

# Against Clement of Alexandria



R. J. M. I.

By

The Precious Blood of Jesus Christ,  
The Grace of the God of the Holy Catholic Church,  
The Mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary,  
Our Lady of Good Counsel and Crusher of Heretics,  
The Protection of Saint Joseph, Patriarch of the Holy Family,  
The Intercession of Saint Michael the Archangel,  
and the cooperation of

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

To Jesus through Mary

*Júdica me, Deus, et discérne causam meam de gente non sancta:  
ab hómine iníquo, et dolóso érue me*

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

Original version: 10/2017; Current version: 10/2017

**Mary's Little Remnant**

302 East Joffre St.

Truth or Consequences, New Mexico 87901-2878, USA

Website: [www.JohnTheBaptist.us](http://www.JohnTheBaptist.us)

(Send for a free catalog)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>This article will be a chapter in my book The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics</i> .....	3
<i>Brief history of Clement of Alexandria</i> .....	3
<i>His apostasy for believing that Greek philosophy is a true religion and saves men</i> .....	4
<i>His apostasy for glorifying philosophy</i> .....	4
<i>His apostasy for believing that God inspires men to worship the stars and planets</i> .....	5
<i>His apostasy for believing that Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit were created</i> .....	6
<i>His apostasy for believing the Universal Salvation heresy</i> .....	7
<i>His heresy for believing that men have two souls</i> .....	8
<i>His heresy for believing that original sin is not a real sin</i> .....	8
<i>His apostasy for believing Gnosticism and stoicism</i> .....	9
<i>His works were condemned in the invalid and heretical Pseudo-Gelasius Decretals, and his name was removed from the Roman Martyrology</i> .....	10

### **This article will be a chapter in my book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics***

This article was taken from a chapter titled “The Anti-Church Fathers: Clement of Alexandria” in my book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics* (hereafter *HCAS*). When that book is published, this article will only be available as a section in my main Hellenization book.

### **Brief history of Clement of Alexandria**

The apostate Clement of Alexandria was born c. 150 and died c. 215. In 190 he became the head of the Catechetical School of Alexandria, taking the place of the precious head, the apostate Pantaenus:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Clement of Alexandria”: “(Properly TITUS FLAVIUS CLEMENS, but known in church history by the former designation to distinguish him from Clement of Rome)... Clement was an early Greek theologian and head of the Catechetical School of Alexandria. Athens is given as the starting-point of his journeyings, and was probably his birthplace. He became a convert to the Faith and travelled from place to place in search of higher instruction, attaching himself successively to different masters: to a Greek of Ionia, to another of Magna Graecia, to a third of Coele-Syria, after all of whom he addressed himself in turn to an Egyptian, an Assyrian, and a converted Palestinian Jew. At last he met Pantaenus in Alexandria, and in his teaching ‘found rest’... At an uncertain date, in the latter half of the second century, ‘a school of oral instruction’ was founded. Lectures were given to which pagan hearers were admitted... Pantaenus is the earliest teacher whose name has been preserved. Clement first assisted and then succeeded Pantaenus in the direction of the school, about A.D. 190.”

Clement, like his predecessor Pantaenus, glorified pagans and their philosophies and mythologies and thus Hellenized Christianity. He taught Origen. And in 203 Origen was made the next head of the school.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See RJMI book *HCAS: History of the Anti-Church Fathers’ Hellenization of Christianity: ...The Catechetical School of Alexandria*.

## His apostasy for believing that Greek philosophy is a true religion and saves men

He was an apostate for teaching that Greek philosophy paved the road for Christianity, that Greek philosophy is a true religion that sanctifies and saves men, that Christians should learn philosophy in order to better understand the Catholic faith, and that Christians should learn how to be virtuous and moral by studying Greek philosophy and imitating the pagan Greeks:

Apostate Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* (aka *Miscellanies*), 208: “[b. 1, c. 5] Before the advent of the Lord, philosophy was necessary to the Greeks for justification. And now it becomes conducive to piety; being a kind of preparatory training to those who attain to faith through demonstration. ‘For thy foot,’ it is said, ‘will not stumble, if thou refer what is good, whether belonging to the Greeks or to us, to Providence.’ For God is the cause of all good things; but of some primarily, as of the Old and the New Testament; and of others by consequence, as philosophy. Perchance, too, philosophy was given to the Greeks directly and primarily, till the Lord should call the Greeks. For this was a schoolmaster to bring ‘the Hellenic mind,’ as the law, the Hebrews, ‘to Christ.’ Philosophy, therefore, was a preparation, paving the way for him who is perfected in Christ...

“[b. 7, c. 2] And that he whom we call Saviour and Lord is the Son of God... It is he who also gave philosophy to the Greeks by means of the inferior angels. ... He has dispensed his beneficence both to Greeks and Barbarians [Faithful Jews]... For, having furnished the one with the commandments, and the other with philosophy, he shut up unbelief to the Advent. Whence every one who believes not is without excuse. For by a different process of advancement, both Greek and Barbarian, he leads to the perfection which is by faith.”

## His apostasy for glorifying philosophy

*History of Dogmas*, by apostate Rev. J. Tixeront, D.D., 1913: “Clement is both a strong [RJMI: an apostate] Christian and a staunch philosopher... His enthusiasm for Philosophy is well known... Clement is an Eclectic. Plato and Pythagoras are his favorite masters, and after them, Zeno [the Stoic] and Aristotle. He excludes only Epicurus and the Sophists... Clement describes his own undertaking: viz., by means of Philosophy, to search more and more deeply into faith, to transform the latter into a science... In exegesis he adopts Philo’s principles. He applies them with unhesitating boldness to the Old Testament, whose facts, in his hands, vanish away into mere symbols... Scripture, the teaching of the Church and of the Ancients, and Philosophy: these are, according to Clement, the three elementary factors of Theology [RJMI: of Theophilosophy, of Scholasticism]... The God of Clement is indeed the God of Christians [RJMI: of anti-Christians]... but he is also a God conceived in the Platonic fashion...”<sup>2</sup>

Hence, Clement’s god is a new kind of god, a god who is part Christian and part pagan. Clement merges the true God of Christians with the false god of the pagan philosophers and produces a monster—the two-headed god of Theophilosophy.

---

<sup>2</sup> v. 1, c. 7, s. 1, pp. 244-247.

## His apostasy for believing that God inspires men to worship the stars and planets

While Clement correctly condemned atheism and the worship of images, he idolatrously taught that God inspired men to worship the planets and stars to more easily lead them to God:

Apostate Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* (aka *Miscellanies*), 208: “[b. 6, c. 14] Not only then the believer, but even the heathen, is judged most righteously. For since God knew in virtue of His prescience that he would not believe, He nevertheless, in order that he might receive his own perfection gave him philosophy, but gave it him previous to faith. And He gave the sun, and the moon, and the stars to be worshipped; ‘which God,’ the Law says, made for the nations, that they might not become altogether atheistical, and so utterly perish. But they, also in the instance of this commandment, having become devoid of sense, and addicting themselves to graven images, are judged unless they repent... For this was the sway given to the nations to rise up to God, by means of the worship of the heavenly bodies. But those who would not abide by those heavenly bodies assigned to them, but fell away from them to stocks and stones, ‘were counted,’ it is said, ‘as chaff-dust and as a drop from a jar,’ beyond salvation, cast away from the body...”

St. Paul warned against idolaters like Clement when he said,

“Beware lest any man cheat you by philosophy and vain deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the elements of the world [RJMI: such as astrology and the worship of stars and planets], and not according to Christ.” (Col. 2:8)

And St. Peter also condemns Clement when he says to beware of those who “wrest...the scriptures to their own destruction.” (2 Pt. 3:16) In this case, Clement wrests Wisdom 13:1-9 by woefully and idolatrously misinterpreting it to mean that God inspires men to worship the stars and planets in order to lead them to him:

“But all men are vain, in whom there is not the knowledge of God, and who by these good things that are seen could not understand him that is, neither by attending to the works have acknowledged who was the workman but have imagined either the fire, or the wind, or the swift air, or the circle of the stars, or the great water, or the sun and moon, to be the gods that rule the world. With whose beauty if they, being delighted, took them to be gods, let them know how much the Lord of them is more beautiful than they, for the first author of beauty made all those things. Or if they admired their power and their effects, let them understand by them that he that made them is mightier than they: For by the greatness of the beauty and of the creature, the creator of them may be seen so as to be known thereby. But yet as to these they are less to be blamed. For they perhaps err, seeking God, and desirous to find him. For being conversant among his works, they search and they are persuaded that the things are good which are seen. But then again they are not to be pardoned. For if they were able to know so much as to make a judgment of the world, how did they not more easily find out the Lord thereof?” (Wis. 13:1-9)

While God credits men for seeking him, he does not credit them when they miss the mark and thus worship anything other than the one true God. Even though star and planet worshippers are less to be blamed than atheists and those who worship statues or other works of human hands, they “are not to be pardoned.” It is this part that Clement ignores and omits and thus has God being the author of sin by inspiring men to worship stars and planets. And if God did, then, according to the Book of Wisdom, God would be unjust for not pardoning them for doing so. Hence on the one hand, according to Clement, God inspires men to worship the stars and planets; but on the other hand, according to the

Book of Wisdom, God does not pardon them for doing so. Therefore Clement presents a god in opposition to himself and as the author of sin. Clement's whole purpose is to justify men who worship the stars and planets.

### **His apostasy for believing that Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit were created**

He taught the heresy that Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit were created and thus they are not truly God and hence not co-equal to God the Father:

*History of Dogmas*, by apostate Rev. J. Tixeront, D.D., 1913: "And yet some have thought that in his works there are traces of subordinationism: for he not only applies to the Son the appellations Philo gives to the Word: he...declares that...the Son's nature is the nearest to Him who alone is all powerful, that the Son can be demonstrated and known, while the Father [p. 249] can be neither known nor demonstrated.<sup>3</sup> Nay, if Photius<sup>4</sup> is to be believed, Clement looked upon the Son as a creature; and it must be said that the Alexandrian doctor has, on this subject, expressions somewhat perplexing.<sup>5</sup> ...Concerning the Holy Ghost, our author says nothing special, nothing that is not already found in Holy Writ.<sup>6</sup> However, the reader's attention may be drawn to the passage where he calls the Son and the Holy Spirit '*primitivae virtutes ac primo creatae* [first virtues also first created], *immobiles existentes secundum substantiam*.'<sup>7,8</sup>

Apostate Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 208: "[b. 7, c. 1]: The Son, from whom we are to learn the remoter Cause, the Father of the universe, the most ancient and the most beneficent of all... [b. 7, c. 2] But the nature of the Son, which is nearest to Him who is alone the Almighty One, is the most perfect, and most holy, and most potent, and most princely, and most kingly, and most beneficent."

*Adumbrationes* [Outlines or sketches], III. Comments on the First Epistle of St. John, Chap. 2, Ver. 1: " 'And if any man sin,' he says, 'we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ.' For so the Lord is an advocate with the Father for us. So also is there an advocate [Holy Spirit], whom, after his assumption, he vouchsafed to send. For these [the Son and the Holy Spirit] primitive and first-created virtues are unchangeable as to substance, and along with subordinate angels and archangels, whose names they share, effect divine operations." [In *Fragments*]

The apostate Eusebius of Cesarea picked up this same heresy from Clement and uses almost the same words:

Apostate Eusebius of Cesarea, *Church History*, Bk. 1, Chap. 2: "Then, when the excess of wickedness had overwhelmed nearly all the race, like a deep fit of drunkenness, beclouding and darkening the minds of men, the first-born and first-created wisdom of God, the pre-existent Word himself, himself, induced by his exceeding love for man, appeared to his servants..."

Eusebius was influenced by apostates from the Catechetical School of Alexandria, such as Pantaenus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. He was taught in Cesarea of Palestine by the apostate Pamphilius who was taught by the apostate Origen who was taught by the apostate Clement of Alexandria who was taught by the apostate Pantaenus.

<sup>3</sup> Footnote 1: "*Strom.*, VII, i, col. 404; VII, 2, col. 408; IV, 25, col. 1365."

<sup>4</sup> Footnote 2: "*Codex* 109. Rufinus of Aquileia also points out in Clement's work, passages that have the same meaning, though he supposes they were interpolated (*Epilogue in Apologetic. S. Pamphili*, edit. of Origen by Lommatzsch, XXV, 387)."

<sup>5</sup> Footnote 3: "*Strom.*, V, 14, col. 132; VI, 7, col. 278; *Adumbrationes*, col. 735, 736."

<sup>6</sup> Footnote 4: "*Cohort.*, VIII, col. 188, 189; *Strom.*, IV, 26, col. 1373; VII, 2, col. 413; VII, 14, col. 351, foll."

<sup>7</sup> Footnote 5: "*Adumbrationes*, col. 735, 736."

<sup>8</sup> v. 1, c. 7, s. 1, pp. 248-249.

## His apostasy for believing the Universal Salvation heresy

The apostate Clement of Alexandria believed in the Universal Salvation heresy (aka the *Apocatastasis* heresy) which states that all angels and all men will eventually be saved. He believed that devils and damned humans will eventually be purified and perfected and hence saved from the hell of the damned. Hence he taught the heresy that God does not punish but only chastises angels and men in which his chastisements are guaranteed to convert all of them, some of them converting after death in the hell of the damned. Hence he did not believe that God punishes any angel or human with everlasting damnation:

*History of Dogmas*, by apostate Rev. J. Tixeront, D.D., 1913: “He admits that, after death, the souls of sinners will be sanctified by an intelligent fire, and that the wicked will be likewise punished by fire.<sup>9</sup> Is their chastisement to last forever? Clement does not think so: those tortures of which he speaks in the seventh *Stroma*, 2 (col. 216), and which follow the final judgment bring the guilty to repentance. This same idea occurs again in the 12th chapter (col. 506); besides, in the 16th chapter (col. 541) the author lays down the principle that God does not punish, but only corrects, that is, that any punishment on His part is remedial.<sup>10</sup> When we remember that later on Origen started from the very same principle to infer the *apocatastasis*, we are probably right in believing that Clement understood this principle in the same way as his illustrious successor [Origen].

“Anyhow, he adds that, for the elect, they shall be received into one of the three dwelling-places signified by the numbers thirty, sixty, a hundred, of the parable of the seed (Matt., 13:8).<sup>11</sup> The Gnostic alone is allowed to enjoy what the eye has not seen, nor the ear heard, what has not entered into the heart of man to conceive. He will enter the house of God, there to contemplate him in a light unchangeable and eternal.<sup>12, 13</sup>

Apostate Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 208: “[b. 7, c. 2] Wherefore also all men are his; some through knowledge, and others not yet so; and some as friends, some as faithful servants, some as servants merely. This is the Teacher, who trains the Gnostic by mysteries, and the believer by good hopes, and the hard of heart by corrective discipline through sensible operation. Thence his providence is in private, in public, and everywhere... He does care for all, which is befitting for him who has become Lord of all. For he is Saviour; not [the Saviour] of some, and of others not. But in proportion to the adaptation possessed by each, he has dispensed his beneficence both to Greeks and Barbarians, even to those of them that were predestinated, and in due time called, the faithful and elect. Nor can he who called all equally, and assigned special honours to those who have believed in a specially excellent way, ever envy any...

“And how is He Saviour and Lord, if not the Saviour and Lord of all? But He is the Saviour of those who have believed, because of their wishing to know; and the Lord of those who have not believed, till, being enabled to confess him, they obtain the peculiar and appropriate boon which comes by him... Then at the highest extremity of the visible world is the blessed band of angels; and down to ourselves there are ranged, some under others, those who, from One and by One, both are saved and save.

“As, then, the minutest particle of steel is moved by the spirit of the Heracleon stone when diffused over many steel rings; so also, attracted by the Holy Spirit, the

<sup>9</sup> Footnote 1: “*Strom.*, VII, 6, col. 449; V, 14, col. 133.”

<sup>10</sup> Footnote 2: “Cf. *Strom.*, VI, 14, col. 329, 332.”

<sup>11</sup> Footnote 3: “*Strom.*, VI, 14, col. 337; IV, 18, col. 1321.”

<sup>12</sup> Footnote 4: “*Strom.*, IV, 18, col. 1321; VII, 10, col. 481; VII, xi, col. 496.”

<sup>13</sup> v. 1, c. 7, s. 1, p. 256.

virtuous are added by affinity to the first abode, and the others in succession down to the last. But those who are bad from infirmity, having fallen from vicious insatiableness into a depraved state, neither controlling nor controlled, rush round and round, whirled about by the passions, and fall down to the ground.

[RJMI: He does not mean that those who fall down are lost forever. He means that those who did not cooperate with God when alive will be sent to hell to be punished severely until they repent and confess God and thus will eventually be saved. But they will not attain as high a place in heaven. This is certain because in the quotes above he says that Jesus is “the Lord of those who have not believed, till, being enabled to confess him, they obtain the peculiar and appropriate boon which comes by him” and “both (angels and men) are saved and save.” And as you will read below, he says that God “compel[s] egregious sinners to repent.”]

“For this was the law from the first, that virtue should be the object of voluntary choice. Wherefore also the commandments, according to the Law, and before the Law, not given to the upright (for the law is not appointed for a righteous man), ordained that he should receive eternal life and the blessed prize, who chose them. But, on the other hand, they allowed him who had been delighted with vice to consort with the objects of his choice; and, on the other hand, that the soul, which is ever improving in the acquisition of virtue and the increase of righteousness, should obtain a better place in the universe, as tending in each step of advancement towards the habit of impassibility, till ‘it come to a perfect man,’ to the excellence at once of knowledge and of inheritance. These salutary revolutions, in accordance with the order of change, are distinguished both by times, and places, and honours, and cognitions, and heritages, and ministries, according to the particular order of each change, up to the transcendent and continual contemplation of the Lord in eternity... But necessary corrections, through the goodness of the great overseeing Judge, both by the attendant angels, and by various acts of anticipative judgment, and by the perfect judgment, compel egregious sinners to repent.”

### **His heresy for believing that men have two souls**

*History of Dogmas*, by apostate Rev. J. Tixeront, D.D., 1913: “He [Clement of Alexandria] is trichotomist. Man possesses two souls: one, carnal and sensitive, the other, intelligent and ruling, that is not begotten with the body...<sup>14,15</sup>

### **His heresy for believing that original sin is not a real sin**

*History of Dogmas*, by apostate Rev. J. Tixeront, D.D., 1913: “Sin is our own deed, a deed, though, which is natural and common to all of us: the Logos alone is without sin.<sup>16</sup> Clement nowhere speaks clearly of original sin. True, he knows the disobedience of our first parents and thinks that, as they were created in a state of infancy, their fault consisted in uniting in wedlock, before the time appointed to them by God; true, he admits also, that by his sin Adam gave to men an example which they are not slow to follow; but he seems to deny the imputation that might be made to them of that sin, by affirming that only the acts of our choice can be imputed to us.<sup>17,18</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Footnote 8: “*Strom.*, VI, 6, col. 273; VI, 16, col. 360.”

<sup>15</sup> v. 1, c. 7, s. 1, p. 249.

<sup>16</sup> Footnote 1: “*Strom.*, II, 15, col. 1000, 1004; IV, 26, col. 1373, 1377; *Paed.*, III, 12, col. 672; cf. *Cohort.*, XI, col. 228.”

<sup>17</sup> Footnote 2: “*Strom.*, II, 15, col. 1004; III, 17, col. 1205; III, 14, col. 1193, 1196; *Cohort.*, XI, col. 228; *Adumbr. in epist. Judae*, col. 733.”

<sup>18</sup> v. 1, c. 7, s. 1, p. 250.

Apostate Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 208: “And those [sins] are not reckoned that are not the effect of choice...”<sup>19</sup>

## His apostasy for believing Gnosticism and stoicism

*History of Dogmas*, by apostate Rev. J. Tixeront, D.D., 1913: “Clement is...a staunch philosopher... His enthusiasm for Philosophy is well known... Clement is an Eclectic. Plato and Pythagoras are his favorite masters, and after them, Zeno [the Stoic] and Aristotle. He excludes only Epicurus and the Sophists...”

“Photius has charged Clement with Docetism. The accusation is only partly deserved. On one hand, Clement sets aside Docetism strictly so called; he admits in Jesus Christ a real body, a material blood, a passible manhood; on the other hand, he thinks that his body was free from the common and natural necessities of eating and drinking, and his soul, from the motions of passions, from joy and sadness. He even records, without any disapproval, a certain tradition that represented the Saviour’s flesh as impalpable and offering no resistance to the sense of touch.”<sup>20</sup> ...

“Here we touch one of the most important points of Clement’s doctrine. There is no doubt that he divided Christians into two categories: those who content themselves with the common faith, and those who rise to Gnosis...”<sup>21</sup>

“What, then, should we exactly understand by a Christian Gnostic? Clement has described him in several places; in the seventh Stroma (10-14) especially, he has left us an ideal picture, in which it is easy to notice two principal features. First of all, the Gnostic has a knowledge and, as it were, an intuitive perception of the truths that faith prompts us to believe, without revealing to us their contents: he has the understanding of God and of things divine in general, of man and his nature, of virtue, of the supreme good, of the universe and its origin: the ‘great mysteries,’ of which the smaller ones are a mere preparation, are revealed to him.”<sup>22</sup> Then the Gnostic leads a perfect life, characterized by the practice of two virtues: one Stoic, the other Christian. The former is insensibility: the Gnostic has uprooted from his soul every passion and desire, all the sensible part of his nature: hence he has no need of the inferior virtues necessary for the struggle: no event can shake him, nor can he be reached by any emotion: he is the ideal philosopher of the Porch.”<sup>23</sup> ...His originality consisted in introducing, on the one hand, into the idea of perfection, the intellectual and Platonic element of knowledge; on the other, the practice of the Stoic virtue of apathy, into its moral element. In this we recognize the two influences, philosophic and Christian, which told on his mind and re-echoed, as it were, in his teaching...

“Anyhow, he adds that, for the elect, they shall be received into one of the three dwelling-places signified by the numbers thirty, sixty, a hundred, of the parable of the seed (Matt., 13). The Gnostic alone is allowed to enjoy what the eye has not seen, nor the ear heard, what has not entered into the heart of man to conceive. He will enter the house of God, there to contemplate Him in a light unchangeable and eternal.”<sup>24,25</sup>

Hence the apostate Clement of Alexandria adds another heresy to his Gnostic heresy. In the last paragraph above, he teaches that in heaven God is seen by the Gnostics only, and not by the lower classes. What follows is a small sample of his Gnostic heresy:

---

<sup>19</sup> b. 2, c. 15.

<sup>20</sup> Footnote 1: “*Strom.*, VI, 9, col. 292; cf. III, 17, col. 1161, 1164; *Paed.*, I, 2, col. 252; *Adumbr. in I Joan.*, i, col. 735.”

<sup>21</sup> Footnote 4: “*Paed.*, I, 6, col. 288, 293.”

<sup>22</sup> Footnote 1: “*Strom.*, V, II, col. 108; VI, 8, col. 289; VI, 10, col. 300; VII, 3, col. 421.”

<sup>23</sup> Footnote 2: “*Strom.*, VI, 9, col. 292, foll.”

<sup>24</sup> Footnote 4: “*Strom.*, IV, 18, col. 1321; VII, 10, col. 481; VII, 11, col. 496.”

<sup>25</sup> v. 1, c. 7, s. 1, pp. 244-247, 250-253, 256.

Apostate Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 208: “[b. 6, c. 9] The Gnostic is such that he is subject only to the affections that exist for the maintenance of the body, such as hunger, thirst, and the like. But in the case of the Saviour, it were ludicrous [to suppose] that the body, as a body, demanded the necessary aids in order to its duration. For he ate, not for the sake of the body, which was kept together by a holy energy, but in order that it might not enter into the minds of those who were with him to entertain a different opinion of him: in like manner as certainly some afterwards supposed that he appeared in a phantasmal shape. But he was entirely impassible; inaccessible to any movement of feeling — either pleasure or pain. While the apostles, having most gnostically mastered, through the Lord’s teaching, anger and fear, and lust, were not liable even to such of the movements of feeling, as seem good, courage, zeal, joy, desire, through a steady condition of mind, not changing a whit; but ever continuing unvarying in a state of training after the resurrection of the Lord.

“And should it be granted that the affections specified above, when produced rationally, are good, yet they are nevertheless inadmissible in the case of the perfect man, who is incapable of exercising courage... Nor does he need cheerfulness of mind: for he does not fall into pain, being persuaded that all things happen well. Nor is he angry: for there is nothing to move him to anger... So that on these accounts he is compelled to become like his Teacher in impassibility. For the Word of God is intellectual, according as the image of mind is seen in man alone...

“We must therefore rescue the gnostic and perfect man from all passion of the soul. For knowledge (*gnosis*) produces practice, and practice habit or disposition: and such a state as this produces impassibility, not moderation of passion. And the complete eradication of desire reaps as its fruit impassibility. But the Gnostic does not share either in those affections that are commonly celebrated as good, that is, the good things of the affections which are allied to the passions: such, I mean, as gladness, which is allied to pleasure: and dejection, for this is conjoined with pain: and caution, for it is subject to fear. Nor yet does he share in high spirit, for it takes its place alongside of wrath... He has withdrawn his soul from the passions... How, then, has he any more need of fortitude, who is not in the midst of dangers...”

### **His works were condemned in the invalid and heretical Pseudo-Gelasius Decretals, and his name was removed from the Roman Martyrology**

Apostate Clement of Alexandria’s works were condemned c. 550 in the invalid and heretical Pseudo-Gelasius Decretals:

Invalid and heretical *Pseudo-Gelasius Decretals*, Anonymous, c. 550: “LIKEWISE A LIST OF APOCRYPHAL BOOKS: ...the works of the other Clement, of Alexandria.”

For a time in the history of the Catholic Church (probably sometime from the 11th century onward), the apostate Clement of Alexandria was venerated as a saint and mentioned in the *Roman Martyrology*. However, Apostate Antipope Clement VIII removed his name from the *Roman Martyrology* on the advice of the apostate Baronius. Although the apostate Antipope Benedict XIV upheld the decision, he did so weakly and heretically because he said that Clement may not have taught any errors but was at least “suspect” of errors—even in spite of the overwhelming evidence that Clement was a notorious apostate!

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Clement of Alexandria”: “Clement has had no notable influence on the course of theology beyond his personal influence on the young Origen. His writings were occasionally copied, as by Hippolytus in his

‘Chronicon,’ by Arnobius, and by Theodoret of Cyrus. Jerome admired his learning. Pope Gelasius in the catalogue attributed to him mentions Clement’s works, but adds, ‘they are in no case to be received amongst us.’ Photius in the ‘Bibliotheca’ censures a list of errors drawn from his writings, but shows a kindly feeling towards Clement, assuming that the original text had been tampered with. ...Down to the seventeenth century he was venerated as a saint. His name was to be found in the martyrologies, and his feast fell on the fourth of December. But when the Roman Martyrology was revised by Pope Clement VIII (1592-1605) his name was dropped from the calendar on the advice of Cardinal Baronius. Benedict XIV maintained this decision of his predecessor on the grounds that Clement’s life was little known, that he had never obtained public cultus in the Church, and that some of his doctrines were, if not erroneous, at least suspect.”