

ARTICLE III.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA NOT AN AFTER-DEATH PROBATIONIST OR UNIVERSALIST.

BY THE REV. WM. DE LOSS LOVE, D. D., SOUTH HADLEY, MASS.

OF late, in the "New Departure" controversy, some have gladly and some have regretfully said, that Clement of Alexandria was a believer in after-death probation. Some have gone farther, and said that he believed also in the doctrine of Universal Salvation, even in the salvation of demons, and of Satan the ruler of demons. These views have found some sanction among authors of former days. Several writers have recently quoted Dr. Shedd thus: "Clement and Origen both found the final recovery of Satan and his angels, upon this abiding existence of free-will to good in the rational spirit" (Hist. Chris. Doc., Vol. II, p. 416). Dr. Shedd does not cite Clement's *language* to prove his statement, but cites Baumgarten-Crucius. The reference of the latter is to Clement thus: "Now the devil, being possessed of free-will, was able both to repent and to steal; and it was he who was the author of the theft, not the Lord, who did not prevent him" (Miscellanies, Bk. I, chap. 17). Though Clement believed the devil was *able* to repent, that does not show that he believed he *would* repent. The passage cited for proof does not prove that Clement believed in "the final recovery of Satan and his angels." It is not best for evangelical men to be led about by such sort of evidence, or for unevangelical men to trust to it. In *our* day, the greater portion of theologians believe in the free-will of Satan; and yet, they have not the least expectation that he will ever repent. They believe that something more than *power* to repent is necessary to repentance.

The second reference of Baumgarten-Crucius to Clement's testimony is, to *Miscellanies*, Book seven, chapter twelve. On those several pages, the only possible reference, in either Greek or English, to anything approaching this subject, is in one place to human freedom of choice, and in another to the true Gnostic or Christian, *not* to Satan, thus: "He, attracted by his own hope, tastes not the good things that are in the world, entertaining a noble contempt for all things here; pitying those that are chastised after death, who through punishment unwillingly make confession." This does not *claim* "the final recovery of Satan and his angels." Its most probable reference is, to punishment after death of sinners of the human race, who are *not* recovered, because their confession is "unwillingly" made. Possibly it is a reference to Clement's view of purgatory; yet, sinners there confess "willingly." In connection with this second reference to Clement, Baumgarten-Crucius gives two Greek phrases, apparently the first and last of a sentence, or passage, with a dash between, thus: "*επιβιζονται μετανοεῖν—παιδύουσις ἀναγκαῖαι.*" The former phrase may be rendered, "They are severely forced to repent;" or, possibly, "They give great diligence to bring themselves to repent." The latter phrase means, "Necessary disciplinings." The whole passage *seems* to be a quotation from Clement; and yet it is not found in this place of reference or anywhere else so far as appears. As it here stands it does not prove anything. If it be a mere comment of Baumgarten-Crucius, it is only his opinion. If there is a passage anywhere in Clement's writings, beginning and ending thus, it may simply refer to his purgatorial view.

Gieseler (*Ch. Hist.* Vol. I., p. 214) says that Hofstede de Groot has proved that Clement did *not* hold that the devil was capable of salvation.

With reference to probation after death for *mankind*, Professor Shedd says: "Clement of Alexandria, the teacher of Origen, makes the following representations, according to Redepenning: 'The deep corruption of

mankind fills God, whose compassion for man is as unlimited as his hatred towards evil, not with anger, for he is never angry, but with the tenderest and most pitiful love. Hence he continually seeks all men, whom he loves for their own sake and their resemblance to God, as the bird seeks her young who have fallen from the nest. His omnipotence, to which nothing is impossible, knows how to overcome all evil, and convert it into good. He threatens, indeed, and punishes, but yet only to reform and improve; and though to public discourse the fruitlessness of repentance after death be asserted, yet hereafter not only those who have not heard of Christ will receive forgiveness, but it may be hoped that the severer punishment which befalls the obstinate unbelievers will not be the conclusion of their history. For man, like every other spiritual being, can never lose his free-will. By means of this power, at all times, here and hereafter, noble minds, aided by that divine power which is indispensable to success, are lifting themselves up from ignorance and deep corruption, and are drawing nearer in greater or less degree, to God and the truth' " (Hist. Chris. Doc., Vol. II, p. 235).

How are the foregoing representations concerning Clement's views sustained? The most or all persons would much prefer that Dr. Shedd himself should give citations from Clement's writings which would sustain the allegations. But they are not thus gratified. The rather, Professor Shedd says: "The citations from Clement upon which Redepenning relies for the above representation, are," etc. He then copies Redepenning's references, which will here be cited and briefly examined. Clement's writings are divided into three classes, thus: *Cohortatio*, or, Exhortation to the heathen; *Pædagogus*, or, The Instructor; and, *Stromata*, or, The Miscellanies. Redepenning's citations from Clement, as given by Professor Shedd, are,

1. "Cohortatio, 74," which is equivalent to, "Exhortation to the heathen," chapter 10, first part. It is a plea to the heathen to abandon the evil customs of their fathers.

Sentences from that paragraph are these: "The good and godly shall obtain the good reward, inasmuch as they held goodness in high esteem; while, on the other hand, the wicked shall receive meet punishment. For the author of evil, torment has been prepared. . . . What an infatuated desire, then, for voluntary death is this, rooted in men's minds! Why do they flee to this fatal brand, with which they shall be burned, when it is within their power to live nobly according to God, and not according to custom? For God bestows life freely; but evil custom, after our departure from this world, brings on the sinner unavailing remorse with punishment. . . . The idols' temples to be in reality graves or prisons. . . . And will you not escape from those dungeons, and flee to the mercy that comes down from heaven? For God, of his great love to man, comes to the help of man, as the mother-bird flies to one of her young that has fallen out of the nest." Here is the idea of free-will in the phrase, "voluntary death." Here is the idea of "good reward" for the "godly," and of "meet punishment" for the "wicked." Here is the idea of God's "great love to man," illustrated by the love of the "mother-bird" for her young. But it *all* pertains to sinful men in *this* life, in an exhortation to them to break off from their sins. Here is the idea of punishment to the impenitent "after our departure from this world," when "evil custom," or sin, "brings on the sinner unavailing remorse with punishment." In this paragraph there is not even a *hint* at universal salvation, or at after-death probation, but at what is directly the *opposite*. "Unavailing remorse with punishment" "after our departure from this world!" "Torment has been prepared" "for the author of evil." No indication here that Satan is to be restored to holiness; rather, the opposite.

On the next two pages following the foregoing citation, are these and similar passages. "What, then, of the Lord? He remembers not our ill desert; he still pities, he still urges us to repentance." "Let us therefore repent, and pass from ignorance to knowledge, from foolishness to wisdom, from

licentiousness to self-restraint, from unrighteousness to righteousness, from godlessness to God. It is an enterprise of noble daring to take our way to God; and the enjoyment of many other good things is within the reach of the lovers of righteousness, who pursue eternal life." "You have, O men, the divine promise of grace; you have heard, on the other hand, the threatening of punishment."

2. "Cohor. 79,"—the same as Exhor, etc. c. 10;—in Clark's Ed. Ant. Nicene Library, Clement, Vol. I, pp. 90, 91. "Let us then openly strip for the contest, and nobly strive in the arena of truth, the holy Word being the judge, and the Lord of the universe prescribing the contest. For 'tis no insignificant prize, the guerdon of immortality which is set before us. Pay no more regard, then, if you are rated by some of the low rabble who lead the dance of impiety, and are driven on to the same pit by their folly and insanity, makers of idols and worshippers of stones." "To whom shall the Lord say, 'Yours is the kingdom of heaven?' 'Yours, whose choice is set on God, if you will; yours, if you will only believe, and comply with the brief terms of the announcement; which the Ninevites having obeyed, instead of the destruction they looked for, obtained a signal deliverance." No sign in this citation of either universal salvation, or second probation. Rather, on the next page, the *opposite* is indicated by the following striking sentence: "Not only unable to pity yourselves, you are incapable even of yielding to the persuasions of those who commiserate you; enslaved as you are to evil custom, and, clinging to it voluntarily till your last breath, you are hurried to destruction."

3. "Cohor. 82"—Exhor. c. 10;—Ant. Nic. Lib., Clem., Vol. I, pp. 93, 94. Clement shows here how unreal and vain are the gods of the heathen, and how real, gracious and sovereign, is the true God. He adduces *nothing* to show that there is an after-death probation, or universal salvation. He even *warns* the heathen by the case of Sodom, and Lot's wife. On the next page, he writes: "Christ is able to save in every place." He is speaking to dwellers on the earth,

and *not* to the lost in hell. He holds out hope in the power of God to save all who call upon him. His next sentence is this: "For he that is fired with ardor and admiration for righteousness, being the lover of One who needs nothing, needs himself but little, having treasured up his bliss in nothing but himself and God, where is neither moth, robber, nor pirate, but the eternal Giver of good. With justice, then, have you been compared to those serpents who shut their ears against the charmers. On the second page following he says: "If you have respect for old age, be wise, now that you have reached life's sunset; and albeit at the close of life, acquire the knowledge of God, that the end of life may to you prove the beginning of salvation." No after-death probation, no universal salvation, here; but a strong trend to the opposite. ' 1

4. "Cohor. 89"=Exhor. c. 11;—Ant. Nic. Lib., Clem., Vol. I, pp. 102–104. In this passage occur the following: "That light is eternal life;" "Through the cross brought death to life;" "For sin is eternal death;" "And the Word, having unfolded the truth, showed to men the height of salvation, that either repenting they might be saved, or refusing to obey, they might be judged. This is the proclamation of righteousness: to those that obey, glad tidings; to those that disobey, judgment." "And, what is of the highest importance, salvation runs parallel with sincere willingness—choice and life being, so to speak, yoked together." "The spark of true goodness, kindled in the soul by the Divine Word;" "What, then, is the exhortation I give you? I urge you to be saved. This Christ desires. In one word, He freely bestows life on you." In saying, "I urge you to be saved," he implies a *doubt* about their being saved, and that indicates that he did not believe in universal salvation. This closes the evidence cited from "Cohortatio."

5. "Stromata, VI, 763, 764"=The Miscellanies, B. VI, c. 6;—Ant. Nic. Lib., Clem., Vol. II, pp. 329–331. This is Clement's chapter on the gospel preached to righteous Jews

and Gentiles in hades; in that part of it where the righteous were. The next previous chapter he devotes to showing, that the Greeks, or Gentiles, had some knowledge of the true God. He argues from that the repentance and salvation of *some* of the Gentiles.

(1). There is nothing in the chapter even attempting to show universal salvation.

(2). There is nothing in the chapter attempting to show *probation* for any after death. Such probation means *being put back into another state of trial, with uncertainty as to conversion and salvation*. It is not that for which Clement pleads. But he pleads for belief in the salvation of unevangelized, righteous Gentiles, as well as righteous Jews, the Gentiles especially receiving new light after death, and exercising repentance according to the new light.

(3). They were *righteous* Gentiles on earth, who had died without the gospel, to whom the gospel was preached in hades. Passages, on the three pages, now referred to, concerning this point, are the following: (a). "Wherefore the Lord preached the gospel to those in hades." Who were they? Just previous they are described as "those that were *righteous according to philosophy*." (b). "And they [should bring to repentance] the Gentiles; that is, those who had lived in righteousness according to . . . Philosophy." (c). "It was suitable to the divine administration, that those possessed of greater worth in righteousness, and whose life had been preëminent, . . . yet confessedly of the number of the people of God Almighty, should be saved. (d). "One righteous man, then, differs not, as righteous, from another righteous man, whether he be of the Law or a Greek." (e). "And [if] those who lived rightly before the Law and were classed under faith, and judged to be righteous,—it is evident that those, too, who were outside of the Law, having lived rightly, . . . with all speed turned and believed."

(4). Clement speaks of those unevangelized Gentiles or Greeks as not having *faith*, though having *righteousness*.

Truly, they had not faith in the things of salvation not yet revealed to them; but, if really righteous, they must have had the character and heart of faith, *ready* to believe whenever and wherever the new, gospel revelation came. Clement says, on the three pages now under inspection,—“For to those who were righteous according to the law, faith was wanting.” “Then all who *believe* shall be saved, although they may be of the Gentiles, on making their profession there.” “If, then, he preached only to the *Jews* who wanted the knowledge and *faith* of the *Savior*.” “And those who lived rightly before the Law were classed under *faith*, those, too, who were outside of the Law, on hearing the voice of the Lord, with all speed turned and *believed*.”

(5). Clement assumes that the righteous, though unevangelized, Gentiles, *do* believe on having the opportunity, and do exercise proper repentance. “Straightway, on the revelation of the truth they also repented of their previous conduct.” “That those possessed of greater worth in righteousness, on repenting of their transgressions.” “Those, too, who were outside of the Law, having lived rightly, with all speed turned and believed.” “On hearing the proclamation, might either exhibit repentance.” Clement regards the gospel proclaimed in hades as a touchstone to test souls and draw them to it if of the same spirit.

(6). Clement calls the beginning of the new era of faith and repentance on the part of those dying righteous but unevangelized, a “conversion;” but, plainly, by his own view it is only a *second* conversion. The first was in *this* life, when they began to be “righteous.” “The apostles also, as here, so there, preached the gospel to those of the heathen who were *ready* for conversion.” And the same he held concerning the well-disposed Jews who died before Christ came.

(7). While nothing appears in this section favoring universal salvation, or probation after death, there does appear

the *seed* of what became the Roman Catholic doctrine of *purgatory*, which is not an after-death *probation*, but a *purification* for the righteous who die not sufficiently holy to be admitted at once into heaven. "God's punishments are saving and disciplinary." He does not mean that they are wholly and only such, as we shall hereafter see, but so with such as will rightly use them. Clement adduces no Scripture proof for even the *germ* of the doctrine of purgatory. Nor does he give any evidence that the earlier Christian Fathers held the doctrine. He does refer to the Shepherd of Hermas, where he teaches that the gospel was proclaimed to the righteous dead who departed before Christ came. The doctrine that some of the heathen are righteous and will be saved, he applies to an unwarranted number, embracing even some idolaters. Yet, it is possible that he refers only to such as worshipped the true God under merely an idol by *name*.

6. "Strom. VII, 832"=Mis., B. VII, c. 2;—Ant. Nic. Lib., Clem., Vol. II, p. 410. Here, instead of finding Redepenning's representation that "Omnipotence, knows how to overcome all evil, and convert into good," we find just the *opposite* in this: "For he does not *compel* him who through choosing and fulfilling is able to receive salvation from him." There is evil contrary to God's will. We find here, that the Savior "does care for all;" yet not in a way to justify Universalism; for "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." Still, he "called all equally, and assigned special honors to those who have believed in a specially excellent way."

7. "Strom. VII, 895"=Mis. B. VII, c. 16;—Ant. Nic. Lib., Clem., Vol. II, pp. 481-483. In this passage Clement speaks of "partial corrections, which are called chastisements, which many of us who have been in transgression incur, by falling away from the Lord's people." He says also, that God does not punish in "retaliation for evil." He

says, that some "heretics," who may be those who temporarily fall "away from the Lord's people," "precipitate themselves into judgment," by which he means *discipline*; and he prays that they may "be chastised by God, and undergo paternal admonitions previous to the Judgment." He may mean, previous to *death*. If he means *after* death, unless corrected before, it is again the *germ* idea of purification by the discipline of purgatory.

8. "Strom. VII, 860"=Mis. B. VII, c. 7;—Ant. Nic. Lib., Clem., Vol. II, pp. 438-440. Clement here describes at length the Gnostic, who in his view is the highest kind of Bible Christian. He says: "And the man who turns from among the Gentiles will ask for faith, while he that ascends to knowledge will ask for the perfection of love." He regards *faith* as rudimentary, and *love* as the greatest of Christian attainments.

9. "Strom. I, 369"=Mis. B. I, c. 17;—Ant. Nic. Lib., Clem., Vol. I, pp. 407-409. "So in no respect is God the author of evil. But since free choice and inclination originate sins, and a mistaken judgment sometimes prevails, from which, since it is ignorance and stupidity, we do not take pains to recede, punishments are rightly inflicted." "For it is the work of divine wisdom . . . to ensure that what happens through the evils hatched by any, may come to a good and useful issue, and to use to advantage those things which appear to be evils, as also the testimony which accrues from temptation." He is speaking in general of natural and not moral evils, and wholly, so far as appears, of things of this life. This closes Clement's citations from "Stromata."

10. "Pædagogus, I, 102"=The Instructor, B. I, c. 3;—Ant. Nic. Lib., Clem., Vol. I, pp. 118-120. The "Instructor" is the Word, the Logos, Christ. The present chapter is on "The Philanthropy of the Instructor." The concluding sentence, which comes nearer to our particular inquiries than any other, is this: "Wherefore let us regard the Word as law, and his commands and counsels as the short and straight

paths to immortality; for his precepts are full of persuasion, not of fear."

11. "Pæd. I, 137"—Inst. B. I, c. 8;—Ant. Nic. Lib., Clem., Vol. I, pp. 155-157. Leading sentences are these: "Consequently God does all good. And he does no good to man without caring for him, and he does not care *for* him without taking care *of* him." "The general of an army, by inflicting fines and corporeal punishments with chains and the extremest disgrace on offenders, and sometimes even punishing individuals with death, aims at good, doing so for the admonition of the officers under him." This is not reformatory but exemplary punishment, intended as a sanction or support of law. "It is not, then, from hatred that the Lord chides men; for he himself suffered for us, whom he might have destroyed for our faults." This implies that sinners might justly be destroyed.

12. "Pæd. I. 140"—Inst. B. I, c. 8;—Ant. Nic. Lib., Clem., Vol. I, pp. 159-161. "For the Divine Being is not angry in the way that some think; but often restrains, and always exhorts humanity, and shows what ought to be done. And this is a good device, to terrify lest we sin." This is not saying that it is best to "terrify" under false pretenses. It is equivalent to saying, "Knowing, therefore, the fear of the Lord, we persuade men" (2 Cor. 5: 11). Clement quotes from Ecclesiasticus: "For the fear of the Lord drives away sins, and he that is without fear cannot be justified" (1: 27, 28). He adds: "And God does not inflict punishment from wrath, but for the ends of justice; since it is not expedient that justice should be neglected on our account. Each one of us, who sins, with his own free will chooses punishment, and the blame lies with him who chooses. God is without blame." He means by "justice" something beyond mere correction.

13. "Pæd. I. 142"—Inst. B. I, c. 8;—Ant. Nic. Lib., Clem., Vol. I, pp. 160-162. "I will grant that he [the Lord] punishes the disobedient (for punishment is for the good and advantage of him who is punished, for it is the correction of

a refractory subject); but I will not grant that he wishes to take vengeance. Revenge is retribution for evil, imposed for the advantage of him who takes the revenge. He will not desire us to take revenge, who teaches us 'to pray for those that despitefully use us.' But that God is good, all willingly admit; and that the same God is just, I require not many words to prove." "To show that he is just, and that Jesus is the justifier of him who is of faith." But what does he hold concerning those *not* of faith? "For if one must censure, it is necessary also to rebuke; when it is the time to wound the apathetic soul not mortally, but salutarily, securing exemption from everlasting death by a little pain." He holds that those of faith are corrected, and those not of faith receive everlasting death.

14. "Pæd. I, 149"=Inst. B. I, c. 9;—Ant. Nic. Lib., Clem., Vol. I, pp. 164–173. The object of the chapter is to show, that a beneficent God may justly use severe chastisements for correction and recovery of the fallen. There are no hints that this is to extend to the future world. There are hints of *unavailing* correction. "The Lord acts towards us as we do towards our children." "He shows their offence to be clearer, by declaring that they understood, and thus sinned wilfully." "For if you do not receive his love, ye shall know his power." "Such are the causes of provocation for which the Judge comes to inflict punishment on those that would not choose a life of goodness. Wherefore also afterwards he assailed them more roughly; in order, if possible, to drag them back from their impetuous rush towards death." "He declares that it belongs to the same power both to judge and to do good. For there is power over both together, and judgment separates that which is just from its opposite." "Then justice came down to men both in the letter and in the body, in the Word and in the law, constraining humanity to saving repentance; for it was good. But do you not obey God? Then blame yourself, who drag to yourself the judge."

15. "Pæd. III, 302"=Inst. B. III, c. 11; Ant. Nic. Lib.

Clem., Vol. I, pp. 329-331. "But not to-morrow in truth, but already, are these dead to God; burying their dead, that is, sinking themselves down to death. The apostle very firmly assails them: 'Be not deceived; neither adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor railers,' and whatever else he adds to these, 'shall inherit the kingdom of God.'" "The affection which arises from the fire which we call love, leading to the fire which will never cease in consequence of sin." This does not sound like universal salvation.

The foregoing are all of Redepenning's citations from Clement, as given by Prof. Shedd. Redepenning's representations of Clement's views, on the more important questions, are his own *mistaken* inferences. (1). His citations fail to show Clement holding that Omnipotence "knows how to overcome all evil, and convert it into good" *in the eternal future*. (2). His citations do not show Clement holding that God punishes "*only* to reform and improve." (3). His citations do not show Clement so insincere and immoral as to teach "in public discourse the fruitlessness of repentance after death," and then in private to teach or hold the opposite. (4). His citations do not show Clement holding that all "those who have not heard of Christ" in this world, "will receive forgiveness." (5). His citations do not show Clement holding that there is hope of the final salvation of even "the obstinate unbelievers."

Redepenning says further of Clement's views, which Prof. Shedd does not quote: "In the Stromata, which are intended for the more advanced, the eternity of hell pains, and the immutability of the fate of the dead is everywhere denied. See Strom. VI, c. 6. The expression ἀθάνατον, κακόν, declared in Strom. III, c. 5 to be destined for sinners, is no exception, as the expression is borrowed from the Odyssey XII, 118." 1. Redepenning gives no proof of Clement's denial of "the eternity of hell pains" in respect to all. 2. Homer doubtless meant literally "deathless evil," and

Redeeming gives no proof that Clement did not mean it.

Neander attributes to Clement the "doctrine of a progressive development and course of purification after death" (Torrey's Trans. Ed. 1852, Vol. I, p. 656). That doctrine, Clement held concerning heathen who had "lived rightly" in the world. Neander cites from Clement (Mis. B. VI, c. 6; Clark's Ed. Vol. II, p. 331, ¶3, sentence 2): "For it is not here alone that the active power of God is beforehand, but it is everywhere and is always at work." But this does not prove that Clement held to a "universal restoration." He wrote the sentence in support of his theory that the heathen or Gentile "righteous" would be saved. It is not logical or fair on *that* ground to represent him as either a Universalist or after-death probationist. No one shows that Clement made a universal application of his language. The same kind of reasoning would make him a believer in the final salvation of Satan and all his angels, but it would not be just.

McClintock and Strong's Cyc. Bib. Theol. and Eccles. Lit., in article "Punishment, Future," quotes from Clement (Mis. B. VI, c. 6) thus: "If in this life there are so many ways for purification and repentance, how much more should there be after death. The purification of souls, when separated from the body, will be easier. We can set no limits to the agency of the Redeemer: to redeem, to rescue, to discipline is his work: and so will he continue to operate after this life." This must be a professed summary, and is not wholly correct. Clement, in his plea for Jews and Gentiles "who had lived in righteousness according to law and philosophy," and yet "had ended life not perfectly," says this: "God's punishments are saving and disciplinary, leading to conversion, and choosing rather the repentance than the death of a sinner; and especially since souls, although darkened by passions, when released from their bodies, are able to perceive more clearly, because of their being no longer obstructed by the paltry flesh (Mis. B. VI, c. 6). This is simply the doctrinal germ of purgatory. When Clement is

speaking of "righteous" Jews and heathen, dying before Christ, it is not right to say he applied his statements to others, or to say on that ground that he "advocated universalism."

Schaff-Herzog's Encyclopædia represents Restorationism as Universalism, and then in article "Punishment, Future," by Dr. Francis L. Patton, it declares that Clement was a restorationist. But in article "Apokatastasis," by Dr. J. Köstlin, it declares that there is no proof of his being a restorationist. Was the former statement a fruit of Redepening's unwarranted representations, and the latter a fruit of original investigations? Dr. Köstlin, Professor of Theology in Halle, says: "He [Clement] merely asserted, that, in the next world, there is an operation of salvation upon lost souls; but how far it effected a change he does not say." Köstlin does not say, "operation of salvation upon *all* lost souls." He refers, doubtless, to the heathen that "lived rightly" in this life.

CLEMENT ON PUNISHMENT.

Redepening represents Clement as holding that God punishes "only to reform and improve;" and many, following this statement made some fifty years ago, have said, that Clement's view leads to Universalism, because he held that all punishment is simply *reformatory*. Clement's chief statements about punishment, pertain to its infliction upon the righteous, and mostly in this world. In all these cases its design, as he conceived it, was reformatory. He often speaks of God's *design* in punishment, implying that its *tendency* is reformatory, whether in all cases it reforms or not. Just as, when the Lord says, "The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance," the meaning is that it *tends* to lead; not, that it always does lead to repentance. The three designs in punishment are, first, reformatory; second, exemplary, or deterrent, or preventive; third, vindicatory, or retributory. The vindicatory has also a deterrent influence, and those two kinds of punishment inflicted upon some, have often a

reformatory influence upon others. Did Clement hold to anything but a reformatory design in punishment? He says: "But punishment does not avail to him who has sinned, to undo his sin, but that he may sin no more, and that no one else fall into the like. Therefore the good God corrects for these three causes: First, that he who is corrected may become better than his former self; then that those who are capable of being saved by examples may be driven back, being admonished; and thirdly, that he who is injured may not be readily despised, and be apt to receive injury." (Mis. B. IV, c. 24). Here are the reformatory and deterrent designs. And in the third kind may be the vindicatory; for, God does not punish the transgressor after death for the sake of *revenge*, but by the retribution of justice to protect his universe from "injury." Clement elsewhere speaks of punishment for the ends of *justice*, implying the Divine right to punish the guilty. "God does not inflict punishment from wrath, but for the ends of justice; since it is not expedient that justice should be neglected on our account" (Inst. B. I, c. 8). "Such he wishes us to be, that we may be blessed. Again, showing the opposite scale of the balance of justice, He says: 'But not so the ungodly—not so; but as the dust which the wind sweeps away from the face of the earth.' By showing the punishment of sinners, and their easy dispersion, and carrying off by the wind, the Instructor dissuades from crime by means of punishment; and by holding up the merited penalty, shows the benignity of his beneficence in the most skilful way, in order that we may possess and enjoy its blessings" (Inst. B. I, c. 10). Here is retributive punishment upon some, and by it others are warned and dissuaded. "'Being judged by the Lord,'" says the Apostle, 'we are chastened, that we may not be condemned with the world.' For the prophet had said before, 'chastening, the Lord hath chastised me, but hath not given me over unto death'" (Mis. B. I, c. 27). Here is punishment of some for correction—chastisement—and the assumption of retributive punishment to others. Judging from

all this the conclusion follows, that they are wrong who represent Clement as holding that God punishes "only to reform and improve."

CLEMENT ON UNENDING RETRIBUTION.

Probably it is on the ground of Redepenning's statements, that McClintock and Strong's Cyclopædia, article "Universalists," says, that Clement of Alexandria "advocated Universalism on the ground of the remedial character of all punishment. Many have joined in a similar statement. We have seen that Clement did NOT say that all punishment is effectually remedial. Did Clement hold that to some unending retribution would be allotted? "Will you not allow the heavenly Word, the Savior, to be bound on to you as an amulet, and, by trusting in God's own charm, be delivered from passions which are the diseases of the mind, and rescued from sin?—for sin is eternal death" (Exhor. c. 11). "Such are the men who believe in their belly, 'whose God is their belly, whose glory is their shame, who mind earthly things.' To them the Apostle predicted no good when he said, 'whose end is destruction'" (Inst. B. II, c. 1). "Punishments after death, on the other hand, and penal retribution by fire, were pilfered from the Barbarian [Jewish] philosophy." "For the fiery men are meant to signify the angels, who seize and punish the wicked. 'Who maketh,' it is said, 'his angels spirits; his ministers flaming fire.' It follows from this that the soul is immortal. For what is tortured or corrected, being in a state of sensation, lives, though said to suffer" (Mis. B. V, c. 14). Clement quotes from Heraclitus as a borrower from the Hebrews, "who considered that there was a world everlasting," and who said that there "is, and will be ever-living fire, kindled according to measure and quenched according to measure" (Mis. B. V, c. 14). "'They which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God'" (Mis. B. IV, c. 8). "'Declare among the heathen his statutes,' that they may not be judged, but that those

who have previously given ear [lived rightly] may be converted [to Gospel truth]. But those who speak treacherously with their tongues have the penalties that are on record" (Mis. B. VII, c. 16). "And the way of the ungodly shall perish" (Mis. B. II, c. 15). "It is in reference to the unbelieving that it is said, 'that they are reckoned as the chaff which the wind drives from the face of the earth, and the drop which falls from a vessel'" (Mis. B. IV, c. 24). "The Gospel supposes two ways—the Apostles, too, similarly with all the prophets—and seeing they call that one 'narrow and confined' which is circumscribed according to the commandments and prohibitions, and the opposite one, which leads to perdition, 'broad and roomy,' open to pleasures and wrath" (Mis. B. V, c. 5). "'The broad and wide way leadeth to destruction.' . . . 'Fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee.' . . . 'What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul'" (Mis. B. IV, c. 6). "'For except ye believe,' says the Lord, 'ye shall die in your sins'" (Mis. B. V, c. 13). "And they will understand neither the honors after death, which belong to those who have lived holily, nor the punishments of those who have lived unrighteously and impurely.' He quotes approvingly, 'Life were indeed a feast to the wicked, who, having done evil, then die; were not the soul immortal, death would be a godsend'" (Mis. B. IV, c. 7). "For God bestows life freely; but evil custom, after our departure from this world, brings on the sinner unavailing remorse with punishment" (Exhor. c. 10). Even where Clement contends that "the excellent among the Greeks worshipped the same God as we," and hence would have the privilege of hearing the gospel in hades, he implies the final condemnation of those who "believed not" (Mis. B. VI, cs. 5, 6; Clark's Ant. Nic. Clem., Vol. II, p. 326, 332). "It was therefore a fit subject for all fear on the disciples' part; if both he that possesses wealth and he that is teeming with passions were the rich, and these alike shall be expelled from the heavens. For salvation is the privilege of pure and passionless souls"

(Who is the rich man that shall be saved? s. 20). "Being deprived of eternal life" (Ibid. s. 26). "The penalty for which is the punishment of eternal fire" (Ibid. s. 33). "But if one chooses to continue and to sin perpetually in pleasures and values indulgence here above eternal life, and turns away from the Savior, who gives forgiveness; let him no more blame either God, or riches, or his having fallen, but his own soul, which voluntarily perishes" (Ibid. s. 42). "Immortal are all souls, even those of the wicked, for whom it had been better not to have been incorruptible; for, punished by a limitless infliction of unquenchable fire, and dying not, they obtain no end of their misery" (Fragment from Clement's lost work on the "Soul;" *Patres Graeci*, Vol. VI., Wirceburgi; Sheldon's *Hist. Chris. Doc.*, Vol. I., p. 154). In reference to the above Fragment from the work on the "Soul," Prof. Sheldon recently says, that he has found it also "in the writings of Maximus (Confessor), a distinguished writer of the seventh century, who quotes it as coming from Clement, together with another extract on the nature of the soul. It is contained in his *Capita Theologica*, Sermo LIII., a work made up mostly of quotations from a great number of writers. Migne's *Patrologia* gives the passage both in the writings of Clement (under the head of 'Fragmenta') and also in those of Maximus. The reference of the passage to Clement's work on the "Soul," is rather a probable conjecture than a certain conclusion. Maximus does not specify the particular work of Clement from which he obtained it. The editor in Migne gives it as being from the *De Anima*."

Taking all of the foregoing into consideration, several conclusions follow:

1. It can not be just longer to say, that Clement of Alexandria "advocated Universalism," or was a Universalist.
2. It is not right against Clement's own declaration to say, that he held to the "remedial character of all punishment" as to its *effect*, whatever he may have held as to its *tendency*.

Therefore, his view concerning punishment does not favor Universalism.

3. It is unsustained by evidence, that Clement was an after-death probationist. He did teach, that both Jews and Gentiles, dying before Christ came, and in many things having lived "rightly" here, yet having ended life "sinfully," had the gospel preached to them by either Christ or his Apostles, and became purified for heaven. This was not *probation* but *purgatory*.

4. It is wrong to charge Clement, as some do, with double dealing,—teaching the opposite of Restorationism in public, and Restorationism itself in private. So grave an impeachment requires evidence. He seems too serious and earnest, too much a believer and dealer in Scripture, too able and fruitful in writings, to resort to any such deceitful pretence in doctrine. Even his Gnosticism did not make him such a consummate hypocrite. He claimed that every true Gnostic was a high-minded Christian.

5. The suggestion of some that Clement was a Restorationist because his pupil Origen was, is unworthy of credit. The same kind of reasoning could be applied to convict Clement of believing in the preëxistence of all human souls, even of the human soul of the Redeemer; for, his pupil Origen believed in it. Even Origen himself proves to be but a feeble support of the doctrine of Restorationism. It was a tenet he held in his earlier age. His work against Celsus, by far his most able and interesting, and written in his later years, contains hardly any glimpses of that view; nothing that of itself would show it. Neander was so impressed with signs of change on this point in Origen, that he said, "It may be questioned whether this also was not one of those points upon which his views became changed at a later period of his life" (Hist. Chris. Rel. Ch., Torrey, Vol. I., p. 656).

6. The last evidence that after-death probation was held by the Christian Fathers in the *second* century, gives way in the showing that Clement did not hold that view. His writ-

ing of anything akin to that subject dates as late as A. D. 195.

7. Clement's view on any given subject, should be inferred, *not* from isolated passages, but from the great sum of all he says concerning it. He did not define, or adhere to his definitions, so carefully as authors generally do now. Nor did scarcely any of his period. Not observing this difference has led to many misinterpretations of his meaning.

8. Redepenning's misstatements concerning Clement's belief, having been put in circulation long ago, and having been handed on through a long line of students and scholars, have done much harm to evangelical religion. They have delusively encouraged errorists, and have unjustly weakened the hearts and hands of many loyalists to the truth.

9. We all have an urgent and solemn duty not to slander or misrepresent the dead. We have an important office in keeping the just reputation of those who are not here to answer for themselves.