***Abstract***

The *Pseudo-Clementines* is the traditional title of a unique, Christian novel (3rd-4th century), transmitted in several versions. This contribution focuses on the Greek version, called the *Homilies*, and more specifically on a much discussed part of those *Homilies*, namely the discussions with the pagan Appion. The passage in which the main character Clement enters into discussion with Appion, shows us how those characters claim truth and argue about the true culture, philosophy, education, sexuality etc. This passage is all too often considered as ‘separate’ and ‘alien’ in the *Pseudo-Clementine* source criticism, making it underexposed territory in rhetorical and literary research, but also in philosophical research. This contribution offers a rhetorical and narrative analysis of those disputes with Appionincluding some philosophical insights. This analysis also serves as a case study for the overall reading experience and the general interpretation of the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*.
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**The role of the *Homilistic* disputes with Appion (*Hom*. 4-6)**

The *Pseudo-Clementines* present themselves as the autobiography of Clement of Rome[[1]](#footnote-1). As a young boy he struggled with some philosophical, existential questions, lost his parents and brothers, later he met Barnabas and Peter, converted to Christianity and was eventually reunited with his family. We have two fourth-century text traditions of these *Pseudo-Clementines*: the *Homilies* (or *Klementia*) and the *Recognitions* (also referred to in singular as the *Recognitio*). In both, we encounter a series of disputes between, on the one hand the Apostle Peter, and, on the other hand, Simon the Magician, the ‘father’ of the Gnostic sects[[2]](#footnote-2), and several recognition scenes of Clement’s family. In the *Homilistic* version we also have a series of disputes between Clement and the pagan Appion[[3]](#footnote-3) (*Hom.* 4-6), who is a follower of Simon. These disputes deal with the distinction between Judaism and Hellenism, the value of the Greek paideia and Clement’s conversion. In the *Pseudo-Clementine* source criticism, this passage is all too often considered as ‘separate’ and ‘alien’ and is seen as coming from an independent source, an Alexandrian Jewish ‘Disputationsbuch’ which supposedly intruded the *Homilistic* corpus. This is the reason why these disputes are far too underexposed in narrative, rhetorical and philosophical research. My contribution addresses the question why these disputes, in the way they are preserved, are included in this *Homilistic* version and what their function is in order to better understand the *Homilies* as a whole. Firstly, I will discuss the status quaestionis concerning these debates and in particular the ‘Disputationsbuch’-theory. Secondly, I will approach the particular character of these disputes, the choice of their main actors and their implications, proving that the opposition between Judaism and Hellenism and the choice of Appion as Clement’s opponent logically fit in the *Homilistic* corpus. Finally, after this understanding of the character of these disputes within its literary context, I will further explain how these debates fit even more profoundly in the *Homilies* by means of discussing three major motifs: paideia, truth and sophrosyne. The dynamics of these motifs are found in the whole *Homilistic* work and play a particular role in the debates between Appion and Clement which in their turn influence the further life path of Clement. During the discussion of these three steps, I will raise serious doubts concerning the arguments for a ‘Disputationsbuch’-theory and even show that such a theory is not necessary for our understanding of *Hom.* 4-6.

**Status Quaestionis (Hom. 4-6)**

Researchers of the 19th century approached the *Pseudo-Clementines* as a patchwork of different sources of which the *Grundschrift* would be the main source. This ‘Grundschrifthypothese’ established a basic work on which both *Pseudo-Clementine* traditions are based and of which nothing is preserved. This *Grundschrift* may have originated in early 3rd century in Jewish-Christian circles in Coele-Syria.[[4]](#footnote-4) Researchers even assume other hypothetical basic works for this *Grundschrift* such as the *Κηρύγματα Πέτρου* and the *Ἀναβαθμοὶ Ἰακώβου*. In light of this source criticism, the disputes between Appion and Clement have been experienced as ‘alien’ in comparison to the rest of the *Homilies* because they do not have a real counterpart in the *Recognitions*, except for a few similar topics in chapter X, 17-51[[5]](#footnote-5). The particular framework and the structure of the content of these disputes are indeed unique to the *Homilies*. This would imply that the disputes between Clement and Appion were not an original part of the *Grundschrift* and intruded into the *Homilistic* version.[[6]](#footnote-6)In the 19th and 20th centuries, important researchers like Hans Waitz, Werner Heintze and Carl Schmidt paved the way for this interpretation, allowing more recent researchers such as Bernd Reiner Voss and William Adler to accept that these debates originated from a Hellenistic-Jewish ‘Disputationsbuch’, a kind of a Jewish apologetic work, situated in second-century Alexandrian Judaism.

To begin with, Hans Waitz states that the disputes between Appion and Clement were not originally included in the *Grundschrift*, but were added to the *Homilies* in later times. He does not, however, describe this extra source as Jewish. His arguments are[[7]](#footnote-7):

1. Peter, as ‘Apologet des Christentums’, who, in the first three *Homilies*, defended the doctrine of the True Prophet against the heretic Simon the Magician, strikingly disappears into the background.
2. Appion, Clement’s opponent in *Hom*. 4-6, does not make many other appearances in the rest of the story (7.5.9 and 20.11). The same goes for his two companions, Annubion and Athenodorus.
3. The discussions on pagan paideia are as ‘ein abgeschlossenes Ganzes’ due to the lack of a specific Christian point of view, in contrast to the rest of the *Homilies*. No quotations from the Old and New Testament can be found in this excerpt, but there are references to pagan works such as Homer’s *Iliad* (e.g. 5.12; 6.3) and many pagan names, e.g. Zeus (26x) and Hera (10x), which do not occur as much in the rest of the *Homilies*. Also the rare expression in the *Pseudo-Clementines*,‘*ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες*’ (4.11) and a large number of ‘hapax legomena’ would suggest the ‘alienness’ of these disputes.
4. This ‘abgeschlossenes’ character is even more noticeable in the particular style of this excerpt in contrast to the rest of the *Homilies*.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Ten years later, Werner Heintze also argued that these disputes were not part of the original *Grundschrift*.[[9]](#footnote-9) His arguments are broadly similar to those of Waitz[[10]](#footnote-10): Peter’s dissapearance into the background, the rare expression of ‘*ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες*’ and the privileged role of ‘das Griechische’[[11]](#footnote-11). The small roles of Athenodorus and Annubion are striking to him as well, as it was to Waitz. Clement explained at the beginning of his speech (*Hom*. 4.12) that he would refute polytheism (= Appion’s domain), the doctrine of fate (‘*εἱμαρμένη*’ or ‘*γένεσις*’, the domain of the astrologer Annubion), and the unforeseeing destiny without the superintendence of any master (‘*ἀπρονόητον φοράν*’, the domain of the Epicurean Athenodorus), but he actually only refutes Appion’s domain in a more profound way. In Heintze’s opinion, this means several parts of the original disputes got lost when they were incorporated in the *Homilies*. He gives an additional narrative inconsistency: at the end of *Homilie* 3, Peter sent Clement, Nicetas and Aquila to Tyre (3.73). In the corresponding narrative in the *Recognitions*, twelve people are sent forward by Peter (III.69). However, in both versions it is mentioned how twelve people meet Peter in Tripoli (8.3; IV.1). This would be a mistake of the *Homilist*.[[12]](#footnote-12) However, I will not deal with this argument in the rest of this article as it has no further major implications for our understanding of *Hom.* 4-6 and their role in the rest of the story. The last argument which Heintze underscores, is the emphasis on Judaism. The role of Christianity is pushed into the background.[[13]](#footnote-13) Therefore, Heintze considers these disputes to be coming from ‘einer jüdischen Disputationsschrift’. Carl Schmidt repeated the arguments of both researchers and also argued that there is a ‘Benutzung eines jüdisch-apologetischen Werkes’, which he situated after Josephus’ *Contra Apionem* (ca. 93) and before the Jewish revolt under Trajan (115-117) and the revolt of Bar Kochba (132-135).[[14]](#footnote-14)

On the other hand, Bernard Rehm claims that the part of *Hom.* 4-6 is an original construction of the *Homilist*.[[15]](#footnote-15) His arguments are:

1. On the linguistic level, ‘hapax legomena’ are spread over the whole *Homilies* and not only in *Hom.* 4-6.
2. Bible citations do not fit in the discussion about Greek paideia which explains the lack of them in *Hom.* 4-6.[[16]](#footnote-16)
3. The stress on Judaism is due to the ignorance of Appion concerning the distinction between Christianity and Judaism. Pagans were unable to make a distinction between them in the first years after Christ’s death.

Nevertheless, the arguments of Waitz, Heintze and Schmidt have strongly influenced the research on the *Pseudo-Clementine* literature in the 20th and 21st century, especially concerning *Hom.* 4-6. Bernd Reiner Voss, for example, in his study on the dialogue in early and late ancient Christian literature, states that the debates with Appion are ‘ein geschlossenes Ganzes’, regarding their composition as well as their style.[[17]](#footnote-17) William Adler, who traces the story of the young, ‘lovesick’ Clement to the Hellenistic rhetorical schools, sums up the arguments of Waitz and Heintze[[18]](#footnote-18), and Dominique Côté also refers to the theory of a Jewish apologetical work without renouncing it.[[19]](#footnote-19) They all agree on the existence of the ‘Disputationsbuch’. This part of the ‘Quellenanalyse’ has different consequences. The underexposure of the literary and philosophical value is one of them. In recent years, however, a shift occurred in the *Pseudo-Clementine* research context, away from a narrow source-critical approach, to a new (literary) appreciation of the *Pseudo-Clementine* versions as we have them at our disposal (today).[[20]](#footnote-20) My contribution belongs to this kind of approach. The aforementioned arguments and hypotheses do not explain the role and the importance of *Hom*. 4-6 in the whole *Homilistic novel*. On the contrary, it led to the consequence that these disputes between Appion and Clement are far too underexposed in narrative, rhetorical, and philosophical research. These debates definitely fit in the whole *Homilistic* body. First, we have to understand the unique character of these debates and the choice of Appion and Clement as opponents and nuance several of the arguments of the aforementioned researchers before we can truly understand their function.

**Hellenism vs. Judaism: an inappriopriate battle in the *Homilies*?**

*Hom.* 4-6 deal with a debate between the Jewish and Greek world of which Clement and Appion are the main actors.The stress on Judaism and on the Greek world, and the lack of Bible citations were three of the main arguments to consider *Hom.* 4-6 as intrusive. Are these arguments indeed valid? To begin with, the two main actors, Clement and Appion, provoke the ‘battle’ between the Greek and Jewish worlds and are ideal opponents to each other. Appion is introduced as ‘Pleistonices’ (*Ἀππίωνα τὸν Πλειστονίκην*), a man of Alexandria(*ἄνδρα ἀλεξανδρέα*)[[21]](#footnote-21)*,* a grammarian by profession(*γραμματικὸν τὴν ἐπιστήμην*)*,* whom Clement knew to be a friend of his father’s (4.6). First of all, *Πλειστονίκην* etymologically means something like ‘victor in many contests’.[[22]](#footnote-22) This means he is a tough opponent for the younger and less experienced Clement. Another possibility is that it is related to ‘νεικέω’ (to quarrel), meaning something like ‘the quarrelsome’. Thus, Appion is a perfect candidate for a debate. His profession of ‘grammarian’ especially will help him to quarrel or discuss. The term of *γραμματικός*[[23]](#footnote-23), as Bremmer explains it, has two interrelated meanings: on the one hand it means ‘grammaticus/teacher’, on the other hand, it refers to ‘a cultivated person’. This shows of course his intellectual character and his background settled in the Greek paideia. Moreover, the historical Apion was known for his works on Homer, as Seneca pointed out in his *Epistula 88*.[[24]](#footnote-24) This explains the Homeric references and citations in these disputes such as in *Hom.* 5.12 which refers to *Il.* 1.544 and 6.3 to *Il.* 7.99. Both *Homilistic* passages are, not accidentally, attributed to Appion. This allows us to understand and nuance one of the criticisms of Waitz (see c.) and other researchers. They pointed out that no quotations from the Old and New Testament were cited in these disputes containing references to pagan works such as Homer’s *Iliad* and many pagan names which do not occur as often in the rest of the *Homilies*. But this can be explained by the choice of the *Homilist* for Appion to serve as Clement’s opponent, who is defending the Greek paideia, especially due to his knowledge of mythology and Homer. References to the Old and especially to the New Testament do not fit in these disputes on Greek culture, as Rhem also pointed out. Not only Appion has a background of Greek paideia, Clement has too. He went to several philosophical schools before his conversion in order to find answers to his existential questions such as ‘Is there life after death?’ or ‘Is this world created, and was there anything before it was made?’ (1.1.2-5).

From my boyhood, then, being involved in such reasonings, in order to learn something definite, I used to resort to the schools of the philosophers. But nought else did I see than the setting up and the knocking down of doctrines, and strifes, and seeking for victory, and the arts of syllogisms, and the skill of assumptions; and sometimes one opinion prevailed,—as, for example, that the soul is immortal, and sometimes that it is mortal (1.3.1-2).[[25]](#footnote-25)

This way, Clement has the same tools as Appion to engage in discussion with him.[[26]](#footnote-26) The Greek world is allowed to come to the fore because both Appion and Clement share this world. But, in contrast to Clement, Appion fervently hates the Jews.[[27]](#footnote-27) Therefore, he tied up with Simon the Magician, Peter’s big opponent, who as a Samaritan is also a hater of the Jews (5.2.4). Hating the Jews, Appion becomes the right person for questioning Clement’s conversion to a religion of a Jewish origin. In fact, the *Homilist* is tied to this connection which is due to the link with the historical Apion against whom the Jewish author Josephus wrote the treatise *Contra Apionem* (ca. 93 A.D.). In this work, it is told that Apion was born in the second half of the first century B.C. in Upper Egypt and that he studied in Alexandria with Didymus Chalkenterus as his teacher.[[28]](#footnote-28) He worked in Rome during the reigns of Caligula (37-41) and Claudius (41-54). In 39, Apion was the leader of an Alexandrian delegation to Rome on the occasion of a Greek pogrom in which many Jews were killed. A fierce battle was being fought between the Greek-Alexandrian and the Jewish parties concerning the rights to earn citizenship.[[29]](#footnote-29) In light of this historical and literary background of Apion, the *Homilist* is rather forced to keep the Jewish character of these backgrounds, in opposition to the Greek world. Also the assumed background of Clement probably forced the *Homilist* to use the Jewish character. Bernard Pouderon linked the literary character of Clement to Flavius Clemens, a relative of the emperor Domitian. The latter, according to Cassius Dio, executed Flavius Clemens for converting to Judaism.[[30]](#footnote-30)

Declaring that Appion did not know the difference between Christianity and Judaism, as Rehm did, is not enough to understand the Jewish character of *Hom.* 4-6 in opposition to the Hellenistic character. Moreover, emphasis on Christianity would require another pagan opponent (this role is filled in by Simon in the rest of the *Homilies*). So, Appion and Clement are complementary opponents, but what happened to Athenodorus and Annubion in these disputes? Clement and Appion are followers of, respectively, Peter and Simon. This is, in my opinion, a continuation or, at least, an influence of the *Pseudo-Clementine* doctrine of syzygia[[31]](#footnote-31). This doctrine is a law of creation – as Peter explains it in a metaphysical framework (2.33.1) – meaning that God creates everything in pairs, which is linked to the existence of two worlds (the current, perishable world ruled by Evil and the future world dominated by Good). So, just like the bad Simon and the good Peter are a pair, we may also suppose the same concerning Appion and Clement. This way, the law of syzygia is also a narrative device and this is key to understanding the role of Athenodorus and Annubion. It excludes Appion from Athenodorus and Annubion in opposition to Clement.[[32]](#footnote-32) As such, these factors (hating Jews, *Πλειστονίκην*, Greek paideia/grammaticus and syzygia) explain the emphasis on the opposition between Clement and Appion, and may also explain why Annubion and Athenodorus were moved to the background. Clement needs Appion as an opponent, Appion needs Clement as his opponent. This could refine our view concerning the criticism of, especially, Heintze, who suggested parts of Clement’s speech were missing (Clement stated he would not only deal with the domain of Appion, but also with the domains of Athenodorus and Annubion).

At their first meeting and confrontation in Tyre, Appion wanted to help Clement to get back on the ‘right’ path, away from acting most impiously (*τὰ μέγιστα ἀσεβεῖ*) in forsaking the ancestral customs (*καταλιπὼν μὲν τὰ πάτρια*) and falling away to those barbarous ones (*ἀποκλίνας δὲ εἰς ἔθη βάρβαρα*; 4.7.3.). The focus on the concept of ‘barbarism’ is not new in the *Homilies*.[[33]](#footnote-33) In Alexandria, Barnabas, testifying the deeds and words of Jesus, is mocked by ‘men of paideia’(*ἐκ παιδείας κοσμικῆς ὁρμώμενοι φιλόσοφοι*) as being barbaric (1.11.1). Clement, who went to listen to Barnabas, defended him and considered the mocking philosophers as ‘truthless’, because the truth consorts with those same barbarians (1.11.5). The shift from an ethnic connotation of the term ‘barbarism’ to a cultural one is worth noting. As a Levitian, Barnabas is indeed barbaric to the ‘men of Greek paideia’. Clement changes this connotation. The barbarians are superior concerning the truth while the philosophers are deprived from this truth. Later, Appion’s accusation that Clement has turned his back on the ancestral habits and that he is now following the barabarous customs, specifically illustrate the cultural side of the debate between Judaism and Hellenism. Clement extensively reacts to this by turning around the concepts of ‘eusebia’ and ‘asebia’. ‘Eusebia’[[34]](#footnote-34), in this light, is a concept strongly connected to the preservation of ancient, honoured and ancestral traditions (in opposition to ‘asebeia’), which Clement seems to have turned against. Being pious, Clement explains, does not include merely accepting the impious, ancestral customs and ideas (4.8.3). Before Appion is able to reply, Clement moves this conversation to a secluded place, a garden, in order to escape from the masses but also from those who philosophize for their own good and are constantly mocking others. What follows is a full explanation by Clement on the difference between truth and habit, linked to ‘eusebia’ and ‘asebia’. In this dissertation he attacks the ancestral habits, and specifically the Greek myths about the adulterous and child devouring gods (this is in line with the mythological knowledge of the literary Appion and the historical Apion). These are untrue, false and despicable (4.8.5-6; 4.11.1-2). The rejection of these adulterous myths and the redefinition of piety happens, not accidentally, in the chosen setting of a garden. Its origin may be the *locus amoenus* in Plato’s *Phaedrus* (which was no garden), but we can encounter it clearly in Cicero’s *Tusculanae Disputationes*.[[35]](#footnote-35) Just in this similar, classical *topos* the classical world view is under attack, especially when Clement explicitly redefines ‘eusebia’ in the context of ‘barbarism’ stating that the doctrine of the barbarous Jews (*ὁ δὲ τῶν* (*ὡς ὑμεῖς φατε*) *βαρβάρων Ἰουδαίων λόγος*) is the most pious one (*εὐσεβέστατός ἐστιν*; 4.13.3), revealing the tensions between both worlds. So, pietas, linked to truth, belongs to the Jewish world. I already pointed out why Appion and Clement are the ideal competitors in a battle between a Greek and Jewish world. But the fact that Judaism is emphasized in these disputes is indeed striking, which was one of the specific remarks of Heintze.[[36]](#footnote-36) It is remarkable that the *Homilist* kept the focus on Judaism and even more so that he chose to put this into his text. Instead of considering this a careless adaptation of a Jewish ‘Disputationsbuch’, it is necessary to understand that this Jewish character (versus the Greek character of the opponent) does not stand in contrast with the rest of the *Homilies*. A.Y. Reed rightly argues: ‘*Rather than focusing on differences between Jews and Christians, the Homilies depict them as united in the same goals: they seek to promote piety and to uproot the truth of monotheism in a world filled with demons, impurity, “heretical” lies, and polytheistic error.*’[[37]](#footnote-37) This continuation can already be noticed in the first three *Homilies*, for instance, 3.3.2-4.2 (Peter):

‘And with us, indeed, who have had handed down from our forefathers the worship of the God who made all things, and also the mystery of the books which are able to deceive, he will not prevail; but with those from amongst the Gentiles who have the polytheistic fancy bred in them, and who know not the falsehoods of the Scriptures, he will prevail much.’

As such, the continuation between Judaism and Christianity and the conflict with polytheistic *Gentiles* is already introduced in the first *Homilies*, which is developed further in *Hom.* 4-6, and is also continued afterwards, e.g. 8.5-7 (also 9.1.1; 11.7-16; 16.14):

‘For even the Hebrews who believe Moses, and do not observe the things spoken by him, are not saved, unless they observe the things that were spoken to them. For their believing Moses was not of their own will, but of God, who said to Moses, ‘Behold, I come to thee in a pillar of cloud, that the people may hear me speaking to thee, and may believe thee for ever.’ Since, therefore, both to the Hebrews and to those who are called from the Gentiles, believing in the teachers of truth is of God, while excellent actions are left to every one to do by his own judgment, the reward is righteously bestowed upon those who do well. For there would have been no need of Moses, or of the coming of Jesus, if of themselves they would have understood what is reasonable.’ (8.5-7; Peter)

This whole division is placed in a syzygetical genealogy of error and truth with the pagan religion and culture on the side of the opponents of which Appion is an important exponent. A very important passage which illustrates this division is 11.16.2:

‘For he is a worshipper of God, of whom I speak, who is truly pious, not one who is such only in name, but who really performs the deeds of the law that has been given him. If any one acts impiously, he is not pious; in like manner as, if he who is of another tribe keeps the law, he is a Jew; but he who does not keep it is a Greek.’

Reed rightly points out: ‘*By this reasoning, the battle between Judaism and Hellenism is a perennial one, which speaks to the struggle of the pious against the impious in all times and places*’.[[38]](#footnote-38) As such, *Hom.* 4-6 fit in a larger *Homilistic* construction. This explanation of ‘Greeks’ versus ‘Jews’ gives us a view on the role of these disputes and nuances several criticisms (the role of Appion and Clement, and the emphasis on the Greek and Jewish worlds). However, we encounter here the complex and paradoxical character of these *Pseudo-Clementines*. Not only the main character Clement has a background of Greek paideia, but, of course, so does the author of the *Homilies*. He is the one who is able to write such a complex text in Greek, filled with philosophical and rhetorical disputes. In short, there is something strange going on. The author uses this ‘Greekness’ to reject ‘Greekness’. Côté stated, without giving an answer on it, that the literary and rhetorical competency of the author of this passage counteracts the rejection of the *paideia*.[[39]](#footnote-39) But this fits in a larger *Homilistic* construction. Before explaining this paradox, I want to give an example of another, similar, paradoxical situtation: allegorical interpretations are rejected in the *Homilies*, for example by showing how Simon the Magician uses these to mislead people (2.25.3): ‘Moreover, by cunningly explaining [*ἀλληγορῶν*] certain things of this sort, made up from Grecian myths[[40]](#footnote-40), he deceives many.’ However, to explain how the truth can be reached, Peter uses an allegory in *Hom*. 1.18-20. With the external help of the True Prophet ignorants will be freed from a house full of smoke. Nobody can see through it, not even the philosophers. This house is not obscured by external factors but by human sin. Only through the Prophet’s advent is salvation possible. This is clearly a reinterpretation of Plato’s allegory of the cave.[[41]](#footnote-41) In this particular example, we see a redefinition of the Greek paideia on two levels. On the one hand, the *Homilist* incorporated a classical philosophical image in a Judeo-Christian worldview, showing his ability to use the classical paideia. On the other hand, the *Homilist* redefines the contents of Plato's comparison. To achieve true knowledge, there is need for an external epistemological tool: the True Prophet. One cannot escape from the house/cave and perceive the true light without His help.

A similar technique can be seen at the denouement of the *Homilies* (20.12-etc.). After recognizing his father, Clement has at last found his entire family. However, Simon is trying once again to confuse everyone by giving Clement’s father his own face. Peter discovers this, but instead of revealing it, he uses it against Simon himself by letting this ‘pseudo-Simon’ testify in front of the people that Peter is right. Thus, we see how the dissimulative, persuasive devices of the opponents are being used by Peter himself, and, in fact, by the *Homilist*. The world of the opponents is rejected by the devices of those same opponents. This is key to understanding the remark of Waitz (remark d) that the ‘abgeschlossenes’ quality of these disputes is even more noticeable through the style of this passage: ‘Der Stil ist glatt und nicht ohne Eleganz.’ As explained earlier, Clement and Appion are the ideal protagonists of these disputes due to their same, classical background. Appion uses this background to oppose Clement’s conversion. Clement wanted to hold these disputes in a, literally, classical *topos*: the secluded garden. Precisely in this classical context, the attack on the classical worldview takes place. So, the classical background is used to reject this same background in the disputes with the grammaticus Appion. And as the *Homilist* is letting Appion use a smooth style of speech due to Appion’s background as grammaticus, he also lets Clement use, due his same educational background, this style to reject this Greek background. Peter or Barnabas would not fit in this role due to their lack of dialectics. This explains the particular style of these disputes.

In fact, the *Homilist* does not only let Clement use the Greekness as a reaction against Appion. He also lets him be one step ahead in using this classical background. Appion is sick and absent on the second day of their disputes (*Hom.* 5). Normally, he would have defended an allegorical explanation of the Greek myths on this day. Clement takes this opportunity to tell an anecdote from his youth. Appion was a friend of Clement’s father and saw during a visit that the young Clement was ill, suspecting he was lovesick for a matrona.[[42]](#footnote-42) But in his story about his ‘lovesickness’, Clement is creating a beautiful setting of dissimulation which he consciously uses in a rhetorical manner. After all, the young Clement was not in love, he was ill due to unanswered philosophical questions which were taunting him since the beginning of the story. The desired Roman matrona simply does not exist, so Appion wanted to convince a non-existent woman to commit adultery. The sick Appion is absent from Clement’s public reading of his love letter while Appion himself wrote this letter for the sick Clement. Even more striking is how Appion was trying to convince the non-existent woman with various sophisms, while he is the one being tricked the whole time. The ‘pseudo-matrona’ who wrote an answer to Appion’s letter, rejecting the content of this letter and admitting she converted to the Jewish faith, is none other than Clement himself. This ‘metamorphosis’ of Clement into a matrona who converted to Judaism is a reversal of all those examples, summed up in Appion’s letter, of Zeus changing himself in all sorts of shapes to trick boys, girls and women in order to commit adultery, e.g. as golden rain in the case of Danaë (5.11.3-14). Clement, in fact, misleads Appion by his metamorphosis and undermines his love letter, while Zeus deceives women and their husbands by violating the laws forbidding adultery. Moreover, at the level of the letter, *dissimulatio* rules again. All those ‘adulterous victories’ Appion’s letter sums up, are given from the perspective of a male individual (e.g. Zeus) ‘conquering’ a woman or a boy. The matrona must learn, according to Appion, the benefits of those ‘adulterous victories’ (e.g. being put as a constellation in the sky) and take on the passive sexual role (corresponding to the traditional sexual ethics).[[43]](#footnote-43) However, the irony lies in those benefits. Only gods can grant them: the presumed letter writer is no god! This dissimulation is certainly due to Clement’s background of paideia, obtained by rhetorical education including the common progymnasmatic principles of ‘anaskeue’ (confirmation) and ‘kataskeue’ (refutation), which are mentioned several times in the *Homilies* and which Clement definitely knew as described in the *Homilies* (e.g. 1.19.3; 5.2.2).[[44]](#footnote-44) With those principles, he knows the pros and cons of his opponent’s arguments. He is so skilled that he even interrupts Appion and finishes his allegorical dissertation himself on the third and last day of these disputes (6.11-etc.).

This all explains the privileged role of ‘das Griechische’ as Heintze stated, but also the disappearance of Peter to the background and the rare expression[[45]](#footnote-45) of ‘*ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες*’, which is definitely not innocent now that we understand the distinction between ‘Greeks’ and ‘Jews’ and its dynamics.[[46]](#footnote-46) Thus, I have made clear how we should understand the particular character of these disputes, the choice of the two opponents, and how the clash between the ‘Greeks’ and the ‘Jews’ functions in the larger *Homilistic* work. Moreover, when we read the work from beginning to end, we notice that *Hom.* 4-6 are more deeply embedded in the *Homilistic* body. They have an important and constructive role in this process of claiming truth and this without being ‘alien’ to the rest of the story. In order to better understand the role of these disputes in the *Homilistic* corpus, we have to discern which topics are important in the development of the *Homilistic* story. By looking at the motifs in *Hom*. 1-3, several expectations can be built up for the rest of the story, including and determining *Hom.* 4-6. However, we also have to examine, in case *Hom.* 4-6 would be intrusive, whether the *Homilist* made the disputes fit in the whole story, or, maybe, just rewrote the first *Homilies* in order to correspond with the following three *Homilies*. It will be clear that these dynamics are driving forces all over the *Homilistic* corpus, not just in the first six *Homilies*, and that they have a constructive role in the larger distinction between ‘Greeks’ and ‘Jews’. Several important motifs emerge: sophrosyne, truth and paideia containing philosophy, Egypt and magic, mythology and allegorization.

**‘Greek’ paideia vs. Judeo-Christian truth**

To begin with, the claim of truth is what it is all about, not only in the disputes between Appion and Clement, Hellenism and Judaism, but in the *Homilies* as a whole. In the beginning, Clement asks several existential questions about the (im)mortality of souls and the eternity of the world. It keeps him busy, not just for a while, but constantly (*ἀπαύστως*, 1.2.1). According to Clement, a virtuous and good life is only possible when the soul is immortal, because only then the possibility is there to punish or reward people for the way they lived their lives. But since he has no answers to his questions yet – he concludes – it is better to live piously by subduing bodily pleasures (*τῶν τοῦ σώματος κρατεῖν ἡδονῶν*; 1.4.5). In this way, Clement is aware of his own subjectivity and individual position in the cosmos, only he does not know the answers to his existential questions and the value of his being. This is not uncommon in its historical context. The awareness of the own subjectivity is explained in *le souci de soi*, the third part of Foucault’s *Histoire de la sexualité*, in which he focuses on the first centuries A.D. and the techniques that enable the individual (of the upper class) to subjectify himself. The increasing *cura sui* and (sexual) temperance in moral thinking of that time is not a sharpening of a codex of prohibitions but an intensification of self-reliance, meaning the process of constituting oneself as a subject of one’s own actions and the technique of ‘hermeneutics of the self’.[[47]](#footnote-47) This hermeneutics of the self and the particular choice of sophrosyne, will guide Clement into a *Homilistic* world of truth, God and salvation. The first steps in his quest for answers to these existential questions lead him to visit several philosophical schools. However, Clement quickly realizes that the philosophers offer nothing more than vain rhetoric, syllogisms and the ‘skills’ to be always right (1.3.1-4) in order to raise their reputation among (paying) students.[[48]](#footnote-48) They are not as much interested in the *souci de soi*, as they are in the *souci de sous*. The cacophony of many different philosophical opinions (*dissensus philosophorum*) only consists of ‘hypotheses’ – an important concept in the *Pseudo-Clementines*. Later, when Clement has become a follower of Peter, Peter clarifies that ‘hypotheses’ do not provide any truth:

‘But otherwise it is impossible, as you also know, since you said a little while ago that every doctrine is set up and pulled down (*πᾶσα ὑπόθεσις ἀνασκευάζεται καὶ κατασκευάζεται*), and the same is thought true or false, according to the power of him who advocates it; so that doctrines do not appear as they are, but take the appearance of being or not being truth or falsehood from those who advocate them.’ (1.19.3)

The philosophers are constantly changing their opinions or hypotheses and do not provide any answers to Clement’s questions. These hypotheses are linked to the ‘wordloving’ character of the philosophers as we notice when Clement arrives in Alexandria after he left the philosophical schools. There, he asks some philosophers what they know about the rumours he heard about the events in Judea. Soon he comes into contact with Barnabas, whom he went to listen to and whom he hears speaking the ‘truth’ without any form of dialectics (*οὐ διαλεκτικῇ τέχνῃ*, 1.9) and without any complexity nor preparation (*ἀκάκως καὶ ἀπαρασκευάστως*, 1.9). While the public is listening, the ‘men of Greek paideia’ are laughing at him (*γελᾶν αὐτὸν καὶ χλευάζειν*)[[49]](#footnote-49), calling him ‘barbaric’ as I mentioned and attacking him with their ‘syllogisms’ (*κεχρημένοι τοῖς συλλογισμοῖς*; 1.10.1). Clement, in his defence of Barnabas, points out the inability of his opponents to obtain truth due to their mockery and ‘word-loving’ attitude:

‘[…] you come here, and besides your not understanding what is for your advantage, to your own injury you laugh at the truth, which, to your condemnation, consorts with the barbarians, and which you will not entertain when it visits you, by reason of your wickedness and the plainness of its words, lest you be convicted of being merely lovers of words, and not lovers of truth and lovers of wisdom (*εἰκῆ φιλόλογοί ἐστε καὶ οὐ φιλαλήθεις φιλόσοφοι*).’ (1.11.4-7).

This way, mockery and wordgames characterize ‘paideia’. It becomes clear that in the *Homilistic* version, paideia contains ‘philologic’ and ‘hypothetical’ philosophy as well as dialectics. This classical paideia fails because it provides no answers to Clement’s existential questions; it rather deceives people. As aforementioned, Simon uses this classical paideia and the technique of allegorization in order to deceive people (2.25.3). This allegorization and the accompanying mythology (cf. Ap(p)ion) enlargen the *Homilistic* concept of paideia, which is very important for the rest of the story. Thus, this *Pseudo-Clementine* representation of paideia functions as a caricature in order to attack the opponents in this story. This is key in representing Judeo-Christianity as the ‘true way’, the truth. Moreover, this claim of truth is further developed in *Hom*. 1-3. These first three *Homilies* deal with the false pericopes in Scripture and show how Peter and Clement most emphatically claim the truth in these *Homilies* by repeatedly referring to the doctrine of the ‘True Prophet’ (e.g. 1.15.4; 2.3; 2.7) and terms such as ‘truthloving’ (φιλαληθῶς) and the like (1.10.8; 1.11.7). Especially the doctrine of the syzygia is of great importance when explaining how the world is created and how it undergoes the constant succession of ‘bad – good’, such as the bad Cain followed by the good Abel, or the heretic Simon preceding Peter, who knows the true doctrine (2.16.2; 17.3). This way, the tension between ‘false’ and ‘true’ is linked to ‘bad’ and ‘good’ and has a central role in the beginning of the work, preceding *Hom.* 4-6 where it excluded Appion from Athenodorus and Annubion. It is the model of the ‘bad and false’, characterized by vain talking, dialectics, syllogisms and hypotheses, Simon the Magician and the other opponents are strongly linked with. Later, this also becomes clear in Peter’s representation of Simon as the beginning of all upcoming, post-apostolic false apostles, false prophets, heresies and desires of supremacy (*ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδεῖς προφῆται, αἱρέσεις, φιλαρχίαι*; 16.21.3-4).

So the background of both the philosophers and Simon is embedded in the Greek paideia. This way, Greek paideia is thé background of the *Homilistic* opponents and belongs to the ‘error’-side. This is especially made clear in *Hom*. 4-6, the ‘Greeks’ being the opponents of the ‘Jews’. Appion, an example of the Greek paideia and follower of Simon, who used that paideia to deceive people, belongs to the side of ‘error’ due to the several links and shared motifs with Simon – who clearly functions as a narrative model other opponents share several motifs with – and the world of the ‘Greeks’. By entering Appion’s domain, Clement takes the world of the ‘Greeks’ under attack. He considers the entire Greek culture or paideia as a demonic creation full of unbridled passions (*ἀκρασία*) and repeatedly denounces the sexual indulgence and adultery in the mythological world of his opponents. This mythological world is a danger for people because the gods and thus also their adulterous acts serve as exempla for humans. If the gods are permitted to commit adultery, then so are humans. So, this feature of imitation in the Greek paideia, in its function as education and the result of that education, creates a bad background. Moreover, Clement rejects Greek paideia by explicitly characterizing it as a most dreadful ‘hypothesis’ of an evil demon (*κακοῦ δαίμονος χαλεπωτάτην ὑπόθεσιν εἶναι λέγω*; 4.12.1). In the past, this word caused some difficulties to translate. T. Smith translated it as ‘fabrication’, A. Siouville as ‘suggestion’, and D. Côté as ‘proposition’[[50]](#footnote-50). Anyway, ‘hypothesis’ perfectly fits in the context and characterization of the story, because this term characterizes the Greek paideia as it did in the beginning concerning the Greek philosophical schools. These schools failed, the philosophers were portrayed as ‘vain lovers of the word, not loving the truth’ (1.11.7). They kept changing their ‘hypotheses’, characterizing the distance between their fragmented and constantly changing epistemology and the ‘truth’. In light of this concept of ‘hypothesis’, we can understand the *Homilist’*s choice of this word. It characterizes the Greek paideia which is linked with dialectics, rhetoric and philosophers as ‘vain philologists’ (1.11.7). For example, in *Hom*. 1.9, Barnabas characterized his testimonies as being without any form of dialectics, in opposition to the ‘men of paideia’, who mocked Barnabas for it (1.10.5-6; 11.1-7). This mockery and the link between their classical paideia and the deception of the masses, as indicated in the case of Simon the Magician (e.g. 2.22.3 and 2.25.3), are obviously not the most powerful features to build up credibility. Paideia is just a variable stream of hypothetical opinions which characterize the vain rhetorical and ‘philological’ philosophy.[[51]](#footnote-51) Clement gives an example as proof of this variable and ‘word-loving’ paideia: Appion’s love letter (4.9-19). Appion tried to help the ‘lovesick’ Clement by proposing two solutions. Firstly, he proposed to conquer the woman with magic but Clement did not want to force the woman against her will. Appion’s second ‘cure’ is an ‘ode to adultery’. This ode, or encomium, was meant to convince the matrona, a married woman, of all the benefits of adultery. Clement integrates this letter, all those years later, in his own speech (in Appion’s absence) in Tyre, proving the anti-Judaism of Appion[[52]](#footnote-52) and the wickedness of his paideia. Appion’s two solutions show the vain, rhetorical side of his paideia, but also the link with magic (which I will discuss later on). With his love letter, Appion wants to show the invincible power of Eros with many examples of adulterous adventures of Zeus and other Olympian, male gods (5.11.3-12) and with examples of philosophers defending adultery (5.18). On the third day of the disputes, Appion admits that this letter does not contain the truth, which is hidden behind the myths (6.1.2-4). He will use an allegorical explanation of the myths as a reaction against the accusations of the classical paideia being vain and wicked. But already on the first day, he states that myths are just a concealment of a hidden truth (4.24). This ‘truth’ will be interpreted as an Orphic cosmogony, extracting in an allegorical way the mythological shell from the hidden truth. However, Appion claimed at the end of his letter that he spoke the truth, himself being a hierophant in love mysteries and teaching his students the truth (5.19). Thus, ‘Truth’ is being used in vain. It was meant to serve the rhetorical strategy of Appion in order to help Clement. Instead, it actually serves Clement’s rhetorical stratagem. He insists on a strategy of literal reading by taking the myths literally and demonstrating the wrongful ‘Greek paideia’

‘This, O men, is the instruction of the Greeks(*ἡ τῶν Ἑλλήνῶν παιδεία*), affording a bountiful licence[[53]](#footnote-53) (*γενναίαν ὑπόθεσιν*) to sin without fear(*ἔχουσα πρὸς τὸ ἀδεῶς ἐξαμαρτάνειν*).’ (5.9.5)

The Greek paideia is, remarkably, again a ‘hypothesis’. But, this *Pseudo-Clementine* concept of hypotheses, vain rhetoric and ‘philological’ philosophers is not innocent. According to Clement, the purpose is to sin, and sins are not considered as something pure as we could notice in Peter’s allegory of the house. Sins defile the house with smoke.[[54]](#footnote-54) Thus, the ‘Greek’ world is a sinful and impure world, a place of defilement.

**Paideia: defilement vs. purity**

After he considered the paideia as a ‘hypothesis’ of demons with gods as bad examples[[55]](#footnote-55), Clement describes the effects of the Greek paideia in the same register as ritual purity and defilement are described elsewhere in the *Homilies* (e.g. 7.4.2-5; 8.1-2; 11.28.1-30.3), showing again the link between *Hom.* 4-6 and the rest of the *Homilies*. This defilement is contagious as can be noticed in cities where people commit more sins than people in rural areas, where one is excluded from the paideia in the cities (4.18.1). Greek culture is not a rural phenomenon, but an urban one.[[56]](#footnote-56) Myths, theatres, literature representing this culture should all be avoided (4.19.3). This culture propagates adultery through its myths, theatre etc. which is also described in terms of contagious defilement. Clement compares committing adultery and the accompanying bad consequences to a man being killed by a rabid dog (4.21). Hence, students, still having flexible minds, should avoid this paideia and in particular, the adulterous myths (5.25-26). These stories, when planted as bad seeds in their minds, develop and stay there irresistably because habits are hardly weaker than nature (4.18.4).[[57]](#footnote-57) A particular way of limiting this defilement is marriage that restricts the plague of desire and counteracts wrong habits, as Clement suggests (5.25.3). Peter has already stated that adultery and sins destroy not only the person himself but also the person who is associated with him or her. He compares this with the madness of a dog, infecting others (3.68.3), thus, using the same imagery as does Clement.

The characterization as infectious defilement and the contrast between piety and impiety is important in the rest of the *Homilies*, related to ritual purity and physical defilement as Reed explains.[[58]](#footnote-58) In the following *Homilies* (7-11), Peter adresses the issues of idolatry and polytheism which defile the soul and the body (7.3.1-4; 8.4; 8.15.1-20.4; 9.9.1-4). He explains that the Giants brought sickness in this world by shedding polluted blood into the air. After the purifying Flood, these Giants became the evil demons whom sacrificial meat was offered to and eaten by people whose souls and bodies were polluted by the demons. These demons, as mentioned at the beginning of this segment, were also at the root of the Greek paideia as Clement stated. This way, Greek paideia, impiety and impurity are all again linked to each other and to ‘non-truth’. But it also shows how *Hom.* 4-6 fit in the *Homilies* and the further development of the ‘wrong Greek otherness’ and the pure rightness of Clement’s chosen path. The fear of impurity and defilement in this work is not surprising in its historical context. Practicising philosophy and searching for answers to existential questions and the *cura sui* are increasingly connected with the *technè iatrikè* in the first centuries A.D.[[59]](#footnote-59) The body has become more fragile and vulnerable which influences the stability of the mind. Therefore, the defilement has to be avoided as much as possible, like ‘Greekness’ and Greek paideia, the sources of defilement in the *Homilies* in order to maintain physical health and mental stability which is very important in Clement’s quest for answers.

**Useless magic vs. philanthropic miracles**

The other suggested remedy for the cause of Clement’s lovesickness (*αἰτίαν τῆς* *νόσου*; 5.3.1) – not by accident another medical reference – as suggested by Appion was magic, an important topic right from the very beginning of the *Homilies*. After the failure of the philosophical schools, Clement wanted to go to Egypt to get in touch with a magician who could raise spirits in order to learn more about the souls in the afterlife and, thus, about (im)mortality. But a befriended philosopher, whose name is not mentioned in the text, discouraged him to go because this practice of magic and necromancy is ‘impious’ (1.5). Here, we notice an important and frequently mentioned cluster in the *Pseudo-Clementines* of magic, Egypt and impiety.[[60]](#footnote-60) In the *Pseudo-Clementines*, it is Simon the Magician who has come into contact with the Greek paideia in Alexandria and who has become a powerful magician (2.22.3). This goes back to the *Acts of the Apostles* (8:9-25) where Simon, who is a Samaritan, saw the apostles perform several miracles in Samaria and considered them as fellow wizards. Since his appearance in the *Acts*, Simon rapidly became the major opponent of the true faith in Christian texts and has always been linked to magic.[[61]](#footnote-61) This theme of magic knows a varied vocabulary in the *Homilies*.Terms such as *δύναμις* (3x), *γόης* (6x), *γοητεύω* (2x), *μάγος* (34x), *μαγεία* (19x), *μαγικός* (4x), *σημεῖα* (9x) and *τέρας* (9x) are used multiple times in the whole *Homilies* in reference to magical ability and miracles. In the *Homilies*, *δύναμις* is mostly used in the sense of ‘power’ (39x) of which three times it specifically indicates the manifestation of magical power.[[62]](#footnote-62) *Γόης* and *γοητεύω*[[63]](#footnote-63) have a bad connotation meaning something like ‘juggler’, ‘jugglery’ and ‘cheat’[[64]](#footnote-64) and are connected to (the ban of) the opponents. *Μάγος*, *μαγεία* and *μαγικός* are the most common words referring to magic. Since the fifth century, the Greeks used the terms *μαγεία* and *μάγοι* – referring to the priestly class in the society of the Medes – to designate the religious practices and their performers, just as the magi who visited Jesus in Betlehem.[[65]](#footnote-65) This tradition of mageia would go back to Zarathustra (or Ζωροάστρης in Greek) according to (pseudo-)Plato (*Alcibiades* 122a)[[66]](#footnote-66) and to Pliny (*NH* 30.2.3). In the *Homilies*, the tradition goes back to the son of Noah, Ham (ancestor of the Hamites to which, not coincidentally, the Egyptians, Babylonians and Persians belong), who taught the art to his son Mestraim[[67]](#footnote-67). Apart from the *Homilistic* reference to Egyptian magicians or magicians who are considered as gods after their deaths in the euhemeristic view of Clement[[68]](#footnote-68), these terms mostly refer to the magical abilities of Simon[[69]](#footnote-69) and also of Appion when he wants to use magic as a medicine.[[70]](#footnote-70) The same terminology is also used when Simon accuses Peter of being a magician[[71]](#footnote-71). Hence, these terms too, besides *γόης* and *γοητεύω*, are linked with the opposition[[72]](#footnote-72) or the action of rejecting someone in the *Homilies*.[[73]](#footnote-73) The following word *τέρας* means ‘sign, wonder, marvel, portent’, just as *σημεῖα* can take on the same meaning.[[74]](#footnote-74) In the *Gospel of Marc* (13.22) and *Matthew* (24.24)it is specifically linked to false prophets. In the *Gospel of John* (4.48), the *Acts* (2.22, 2.43, 4.30, 5.12, 6.8, 7.36, 14.3, 15.12), *Hebrews* (2.4), *2 Thessalonians* (2.9), *2 Corinthians* (12.12) and *Romans* (15.19), *τέρατα*, in combination with *σημεῖα*,indicates in a more neutral way the signs and wonders (*σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα*) of a prophet, just as in the *Homilies*.[[75]](#footnote-75) In short, magic is very important in the *Pseudo-Clementines* and this topic with its specific vocabulary indicates once more the unity of this work. Noteworthy, the more negative terms, *γόης*, *γοητεύω*, *μάγος*, *μαγεία* and *μαγικός* are thus being used for rejecting the opponent’s magical ability and eventually these terms also fit in the larger distinction between ‘Greeks’ and ‘Jews’ because these negative terms are especially related to Appion and Simon.

In the first *Homilies*, it was mentioned how Simon had learned paideia and magic in Egypt. Appion, being an Alexandrean grammarian, and also having learned magic, is once again the appropriate follower of Simon. This way, in the *Homilies*,magic is an important feature linked to the concept of ‘paideia’. Historically, magic and Greek paideia were not two inseparable concepts[[76]](#footnote-76) but as mentioned before, the *Pseudo-Clementines* construct a rhetorical and caricatural concept in order to attack the opponents.[[77]](#footnote-77) Moreover, Clement, disappointed by the philosophical schools, wanted to search for a magician who would be able to perform necromancy in order to learn more about the afterlife (1.5). There is, however, an important nuance: according to Peter, there is a difference between philanthropic and useless magic as practiced by Simon the Magician (2.34). So, the fact that Simon performs magic is not denied and magic is not totally rejected by Peter. For example, Simon is able to transform Faustus, Clement’s father, into himself. Moreover, Peter himself testifies how Simon is able to make statues walk around and how he flies in the air. But this magic and these miracles are in vain, useless, they are meant to deceive people (2.34.2), as vain rhetoric does (both representing Greek paideia). It is in the line of this characterization that Appion’s use of magic is presented. He wanted to ‘conquer’ a woman with magic in order to heal the young Clement. This seems to us, readers, to be philanthropic but it is not. In *Hom.* 5.3, it becomes clear that Appion, when he fell in love, used magic in order to ‘conquer’ the woman and force her to love him. When he managed to do this, he dumped her to conquer a new love. This concept of ‘non-philantropic’ magic is rejected in the *Homilistic* work. For example, magic and magicians are clearly driven away in 7.10.2-3 (see also 20.13) when we are dealing with the more negative terms for magic as *γόης* (*γόησιν* 7.10.2). It is indeed interesting that magic and miracles are not denied, nor the magical capacity of Peter. But, the *Homilist* made a distinction between philanthropic and useless magic. This relates, according to Bremmer, to the contemporaneous problem of Christians who wanted to differentiate themselves from their pagan competitors.[[78]](#footnote-78) Historically, magic, astrology, etc. were indeed important topics in late antiquity. For example, philosophers were regarded more and more as magicians and astrologers and in a battle for offering the fourth-century people salvation, the *Homilies* had to react to this.[[79]](#footnote-79) But it is especially also a clarification of the *Homilistic* distinction between ‘Greeks’ and ‘Jews’. The world of the ‘Greeks’ is characterized by the more negative terms and by useless magical deeds, the world of the ‘Jews’ only has philanthropic miracles. Simon and Appion are the perfect *Homilistic* opponents concerning this theme of magic. The former because he is known as a magician, the latter because both the historical Apion and the *Homilistic* Appion are described as having magical abilities. This way, ‘magic’, belonging to the motif of paideia, is important all over the *Homilistic* body and connects *Hom.* 4-6 with the rest of the story of which the last chapter reports how the emperor pursues the magicians (20.13).

**Allegories as wicked defence mechanisms**

Appion wants to save the paideia with an allogerical interpretation of the myths, which Clement rejects by pointing out the dangers of these myths. People imitate these myths too easily. Clement’s criticism is only possible with a literal hermeneutics of myths by setting a direct relationship between myths and daily life in the form of imitation. In the first three *Homilies*, Peter also uses a literal reading method when approaching the so-called pericopes in the Scripture in his disputes with Simon the Magician. There is no room for allegorical interpretations or ‘rationalizations’ in the approach to the Scripture. We have seen this latter form of interpretation in the negative description of Simon as mass deception (2.25.3). So, when Appion clarifies that he will use allegorical hermeneutics (‘ἀλληγορήσας’, 4.24.5) to reveal the truth behind the myths, he is taking a false start. He wants to get the truth back on his side by considering his ode to adultery as just an invention (6.1.4). However, he claimed to speak the truth in his ode as a hierophant in love mysteries (5.19). Thus, Appion’s truth is elusive. Appion, in turn, thinks of the literal hermeneutics as making ‘no sense’ and tries to make this clear in his denial of the literal reading method of the Greek myths: it is absurd to think that, for example, Cronus devoured his children. Clement, in his turn, points out, besides the danger of people imitating the myths, the human evil behind it (6.17; 4.12; 4.25), namely philosophers rationalizing wicked deeds and myths in order to sin freely. Therefore, he emphatically turns to euhemerism. Clement enriches this vision with several catalogues enlisting tombs of kings who are seen as gods (5.23.1; 6.20). This euhemerism strengthens his literal reading method by enlarging the absurdities and impiety of the myths.[[80]](#footnote-80) Moreover, later in the *Homilistic* corpus, allegories are refuted as being wicked features of the opponents, e.g. in the Egyptian polytheism, where Egyptians are described as honouring all sorts of beings, going from onions to farts. Ashamed by this, people wanted to defend these cults and accompanying myths by using allegories (10.18.4-5). So, allegories, as part of the paideia, belong strongly to polytheism and, thus, to the world of the ‘Greeks’. This representation of allegories as some sort of pagan defence mechanisms and rationalization techniques as is the case with Simon, Appion and the Egyptian polytheism is also described in other, extra-homilistic testimonies, such as *De errore profanarum religionum* (2.6) of Julius Firmicus Maternus (early 4th century).[[81]](#footnote-81) It was also an important topic particularly in the Stoic movement[[82]](#footnote-82) as well as in the Neoplatonism such as *the cave of the nymphs* of Porphyry.[[83]](#footnote-83) So allegories, besides magic, pollution and the *technè iatrikè*, paideia and truth, show how this work does not consist of 20 *Homilies* of which 3 are intrusive. On the contrary, *Hom.* 4-6 play a particular role in the development of these *Homilistic* dynamics and of the accompanying life path of Clement who is on his quest for answers. Until now, I have pointed out how the whole *Homilistic Pseudo-Clementines* deal with truth and the Greek paideia, two major motifs, and how *Hom.* 4-6 play an important role in the rest of these *Homilies* concerning these themes, but also in setting out a clash between ‘Greeks’ and ‘Jews’. In short, the ‘Greek’ background has to be rejected in order to find answers to existential questions. As mentioned earlier, the choice for a particular background also implies a particular attitude. Here we reach the third and last important motif I deal with, sophrosyne. This life choice of chastity is above all an attitude of Clement to his unanswered existential questions, but it quickly becomes a reaction against the impious, impure and inimical ‘Greekness’. In this attitude of being sophron, all these discussed elements will come together.

**‘Sophrosyne’: women as signs of error and truth**

From the beginning we get the information that the pagan Clement, a Roman citizen, wants to live chastily from a very young age (*τἠν πρώτην ἡλικίαν...σώφρωνος*; 1.1). Opening a story with a description of the main virtues is typical of many ancient tales, such as the *Romance of Alexander* or books of the Old Testament such as *Tobit*.[[84]](#footnote-84) Sophrosyne has a strong philosophical connotation as ‘temperance’ among the four cardinal virtues: phronèsis, andreia, dikaiosune and sophrosyne.[[85]](#footnote-85) It originally meant ‘being moderate, between extremes’, or ‘doing what is appropriate to gods and men’ (e.g. being pious, cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, 3.9-10)[[86]](#footnote-86). In light of this, this virtue could also mean ‘of sound mind, prudent, reasonable’[[87]](#footnote-87), but in the *Pseudo-Clementines* and, in general, in Christian ethics[[88]](#footnote-88), it has the more narrow connotation of sexual moderation. Nevertheless, this concept is still a philosophical one which is linked to a particular choice of life, knowledge and the several existential questions which are taunting the young Clement, so, it still has a link with epistemology. Judeo-Christianity provides in the course of the story the true answers to these questions, but, as explained, there are several threats, which are situated on the level of philosophical and religious doctrines, but also on the level of sexuality. The first to form a threat is Simon the Magician both on a dogmatic level and on a sexual level. He is a representative of the *Homilistic* concept of classical paideia. He knows the classical paideia, has learned magic in Egypt and deceives people with allegories of Greek myths, even though he is claiming the truth based on a combination of all these elements. For a long time, he was a follower of John the Baptist (2.23) who was killed while Simon was in Egypt learning magic (2.24). After a power struggle with Dositheus, the successor of John the Baptist, Simon became the leader of John’s followers. He suggested that the famous Helen of Troy descended from heaven as an emanation of truth to walk beside him.

‘[…],being queen, as the all-bearing being, and wisdom, for whose sake, says he, the Greeks and barbarians fought, having before their eyes but an image of truth (*εἰκόνα φαντασθέντες ἀληθείας*); for she, who really is the truth, was then with the chiefest god.’ (2.25.2)

However, this truth is being undermined. Helen as a symbol of ‘truth’ is just a mythological symbol of deceptive, false gnosis (knowledge), as a result of the indication that Simon deceives people with his allegories of Greek myths among which the myth about Helen (2.25.3). The tradition surrounding Helen as being ‘an image’ in Troy and the link with a vain truth can already be found in the work of Stesichorus (c. 630-555 B.C.) and in the tragedy *Helen* written by Euripides (c. 480-406 B.C.). In both works, the real Helen was living in Egypt during the Trojan War while this war was being fought for just an ‘idol’ of Helen. Furthermore, the link between Helen, magic and convincing someone can be explicitly found in Gorgias’ *Helen* (5th century B.C.). And above all, Helen as part of Simon’s doctrinal system, and the rejection of it, can already be found in the work of Irenaeus of Lyon (*Adv. Haer*. 1.23.2).[[89]](#footnote-89) So, we have to deal with a hybrid characterization of Helen with features developed in several works and traditions. Not only is this Simonian system rejected in the beginning of the *Homilies* by these links with deception and error, it is also attacked by Clement in his upcoming confrontation with Appion, when he connects Helen to adultery and the mischievous mythology. The link between Helen and adultery especially is of great importance here. Many men fought long wars of which she was the cause.[[90]](#footnote-90) These wars, the destruction of families, the annihilation of cities and many other crimes are the consequences of adultery according to Clement (4.22). So, Simon and Helen within his representation of truth, are not a paragon of truth nor of sophrosyne.

For the most important link with adultery and unbridled passions (*ἀκρασία*), we have to take Appion into account. He promotes adultery as a ‘pseudo-Clement’, writing an ode to adultery based on the classical paideia. He could in fact hide behind this, saying these words were not his own, which he actually does on the third day of the discussions (6.1.4). Yet he betrayed himself earlier by stating that he used magic to conquer women. When his beloved one also fell in love, he dumped her immediately for another victim. Therefore, Clement accuses him, and generally all the grammarians and sophists, of sexual ‘akrasia’ (4.16.4). This is remarkably the same pattern of those same men who exchange one hypothesis for another (1.3.1-2; 1.19.3). Thus, once again epistemology and sexuality show the same dynamics and some models come to the surface: on the one hand, Clement and the Judeo-Christian legitimate marriage, on the other hand, Simon the Magician, his ‘Helen-model’ and the ‘akrasia’-model of the ‘men of paideia’, representing the ‘Greeks’ due to their connecting motifs.

The distinction between the various models can especially be noticed in the setting of Tyre. This is not only the place of the discussions between Appion and Clement, but also the perfect place for this distinction due to the different links with the Greek novels.[[91]](#footnote-91) Achilles Tatius (2nd century) tells how Clitophon, in Tyre, fell in love with Leucippe and how he heard someone playing a song on his zither about Apollo and Daphne (*Leucippe and Clitophon*, 1.5). It also serves as a *Homilistic* place of conversion. It is here that Appion questions Clement’s conversion, away from the Greek world.[[92]](#footnote-92) The importance of the conversion (at the expense of the classical background) explains, besides the choice of the pagan Clement, the introduction of Berenice, and her mother Justa, due to their link with the *Gospel of Mark* (Mk. 7:26; cf. *Hom*. 2.19; 4.1.1) which describes how a Syro-Phoenician, pagan woman asks Jesus to heal her daughter from an evil spirit. He answers that children (= Jews) should eat first and that it is not good to feed the dogs[[93]](#footnote-93) (= pagans). So, these figures do not play a role here by accident. From the position of the pagan ‘dogs’, they became ‘children’ of the faith, just as Clement is finishing his conversion to this same faith. In this *Homilistic* context of Tyre, the role of Berenice and her mother, as well as Clement’s view on the role of marriage as a solution to restrict defilement, clearly show that the Judeo-Christian ideal of ‘sophrosyne’ leaves room for marriage and progeny, but not for adultery and its many bad consequences. Thus, the ‘Helen’-model, and its surrounding resonances of the Trojan War and adultery, does not fit in Clement’s discourse, and neither does Appion’s ‘akrasia’-model.

This ‘Helen’-model functions as a different gnostic, or at least, a heretical model and was already mainly rejected by Peter in the discussions with Simon in the whole *Homilistic* work, but also by Clement, referring to the devastating wars caused by adultery. Clement, however, has to deal more with Appion and other men ‘of Greek paideia’ such as the Epicurean philosopher Athenodorus and the astrologer Annubion, but even before that, (i.e.) in Alexandria where ‘men of Greek paideia’ were mocking Barnabas (1.9). What keeps coming back is their moral relativism. It took no effort for Appion to write an ode to adultery and dumping one woman after another, using the paideia he knew. The moral relativism of Athenodorus and Annubion lies in their Epicurean and astrological system. According to the former, there is no Intelligent Design (nature is ruled by chance), according to the latter, Fate (and the position of the stars) regulates everything. This ensures people they are not accountable for their sins, which is in line with Clement’s remark (5.9.5; people use the paideia in order to sin freely). It is in the discussion with these men that ‘sophrosyne’ is redefined in the context of the ‘truth’ and rejecting the Greek paideia. Their background is demonic, perverse through the many despicable myths about adultery and by their impure, moral relativism represented by their changing hypotheses or, in other words, epistemological relativism.

In contrast, according to Clement who supports the institution of marriage, education should be used to create a second, pious nature without the sinful, adulterous myths and moral/epistemological relativism. The epistemological side clearly comes to the surface once again. Clement’s model, representing a morality of the legitimate marriage and of legitimate children who take care of their parents, will be an important building block for attaining the love of God (11.21.2). It will also be important for Clement in order to recognize his parents in a new world. The old world was broken and fragmented by the adulterous intentions of Clement’s uncle who wanted to rape Mattidia, Clement’s mother who fled because of this. Clement’s father and brothers began to look for her, causing the loss of his family. Clement was left behind in a world with a broken family, represented by fragmented knowledge, variable opinions or ‘hypotheses’. Just as the truth cannot be reached without the help of the True Prophet and his servants, Clement cannot recognize his parents without Peter’s help, servant of the True Prophet, in a world of legitimate marriage, away from unchaste adultery, and in a unifying world under God’s surveillance. Only in this unifying and chaste world, may truth be reached. This is clear when Peter looks back on the recognition of Mattidia on which occasion Clement’s opinion about adultery as a source of all the evil is taken up again (cf. 4.21):

‘Taking occasion by what had happened to our mother, he [Peter, BDV] showed us how the results of chastity are good, while those of adultery are disastrous, and naturally bring destruction on the whole race, if not speedily, at all events slowly. “And to such an extent,” he says, “do deeds of chastity please God, that in this life He bestows some small favour on account of it, even on those who are in error; for salvation in the other world is granted only to those who have been baptized on account of their trust in Him, and who act chastely and righteously.” For perhaps she would have been cut off if she had committed adultery; but God took pity on her for having behaved chastely, rescued her from the death that threatened her, and restored to her her lost children.’ (13.13)

Mattidia did not remarry in the meantime. At first sight, the *Homilies* do not seem to defend ‘remarriage’ at all. A lady who took care of Mattidia said many asked her to marry them, but this lady preferred to live as a widow, as also Mattidia did (12.7.3-4). This chaste attitude was, according to Peter, the premise of Mattidia’s full knowledge of the everlasting kingdom (13.14). Chastity and *true* epistemology thus belong together. Moreover, this knowledge, together with the chaste lifestyle, is unpolluted (cf. pollution). Rejecting anything that has to do with adultery is the basis of sophrosyne and full knowledge (13.19.3).

‘By adultery alone is the breath of God polluted. And therefore it drags him who has polluted it into the fire.’ (13.19.3)

But this does not mean that ‘desire’ within a marriage has to be suppressed (13.16). Marriage serves as a kind of ‘limitation’ of exuberant desires (especially exterior to the marriage) and the plague of lust as Clement already stated in 5.25.3. This brings us to the letters preceding the *Homilistic* narrative and helps us to understand why Clement is important for this motif of sophrosyne. Not only did he lose his mother by an adulterous attempt of his uncle, but he also wrote the following in a letter to James:

‘Above all things, let them [presbyters, BDV] join the young betimes in marriage, anticipating the entanglements of youthful lusts. But neither let them neglect the marriage of those who are already old; for lust is vigorous even in some old men. Lest, therefore, fornication find a place among you, and bring upon you a very pestilence, take precaution, and search, lest at any time the fire of adultery be secretly kindled among you. For adultery is a very terrible thing, even such that it holds the second place in respect of punishment, the first being assigned to those who are in error, even although they be chaste.’ (7)

This way, a particular and necessary life choice was already set in order to achieve answers to existential questions. So, again, *Hom*. 4-6 fit in the whole *Homilies* (including the preceding letters), especially concerning the construction of Clement’s search for the right choice of a ‘sophron’ life. This sophron attitude helps Clement to find truth and salvation, a typical historical aim of the late ancient citizen, or at least as presented in the late ancient literature, resulting in his baptism. It is no coincidence that Clement is baptized at the end of *Hom.* 11, just before the recognition of his parents. Only now that he is baptized, inducted into the pure, pious and chaste life choice and into the true and truthful, ‘Jewish’ background, was he ready to find his family with the help of Peter, apostle of the True Prophet.

**Conclusion**

This article chose an approach different from the *Quellenanalyse*. I have tried to reveal some rhetorical and narrative structures and certain dynamics concerning paideia, truth and sophrosyne in the debates between Clement and Appion, which as a whole is a far too underexposed territory in the *Pseudo-Clementine* research context. I did so in order to better understand and nuance the criticisms of Heintze, Waitz and Schmidt and the role of *Hom.* 4-6 in the whole work. We do not need the hypothesis of a ‘Disputationsbuch’ to understand the unique features of *Hom.* 4-6. Moreover, these unique features do not stand in contrast to the rest of the *Homilies*. In general, the disputes between Appion and Clement discuss the Greek culture (paideia) and education, settled in a larger *Homilistic* distinction between ‘Greeks’ and ‘Jews’, impiety and piety, impurity and purity, error and truth. This ‘Greek’ background or paideia stood face to face with Clement’s ‘Jewish’ point of view. It is striking how strongly the subjects and Clement’s argumentation are intertwined with the cultural, educational background he rejects, which he is able to do using the Greek culture he has been raised in. This explains the choice of the protagonists, the content of these disputes and their style, which Waitz and Heintze put forward as arguments for the intrusive character of *Hom.* 4-6 in the *Homilistic* work, but are in fact to be understood in the *Homilies* themselves. Especially truth and polluting paideia containing ‘world-loving’ philosophy, vain rhetoric, vain magic, Egypt and allegories link these discussions with the rest of the story and are dragged into or rejected by the Judeo-Christian claim of truth in opposition of the ‘world of the Greeks’. Opponents are defined as non-truthful, ‘word-loving’, impure and impious. Useless magic and Egypt are linked with this opposition, the Greek paideia is rejected, classical philosophy is surpassed by Judeo-Christianity as the ‘true way’. The third major motif I discussed is ‘sophrosyne’. Women represented the world of the ‘Greeks’ and ‘Jews’ and the accompanying debates about truth and paideia. In the *Homilies*, only one woman, Clement’s mother, is still standing, representing the legitimate, pure and chaste marriage with legitimate children. Helen, as the personification of Simon’s truth, has not descended from heaven but has rather fallen from her pedestal, and Appion’s ‘akrasia’-model has not remained intact either. The disputes between Appion and Clement are important for the further development of Clement’s journey and his conversion in the footsteps of Peter into a ‘new world’ in which he will recognize his family. That world has to fit into the Judeo-Christian framework with the specific sophrosyne linked to a specific epistemological form, pure and pious ‘paideia’ and the truth which are woven in the whole *Homilistic* body. Clement’s journey is an answer to his alienation in a fragmented, pagan world and *Hom.* 4-6, in the larger, fascinating but rather complex *Homilist* construction, play an important and constructive role in this answer.
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