Modern research on Clement tends to make him a late partisan of the “two-stage” concept of the Logos which we meet in the second-century apologists. According to this, the Logos was embedded from all eternity in the Father, and became a second hypostasis when the Father brought it forth, “before the ages”, as his instrument of creation. This doctrine, which entails that only the nature and not the person of the Logos is eternal, was a heresy for most Christians after the Council of Nicaea, and there is no doubt that it had already lost ground in Alexandria by the time of Clement’s death. Origen denied it, and when Bishop Alexander alleged that Arius held a doctrine of two logoi, he assumed that it would immediately be recognised as heresy. Arius did not maintain a doctrine of emanation, perhaps not even the doctrine of two logoi, and the purpose of this article is to show that we have no grounds for believing that either theory was any more acceptable to Clement than to his successors. In the first part I shall argue that the classic formulation of the “two-stage” theory, in which an outgoing word or logos prophorikos supervenes upon an immanent word or logos endiathetos, was not a universal datum in the time of Clement. In the second I shall challenge the philological and philosophical arguments that have been adduced to prove that he held the
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2 Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History* 1.6. On Origen see below.
3 See e.g. G.C. Stead, “The Thalia of Arius and the testimony of Athanasius”, *JThS* 29 (1978), 31-4. Arius’ extant writings never assert that the title Logos is equivocal, and the confession which he and Euzoius presented to Constantine in 327 speaks of Christ as Logos in juxtaposition with clauses referring to the creation. That is, he is the Logos of the world, not of the Father. Since the Nicene council did not insist on the title Logos, and it figures in a different place in the formulary of Eusebius (Socrates, *HE* 1.8), we must assume that Arius set some store by this sense of the term.
theory; then, examining the testimony of Photius in the third part, I shall give reasons for suspecting a misquotation. Finally, in defending the authenticity of another disputed passage, I shall propose that Clement taught the eternal generation of the Logos, and that he may have framed this doctrine as an antidote to the teaching of the Valentinian school.

I

First it should be observed that the “two-stage” theory cannot be ascribed with equal certainty to all the second-century apologists. It is plainly found in Tatian, who declares that the Logos “sprang forth” from the Father, having previously resided as a potency or *dunamis* within him (*Oratio* 5). It is not so clearly present in Ignatius of Antioch, who (if we follow the Middle Recension of his letters and do not emend the manuscript) spoke of Christ in his epistle to the *Magnesians* as “the Word who proceeds in silence from the Father” (8.3). Some readers have conjectured that this silence is the state of indeterminate or potential being which Christ enjoyed before his emanation from the Father as the Logos; others maintain, however, that Ignatius is alluding to the secrecy of the Father’s operations in the period when, as he writes to the Ephesians, the devil was kept in ignorance of the three mysteries that were fulfilled in Mary’s virginity, her labour and the Cross (*Eph.* 18). This second view is corroborated, not only by the parallel from Ephesians, but by the immediate context in Magnesians, for the author is plainly speaking of the incarnate Christ when he celebrates his “obedience in all things to the one who sent him”.¹ Even less can any case be built on Justin Martyr, for he also affirms a generation of the Logos from the Father (*Trypho* 61.1), but says nothing of any antecedent phase.

Athenagoras makes a better witness, as he writes that, whereas Christ is the Father’s offspring (*γέννηται*), he is in none the less ingenerate (*όυχ ός γενόμενον*). This could be construed to mean that, while his person had a beginning, his nature was eternal; and this in turn could imply that he was immanently or potentially in the Father before he came forth and acquired his own identity (*Legatio* 10). That something of the kind is meant is clear from the subsequent statement that the Son, who from all eternity had been a rational principle in the Father’s mind and one with him in