Achilles as an Allegorical Anti-Adam in the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*

Benjamin De Vos

I n the Garden of Eden, the first couple Adam and Eve were troubled by the question whom they should believe, God or the serpent. This Genesis story (Gen 2:4–3:24) has been often adapted from ancient times to the present day.[1] Particularly in the early centuries of our era, the Genesis story was the subject of disputes concerning free will and sin, sex and abstinence, death and life. Early Christian authors like Irenaeus of Lyon and Methodius of Olympus approached the story as a confirmation of human free will. Others like Augustine interpreted it as the 'fall' of the first humans, from an act of their free will, into a state of inherent sinfulness. In early Christianity, it was also the subject of various apocryphal texts like the *Life of Adam and Eve* or the Gnostic *Apocalypse of Adam*.[2]

---

[1] On the reception of the story in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic traditions see H. N. Wallace et al., "Adam and Eve, Story of," in C. Furey et al. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception* (Berlin 2009) 341–364; J. D. G. Dunn, "Adam," and M. Meiser, "Adam and Eve," in D. G. Hunter et al. (eds.), *Brill Encyclopedia of Early Christianity Online* (2018), consulted 13 March 2020. For later traditions see for example P .C. Almond, *Adam and Eve in Seventeenth-Century Thought* (Cambridge 1999), and S. Greenblatt, *The Rise and Fall of Adam and Eve* (New York 2017).

[2] For discussion of these and other early Christian authors and their views on the Genesis story see E. Pagels, *Adam, Eve, and the Serpent* (New York 1988), and P. C. Bouteneff, "Adam and Eve," in P. M. Blowers et al. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Biblical Interpretation* (Oxford 2019) 525–534. For various Jewish/Christian apocryphal texts: A. Dupont-Sommer et al. (eds.), *Anonyme. La Bible. Écrits Intertestamentaires* (Paris 1987) 1767–1796; M. de Jonge and J. Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*

This article addresses a late-ancient, highly distinctive take on the Genesis story found in the so-called *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* or *Klementia*. This is the extant Greek version of the *Pseudo-Clementine* narrative, regarded by many scholars as the only surviving Christian novel[3] from fourth-century Syria.[4] In one of the many disputes in this rhetorical and philosophical-religious novel, the protagonists Clement and Appion discuss allegorical interpretations of Greek myths. Among them is the story of the Greek hero Achilles and the Trojan princess Polyxena, which, I will argue, is told in a way that evokes the Genesis story of Adam and Eve.[5] This evocation is deeply

_____

(Sheffield 1997), with bibliography at 95–98; J.-P. Mahé and P. H. Poirier, *Écrits Gnostiques. La Bibliothèque de Nag Hammadi* (Paris 2007) 777–805.

[3] E.g. M. Edwards, "The *Clementina*: A Christian Response to the Pagan Novel," *CQ* 42 (1992) 459–474.

[4] There are two main *Pseudo-Clementine* traditions: the *Homiliae* or *Klementia* in Greek, and the *Recognitions* of which we have an adapted Latin translation (of the Greek original) by Rufinus of Aquileia: B. Rehm and G. Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen* I³ *Homilien* and II² *Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung* (Berlin 1992, 1994). There is also a Syriac manuscript from 411 that consists of (again, altered) parts of both those traditions: transl. F. S. Jones, *The Syriac Pseudo-Clementines. An Early Version of the First Christian Novel* (Turnhout 2014). The relationship between the several *Clementine* versions according to earlier scholarship is reviewed by F. S. Jones, "The Pseudo-Clementines: A History of Research," in *Pseudoclementina Elchasaiticaque inter Judaeochristiana* (Leuven 2012) 50–113. Translations in this paper are from M. B. Riddle et al., "Pseudo-Clementine Literature," in A. Roberts et al. (eds.), *The Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*⁴ VIII (Peabody 2004) 364–620.

[5] As discussed below, Achilles' heel is pierced by an arrow rubbed with serpent poison. Olga Nesterova already linked the serpent with the Genesis story and ascribed it to Christian influence on pagan allegorical her-meneutics: "L'Attitude à l'égard de l'allégorie païenne chez les auteurs du corpus Pseudo-Clémentin," in F. Amsler et al. (eds.), *Nouvelles intrigues pseudo-clémentines/Plots in the Pseudo-Clementine Romance* (Prahins 2008) 397–408, at 405. The relationship, however, is deeper than just Christian influence. It is the result of a sophisticated allegorical game, which I uncover by examining the pairs Adam-Achilles and Polyxena-Eve in §1, and their role in the rhetorical-literary context of the *Homilistic* narrative in §3 (in that section I

sophisticated and playful. The mythological framework of the birth and death of Achilles and his love for Polyxena is allegorically associated with the story of Adam and Eve. Moreover, it interacts with the peculiar interpretation of the Genesis story by the apostle Peter in the rest of the *Homilies*. In contrast to many Jewish and Christian views, he acquits Adam of original sin in human history. Here I analyze this double approach to the Genesis story (Achilles and Adam) and its role in the narrative framework.

First, I offer a short introduction to the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*, which discuss and strongly reject allegorical hermeneutics. In this context I examine an allegorical identification of the myth of Achilles and Polyxena with the Genesis story of Adam and Eve that has received very little attention. This allegory is different from other known (allegorical and non-allegorical) traditions about Achilles and Polyxena. In order to understand better this identification within the *Homilistic* framework, I will analyze in the second section its novel characterization of Adam as the sinless True Prophet, the source of a male line that proclaims the truth, in contrast to the deceptive female line of Eve—a contrast worked out in the theory of the so-called *syzygiae*: briefly, human history is a sequence of pairs of opposites, of which the inferior one stands in the line of Eve, the superior in that of Adam. That this analysis illuminates the identification between Adam and Achilles and its larger meaning within the *Homilies* will become clear in section 3. What similarities and differences does the identification draw, and what is its purpose in the *Homilistic* narrative? I will show that it is not 'innocent', but part of

Clement's rhetorical strategy against his opponents, who are defenders of Greek *paideia*. What appears to be trivial play turns out to be strongly connected with the rest of the *Homilistic* narrative. Achilles emerges as a failed 'first man' who has sinned, who has fallen victim to his lust for a woman, and who is a symbol of the opponents in the *Homilies*. This allegorical interpretation is related in the *Homilies* to subjects such as truth, morality, freedom, and death. As a reader, one must be aware of this in order to learn what one should believe according to the *Homilies*.

1. *The curious case of Achilles and Polyxena*
The role of allegorical hermeneutics in the Homilies

The *Pseudo-Clementine* narrative presents the autobiography of Clement of Rome during his time as Peter's student. Having lost his parents and brothers as a young boy, Clement struggles with existential questions like 'Does life after death exist?' or 'Is the world finite?' (*Hom*. 1.1). During his search, he meets not only supportive characters like Barnabas and Peter, but also several intellectual opponents like Simon Magus, the grammarian Appion, the Epicurean Athenodorus, the astrologer Annubion, and anonymous 'philosophers'. He converts to Christianity, which is strongly linked to Judaism in the *Homilies*,[6] and eventually recovers his family in the second half of the narrative. This story is a remarkable blend of philosophy, theology, and rhetoric due to the many teachings of Peter it relates, and the numerous disputes between Clement and his arch-opponent Simon Magus (3.30–57, 16.1–19.23), between Clement and Appion (4.7–6.25), or between Clement and other philosophers (1.7–1.14). These disputes and teachings strongly question the value of Greek culture and education (*paideia*) and deal, among other themes, with astrological determinism (14.3–8), the creation of evil from the four elements

---

[6] The contested notion of 'Jewish-Christianity' in *Clementine* research is discussed by Jones, *Pseudoclementina* 50–113, and by A. Y. Reed, *Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism* (Tübingen 2018).

(19.1–25), and the value of the Old Testament (e.g. 3.30–57).

In particular, the opponents are criticized for applying allegorical hermeneutics to Greek myths and the Jewish Law. The characterization of Simon Magus (an arch-heretical figure in the *Homilies*[7] and elsewhere who makes his first appearance in Acts 8:9–25) offers a good example of this. Aquila, formerly a friend and follower of his, but now of Peter's, criticizes him for explaining the Law allegorically by his own presumption (ἰδίᾳ προλήψει ἀλληγορεῖ, 2.22.6). Simon forces upon the text his own opinion.[8] However, in the rest of the *Homilies* Simon does not resort to allegorical interpretations of the Scripture. This criticism serves rhetorically[9] to reject him for his ignorance of the right interpretation of the Old Testament. It also sharpens the contrast with Peter, who sets forth a literal theory that identifies as "false" problematic pericopes in Scripture (where God seems, e.g., ignorant or weak) without the need for allegorical readings (e.g. 3.5–10).[10] Simon is also said

---

[7] *Hom.* 16.21.3–4; cf. Irenaeus *Adv.Haereses* 1.23.2 (*PG* VII 671–672).

[8] Cf. *Recogn.* 10.42.1–4.

[9] Cf. B. M. J. De Vos, "The Role of the *Homilistic* Disputes with Appion (*Hom.* 4–6)," *VigChr* 73 (2019) 54–88, at 80–81. In *Clementine* research, Simon has been seen mainly as a fictional disguise for Paul and/or later traditions that strongly refer to Paul (e.g. Marcionism). See H. R. Offerhaus, *Paulus in de Clementinen* (Groningen 1894); S. Salles, "La diatribe anti-paulinienne dans 'le Roman pseudo-clémentin' et l'origine des 'Kérygmes de Pierre'," *RBibl* 64 (1957) 516–555; J. Verheyden, "The Demonization of the Opponent in Early Christian Literature. The Case of the *Pseudo-Clementines*," in T. L. Hettema et al., *Religious Polemics in Context* (Assen 2004) 330–359. However, the *Homilistic* Simon is more than that; D. Côté, e.g., sees him as a symbolic enemy in the *Homilies*: "La fonction littéraire de Simon le magicien dans les *Pseudo-Clémentines*," *LThPh* 57 (2001) 513–523.

[10] For this theory (which is not found in the *Recognitions*) in relation to other (Jewish-)Christian discourses see K. Vaccarella, *Shaping Christian Identity: The False Scripture Argument in Early Christian Literature* (diss. Florida State Univ. 2007); D. H. Carlson, *Jewish-Christian Interpretation of the Pentateuch in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* (Minneapolis 2013); K. Shuve, "Unreliable Books: Debates over Falsified Scriptures at the Frontier between Judaism and

to allegorize Greek myths, including the myth of Helen. Aquila tells Peter that Simon's goal is to mislead people (2.25.3):

> But Simon is going about in company with Helena, and even till now, as you see, is stirring up the people. And he says that he has brought down this Helena from the highest heavens to the world; 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;[11] for she, who really is the truth, was then with the chiefest god. Moreover, by explaining certain things of this sort in a convincing and allegorical way, made up from Greek myths (Ἑλληνικοῖς μύθοις συνπεπλασμένα πιθανῶς ἀλληγορῶν), he deceives many (ἀπατᾷ πολλούς).

Thus, the rhetoric of the *Homilies* targets allegoresis for rejection because it deceives people.[12] One other passage is worth noting in this connection, the dispute between Appion and Clement about Greek *paideia* (*Hom.* 4–6). Appion,[13] a grammarian who knows a lot about Greek culture, is said to be a

___

Christianity," in *Books and Readers in the Premodern World. Essays in Honor of Harry Gamble* (Atlanta 2018) 171–206. Carlson and Shuve link the literal method of false pericopes to fourth-century disputes between the so-called 'Antiochene' authors like Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodorus of Tarsus (and thus the *Homilies*) and 'Alexandrian' allegorical interpreters like Didymus the Blind (and thus the *Homilistic* Simon Magus).

[11] This refers to the classical tradition that during the Trojan War Helen was actually in Egypt, and only an 'image' of her at Troy: so Stesichorus' *Palinode*, Euripides' *Helen* (e.g. 35–40), or Philostratus' *V.Apol.* (4.16.5).

[12] For the link between Helen and Simon see also Irenaeus *Adv.Haereses* 1.23.2 (*PG* VII 671–672). The rejection of allegories belongs to a broader intellectual discussion in Christian and pagan circles about which texts, biblical and mythical, allegorical hermeneutics should be applied to: see e.g. P. Sellew, "Achilles or Christ? Porphyry and Didymus in Debate over Allegorical Interpretation," *HThR* 82 (1989) 79–100. The *Homilies* radically reject allegorical readings in both cases.

[13] In the *Recognitions*, Nicetas, brother of Aquila and Clement, discusses similar allegories to inform Peter (10.30–34). In the Syriac version of the *Pseudo-Clementines* there is no similar passage.

friend of Simon (4.6).[14] In his discussion with Clement about the value of Greek *paideia*, Appion wants to defend the "immoral" Greek myths by using an allegorical reading.[15] Appion calls this kind of reading the right philosophical doctrine (ἔχει τινὰ λόγον τὰ τοιαῦτα οἰκεῖον καὶ φιλόσοφον, 6.2.12), while explaining Greek myths and mythical names etymologically as natural elements—for example, Zeus as boiling substance (ζέω, 6.7.5). In this way Appion's allegorical hermeneutics is strongly linked to the Stoic etymological and allegorical approach to myths and gods.[16] Clement, in turn, rejects this approach because it does not support *pietas*, an important theme in his refutation of Greek culture (e.g. 6.25).[17]

But something noteworthy happens in the narrative. Appion notices that Clement is falling asleep during his explanation. He angrily asks if Clement does not think it is interesting enough and questions whether he has even understood the explanation (6.11). A bored Clement answers that he is already familiar with these allegorical interpretations and even knows of others; and he even finishes Appion's speech in a rhetorical performance of an *ethopoeia*.[18] In other words, despite his later

[14] For more on Appion in the *Homilies* see J. N. Bremmer, "Apion and Anoubion in the *Homilies*," in *Maidens, Magic and Martyrs in Early Christianity: Collected Essays* I (Tübingen 2017) 251–65; De Vos, *VigChr* 73 (2019) 54–88, and "The Disputes between Appion and Clement in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*: A Narrative and Rhetorical Approach to the Structure of *Hom.* 6," *Ancient Narrative* 16 (2020) 81–109.

[15] E.g. 4.25.6 (ἀλληγορήσας).

[16] For this Stoic use of allegories: P. De Lacy, "Stoic Views of Poetry," *AJP* 69 (1948) 241–271; L. Brisson and C. Tihanyi, *How Philosophers Saved Myths: Allegorical Interpretation and Classical Mythology* (Chicago 2004) 41–49.

[17] Thus, the *Homilistic* narrative stands in the line of Tatian's *Discourse to the Greeks* (21; *PG* VI 851–856) or Athenagoras' *Supplicatio* (22; *PG* VI 936–942), which reject the application of allegorical hermeneutics to Greek myths. See J. Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie. Les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*² (Paris 1976) ch. 7, "Une critique conséquente de l'allégorie païenne: celle des milieux chrétiens non-allégoristes," esp. 393–394.

[18] In the *Recognitions*, Nicetas, who is explaining the 'pagan' allegorical

rejection of allegoresis, Clement here adopts Appion's method and impersonates him, thus pretending to be a 'pseudo-Appion'. This will prove important for my interpretation in §3. But Clement subtly and tacitly changes the use of allegorical hermeneutics. While Appion identified gods and demi-gods with forces of nature, Clement shifts the focus towards morality and alludes to the Genesis story, which is not mentioned in the parallel passage of the Latin *Recognitions* (the Syriac version does not render this passage at all).

Clement, as 'pseudo-Appion', discusses the Judgement of Paris. Paris stands for barbarous impulses (ἡ ἀλόγιστος ὁρμὴ καὶ βάρβαρος, 6.15.3); he chooses Aphrodite (who stands for lust) and neglects Hera and Athena (dignity and courage). Clement also discusses the marriage of Peleus and Thetis and says that Peleus stands for clay (πηλός, 6.14.2) and Thetis for water (as the daughter of Nereus).[19] Their mixture is the basis for all human bodies. This novel explanation reappears in two later sources: the Latin *Mythologies* (3.7) of Fulgentius (5th–6th cent.),[20] and the Syriac *Liber Scholiorum* of Theodore bar Konai (8th

―――

interpretations of similar Greek myths to Peter, is not interrupted during his speech and continues his explanation of the myths about Peleus' marriage and Paris' judgement (see n.13 above). For this concept of *ethopoeia* see H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*³ (Stuttgart 1990) §§820–825; for this particular one see De Vos, *Ancient Narrative* 16 (2020) 81–109.

[19] Cf. *Recogn.* 10.41.7: *aridum […] elementum* and *umidum […] elementum*. For mythological traditions about Peleus and Thetis see R. Vollkommer, "Peleus," *LIMC* VII (1994) 251–269. For an etymological link with 'clay' in other literary traditions see L. Bloch, "Peleus," in *Roscher* III 34. As Pépin (*Mythe* 400) has noted, a link with clay in Stoic interpretations has not been found. Thetis is usually (but not in the *Homilies*) associated with τίθημι, ἀπόθεσις, or διαθεῖσα: D. A. Russell and D. Konstan, *Heraclitus: Homeric Problems* (Atlanta 2005) 49 n.3 and 63–64; and "Thetis," *Roscher* V 785–799.

[20] R. Helm and J. Préaux, *Fabii Planciadi Fulgentii V.C. Opera* (Stuttgart 1970) 3–80, at 70. Fulgentius does not offer an etymological analysis of 'Achilles'.

―――――――

cent.), who was influenced by this *Homilistic* witness.[21] Clay and water as basic elements in the fashioning of man occur in Greek literature. Ps.-Apollodorus (*Bibl.* 1.45) tells of Prometheus, who molds men with water and earth. In the *Homilistic* text, Peleus and Thetis are immediately preceded by the same Prometheus, etymologized as the "foresight" by which all things arose (ἡ προμήθεια, ὑφ᾽ ἧς τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, 6.14.2). But the allegorical association of Peleus as clay, Thetis as water, and Prometheus as foresight with the creation of man is original to the *Homilies*. The allegorical interpretation of the myth about Achilles and Polyxena will lead the reader to the Genesis story of the first couple, Adam and Eve.

Achilles and Polyxena: an allegorical Genesis couple

Πηλεὺς πηλὸς ὁ ἀπὸ γῆς εἰς ἀνθρώπου γένεσιν περινοηθεὶς καὶ μιγεὶς τῇ Νηρηΐδι, τουτέστιν ὕδατι. ἐκ δὲ τῆς τῶν δύο μίξεως (ὕδατός τε καὶ γῆς) ὁ πρῶτος οὐ γεννηθεὶς ἀλλὰ πλασθεὶς τέλειος καὶ διὰ τὸ μαζοῖς χείλη μὴ προσενεγκεῖν Ἀχιλλεὺς προσηγορεύθη· ἔστι δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ ἀκμή, ἥτις ἐὰν ἐπιθυμίαν—Πολυξένην ὡς ἀληθείας ἀλλοτρίαν οὖσαν καὶ ξένην—ἐπιθυ-μεῖ[22] ἰῷ ὄφεως ἀναιρεῖται, βέλει κατὰ πτέρναν καὶ κατὰ ἴχνος ἐνέρποντος τοῦ θανάτου.

---

[21] A. Scher, *Liber Scholiorum* (Leuven 1960) 288. It is remarkable that the Greek *Homilies* influenced later Syriac literature, and not only via the Syriac translations, since the extant Syriac version of 411 of the *Pseudo-Clementines* does not have this discussion about allegories. This intertextuality was noticed by T. Nöldeke, "Bar Choni über Homer, Hesiod und Orpheus," *ZDMG* (1899) 501–507.

[22] According to Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen* I ix and 111, some words are missing here: <…>, "gegen die Handschriften angesetzte Lücke." He suggests <προσλάβῃ, ὥσπερ>. *Vat.Ottob.gr.* 443 (O) has ἐπιθυμεῖ, which is rejected by Rehm (the text already has ἐπιθυμίαν). Although *Paris.gr.* 930 (P) does not have ἐπιθυμεῖ, this could be the result of haplography. Scholars agree that both manuscripts are independent copies of an older source. Rehm's conjecture is difficult to defend on the basis of the manuscripts. All things considered, the construction in O (ἐπιθυμίαν […] ἐπιθυμεῖ) seems the best solution. I thank the editors of *GRBS* for their helpful remarks here.

Peleus is clay, namely, that which was collected from the earth and mixed with Nereis, that is, water, for the production of man; and from the mixing of the two, that is, water and earth, the first offspring was not begotten, but created as complete, and called Achilles, because he never put his lips (χείλη) to the breast. *He is also himself the bloom of life, which, when it thirsts for desire—Polyxena, that is, something other than the truth, and foreign (ξένην) to it—is killed by the poison of a snake, death penetrating through an arrow in the heel and foot.*[23]

We will examine three points: (a) the creation of Achilles, (b) his relationship with Polyxena, and (c) his death. In all three we can find connections with the characters of Adam and Eve during and after their stay in Eden. I will also elaborate further on these points in §2 and §3, but first we should consider the following peculiar and novel allegorical elements.

First, the name of Achilles is explained as α-privative plus χείλη, a pun for 'without lips', explained with reference to having been raised without lips on his mother's breasts. This folk etymology is not unique to the *Homilies*.[24] But the combination of Peleus as clay, Thetis as water, and Achilles as raised without lips on his mother's breasts is unique: "the first offspring was not begotten, but created as complete" (ὁ πρῶτος

---

[23] Alterations to Riddle's translation are in italics. Riddle (*Pseudo-Clementine Literature* 462) follows the restoration of Albert Schwegler (*Clementis Romani quae feruntur Homiliae* [Stuttgart 1847]): "Still in the bloom of life, he is slain by an arrow while desiring to have Polyxena." Other recent translations follow the Vatican manuscript (O). J. Wehnert, *Pseudoklementinische Homilien* (Göttingen 2010) 131 n.25: "Konjekturen sind nicht erforderlich." The recent French translation also follows this textual tradition: A. Le Boulluec et al., "Homélies," in P. Geoltrain et al. (eds.), *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens* II (Paris 2005) 1175–1589, at 1358.

[24] Ps.-Apollodorus (*Bibl.* 3.13.6) writes that Achilles had not put his lips to his mother's breasts because he was raised by the centaur Chiron. For the story that Achilles lost his lips when immersed into fire or boiling water by his mother see D. Sigel, "Achilles," *Brill's New Pauly* (2006: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e102220, consulted 16 March 2020). For other interpretations see C. Fleischer, "Achilles," *Roscher* I 25–65, at 64–65.

οὐ γεννηθεὶς ἀλλὰ πλασθεὶς τέλειος). Achilles' failure to be breast-fed was not because Chiron raised him but because he was created already as an adult. Hence, Achilles becomes a Greek type of the Old Testament first man Adam, the archetype.[25] As noted by Fabienne Jourdan, the phrase οὐ γεννηθεὶς ἀλλὰ πλασθεὶς strongly points to Adam's creation.[26] Gen. 2:7 states that God created man (καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον) and later authors refer to Adam as not born, but created (μὴ γεννηθέντος ἀλλὰ πλασθέντος).[27] Also, πλασθεὶς τέλειος reflects an early Christian discussion whether Adam was full-grown or still a child when he committed the original sin. I will return to this in §3, but we can see already how Achilles resembles Adam in Clement's/Pseudo-Appion's explanation.

The identification of Adam and Achilles grows more remarkable if we take into consideration the hero's death by an arrow. Achilles, as the bloom of life, desires Polyxena ('desire/lust'), and this desiring leads to his death. Greek and Roman sources relate that Achilles killed Polyxena's brother, the Trojan prince Troilus, while the latter accompanied his sister to the well. For example, the late-ancient pseudo-chronicle of the Trojan War attributed to Dictys (3.2, 4.10) recounts that Achilles fell in love with her. In some late sources, Polyxena as an object of Achilles' desire plays a small role in his death.[28]

[25] For a list of comparisons between Adam and other figures of Greek myth (Orpheus, Prometheus, and Heracles, but not Achilles) see H. Schade, "Adam und Eva," *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie* (Rome 1968) 43.

[26] *Orphée* II 330. I argue that Adam and Achilles are also linked by their downfall and their relationship with women. There is also a strong link between Eve and Polyxena that has not been noted. I analyse below this network of links in the context of the whole narrative.

[27] E.g. [Basil] *Adv.Eunom.* 4.26, τοῦ Ἀδὰμ μὴ γεννηθέντος ἀλλὰ πλασθέντος (*PG* XXIX 680A).

[28] Further on Polyxena in O. Touchefeu-Meynier, "Polyxena," *LIMC* VII (1994) 431; E. R. Harder, "Polyxena," *Brill's New Pauly* (http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1002550, consulted 17 March 2020). The *Homilies* are not mentioned.

She seems to play the same role in the *Homilies*, which connect her with the downfall of Achilles *qua* bloom of life. It is for her that Achilles longed (ἐπιθυμίαν […] ἐπιθυμεῖ). Neither Paris nor Apollo is tied explicitly to his death, a departure from better-known traditions.[29] Nobody shoots the arrow. Instead, it is Polyxena *qua* desire foreign to the truth who brings down Achilles (the bloom of life), hit by an arrow. This introduces mortality into life. Adam too has been blamed for mortality because he chose to follow the example of his wife.[30] In §2 I will show that Polyxena and her name are connected to the *Homilistic* portrayal of Eve: their shared characterization as 'strangers to the truth' emphasizes the parallel between Achilles-Polyxena and Adam-Eve. This is the reason why neither Paris nor Apollo is mentioned and only Polyxena stands next to Achilles, the created man.

Another factor that ties Achilles to Genesis is the role of the snake. The passage states that Achilles eventually dies from an arrow shot to the foot/ankle (βέλει κατὰ πτέρναν καὶ κατὰ ἴχνος ἐνέρποντος τοῦ θανάτου), as was commonly held in late antiquity.[31] Less traditional is the report that the arrow was rubbed with snake poison (ἰῷ ὄφεως ἀναιρεῖται).[32] While poison is mentioned in the medieval *Excidium Troiae*, the *Homilistic* witness has been neglected in secondary literature.[33] The con-

[29] A. Kossatz-Deissmann, "Achilleus," *LIMC* I (1981) 81–82.

[30] See n.2 above.

[31] Cf. J. Burgess, "Achilles' Heel: The Death of Achilles in Ancient Myth," *ClAnt* 142 (1995) 217–244. See also Fleischer, *Roscher* I 47–51.

[32] ἰός, which could also mean "arrow," appears three other times in the *Homilies* (9.12.4, 10.14.3, 19.15.6) where it is always linked to "poison" or "being poisoned" by disbelief, ignorance, or demons. The verb ἐνέρποντος suggests the role of the serpent: it crawls.

[33] Anon. *Excidium Troiae*, ed. E. B. Atwood and V. K. Whitaker (New York 1971) 12–13. See also R. Graves, *The Greek Myths* (Harmondsworth 1975) 319 n.23, who refers to the *Excidium Troiae*. In his translation of the *Posthomerica* of Quintus of Smyrna, A. S. Way also renders ἰός (3.148) as poison that causes Achilles' strength to ebb away. J. Burgess, in turn, inter-

nection between Achilles and the snake is either an invention of the author, or it comes from a lost tradition. In either case, by connecting Achilles' heel and serpent poison the *Homilies* point to the role of the serpent in Genesis, in particular to the episode after Eve and Adam's expulsion from Eden: in Gen. 3:15[34] God states that the seed of the snake will strike the seed of Eve in the heel. This fits in with Peter's exposition on evil and sin in Laodicea (*Hom.* 19.15.6–7):

> Poisonous serpents […] which things would not have been injurious had not man sinned, for which reason death came in. For if man were sinless, the poison of serpents would have no effect (οὐχ ἑρπετῶν ὁ ἰὸς εἰργάζετο); […] but losing his immortality on account of his sin (δι᾽ ἁμαρτίαν δὲ ἐκπεσὼν τοῦ ἀθάνατος εἶναι), he has become, as I said, capable of every suffering.

Thus, Achilles is the created man who has sinned and has fallen victim to the serpent's poison. This unique combination of elements points to the Genesis story: Adam as the first man, created by God; Eve, the first woman, a stranger to truth; the serpent, threatening humans with death ever since the loss of Paradise. This parallel between Achilles and Adam is reinforced by the version of the Genesis story Peter tells in the *Homilies*: remarkably, for him Adam is the sinless, foreknowing True Prophet, the starting point of the line of true knowledge throughout human history. In contrast to this sinless Adam, in the *Homilies* Achilles allegorically represents the sinful Adam.

---

prets it as "arrow," as does Neil Hopkinson in the new Loeb. In the *Homilies*, ἰός always means poison and is strongly linked with the serpent, and βέλος is used instead for "arrow." See Quintus Smyrnaeus, *The Fall of Troy*, transl. A. S. Way (Cambridge 1913) 126–127; Burgess, *ClAnt* 14 1995) 224; and Quintus Smyrnaeus, *Posthomerica*, ed. and transl. Neil Hopkinson (Cambridge 2018) 142–143.

[34] As noted above (n.5), Nesterova had already briefly connected the passage with the serpent in Genesis.

2. *The Homilistic Adam and Eve*

Adam and Eve play a dualistic role in the *Homilies*. They are not chiefly associated with their expulsion from Eden but with the doctrine of *syzygiae*. Peter explains that everything in human history comes in pairs of opposites, with the first couple determining later *syzygiae* (2.15–18).[35] Adam represents the line of true, prophetic knowledge; Eve, that of deceptive, female knowledge (3.22–26). The distinction God made between the two is emphasized in 3.22.1, which states that Adam's companion differed as much from him as quality (μετουσία) from substance (οὐσίας), moon from sun, or fire from light. From this original couple, every new generation brings forth a pair, of which the first member is inferior and stands in the line of Eve,[36] while the second is superior and stands in the line of Adam. This seems paradoxical, for Adam was created before Eve. But in the *Homilies* there is a difference between God's order of creation and the order of human events. While God created the 'superior' first, among humans the 'inferior' precedes the 'superior'. Adam and Eve, as God's creatures, belong to the first order; the next generation, Cain and Abel, to the second, human order. To be clear, although each member of these couples is ascribed to either the female line of Eve or the male line of Adam, they all consist of two men: Cain and Abel, Esau and Jacob, Aaron and Moses, John the Baptist and Jesus, Simon Magus and Peter, and eventually the Antichrist and Christ. Eve's line is strongly tied to everything that is strange to the truth (3.24.3–4).[37]

[35] In the *Recognitions* we encounter a doctrine of ten *paria* (e.g. Pharaoh vs. Abraham and Egyptian wizards vs. Moses, *Recogn.* 3.61.1), but the *syzygiae* receive their own distinct development in the *Homilies*.

[36] Surprisingly, Eve is not mentioned by name in the *Homilies*, maybe a kind of *damnatio memoriae*. Amsler relates this omission to other unnamed Old Testament women in the *Homilies*: F. Amsler, "Qui a dit qu'Adam avait péché? Adam et Ève dans les *Homélies* pseudo-clémentines," *Apocrypha* 25 (2014) 195–210, at 202.

[37] P. Therrien discusses this theory in the context of Gnosticism, Montan-

The allegorical and etymological explanation of Polyxena fits with the negative *Homilistic* model of Eve and her false knowledge. Polyxena stands for "what is foreign and a stranger to the truth" (with *poly-* passed over in silence). According to LSJ, Polyxena is usually understood as "entertaining many guests, very hospitable" or "visited by many guests." Not so in the *Homilies*, where she is "a stranger to the truth." The *Homilistic* narrative is the oldest extant source that features this particular explanation of her name.[38] It is Clement/pseudo-Appion who emphatically makes reference to "truth," by which he conforms Polyxena to the Eve that Peter portrays. Anyone who chooses the deceptive side aligns himself with this negative female identity. This is exactly what Achilles did. Adam, in contrast, stands for the male line of true knowledge. The teachings of Peter and several arguments between him and Simon illustrate this, even before the disputes of Appion and Clement in *Hom.* 4–6. One of the important subjects is Adam's innocence. Peter states that Adam did not sin (2.52.2): "For, as I am persuaded, neither was Adam a transgressor, who was fashioned by the hands of God" (ὡς γὰρ πέπεισμαι, οὔτε Ἀδὰμ παραβάτης ἦν, ὁ ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ χειρῶν κυοφορηθείς).

Adam is innocent *tout court* (also 3.17.1, 3.20.1).[39] He pos-

---

ism, and (Jewish-)Christianity: "Le Christianisme ancien revisité: Parcours à travers les *Homélies* et les *Reconnaissances*," in K. Chahine et al., *Actes du 17ᵉ Colloque international étudiant du Département des sciences historiques de l'Université Laval* (Quebec 2018) 156–189.

[38] Fulgentius (3.7: n.20 above) and, with him, the Second Vatican Mythographer (249: P. Kulcsár, *Mythographi Vaticani I et II* [Turnhout 1987] II 38) offer an indepedent variant, explaining Polyxena as "strange to many." Theodore bar Konai depends on the *Homilistic* variant in his *Liber Scholiorum* (288.25–26: R. Hespel and R. Draguet, *Livre des Scolies* [Leuven 1981] 215) and adds that Polyxena also stands for the venomous snake.

[39] According to Bautch, Adam's sinlessness may be hinted at by the Enochic *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 En.* 83–90), which refers to Cain's murder as the first sin (85.4): K. C. Bautch, "The Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*' Use of Jewish Pseudepigrapha," in P. Piovanelli et al. (eds.), *Rediscovering the Apocryphal Continent: New Perspectives on Early Christian and Late Antique Apocryphal Texts*

sesses true foreknowledge, which enabled him rightly to name all the creatures and his sons (3.21.1: Gen 2:19), and he is, moreover, the first incarnation of the True Prophet immortal by the indwelling of τὸ ἅγιον Χριστοῦ […] πνεῦμα (3.20.2). This *Homilistic* figure recurs throughout human history and is linked to characters like Adam[40] and Jesus. Peter ascribes to him foreknowledge and sinlessness (ἀναμάρτητος, 2.6.1). Adam's full knowledge prevents him from sinning. Peter rejects as false pericopes passages in Genesis that suggest that Adam might sin.[41] Because God created Adam in his own image, he had foreknowledge and did not need to eat the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (3.18, 3.21,[42] 3.42–43). Simon, on the contrary, insists on Adam's sinfulness, God's ignorant

_____

and Traditions (Tübingen 2015) 337–350, at 342–348. Adolf von Harnack had already suggested Apelles, Marcion's student, as the source: *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (Leipzig 1924) 419*.

[40] Never called a prophet in the Old Testament, some later ascribed to him prophetic abilities (e.g. Jos. *AJ* 1.70). For the True Prophet in the *Pseudo-Clementines* see L. Cerfaux, "Le vrai Prophète des Clémentines," *RecSciRel* 18 (1928) 143–163; H. J. W. Drijvers, "Adam and the True Prophet in the Pseudo-Clementines," in C. Elsas et al. (eds.), *Loyalitäts-konflikte in der Religionsgeschichte: Festschrift für Carsten Colpe* (Würzburg 1990) 314–323; H. M. Teeple, *The Prophet in the Clementines* (Evanston 1993); C. A. Gieschen, "The Seven Pillars of the World: Ideal Figure Lists in the Christology of the Pseudo-Clementines," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 12 (1994) 47–82; S. C. Mimouni, "La doctrine du Verus Propheta de la littérature pseudo-clémentine chez Henry Corbin et ses élèves," in M. A. Amir-Moezzi et al. (eds.), *Henry Corbin. Philosophies et sagesses des religions du Livre* (Turnhout 2005) 165–175; J. van Amersfoort, "The Ebionites as Depicted in the Pseudo-Clementine Novel," *JEastCS* 60 (2008) 85–104. For a recent overview see D. Côté, "Le vrai Prophète et ses incarnations dans les *Homélies* pseudo-clémentines," in E. Crégheur et al. (eds.), *Christianisme des origines. Mélanges en l'honneur du Professeur Paul-Hubert Poirier* (Turnhout 2018) 309–337.

[41] The same is said of other Old Testament figures like Noah, Abraham, Jacob, and Moses: *Hom.* 2.52 and 18.13–14.

[42] διὸ πῶς ἔτι φυτοῦ χρείαν εἶχε προσλαβεῖν, ἵνα τί ποτ' ἔστιν ἴδη καλὸν ἢ κακόν;

_____

mistakes, and Adam's exile from Eden (e.g. 3.39; cf. Gen 3:22, 6:6, 18:21).[43]

It is clear that the portrayal of Achilles does not fit Peter's characterization of Adam. His longing (ἐπιθυμίαν […] ἐπιθυμεῖ) for female knowledge, represented by Polyxena, stands rather in contrast to Peter's Adam. This contrast grows clearer in the light of the *Homilistic* link between sinner and serpent illustrated by Peter's statement in 19.15.6–7 quoted above (see also 8.18). Although in the *Homilies* Adam was not responsible for introducing death into the world, Achilles' death by snake poison should be viewed in the light of Gen 3:15. Furthermore, the serpent stands for error and everything that is against the truth. In his Tripolis discourse about the role of the True Prophet in bringing knowledge to the ignorant, Peter assesses the role of the snake in the following way (11.18–11.19.2):

> Wherefore, as to the matter in hand, although in ten thousand ways the serpent that lurks in you suggesting evil reasonings and hindrances (ἐν ὑμῖν ἐνδομυχῶν ὄφις, κακοὺς ὑποβαλὼν λογισμοὺς καὶ ἀσχολίας) wishes to ensnare you, therefore so much the more ought ye to resist him, and to listen to us assiduously. For it behooves you, as having been grievously deceived, to know how he must be charmed. But in no other way is it possible. But by charming I mean the setting yourselves by reason in opposition to their evil counsels (ἐπᾴδειν δὲ λέγω τῷ λογισμῷ ἀντιτάσσεσθαι ταῖς κακαῖς αὐτοῦ συμβουλίαις), remembering that by promise of knowledge he brought death into the world at the first (μεμνημένους ὅτι ὑποσχέσει γνώσεως ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς τῷ κόσμῳ θάνατον ἐξειργάσατο). Whence the Prophet of the truth, knowing that the world was much in error, […] setting truth over against error, sending as it were fire upon those who are sober, namely wrath against the seducer, which is likened to a sword [Mt 10:34], and by holding forth the word he destroys ignorance by knowledge, cutting, as it were, and separating the living from the dead (ὥσπερ τέμνων καὶ χωρίζων ζῶντας ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν).

---

[43] When Simon cites to Adam's failure to foreknow that the snake would deceive Eve (3.42), Peter counters with his ability to name rightly.

In this way, the allegorical characterization of Achilles not only fits with this image of the ignorant sinner, but also forms an anti-type for the *Homilistic* Adam who is the sinless, immortal True Prophet. In the next section I argue that Clement in the *Homilies* develops this portrayal of Achilles further into an anti-Adamic figure, a precursor of Simon and all who chose the false, female knowledge.

3. *A battle for truth and freedom in the Homilies*

What is the purpose of the contrast between Adam and Achilles in the *Homilies*? Olga Nesterova has observed that Jewish and Christian elements have influenced the allegories of the *Pseudo-Clementines*. In our case, in particular, she has rightly noted that the snake points to Gen 3:15 and that, together with Polyxena, it is put on the same level as the devil.[44] She believes that the *Homilist* (or at least "les auteurs de la section allégorique du roman," who were "prosélytes d'origine et de formation païenne," 399) viewed positively these Christian and Jewish elements in the allegoresis of Greek myth (407):

> En même temps, les rédacteurs chrétiens du corpus sont disposés […] à se servir de cette technique interprétative pour retrouver des allusions bibliques et des enseignements moraux dans les récits mythologiques.

Justin Martyr[45] and Clement of Alexandria[46] had already claimed that Greek mythology sometimes adumbrated Christian truth. This social and intellectual background is certainly relevant to the *Pseudo-Clementines*. But I believe that there is a deeper meaning behind the allegorical pairing of Achilles and Adam. Rhetorically and philosophically, in the *Homilies* (Jewish-)Christianity is the only correct worldview. As noted above, neither Greek *paideia* nor, in particular, allegorical hermeneutics are well received. In contrast to Justin and Clement,

[44] Nesterova, in *Nouvelles intrigues* 405.

[45] 1 *Apol.* 54 and 2 *Apol.* 8 (*PG* VI 408–412, 457).

[46] *Stromata* 5.14.99.4–6 (*PG* IX 149).

the *Homilist* displays knowledge of Greek myths and interprets them allegorically only in order to attack them.

This strategy serves not only to attack the myths but also to refute the hermeneutical approach itself. First, Clement performs an *ethopoeia* and finishes Appion's speech as if he were Appion himself. Then, he refutes allegorical hermeneutics *in propria persona* as inherently impious (6.17–19). Allegorical explanations cannot cope with immoral myths, a corrupting influence on many. The reality behind the myths is not uncovered by allegory but by Euhemerism: gods and heroes are nothing more than ordinary magicians who deceived their contemporaries. The refutation of allegoresis is implicit in Achilles' case: it comes about by Clement's linking Achilles—an inverted type of Adam—to the female line of Eve, whose deceptive, lethal knowledge Polyxena embodies. In other words, Achilles *qua* representative of the Greek world belongs to the deceptive, female side in the *Homilies*. In its competition with Simon, Appion, and the philosophers, the 'true' Jewish-Christian world is not marred by a fallen Adam and his original sin. Within the broader framework of the whole *Homilistic* narrative, the world of the opponents belongs to the wrong side of the *syzygiae*.

Simon Magus chose the wrong side. While disputing with him, Peter asserts that Simon does not possess any truth according to the *syzygetical* logic (2.18.1–2). He is Peter's deceitful precursor. His 'truth' is represented by a woman: the infamous Helen, Simon's companion, the arch-mother (κυρίαν οὖσαν, ὡς παμμήτορα οὐσίαν καὶ σοφίαν, 2.25.2), over whom Greeks and barbarians fought although they had before their eyes but an image of the truth (εἰκόνα φαντασθέντες ἀληθείας).[47] This ties together the examples of Eve, Polyxena/Achilles, and Helen/Simon. During their dispute in Laodicea, Peter uses *syzygetical* logic to explain why Simon is so hard to persuade (17.15.5–7):

---

[47] She was in fact, Simon claimed, with the foremost God (2.25.2). See also nn.11–12 above.

but I do not undertake to persuade you. For the man who is inclined to fall in love with a bad woman, does not change his mind so as to care for a lawful union with another woman in every respect good; but sometimes they love the worse woman through prepossessions, though they are conscious that there is another who is more excellent. And you are ignorant, in consequence of some such state of mind.

This leads us to two further themes that link Achilles to other opponents: lust and freedom. Lust (ἐπιθυμία)[48] and death figure prominently in Achilles' allegory.[49] The hero's death seems tied to lust that is glossed as "Polyxena" (a stranger to the truth). This is illuminated by Clement's allegoresis of the Judgement of Paris at 6.15:[50] Paris gives the victory to lust alone (μόνῃ τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ τὴν νίκην ἀποδῷ) by choosing Aphrodite ("pleasures," ἡδοναί) instead of Hera ("dignity," σεμνότης) or Athena ("manliness," ἀνδρεία). Achilles, Simon, and Paris are all examples of men who have lusted after the 'wrong' woman.[51] Lust also plays a crucial role in the disputes with Appion. According to Clement, Greek education is a terrible invention of an evil demon (*Hom.* 4.12.1). Young people are corrupted by myths in which gods and demi-gods exhibit every kind of passion (παντο-παθεῖς). The educators (grammarians and sophists) take them as

[48] For ἐπιθυμία in classical and Hellenistic thought and its use in Jewish and Christian discourses see F. Büchsel, "Epithumia," in G. Kittel (ed.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart 1933–1974) III 168–173; R. Wilpert, "Begierde," *RAC* 2 (1954) 62–78.

[49] In the *Life of Adam and Eve* (19) the serpent injects poisonous *epithymia* into the fruit.

[50] For similar readings in Neoplatonic traditions see R. Lamberton, *Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (Berkeley 1986) 35.

[51] In the Tripolis discourses (*Hom.* 8–11) Peter refers to the actual sin (of ingratitude and lust) of later generations of men, linked with the Enochic theme of angels coming down to earth and falling victim to human lust. As Peter explains further, the union of these angels with women caused the birth of cannibalistic giants who lived on after the deluge as Greek gods still subject to desire (8.13).

an excuse to practice indecencies freely (4.17.2). Appion the grammarian, an expert in myth, is himself a perfect example of sexual incontinence (*akrasia*): he once used magic to gratify his infatuation (4.3).

Neither Peter nor Clement, however, entirely rejects lust, for according to Clement it fosters procreation within lawful marriage (5.25).[52] That Christian marriage protects from sexual *akrasia* fits with the theme in the *Homilies* that (Jewish-) Christianity can bring freedom from those "irresistible" lusts that typify the pagan world. While Appion insists that men are at the mercy of the god Eros (5.10.6–7),[53] Clement (through Peter) reaffirms freedom from passions and a proper use for lust in reproduction (19.21.3–4): "For lust has, by the will of Him who created all things well, been made to arise within the living being, that, led by it to intercourse, he may increase humanity" (cf. 20.4.4).

The themes of freedom, lust, women, knowledge, and death recur in the contrasts between Achilles and Adam, Simon and Peter, and Appion and Clement. The allegory of Achilles and Polyxena is not only a remarkable literary and philosophical achievement; it also serves a rhetorical function in the *Homilies* as an implicit attack on the opponents of Christianity.

It is noteworthy that with the example of Achilles the *Homilies* not only attack the pagan Greek world, but also reject several Jewish and Christian views on the Genesis story. While the

---

[52] According to L. Cirillo, this double connotation of lust (positive and negative) results from the use of several sources in the *Grundschrift*. Both connotations, however, are compatible: lust plays a positive role only within marriage among the baptized (11.26.1–4, cf. 19.23): L. Cirillo, "Le baptême, remède à la concupiscence, selon la catéchèse ps.-clémentine de Pierre," in T. Baarda et al. (eds.), *Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A. F. J. Klijn* (Kampen 1988) 79–90, esp. 82.

[53] Cf. 4.23.3 (gods as slaves of lust) and 9.10.2 (demons in people incite lust). See also E. Pagels, "'Freedom from Necessity'. Philosophic and Personal Dimensions of Christian Conversion," in G. A. Robbins, *Genesis 1–3 in the History of Exegesis. Intrigue in the Garden* (Lewiston 1988) 67–76.

Greek hero inverts the *Homilistic* Adam, this inversion rejects the characterization of of Adam in rival Christian traditions. Authorities like Irenaeus,[54] Methodius of Olympus,[55] and John Chrysostom[56] defended the idea of free will and freedom from passion by referring to Adam's sin. Like Adam, later generations still have a free will. We have seen that in the *Homilies* Adam's (fore)knowledge and free will enabled him not to sin, and his example must be followed. Moreover, the description of Achilles as πλασθεὶς τέλειος recalls the debate whether Adam was "full-grown" (τέλειος) or not (ἀτελής) when he sinned.[57] The *Homilist*'s theory of a sinless Adam renders the debate moot. By putting forth Adam and Jesus as two embodiments of one and the same True Prophet, the *Homilist* also rejects the Pauline Adam-Christ typology of Romans 5:12–21. In this way, the opponents and the intra-*Homilistic* world of Achilles become multi-layered and serve for attacking diverse intra- and extra-*Homilistic* groups and ideas. Achilles is not only the 'first man' and representative of the Greek corrupt world, who has made the wrong choice; he is also a type of the Adam rejected in the *Homilies* but adopted by many Christian authors.

Conclusion

In this article we have examined the *Homilies*' allegorical identification between the myth of Achilles and Polyxena and the Genesis story of Adam and Eve. In this allegoresis, the *Homilistic* novel cleverly plays with several early Christian and late antique intellectual traditions. The result is an innovative version of both Genesis 1–3 and the Greek myth, from which Adam emerges as the sinless True Prophet. I discussed this characterization in section 2, which also reviewed the *syzygetical* framework that makes Adam the origin of the line of true

[54] E.g. *Contra Haereses* 4.37.1 (*PG* VII 1099).

[55] *On Free Will*, esp. *PG* XVIII 261–264.

[56] *Homily on Genesis* 17.9 (*PG* LIII 147).

[57] See for a discussion Bouteneff, in *The Oxford Handbook* 528.

knowledge, vis-à-vis Eve's female line of false knowledge. Section 3 traced the *Homilistic* themes of truth, freedom, passion, and mortality in the allegorical equivalences between Adam and Achilles, and Eve and Polyxena. Achilles' choice of lust and what is foreign to the truth makes him into a *Homilistic* anti-Adam. This anti-Adam stands for the opponent's world, the target of Clement's implicit attack. This world has no claim to truth and morality—not even if one allegorizes its traditions. Achilles, the created man according to the allegory, is also a fallen man. By wearing the rhetorical mask of *ethopoeia*, Clement manages to ascribe to the *syzygetical* line of Eve the worlds of Achilles and Polyxena, of Simon and Helen, and of Appion and other exponents of Greek *paideia*. As Nesterova and Jourdan observed, there are references to Genesis in the allegory of Achilles and Polyxena; but there is more at stake. This remarkably sophisticated allegoresis allows the *Homilist* to construct rhetorical, philosophical, and apologetic arguments for his cause. This novel opposes not only Greek *paideia* (with its myths and philosophical allegories) but also those Christian interpretations of Genesis in which Adam sinned. Its intellectual accomplishment demands our attention.[58]

March, 2021   Dept. of Philosophy and Moral Sciences
                             Ghent University
                             Bmardvos.DeVos@UGent.be