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The concept of logos as it was understood by Stoics, Middle-Platonists, Neo-Pythagoreans, Gnostics, and early Judeo-Christians was the unifying tenet for the ancient metaphysics, epistemology, rhetoric, ethics, and soteriology. It had a decisive impact on the formation of what we call the Alexandrian school of christology. Clement of Alexandria is rightfully allotted an extraordinary position for his synthesis of many traditions, however diverse and often contradictory they might appear. Despite the many studies on Clement’s literary legacy a new assessment of Clement’s christology informed by his understanding of divine Logos is yet to be written.

In this paper I would like to ask the question in how many logoi did Clement believe?

Before exploring the proposed question, we should remind ourselves that only five of Clement’s ten known writings have survived, i.e., Protreptikos, Paidagogos, Stromateis (eight volumes), Quis Dives Salvetur, and Excerpta ex Theodoto. In addition, there are scattered quotations in the later fathers who cited Clement’s lost works, such as Hypotyposes and Adumbrations, which were Clement’s commentaries on the NT books and possibly on some Hebrew Scriptures, as well. From those five mentioned books, only three were meant for publication; the rest were Clement’s private notes either for his lectures or more likely the sketches for his written or unwritten compositions.
My departing point in the question of Clementine Logos is the study conducted in the first half of the last century by P.B. Pade published in 1939.\(^1\) Even though Pade was not certain how to interpret the passages from *Excerpta* and *Hypotyposes*, he categorized them as dubious and dwelled on the more reliable texts of *Protrepticus*, *Paedagogus*, *Stromateis*, and *Quis dives salvetur*, as well as *Adumbrationes* which even though carry the same weight of suspicion as *Excerpta* and *Hypotyposes*, they confirmed his arguments based on the more reliable texts. After a comprehensive study of the texts of his choice, *see passages in the sections A, B, and C below*, Pade concluded that Clement believed in one Logos who is fully divine, consubstantial and coeval with the Father – all theological characteristics that make Christ the ultimate figure in the history of the world and humanity, which Pade found in full agreement with the later orthodox formulations of Nicaea and henceforth.

In turn, Robert Casey\(^2\) and Harry Wolfson\(^3\) challenged the point of view represented by such scholars as Pade. Casey and Wolfson based their argumentation on a linguistic analysis of Theodor Zahn\(^4\) who claimed the authenticity of a certain citation of Clement’s *Hypotyposes* found in the ninth century encyclopedic compendium of Photius\(^5\)


who found Clement’s doctrine of Logos as incompatible with that which was established at Ecumenical Councils. See section F.α.1 below. Casey and Wolfson found evidence from Clement’s “secure” texts and attempted to demonstrate that after all Clement believed in two logoi or as Wolfson put it a two-stage theory of Logos’ successive emanation. Just as Photius in the ninth century, so also Casey and Wolfson placed Clement’s theology closer to the later formulations of Arius, who supposedly preached an ontological differentiation between the paternal Logos and the Logos that was the instrument of cosmic creation and interaction with humanity.6 Wolfson revisited Pade’s citations that speak of Logos as the one who possesses full divinity and equality with the Father and concluded that just like the Apologists so also Clement believed in a twofold emanation of Logos which in turn undermined Logos’ equality with the Father. At the same time, Casey agreed that at some level Logos is fully divine but due to the split within Logos its divine status implies something different than that of the Father, even though that split did not pertain to Logos’ essence (σώσια) but rather to a certain kind of delimitation, circumference (περιγραφή) which is found in Clement’s notes on Theodotus. See section F.α.2 and 3 below.

6 See an Arian passage from Thalia cited by Athanasius in Contra Arianos 1. c. 5 that clearly speaks of the twofold generation of Logos and Sofia. Edwards referred to George C. Stead, “The Thalia of Arius and the testimony of Athanasius,” Journal of Theological Studies 29 (1978): 20-52, esp. 31-4, and ventured that more likely “Arius did not maintain the doctrine of emanation and perhaps not even the doctrine of two logoi... 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 to the creation. That is, he is the Logos of the world, not of the Father. Since 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,” see Edwards, “Clement of Alexandria and his Doctrine of Logos,” Vigiliae Christianae 54 (2000),” 159, n. 3.
This delimitation (περιγραφή), for Jean Daniélou was also a decisive factor as to how one should interpret Logos. He agreed and closely followed the argumentation of Wolfson. He even took Wolfson’s doubt about the authenticity of Adumbrationes as a clear proof that Clement did not believe in the eternal generation of the Son. Daniélou pointed out that Clementine Logos, just as Logos of the Apologists, is strictly bound to the business of the creation of cosmos, and just as the Logos of Philo of Alexandria has a two-fold nature: a) as a potentiality inside God’s mind and b) as the firstling of God’s creation, standing at the peak of cosmic hierarchy of created beings.

This line of argumentation was taken up also by Salvatore Lilla, who claimed that there are not only two but three successive stages of Logos’ emanation: a) the totality of ideas; b) the principle of creation; and c) the world-soul. The three stages, Lilla claimed, corresponded to the different stages of Middle Platonic and later Neo-Platonic emanations of divine intellect. Unlike his predecessors, he found proofs for his arguments not in the dubious texts of Excerpta and Hypotyposes (Adumbrationes were automatically crossed out) but rather predominantly in Protreptikos, Paedagogos, and Stromateis. However, the framework of his thought was, as he himself admitted, derivative of Casey’s and Wolfson’s conclusions. As Arkadi Choufrine rightly pointed out later, Lilla achieved a great accomplishment when he placed Clement’s theology, ethics, and metaphysics in a broader context of a philosophical and religious discussion, and yet at the same time Lilla’s failure was to put too strong an emphasis on Clement’s

---


borrowing from his contemporaries. The fact that Clement was closely familiar with Stoic, Middle Platonic, and Gnostic metaphysical sources did not necessarily make him a Stoic, Middle Platonist or Gnostic, a point which Lilla made at the beginning of his book but fell prey to at the end when he made Clement a transitional figure between Middle and Neo-Platonism. Choufrine, whom I just mentioned, despite his distancing from Lilla still followed a generally accepted paradigm of viewing Clement’s Logos as possessive of a certain gradation.\(^9\) Choufrine distinguished a “vertical” and “horizontal” Incarnation of Logos which corresponds to Logos’ delimitation (περιγραφή) from the Father in the prehistoric phase and παρουσία, the birth of historical Jesus Christ. The passage in the section F.α.2 below (Excerpta 1.19.1) was for Choufrine just as for Daniélou the single and most decisive passage for understanding Clement’s view on Logos.

On the other hand, rather than to search for different degrees of Logos’ emanation, another group of scholars, jointly and independently, looked at Clementine Logos as one integrated agent, the Son of God (a similar approach undertaken by Pade). Claud Mondésert demonstrated how complex is the meaning of the Greek word λόγος and its derivative forms λογικός and λογικώς.\(^{10}\) Walther Völker argued that Clement did know the Greek and Gnostic systems well enough to incorporate them into his genuinely Christian setting.\(^{11}\) Eric Osborn, in turn, recognized certain confusion in

---


Clement’s formulation of the identity of Logos, but he underscored the most important dynamic of Clement’s logology which is expressed precisely in the contraposition of the unity and distinction between the Father and the Son. As the concept of the uniqueness of the Father is fundamental for monotheistic religion, so also the uniqueness of the Son is the key notion for the Christian access to the Father. In other words, if the Father is one, the Son must also be only one, which is reconfirmed by the fact that Clement felt compelled to criticize the Basilideans and Valentinians who viewed the figure of the Savior in different hypostases. Osborn’s key passage that aptly defines Logos comes from the *Stromateis* 4.25.156.1.4-2.3, section A.2 below. Instead of insisting upon successive stages of Logos, as did Lilla and his predecessors, Osborn claimed that Logos’ relation to the Father, cosmos, and humanity reflected different facets of its identity which is defined in relation with the Father and then applied in Logos’ relation to cosmos and humanity. Thus for the Father Logos is the Son; for cosmos it is its Creator; and finally, for humanity at large and for humans in particular Logos is the divine Redeemer, Instructor (Didaskalos), and High Priest.

Logos’ relation to humanity as the Teacher was extensively discussed by Erich Fascher and recently by Judith Kovacs. They followed such historians of philosophy as Overbeck, Bousset, Jaeger and Chadwick who argued that Clement attempted, quite successfully, to integrate a classical Greco-Roman paideia into the nascent Christian

---


religion. Clement’s synthesis of the Teacher in the Greek sense and Rabbi in a Judeo-Christian sense led Fascher and Kovacs to conclude that Clement not only modeled the Christian way of initiation, indoctrination, and deification on different stages of a learning process – inculcating Christianity as a kind of curriculum where final graduation will take place in the heavenly School/Church/God’s Kingdom. But as pertaining to the identity of Christ Clement aimed his metaphysical speculations about Logos to emphasize the absolute competence and authority of Christ the Didaskalos to educate, teach, heal and save humanity. Fascher and Kovacs developed their arguments based mainly on the evidence found in the undisputed texts of Clement without going into the discussion of the unity or successive emanation of Logos found in Excerpta and Hypotyposes, since they took the unity and uniqueness of Logos for granted.

Aloys Grillmeier, one of the most authoritative scholars on patristic christology, also took the unity and uniqueness of Logos as an evident fact. Even though in his portrayal of Clement’s Logos he closely followed Lilla’s study, Grillmeier still believed that the ontological unity between the Father and the Son was more decisive than some of the Clementine experimental speculations in the field of metaphysics that discussed a certain split inside Logos. Grillmeier’s major concern with Clement was his portrayal of the relation of Logos to the human body and soul in which Logos, according to Clement’s interpretation of John’s Gospel, clothed himself for the sake of human salvation. Grillmeier, following Theodor Rüther, acknowledged that Clement did have certain


Docetic tendencies, but those tendencies were exemplified not so much in Logos’ relation to the body – in his direct polemics against Docetists Clement once again reaffirmed the reality, suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus’ body – as in Logos’ relation to the soul, which was impassible (ἀπαθής) and emotionless, feeling neither joy, nor sadness, nor any other human feelings. This is a topic for a different paper: it is important to see, however, that Grillmeier accepted a unitarian interpretation of Clementine Logos.

Even though Völker, Mondésert, Osborn, Fascher and Grillmeier did not delve into philological discussions of the authenticity of Clement’s works, the last word in the field was not yet said. Adolf Knauber was perhaps the first scholar who openly addressed the arguments made by such scholars as Zahn, Casey, Wolfson, and Lilla, by reexamining the well established claim that Clement believed in the two logoi or two (three) stage emanation of Logos.17 Knauber’s main target was the very Photian citation from Clement’s lost Hypotyposes which he persuasively proved as a misread or misunderstood quotation by Constantinopolitan patriarch or more likely by Photian pupils who prepared for their master a sketched summary of Clement’s (and not only Clement’s) teachings. Not only did Knauber show that the passage was an (un)intentional “fraud” but also that there is substantial evidence in Clement’s extant writings that annul duplicity of this hypothesis. Following the intuition of Völker and Osborn, Knauber made the case that Clement believed in only one divine Logos and thus

Knauber took away, in a manner of speech, the Photian anathema that halted the study of Clement’s legacy in the ensuing centuries until the Neo-Patristic renaissance of the last two centuries.

The final word so far in the philological and philosophical reassessment of the Clementine study of Logos is expressed by Marc Edwards in 2000. This scholar argued, that first of all, the two-stage theory of Logos’ emanation was not a predominant belief of the early Christian theologians, as was claimed by Casey and Wolfson (the two exceptions they made was Irenaeus and Origen). On the contrary, Ignatius of Antioch, Justin Martyr, and most certainly Irenaeus (and Clement as he showed), in fact, elaborated different solutions to the problem of reconciliation of the transcendence of the Father and the mediatory position of the Son. Edwards disagreed with Lilla that Logos has three successive stages of emanation which supposedly Clement borrowed from the Middle Platonic emanation schemes. On the contrary, he showed that for example Numenius believed in two eternal intellects, first, the Platonic Form, and the second, the sum of ideas/powers that without mediation generate and administer the cosmos. Thus those two or three “stages” that Wolfson and Lille spoke of are simply Logos’ different aspects or modes of existence. Edwards also demonstrated that the different kinds of logoi appropriated from the Stoic terminology, especially λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος


Clement just as Philo reserved only for expressing human faculties of thought and language and unambiguously distinguished from the divine paternal Logos, see section F.β.2 below. Finally, independently of Knauber, Edwards questioned the authenticity of the Photian quotation and similarly concluded that it was a misreading by the nine-century Byzantine scholar. Moreover, Edwards also revisited the passage of Excerpta 1.19.1, see section F.α.2 below, and demonstrated that it contradicts other, undisputed and better elaborated, formulations of Clement. In light of these conclusions, Clement’s Adumbrationes may seem more genuinely to reflect Clement’s thought than it was believed before.  

Now, to return to our original question in how many Logoi did Clement of Alexandria believe, our answer will depend on whether or not we deem authentic Clement’s opinion expressed in the passages from Excerpta and Hypotyposis. If we do agree with Knauber and Edwards that they are not, which I think they are not, then the answer is clear, only one divine Logos.

Moreover, a closer reading of the Clementine extant works shows that Clement never discussed divine Logos separately. It is always connected either to the search of Didaskalos, interpretation of the New Song, High Priest and so and so forth. Thus

---

20 Sextus Empiricus, Adversus Mathematicos 8.275: They say it is not by the uttered logos that man differs from the irrational beasts (for crows and parrots and jays also emit connected sounds), but by the indwelling one. – φανερά, ὅτι άν θρεπτός οἶχι τῷ προφορικῷ λόγῳ διαφέρει τῶν ἀλλο γονιμῶν (καὶ γὰρ κόρακες καὶ γυπατκοί καὶ κάτι πετιερόν προφέρονται φωναί), ἀλλὰ τῷ ενδιάθετῳ; see Johannes F.A. von Arnim, Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta, vol. 2 (Studgardiae: B.G. Teubneri, 1968), 43.18 and 74.4.

21 Wolfson suggested that even if Adumbrationes are authentic they may have been written under the influence of Clement’s pupil, Origen (sic!).
Clement subordinated his doctrine of Logos to his larger christological image based on culturally permeating notions of Teacher (Rabbi) and High Priest. In other words, I agree with Fascher and Julia Kovacs that Clement’s metaphysics (the doctrine of Logos) served the purpose of establishing a theoanthropological balance that mediated salvation of humanity. Moreover, this salvation given as the gift of love of the Father towards humanity (Paed. 1.7-8, 1.94.8ff; Quis Dives Salvetur 37.3.183ff) is contextualized with the human gradual proximity towards God through several stages of conversion, formation of human character, and achievement of higher knowledge of God. For this, Logos incarnate in Jesus Christ is endowed with the absolute authority as the Educator, Teacher, and High Priest. Clement’s christological conception of Logos becomes clearer only when looked at in one integrated perspective of Logos as the Son, Wisdom, and Countenance of God, on the metaphysical level as well as the Maker of cosmos, the incarnate Educator, Teacher, Savior, New Song, and High Priest on the level of created world, and not merely as a gradual emanation/generation from the First Source.

**Clement’s passages on Logos**


English Translation (with my emendations): *Protrepticus* by George W. Butterworth; *Paedagoge* by Simon P. Wood, *Stromateis* by Roberts-Donaldson; *Fragmenta* and *Excerpta ex Theodoto* by Robert Casey; *Adumbrationes* by Marc Edwards

**A. Logos, the center of all**

1. *Stromateis* 1.13.57.5-6: In the universe, too, all the parts, even if they differ from one another, preserve a family relationship to the whole. So in the same way, philosophy, Greek and non-Greek, has made of eternal truth a kind of dismembering, not in the legends of Dionysius but in the theological understanding of eternal Logos. If anyone
brings together the scattered limbs into a unity, you can be quite sure without risk of error that he will gaze on Logos in his fullness, the Truth.

2. Stromateis 4.25.156.1.4-2.3: All the powers of the divine spirit, gathered into one, complete the same thing, namely the Son; he does not call up the thought of powers exhibited singly. The Son is neither absolutely one as unity nor many as divisible, but one as all is one. Hence he is all. He is the circle of all powers being bound and united in one point.

2. Protrepticus 1.5.2.1-6: What is more, this pure song, the stay of the universe and the harmony of all things, stretching from the center to the circumference and from the extremities to the center, reduced this whole to harmony, not in accordance with Thracian music, which resembles that of Jubal, but in accordance with the fatherly purpose of God, which David earnestly sought.

B. Logos divine

1. Stromateis 7.2.5.3-6: The nature of the Son, which is nearest to Him who is alone the Almighty One, is the most perfect, most holy, most potent, most princely, most kingly, and most beneficent. This is the highest excellence, which orders all things in accordance with the Father’s will, and holds the helm of the universe in the best way, with unwearied and tireless power, working all things in which it operates, keeping in view its hidden designs. For from His own point of view the Son of God is never displaced; not being divided, not severed, not passing from place to place; being always everywhere, and being contained nowhere; complete mind, the complete paternal light; all eyes, seeing all things, hearing all things, knowing all things, by His power scrutinizing the powers. To Him is placed in subjection all the host of angels and gods; He, the paternal Word, exhibiting a holy administration for Him who put [all] in subjection to Him (I Cor 15:27).
2. Excerpta ex Theodoto 1.23.5: *The face [of the Father] is the Son; and those who have been taught by the Son behold it since it is the perceivable [aspect] of the Father. The remaining [aspects] of the Father, however, remain unknowable.

2. Protrepticus 1.6.5-7: Well, because Logos was from above, He was and is the divine beginning of all things; but because He lately took a name – the name consecrated of old and worthy of power, the Christ – I have called Him a New Song. Logos, then, that is the Christ, is the cause both of our being long ago (for He was in God) and of our well-being. This Word, who alone is both God and man, the cause of all our good, appeared lately in His own person to men.

2. Protrepticus 1.7.1.1-4.1: This Word, then, the Christ, the cause of both our being at first (for He was in God) and of our well-being, this very Word has now appeared as man. He alone being both, both God and man – the Author of all blessings to us; by whom we, being taught to live well, are sent on our way to life eternal. For, according to that inspired apostle of the Lord, “the grace of God which brings salvation has appeared to all men, teaching us, that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for the blessed hope, and appearing of the glory of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ.” 23 This is the New Song, the manifestation of the Word that was in the beginning, and before the beginning. The Savior, who existed before, has in recent days appeared. He, who is in Him that truly is, has appeared; for the Word, who “was with God,” 24 and by whom all things were created, has appeared as our Teacher. The Word, who in the beginning bestowed on us life as Creator when He formed us, taught us to live well when He appeared as our Teacher; that as God He might afterwards conduct us to the life which never ends.


24 John 1:1.
3. Stromateis 1.8.4.7-9: God’s Logos became a human, so that you could learn from a human, how human can become god.

D. Logos, the Teacher

1. Paedagogus 1.1.3.3.5-9: The all-loving Word, anxious to perfect us in a way that leads progressively to salvation, makes effective use of an order well adapted to our development: at first, He persuades, then He educates, and after this He teaches.

2. Stromateis 6.7.58.1.1: It remains, then, for us, ascending to seek their teacher.

3. Stromateis 6.7.58.1.3: Since the unoriginated Being is one, the Omnipotent God; one, too, is the First-begotten, “by whom all things were made, and without whom not one thing ever was made” (John 1:3)

4. Stromateis 7.2.7.4: “For He was the Wisdom “in which” the Sovereign God “delighted” (Prov 8:30). For the Son is the power of God, as being the Father’s most ancient Logos before the production of all things, and His Wisdom, He is then properly called the Teacher of the beings formed by Him.

E. Logos, the High Priest

1. Stromateis 5.6.39.3-40.1: So the high priest, putting off his consecrated robe (the universe, and the creation in the universe, were consecrated by Him assenting that, what was made, was good), washes himself, and puts on the other tunic – a holy of holies one, so to speak – which is to accompany him into the adytum; exhibiting, as seems to me, the
Levite and Gnostic, as the chief of other priests (those bathed in water, and clothed in faith alone, and expecting their own individual abode), himself distinguishing the objects of the intellect from the things of sense, rising above other priests, hasting to the entrance to the world of ideas, to wash himself from the things here below, not in water, as formerly one was cleansed on being enrolled in the tribe of Levi. But purified already by the gnostic Logos in his whole heart, and thoroughly regulated, and having improved that mode of life received from the priest to the highest pitch, being quite sanctified both in word and life, and having put on the bright array of glory, and received the ineffable inheritance of that spiritual and perfect man, “which eye hath not seen and ear hath not heard, and it hath not entered into the heart of man”; and having become son and friend, he is now replenished with insatiable contemplation “face to face”.\(^{25}\)

---

F. One Logos?

a. Contra

1. Clement *Fragmenta* 23.11-17, in Photius, *Bibliotheca*. T. 2. Texte établi et traduit par René Henry (Paris: Les Belles lettres, 2003), cod. 109: In his folly he [Clement] is convinced that there are **two Logoi of the Father** of which the lesser appeared to men, but not even that one. For he says: “The Son is called Logos like the paternal Logos but this is not the one that became flesh. No, nor was it the paternal Logos but a certain power of God, a kind of emanation of his Logos that became reason and has been immanent in the hearts of men.”

2. Excerpta *ex Theodoto* 1.19.1: Logos became flesh not only by **becoming a human being** at the moment of his coming down on earth but also “in the beginning,” when Logos, while remaining in his constant identity, became the Son in **individuality** though not in essence.

\(^{25}\) Cf. also *Excerpta* 1.27.1-6.
3. Excerpta ex Theodoto 1.19.5: He took the form of a slave not only by taking (the accident) flesh at the time of his coming on earth, but also in his substance by becoming the subject of a personal individuality: for substance is enslaved in so far as it is passive and subject to the action of the sovereign cause.

"Οθέν και 'μορφήν δούλου λαμβάνειν" είρηται, οὐ μόνον τὴν σάρκα κατὰ τὴν παρουσίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐκ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου δούλης δή ἡ οὐσία, ὡς ἂν παθήτη καὶ ὑποκειμένην δραστηρίῳ καὶ κυριοτάτην αἰτίας.

b. Pro

1. Excerpta 1.8.1: Logos in his identity is God in God, as it has been said “in the bosom of the Father” (John 1:18), inseparable, indivisible, one God.

"Ημεῖς δὲ τὸν ἐν ταύτῃ Λόγον Θεὸν ἐν Θεῷ φαμεν, δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Πατρὸς" ὡναι λέγεται, ἀδιάστατος, ἀμερίστος, ὡς Θεὸς.

2. Strom. 5.1.6.3: The one who gave us a share in being and life has also given us a share in Logos, wishing us at the same time to live rationally and well. For Logos of the Father of all is not this uttered word but is the most manifest wisdom and goodness of God, an almighty power indeed and truly divine, nor is it incomprehensible even to unbelievers, being the will of the Almighty.

ὁ δὲ μεταδόσις ἡμῶν τοῦ εἰναι τε καὶ ἣν μεταδέδοκεν καὶ τοῦ λόγου, λογικῶς τε ἁμα καὶ εὐ ἣν ἔδειλ ἡμᾶς ἢμας ο γάρ τοι πατρός τῶν ὀλλον λόγος ὥρα ὥρας ἑστιν ὁ προφορικός, σοφία δὲ καὶ χρηστότης φανερωμένη της διαμόρφωσιν τε αὐτο παγκοσμίας καὶ τὸ νοῦ θεία, οὐδὲ τοῖς μὴ ὁμολογούσιν ἀκατανόητος, θέλημα παντοκρατορικὸν.

3. Adumbrationes, in Clements Alexandrinus. Opera. Otto Stählin. Vol. 17. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909), p. 209-10: That which was from the beginning, which we have seen with our own eyes, which we have heard (1 John 1:1). In accordance and in keeping with the Gospel according to John, this letter also contains a spiritual principle. Thus when it says “from the beginning”, the elder explained it in this way that the origin of his generation is not separated from the origin that is [or maybe “is in”] the Creator. For when it says “from the beginning”, it alludes to the generation without beginning of the Son who exists coevally with the Father. For the word was indicative of an eternity with no beginning, just as Logos himself, that is the Son of God, in accordance with the equality of their substance, exists as one with the Father, is everlasting and uncreated. That Logos existed always is what it indicates by saying: “Logos was in the beginning” (John 1:2)

Quod erat ab initio, quod vidimus oculis nostris, quod audivimus. Consequens evangelium secundum Joannem et conveniens etiam haec epistola principium spirituale continet. Quod ergo dicit “ab initio”, hoc modo presbyter exponebat, quod principium generationis separatum ab opificis principio non est. Cum enim decit “quod erat ab initio”, generationem tangit sine principio filii cum patre simul exstantis; erat ergo verbum aeternitatis significativum non habentis initium, sicut etiam verbum ipsum, hoc est filius dei, secundum aequalitatem substantiae unum cum patre consistit, sempiternum est et infectum: quod semper erat verbum significatur dicendo: “in principio erat verbum”.
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