Appendix 1

Christian Education in Second-Century Alexandria

To understand better Clement’s particular use of precepts of Greco-Roman *paideia* and its metonymic figure of the *didaskalos*, a brief overview of the educational environment of Alexandria should provide a helpful and informative socio-cultural background to the present study. Birger Pearson, Albertus Klin, and C. Wilfred Griggs, to name just a few contemporary scholars of the earliest Christian Egyptian history, all agree with Colin Roberts’ following opening remarks to his study of Christianity in Egypt that “[t]he obscurity that veils the early history of the church in Egypt and that does not lift until the beginning of third century constitutes a conspicuous challenge to the historian of primitive Christianity.”¹ It is widely recognized that the problem does not arise from a lack of evidence, for during the last three centuries hundreds of manuscripts and fragments at large that were written or circulated in the three first centuries of the Christian era have been discovered in Egypt. The evidence that we possess, however, does not specifically speak of the times and ways Christianity was

founded and initially evolved in Egypt. Thus for scholars of early Christianity of this period, it took much imagination and close reading of the extant literary and archeological evidence to deduce just what kind of communities these early Christian, Judeo-Christian, and Gnostic groups were and how they evolved before the installment of the Alexandrian bishop Demetrius (ca 189-232) in the late second and beginning of the third centuries, a point, from which on, the evidence is more informative and clear – with his episcopacy the domination of the ecclesiastically Catholic community managed to gradually absorb, pasteurize, and structure the multitude of separate groups into one recognizable body.

Scholars usually point to at least three plausible explanations of the lack of clear information prior to Demetrius’ ecclesiastical enthronement. First, as pointed out by Griggs, in Lucan Acts of the Apostles Christian diffusion throughout the Mediterranean area was predominantly oriented towards Palestine, Asia Minor, and Europe and tended to focus less attention on the Egyptian vector. In addition, Paul’s missionary itinerary and epistolary communication clearly leaves the Egyptian province out of the view. Second, there is a great deal of verisimility that the Jewish revolts of 115-117 suppressed by Trajan and then the ensuing revolt led by Bar Kochba in 130-136 and callously suppressed by Hadrian contributed to the fact that the Jewish and with it the first Judeo-Christian population was drastically purged if not entirely eradicated. These events were crucial for the definitive separation of Christians and Jews as well as the strong anti-Jewish elements found in the writings of the second century Christian Egyptian (usually

\[2\] Cf. Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, pp. 3-12.

253
anonymous or pseudonymous) authors.\(^3\) The third plausible although more and more contested proposal is Walter Bauer’s thesis that both Jewish and Gentile Christians of Egypt based their theology and worship on syncretistic and gnostic precepts which with the later (ca the end of the second century) arrival of orthodox ecclesiastical leadership was deemed unorthodox, readily dismissed, and their literary legacy physically destroyed.\(^4\)

The first connections we have between earliest Christianity and Egyptian vicinities come from the New Testament writings although they point out only that the connections were there and not much more. The first remark is the Holy Family’s escape from Herod’s hand into Egypt (Mt 2:13-21). Egypt is mentioned in the New Testament for the second time at the Pentecost (Acts 2), where Egyptians are enumerated along with the other Diaspora Jews who came to Jerusalem for the Feast of Passover and Pentecost and witnessed the descent of the Holy Spirit on the Apostles right after Jesus ascended to Heaven.

---


Third, again in the Acts (18:24), we read that “a certain Jew named Apollo, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus.” Most likely the same Apollo is mentioned also in Acts 19:1; 1 Cor 1:12; 3:5-6; 4:6; 16:12; Tit 3:13. At the same time, the Coptic church maintains a tradition that Mark the Evangelist was the founder of the church of Alexandria and Egypt. The sources that support this tradition, however, originate only with Eusebius’ recoding of a local tradition in his *Historia Ecclesiastica* 2.16.1, in which he had no document beyond the local legends to prove it accurate even if Mark’s presence in Alexandria is not an automatically dismissible fact. The evidence we do have is of a less historiographical and more of a theological and apologetic nature and still may serve as a good source for a better understanding of the Christian community that grew prior to and during Clement’s career in Alexandria.

Roelof van den Broek, indirectly reflecting a New Testament socio-theological analysis of James Dunn who plausibly differentiated four main tendencies of the first and early second century Christianity (Jewish, Hellenistic, Apocalyptic, and Early Catholic), identified six distinct Christian groups in second century Alexandria. To begin with, some groups demonstrated a particular focus on apocalyptic urgency, as the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* indicates. Second, Alexandrian Jewish wisdom theology and the

---


closely associated conservative, i.e., judaizing, type of Christianity of James is reflected in the *Gospel of the Hebrews*. Similarly the *Gospel of the Egyptians* most likely originated from the Greek speaking Egyptian Christians. Fourth, the more educated and philosophically oriented Christians who were later called Gnostics (Basilides, Valentinus, Theodotus) authored such treatises as the *Authoritative Teaching* or the *Gospel of Truth*.$^9$

Van den Broek singled out also the Marcionites as a separate faction. Marcionites may have had close ties with the previous group since they have been also called Gnostics who rejected the Hebrew Scriptures altogether. We find Clement’s polemics in this and other just mentioned groups. And finally, people like Clement and his teacher Pantaenus most likely belonged to the group that preceded the formation of a Catholic, ecclesiastically oriented, congregation that resembled a similar process of structuring as the church of Irenaeus in Lyon.

It is not my intent to go into a detailed description of these groups; I simply want to emphasize three important factors that influenced the formation of the early Egyptian church and provided a backdrop against which Clement produced his body of writing. First, it is the undisputed relation of the earliest Christian community to its parent Jewish identity as exemplified by the presence of such people as Apollo. He must have been a rabbi in Alexandria or a higher rank Jew “eloquent in Scriptures” as Acts record, which indicates that there was an openness to, and reception of, a new interpretation of Hebrew Scriptures through the lenses of the Christian Gospel. The second factor is the educational infrastructure Christians inherited from such Jewish philosophers and

---

$^9$ Cf. Nag Hammagi Collection 6.3.
thinkers as Aristeas and Aristobulus, and Philo of Alexandria. Dawson rightly pointed out that these philosophers long ago launched in Alexandria a careful and painstaking subordination of the Greek classical tradition to the Mosaic law. This process could imply that they reflected and actively engaged in the integration of the Jewish education into the larger Greco-Roman *paideia*. Their curriculum was designed to allow the élite children of Jewish families to be able to enter more easily into the larger society that surrounded them. To a lesser degree, it may have also been targeted to those of Greek, Roman, or other ethnic origin who were interested and willing to join the Jewish group. Membership and participation in the Jewish community did not put up barriers for communication with other communities, even if that communication was polemically flavored. On the contrary, the Jewish and Greco-Roman curricula established themselves in the framework of the same language of literature, philosophy, economy, and political science (cf. Table 2).

The third factor based on the two preceding ones and probably most decisive for Judeo-Christians in not only an Egyptian milieu, was their openness to, and invitation of, the members of non-Jewish, viz., Greek, Roman, Egyptian (Coptic) and other groups, among which we can enlist Clement, for whom entrance into such congregation did not seem (at least as reflected in his writings) to be difficult at all. Only in the case of Origen we see an internal tension between a freelance teacher and the ecclesiastical authority. On the contrary, Christians in Alexandria welcomed Clement’s and Origen’s pedagogical and instructive skills. Even if we accept the suggestion that Clement came from an old

---

Roman aristocratic and therefore most likely financially independent family and did not need to collect salary for his lectures, he and teachers like him still had a guaranteed support from the congregation in which they worked, since the Jewish synagogal structure that included the Beth Sefer (ביח ספד), House of Book, and Beth Talmud (חנמָד ביח), House of Learning, was on the budget of the congregation.¹¹

Henri Marrou in his general (some scholars contend that it is perhaps too general) overview of the education in antiquity refers to an illuminating story. Even though the story comes from the late fourth, I believe it is enlightening for the present study because it shows a certain tendency that most likely goes back to earlier Jewish and Judeo-Christian missionary work in Egypt:

In about the year 372 the Emperor Valens exiled two orthodox priests of Edessa to Antinoë, a place in the wilds of the Thebaïd, as a punishment for resisting his Arianizing policy. There, they were surprised and shocked to discover that things were very different from what they were used to at home and that the Christians were only a small minority amongst a mass of pagans… One of them, Protogenes, started an elementary school and gave lessons in writing and shorthand, but being a missionary as well he carefully selected his passages for dictation or recitation from the Psalms of David or the New Testament. Thus he taught the children a kind of catechism as well, and soon, as a result of his affection for them – as a result of his fellow-priest Eulogius' miracles – they were all converted to the Father.¹²

… Protogenes would have to be regarded as the founder of religious education in the modern sense of the word – i.e. education and instruction in religious matters being combined

¹¹ See Shemuel Safrai, “Education and the Study of Torah,” pp. 956-7. He also reports that even though the teachers were paid for their instructions it was rather represented as a reimbursement for the time they could spend while earning their bread elsewhere or a salary for teaching punctuation and accents which are not part of the Torah. Teaching of the Torah was deemed to be a noble enterprise that commanded it to be done for free and prohibited the payment for it; cf. Mt 10:8; Derek Eretz Zuta 4.

¹² Theodoret of Cyrus, Historia Ecclesiastica 241.4-242.22 (4.18.7-14).
with purely academic work – if he had not in fact come from Edessa, one of the main centers of Syriac culture, where this type of school is known to have been the usual thing.  

Introduction to letters and access to texts was seen in late antique Egypt as access to a higher social status, which customarily was guarded by the Greco-Roman élite that exercised and promoted education in its own exclusive circles and eagerly ensured that outsiders stayed out of it. Ptolemaic Alexandria allowed for a range of social classes, some of which enjoyed certain privileges without necessarily being full citizens, demesmen. The case in Egypt, however, was somewhat different, since the newcomers had a good chance to climb the social ladder. This was true as for the Greeks and later for Romans, as well as for Jews and Egyptians. Despite the Roman prohibitions of intermarriage, the mingling of ethnic groups was not a lacking phenomenon but was common especially in Egypt. Not only in the province, as the above Marrou’s example indicates, but even in a city with a population of nearly half a million like Alexandria, local teachers could not fully satisfy the demand for instruction in letters and professions. Ewa Wipzycka emphasized that Christian communities in Alexandria from the very beginning of its existence participated in making elementary education available to its members as well as to newcomers, mainly Greeks but also people of other ethnic groups. The latter included those who traveled to Alexandria and Egypt from all over the world to gain quick success, economic stability, social reputation, and a status that were

---


unavailable to them elsewhere. Many outsiders regarded Egypt as an exotic paradise where things were happening dynamically and opportunities were abundant. And they did have good reason to think so. Growing economic prosperity boosted by the Ptolemies and reformed by the Romans and its strategic location fitly chosen by Macedonians in the third century BCE led Alexandria to be praised as:

Seat of the immortal gods, august and wealthy, foundation of Alexandria! The gentle climate and fertile soil of Egypt provide you with all good things, happy land! There is abundant grain, infinity flax; from your harbors sail ships with rolls of papyrus and brilliant glass.

Thus, those who lived in Alexandria and those who came to it later were able to integrate into a society, which shared an unparalleled diversity but also a common interest and goal. Besides the economic enticement and relative religious tolerance, educational institutions, either Greek, Roman, or Jewish, were perhaps the most adapting and integrating vehicles through which the city reached its importance and fame in antiquity. Christian groups, regardless of their Apocalyptic, Judeo-Christian, Christian-Gnostic, or Catholic congregational “denomination,” consisted of highly educated rabbis

---
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like Apollo or later of such teachers as Valentinus, Clement and Origen. If they were of Jewish descent, these teachers were unburdened with the necessity to teach in Hebrew. After Paul’s missionary allowance to accept uncircumcised, Judeo-Christian churches and schools were open to accept non-Jews into their circles. Finally, and not less importantly, they had a stability of salary which allowed them to serve their congregations for a fixed compensation. In the end, such highly educated teachers like Clement made the élite luxury of Greco-Roman *paideia* accessible to essentially everyone who wanted it. As Pearson most recently pointed out, the traditional perception that early Christian Alexandrian teachers and their audience were the people of education and means who enjoyed a comfortable life as part of Egyptian middle class is true only to a limited degree. There is more evidence to support the view that the new membership of the Christian congregations came from all social strata and ages, both literate and of means, as well as illiterate and of little or no means. Christian groups, supported by everyone who belonged to it, afforded to keep their doors open to everyone.\(^\text{18}\) The late antique structure of the family exercised an important social role in the dynamic growth of the second century Alexandria. This is why Peter Brown dubs early church both in Rome and Alexandria “a loose confederation of believing households,”\(^\text{19}\) thereby making participation in the synagogue/church life open not only to the adults but also to their

\(^{18}\) Pearson, *Gnosticism and Christianity*, p. 21, made this statement against Jakab, *Ecclesia alexandrina*, 175-214, who was of the opinion that Clement’s audience must have come from the middle class.

\(^{19}\) Peter Brown, *The Body and Society. Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), p. 135. Brown rightly reminds us that we should not forget that, “for Clement, Christ’s words “when two or three are gathered in my name” meant father, mother, and a child praying in a Christian home.”
children, who, as was well established in the Second Temple Jewish custom both in Palestine and in Diaspora, had to be exposed to the study of letters from the age of six in the Beth Hassepher, the house of book, and from the age of twelve or thirteen and on in the Beth Talmud, the house of learning. For those who wanted to continue their studies, they could do so in the higher scribal rabbinical schools that were not lacking in Alexandria prior to Trajan’s pogrom. This Jewish educational program corresponded to the Greek and Roman tiers of education and distinguished the elementary, secondary, and higher levels of *paideia*. In other words, Sofer became the Pedagogue, while Rabbi and Mashneh became the *didaskalos* and Presbyteros (a new title which was first hardly distinguishable from *didaskalos* but with time acquired more of a clerical flavor).

---

20 Shemuel Safrai in “Education and the Study of Torah,” p. 955-7 describes Beth Sefer (ביח ספד), the house of book, which was the study of letters and reading on megillah (a small scroll) by Sofer, the teacher of letters, who taught children of age six for about five years (usually from 9 a.m. or early in the morning until the noon) and Beth Talmud (ביח חלמד), the house of learning, which was the study of Mishnah or oral Law by Mashneh, the teacher of oral Law, who taught children of the age twelve or thirteen during different lengths of years (five, six or even longer) with two sessions, one in the morning and another in the afternoon. Writing was reserved as a professional skill. Curiously, a bachelor could not be a teacher, because the customarily mothers brought children to school. “In the social hierarchy the teachers come last, the order being: sages, the “leaders of the generation,” the heads of synagogues and finally the teachers, though many sources also count the teachers among the spiritual elite of the society.” For Egyptian adaptation of Jewish synagogue and school, see J. Gwyn Griffiths, “Egypt and the Rise of the Synagogue,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 38.1 (1987): 1-15 and Aryeh Kasher, “Synagogues as “Houses of Prayer” and “Holy Places” in the Jewish Communities of Hellenistic and Roman Egypt,” in *Synagogues in Antiquity*. Ed. by A. Kasher, A. Oppenheimer, and U. Rapport (Jerusalem: Hots’a’at Yad Yits’a’ Ben-Tsevi, 1987), pp. 119-132 (in Hebrew), translated into English by Nathan H. Reisner and published in *Ancient Synagogues. Historical Analysis and Archeological Discovery*. Vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), pp. 203-220; on the use of the Greek educational model for the formation of Christian catechesis, see Norbert Widok, “Inkulturation bei Klemens von Alexandrien,” *Studia Patristica* 26 (1993): 559-568; F. Drączkowski, “Dowartościowanie kultury intelektualnej przez Klemensa Alexandryjskiego jako rezultat polemiki antyheretyckiej,” *Studia Pelplińskie* 5 (1975): 189-196. On the other hand, some argued that Christian education for children in the early church was transmitted only at home, see Andrew J. Clark, “Child and School in the Early Church.” *Comparative Education Review* 66 (1968): 468-79; Gerhard Ruhbach, “Bildung in der Alter Kirche,” in *Kirchengeschichte als Missionsgeschichte. Die alte Kirche*. Vol. 1. Ed. by H.G. Frohnes, U.W. Knorr (München: Kaiser, 1974), pp. 293-310; Neymeyr, *Die christlichen Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert*, p. 1.
This fusion of Jewish and Hellenistic education/paideia most certainly took place in the synagogues/school(s) of Alexandria although with the arrival of Christians on the scene it bore the new twist of a missionary call. In one such circle, Clement found his home. There are many good studies devoted to the question of the status of the so-called Alexandrian Catechetical School, although there is very little evidence to support or debunk conclusions various scholars make with regards to the size, structure, and the impact it made on the formation and dissemination of Christianity in second century Alexandria and beyond the city in Egypt and throughout Mediterranean region. As Pearson notes, Roelof van den Broek and Annewies van den Hoek articulated the two contemporary, diametrically opposed but perhaps also complementary, interpretations of the tradition of the Alexandrian School. Each of them agrees with Gustav Bardy’s persuasive illustration that Eusebius’ construal of a well structured and managed school “of sacred learning” that came to its eminence under Pantaenus and then flourished under the leadership of Clement and Origen, as well as later bishops, was an anachronistic projection of a state of affairs contemporaneous with Eusebius unto the origins of Alexandrian church but hardly supported by any documents or other relevant data.

Pantaenus did not leave us any written accounts. Clement mentions his close connection


22 Eusebius Historia Ecclesiastica 5.10-11.
to Pantaenus but this does not suffice to prove the existence of the kind of school
Eusebius informs us about. Finally, the link between Origen and Clement is also very
tentative even if plausible. One of the most dubious facts Eusebius records is Origen’s
overtaking of the control of the School when he was eighteen (6.6.1ff.) in the time, when
Clement left Alexandria possibly out of fear of persecution by Severus or, as van den
Hoek and Pierre Nautin suggested, because of his conflict with the local bishop
Demetrius. Subsequently, Origen also moved to Caesarea because of the escalation of
the interpersonal conflict between him and Demetrius. Thus, van den Broek, agreeing
with the Bardyan deconstruction of the Eusebius’ “myth” of the Alexandrian School,
contends that there was no such school prior to Demetrius and that teachers like
Pantaenus and Clement along with the earlier and contemporary “heretics” as Basilides,
Valentinus, and Theodotus, were simply lay instructors who jointly and/or independently
engaged in polemics with one another while offering private classes to their students.
With the rise of importance of the ecclesiastical structure in Alexandria, those different
teachers offered their service to the church even though they needed bishop’s approval.
Van den Hoek, on the contrary, based her understanding of the Alexandrian school on a
thorough study of Clement’s use of the passages that could refer to the space and
structure in which he worked. She found two terms that describe such space and
structure: διδασκάλειον (found elsewhere but not in Clement) and κατηχησις.

This discussion reveals a particular facet of Christ the didaskalos as functioning in
and through a community and also informs Clement’s position in Alexandrian
community. Based on Clement’s writings, van den Hoek concluded that he must have
fully plunged into a complete range of teaching and scholarship activity. Second, she
questioned van den Broek’s separation between the school and church and supported a long established but still disputed view that Clement was not only a teacher but also an appointed presbyter.23 And third, the existence of a school requires teaching materials and books (and no less importantly a scriptorium), which, as the manuscript collection from Alexandria attests, superseded any other contemporaneous Christian libraries of the period.24 Whatever argument is closer to the truth, the most important factor remains that the teachers played probably the most significant role in the life of early Christian communities both in Egypt as well as other big metropolitan areas of the Roman Empire.25


24 Cf. Harry Gamble, Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts, p. 154. Gamble attests to the presence of an impressively large Christian library in Alexandria which if combined with Clement’s erudition and citation of Philo and Greek authors commands for a larger body of people who took care of this expensive, even in Egypt, enterprise.

25 In this respect the following studies can be a point of reference, even though they disagree on the nature of the synthesis between the Jewish, Judeo-Christian and Hellenistic education, they do provide compelling arguments that this fusion went very deep, see Hans F. von Campenhausen, Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten (Tübingen: Mohr, 1953) saw a continuity between the first and second century Christian teachers; Roger Gryson, “The Authority of the Teacher in the Ancient and Medieval Church,” Journal of Ecumenical Studies 19.2 (1982): 176-82 agreed that there was continuity but also emphasized that by the middle of the third century most of the Christian teachers became ecclesial ministers; Alfred Zimmermann, Die uhrchristliche Lehrer: Studien zum Tradentenkreis der didaskaloi im frühen Uhchristentum (Tübingen: Mohr, 1984) denied a continuity between the first and second century Christian teachers while contending that it became entirely hellenized; John K. Coyle, “The Exercise of Teaching in the Postapostolic Church,” Epistemonike epeteris tes theologikes 15 (1984): 23-43 agreed with Gryson that by the third century Christian teachers either merged or became associated with clerics of local churches.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek ¹</th>
<th>Roman</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Three schools (grammar, music, and physical education)</td>
<td><em>Ludus/Ludi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Advanced grammatical studies</td>
<td><em>Schola</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Philosophy, rhetoric, or law/medicine</td>
<td>Rhetorical schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Ancient Tiers of Education


²⁶ Greek education in the classical period had only two tiers, but later developed a third during the Hellenistic period, which was then mimicked by the Romans.