγχω: 144, 181, 186, 212, 224
θεοσέβεια: 109, 112, 175, 188, 221, 226, 267, 232, 233, 242, 248, 249, 253, 258, 268
ἱεροφάντης: 146, 211, 266, 270
καινός: 113, 115, 117, 120, 121, 177, 253
κρίσις: 222, 237, 270;
κύριος: 119, 222, 234, 252, 264
μάγοι: 142, 188, 195.
μισθός: 156, 168, 226, 236, 248, 256,
μετάνοια: 19, 117, 233, 241f, 247,
νόθος: 143, 235f, 243
νόμος: 113, 143, 237, 249,
οὐρανός: 115, 147, 197, 241, 242, 249, 263
πίστις: 114, 237, 247, 255-257, 267-268
πνεῦμα: 16, 25, 31, 109, 118, 197, 217, 262, 263,
πῦρ: 123, 143, 168, 182, 194, 195, 162
συνήθεια: 115, 174, 191, 207, 213, 243f, 249, 261, 262; cf. ἔθος
σοφία: 119, 192, 194, 218, 248
τάφος: 140, 178, 233
τέχνη: 174, 180, 187, 191, 240,
φάρμακον: 114, 206, 244, 247
φιλοσοφία: 20, 179, 191, 195, 253, 268
φόβος: 122, 160, 177, 227, 237,
φωνή: 116, 123, 124, 216, 218, 220, 225, 229, 245, 268, 279,
χάρις: 222, 224, 237, 245, 259, 270
ὡμοίωσις: 123, 155, 190, 227, 246, 263, 267, 269,
Χριστός: 120, 128, 149, 146, 168, 270

Relevant concepts

animals: 19-22, 109, 115f, 161f, 167, 173, 180, 187f, 217, 234f, 242, 245-248, 267
atheism: 19, 47, 145-147, 161, 184f, 195f, 245
baptism: 35, 44, 117, 222, 223, 236, 241, 251, 255, 258, 266
choice: 21f, 217, 224, 233, 235, 237, 241, 259, 261, 266, 268-270
conversion: 18f, 22, 27, 30, 37, 45, 109, 112, 117, 121-123, 145, 149, 167, 211, 218f, 221, 225, 228, 234, 235, 245, 251, 261, 264-268
Devil:121, 122, 159, 162, 165, 223, 224, 251
Dionysus: 17, 127, 129, 131f, 136, 138-140, 145, 148, 149, 154, 156, 158, 160f, 182, 183f, 188, 242, 265.
Egypt: 10, 27, 36, 114, 133, 141, 146, 161f, 164, 169, 173, 176-178, 181, 205, 210.
Eleusis: 31, 36, 46, 123, 125, 132-136, 141-145, 255, 257, 263-266.
etymology: 25, 114f, 122, 128, 131f, 133, 138, 148, 166f, 174, 177, 194, 213, 225-227, 234, 238, 240, 270.
Heraclitus: 25, 34, 27, 48, 142, 143, 146, 156f, 178f, 182, 195, 235, 254.
Homer: 9, 27, 32, 34, 38, 114, 123, 139, 141, 148, 152-154, 167, 185f, 188, 197, 205, 213, 221f, 223, 254, 256, 262.
idolatry: 115, 122, 148, 173, 190-196, 218f, 231, 238, 244, 247
Fall (of man): 38, 115f, 147-149, 186, 219, 251, 152.
Fatherhood of God: 35, 43f, 122, 154, 163, 197, 210, 221-223, 229, 232, 236, 241, 246, 257, 266f.
inspiration: 205, 208, 212, 215, 217, 219, 245.
light: 109, 113, 145, 150, 177, 182, 203, 217, 219, 224f, 227f, 243, 251, 254-257, 266
Moses: 36, 146, 205, 217, 218, 222, 226, 253,
music: 35, 109-113, 115-120, 123, 153, 225, 229, 261-263, 265, 267,
mysteries: 9, 16-18, 24-28, 35f, 46, 109-112, 119, 121, 124f, 127-145, 155f, 196, 211, 219, 233, 238, 245, 247, 250, 252, 257, 261, 263-266, 270
oldness (of Paganism): 28, 112, 113, 115, 120, 121, 127, 159, 227, 249,
Orpheus: 15-18, 25, 35f, 46, 109-121, 133, 138, 168, 177, 179, 187, 190, 209, 216, 257, 261, 264.
philosophy: 20-23, 26, 28, 30-32, 35, 38-43, 179, 182, 187, 191, 193-196, 199-214, 232, 240, 253, 254.
prophets: 39, 41f, 116, 123f, 191, 199, 215-221.
religion: cf. θεοσέβεια
revelatory style: 26, 112, 150, 171, 238, 257, 270
statues: 116, 159, 173-175, 178-183, 186, 190, 195, 238-240.
superstition: cf. δεισιδαιμονία.
trial against Paganism: 26, 30, 109, 127f, 130, 133, 144f, 150, 153, 161, 191, 170, 181, 186, 212f, 244.
Sibyll: 150, 176, 178f, 190, 207f, 209, 212, 215-217, 239
Zeus: 17, 127, 129, 134-136, 138-140, 147, 151, 153-156, 158-162, 175, 177, 181, 183, 185f, 203f, 209f, 240, 250.