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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is an analysis of the concept of purity in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies. The argument proceeds in two parts. In the first, I argue that the Homilies’ presentation of purity reflects an ancient Jewish background. Thus, the Homilies, like other ancient Jews, divides its concept of purity in two domains: a domain related to the body (bodily purity) and a domain related to ethics (purity of the heart). I then track the differences between these two kinds of purity, noting particularly how they are defiled and how such defilements are removed. Thus, while bodily defilement comes from occasional bodily sources like menstruation and seminal emission, heart defilement comes from sin and one’s earthly conception. Similarly, while bodily defilement is removed by ritual lustrations that can be performed repeatedly as needed, heart defilement can only be removed once through an extensive process that involves education, ascetic practices, and baptism. If one sins afterward, they can only be purified through God’s punishment. In the second part, I note that, though the Homilies’ conception of purity comes from an ancient Jewish background, it does not advocate for the observance of the entire Jewish Law. Rather, it promotes a limited law observance. This limited law observance is due to the Homilies’ audience, which is composed of Gentiles. Thus, the Homilies, together with the Apostolic Decree and the rabbinic Noahide Laws, participates in a discussion prevalent in ancient Judaism regarding the legal requirements of all humanity, including non-Jews.
INTRODUCTION

THE PSEUDO-CLEMENTINE LITERATURE, PURITY LAWS, AND GENTILES

This dissertation is a study of purity in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies.*¹ I argue that the novel, which has been traditionally understood to have arisen out of a Jewish-Christian milieu,² employs a purity framework common in ancient Judaism, in which purity was divided into two domains, one concerning the purity of the body and another concerning ethics. The *Homilies*

¹ It would be more accurate to refer to this work as the *Klementia*, since this is the title that appears in the older of the two manuscripts that preserves it, Codex Parisinus gr. 930 (on this manuscript, see below), as well as the title granted to the work by Photius (*De spiritus sancti mystagogia* 75), Nicon Monachos (*Interpretationes divinorum mandatorum* 24, 39), and Pseudo-Athanasius (*Synopsis* 76). See F. Stanley Jones, “Photius’s Witness to the Pseudo-Clementines,” in *Pseudo-Clementina Elchasiaticaque inter Judaeochristiana: Collected Studies*, OLA 203 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 352–53. While a few scholars have made the switch to *Klementia* (see, e.g., Giovanni Battista Bazzana, “Apelles and the Pseudo-Clementine Doctrine of the False Pericopes,” in “Soyez des changeurs avisés”: *Controverses exégétiques dans la littérature apocryphe chrétienne*, ed. Gabriella Aragione and Rémi Gounelle, CBiPa 12 [Turnhout: Brepols, 2012], 11–32, and Patricia Duncan, *Novel Hermeneutics in the Greek Pseudo-Clementine Romance*, WUNT 395 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017]), the title has seen little adoption outside of Pseudo-Clementine specialists. Because of this, I have opted to continue referring to the work as the *Homilies*. For a brief investigation on how the title *Homilies* came to dominate scholarship on the text, see Jones, “Photius’s Witness,” 353n41.

² The category of “Jewish Christianity” has historically been very popular among scholars of early Christianity, particularly since the work of Ferdinand Christian Baur, as a means of explaining the coexistence of Jewish and Christian beliefs and practices within a single community. On this, see chapter 1 below. However, as scholars have come to recognize that “Judaism” and “Christianity” had not become separate in all places until at least the fourth century CE, the continued use of the term has seen some controversy. While some advocate for its rejection altogether (see, e.g., Daniel Boyarin, “Rethinking Jewish Christianity: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category (To Which is Appended a Correction of my Border Lines),” *JQR* 99 [2009]: 7–36, and Matt Jackson-McCabe, *Jewish Christianity: The Making of the Christianity-Judaism Divide*, AYBRL [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2020]), others have argued for its retention based on the ways ancient “Jewish Christianity” upsets our notions of “Judaism” and “Christianity” (see, e.g., Edwin Broadhead, *Jewish Ways of Following Jesus: Redrawing the Religious Map of Antiquity*, WUNT 266 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010]; Petri Luomanen, *Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and Gospels*, SVigChr 110 [Leiden: Brill, 2012]; and Annette Yoshiko Reed, “Introduction: Historicizing ‘Jewish Christianity,’” in *Jewish Christianity and the History of Judaism: Collected Essays*, TSAJ 171 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018], xv–xxx). Personally, I side with those who seek to cease using the term, as it implies too sharp a distinction between it, Judaism, and Christianity. In its place, I would advocate for something like Karin Hedner Zetterholm’s (admittedly clunkier) “Jesus-oriented Jews”; see Karin Hedner Zetterholm, “Jewish Teachings for Gentiles in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*: A Reception of Ideas in Paul and Acts Shaped by a Jewish Milieu?” *Journal for the Jesus Movement and its Jewish Setting* 6 (2019): 68–87.
refers to these as the “purity of the body” and the “purity of the heart,” respectively. The differences between these are significant, particularly regarding how such states of purity are defiled and how such defilements are removed. Thus, while bodily defilement is contracted through the common bodily functions of menstruation and seminal emission, heart defilement is contracted through grave sin, the demons that infest a person as the result of that sin, and through one’s carnal conception. Similarly, while bodily defilement can be removed multiple times through a ritual lustration, heart defilement can only be removed once through an extended process involving education, asceticism, and, ultimately, baptism. After that, one can only be purified again through divine punishment.

Though it utilizes this ancient Jewish purity framework, the Homilies does not advocate for adherence to the entirety of the Jewish Law among its readers. It does not, for example, require ritual purifications after contact with a corpse, after contact with a leper or after contracting leprosy oneself, or after giving birth. Additionally, the Homilies does not encourage its readers to practice the Sabbath or to be circumcised. The reason for these absences, I argue, is that the novel does not consider such practices to be relevant to its audience of Gentiles. For some ancient Jews, Gentiles were not expected to abide by the whole of the Jewish Law, because that Law had been given to Jews specifically. However, there were elements of that Law that were given not just to Jews but to the whole of humanity, and it was these laws that Gentiles

---

3 It should be noted that “leprosy” (טערץ/λέπρα), as it existed in the ancient world, is not the same as modern-day Hansen’s disease. On this, see Matthew Thiessen, Jesus and the Forces of Death: The Gospels’ Portrayal of Ritual Impurity within First-Century Judaism (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2020), 43–54.
were expected to follow. That the Homilies was directed at Gentiles becomes apparent when one compares the Homilies to two other Jewish teachings directed at Gentiles, the Apostolic Decree and the rabbinic Noahide Laws. The overlap between the three texts suggests that the authors of the Homilies participated in a lively debate among Jews and Christians concerning Gentile legal requirements.

Before commencing the argument proper, I begin with a few preliminary notes on the text itself. Because the Homilies has often been categorized as “Jewish Christian” in the history of its study, it is little known, even among scholars of early Christianity. Thus, it is worthwhile to devote some time to introducing the text.

Introduction to the Pseudo-Clementine Literature

The Texts

The Homilies is part of a larger corpus of material that is collectively referred to as the Pseudo-Clementine Literature. This corpus, as it has survived to us today, is composed of five texts. The two longest are the Homilies and the Recognitions, a pair of novels that narrate similar plots. Though both these texts were originally written in Greek, only the former survives

---

4 This was just one of a range of perspectives on Gentile legal requirements among ancient Jews; for a broader overview, see Terence L. Donaldson, Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE) (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), 467–506.

5 As with the Homilies, I have also opted to continue referring to this work as Recognitions, as is traditional. Jones notes that this work’s title may more accurately be rendered Recognition, given the way Rufinus and Photius refer to it. See Jones, “Photius’s Witness,” 349–51.

6 Most scholars continue to refer to the Homilies and the Recognitions as “novels,” despite the inherent anachronism of such a categorization. I have only seen one challenge to it, that of István Czachesz, who argues that the texts should instead be understood as biographies; see István Czachesz, “The Clement Romance: Is It a Novel?” in The Pseudo-Clementines, ed. Jan N. Bremmer, Studies on Early Christian Apocrypha 10 (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 24–35. Since the genre of the texts factors little in my analysis of it, I have opted to continue referring to them with the traditional “novels.”

7 On a few of their differences, see the note at the end of the plot summary below.
in that language; outside of some Greek and Syriac fragments, the latter is only available in a Latin translation composed by Rufinus of Aquileia around 406 CE. The similarities between the texts means that the two likely share at least one common source, which most scholars have referred to with the German word *Grundschrift* (perhaps best translated into English as “Basic Writing”). Further sources for the novels have also been postulated; I will go into detail on this point in chapter one.

In addition to these two texts, the Pseudo-Clementine Literature also contains three introductory writings. The first is the *Epistle of Peter to James* (henceforth *EpPt*). This text depicts the apostle Peter handing off “the books of my preachings” (τῶν ἐμῶν κηρυγμάτων βιβλίων, *EpPt* 1.2) to James, brother of Jesus and bishop of Jerusalem. Peter warns James not to share his books indiscriminately, but only with those who have proven themselves worthy of receiving them (*EpPt* 1.2). The reason for this exclusivity, Peter states, is the danger of misinterpretation. In the letter, Peter laments that his teachings are already being misinterpreted, even while he is still alive; he writes, “For some of those from the Gentiles have rejected my legal preaching, having undertaken a certain lawless and foolish teaching of the man who is my enemy” (τινὲς γὰρ τῶν ἀπὸ ἐθνῶν τὸ δι’ ἐμὸν νόμιμον ἀπεδοκιμασαν κήρυγμα, τοῦ ἐχθροῦ ἀνθρώπου ἄνω τινα καὶ φλυαρώδη προσηκόμενοι διδασκάλιαν, *EpPt* 2.3). In order to

---

8 The postulation of the *Grundschrift* was a late nineteenth-century development. Earlier in the nineteenth century, scholars tended to argue that one of the works served as the source for the other. See chapter 1 below.

9 The Greek text of *EpPt*, *Diam.*, *EpCl*, and the *Homilies* comes from Bernhard Rehm, ed., *Homilien*, 3rd ed., vol. 1 of *Die Pseudoklementinen*, GCS (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1992). All translations, of this and other texts, are my own unless otherwise indicated.

10 Many scholars have interpreted “the man who is my enemy” to be a veiled reference to Paul. See, e.g., Georg Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen*, 2nd ed., TU 70 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981), 187, and Graham Stanton, “Jewish Christian Elements in the Pseudo-Clementine Writings,” in *Jewish Believers in Jesus*, 314. Other scholars have suggested that the letter attacks Marcion or a Marcionite interpreter of Paul. See, e.g., F. Stanley Jones, “Marcionism in the *Pseudo-Clementines*,” in *Pseudoclementina*, 151–71, and Giovanni Battista
prevent the misinterpretation of his books, Peter suggests the limitation of its readership to those who have been trained to interpret it correctly.11 This mention of the “books of my preachings” has led many scholars posit it as an independent source; in chapter one, I will discuss the various theories surrounding the “Preachings of Peter” (Kerygmata Petrou) source.12

The second introductory writing, called the Diamartyria (henceforth Diam.), describes James’s actions in response to EpPt. In accordance with Peter’s wishes, James establishes a process for the transmission of his preachings. James limits their reception “to someone who is good and pious, who chooses [or is chosen] to teach, who is faithful in his circumcision” (ἀγαθῷ τινι καὶ ἐῳλαβεῖ, τῷ καὶ διδάσκαιν αἵρουμένῳ ἐνπεριτόμῳ τῷ ὃντι πιστῷ, Diam. 1.1).13 After a trial of six years, this person is to adjure (“not swear, since that is not lawful,” μὴ ὁρκίσαι, ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐξεστιν, Diam. 1.2) by a body of flowing water that they will care for the texts and not share them with anyone unless they are deemed worthy (Diam. 1–4). The Diamartyria concludes with the elders of the community approving James’s ritual.

The last introductory writing, longer than the first two, is the Epistle of Clement to James (henceforth EpCl). In this text, Clement informs James of Peter’s death (EpCl 1.5) and his appointment as his successor as bishop of Rome (EpCl 2, 19). Clement also includes a


11 The necessity of education for the correct interpretation of scripture is an important theme in the Homilies, as scripture has over time accrued extraneous material thanks to the working of the Evil One. See chapter 3 below.

12 See n. 32 in chapter 1 on this source’s name.

13 This is one of only a handful of appearances of circumcision in the entirety of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature; elsewhere, it only appears in the Recognitions (Recog. 1.33.5; 5.34.2; 8.53.2; 9.28.1). Note that, in Diam., the practice is not promoted for the general public but only for teachers. See chapter 5 on the absence of a requirement for circumcision in the Homilies.
transcription of Peter’s farewell discourse. In it, Peter describes the duties of various positions within the church, including bishop, presbyter, deacon, catechists, and laity (*EpCl* 2–18).

The relationship of the introductory writings to the novels is debated among scholars. Some have argued that they were written in conjunction with either the *Grundschrift* or with one of its sources; others have argued that they were written in conjunction with, or after, the *Homilies*. Because of their unclear relationship, I have opted to focus on the *Homilies* in this dissertation, only discussing *EpPt*, *Diam.*, and *EpCl* when they may be able to shed light on the *Homilies*.

The Plot of the *Homilies*

The narrative of the *Homilies* plays an important role in its interpretation, and I frequently refer to the narrative context of the passages that I discuss in the body of the dissertation. For this reason, I provide here a detailed summary of the novel’s plot, and I also include an outline in Appendix A for reference. I divide the novel into nine sections: (1) Introduction to Clement (*Hom. 1*); (2) the Sojourn in Caesarea (*Hom. 2–3*); (3) Clement’s Debates with Appion in Tyre (*Hom. 4–6*); (4) Peter’s Discourses along the Syrian Coast (*Hom. 7*); (5) the Tripolis Discourses (*Hom. 8–11*); (6) Clement’s Recognition of his Mother and Brothers (*Hom. 12–13*); (7) Clement’s Recognition of his Father (*Hom. 14–15*); (8) Peter’s Debates with Simon in Laodicea (*Hom. 16–19*), and (9) the Conclusion of the Novel (*Hom. 20*).

---

14 One representative of the former position is Georg Strecker, who argues that *EpPt* and *Diam.* were written in conjunction with one of the *Grundschrift*’s sources, the *Kerygmaton Petrou*; see Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum*, 137–45. One representative of the latter position is John Chapman, who argues that *EpPt* and *Diam.* were written later to explain why the *Homilies* “had been unknown for three hundred years,—it had been imparted only to a select few, under a promise (ratified by blood-curdling imprecations) of absolute secrecy (*sic*)”; see John Chapman, “On the Date of the Clementines,” *ZNW* 9 (1908): 148n1. See further positions in chapter 1 below.
Introduction to Clement (Hom. 1)

As the novel’s first words “I, Clement” (ἐγὼ Κλήμης, Hom. 1.1.1) indicate, the Homilies is told from the first-person perspective of a man named Clement.\(^\text{15}\) Clement is a youth from Rome and a relative of Caesar\(^\text{16}\) who is tortured by questions about the eternity of the soul and that of the world (Hom. 1.1–2, 4). He attempts to ease his pain by hearing the opinions of the philosophers, but he finds their conclusions unsatisfying (Hom. 1.3).\(^\text{17}\) At one point, he resolves to go to Egypt and ask a necromancer to call up a soul so that he can know for certain whether the soul endures after death. Fortunately for him, a friend dissuades him from this course of action (Hom. 1.5).

As he is mulling over these questions, Clement begins to hear report of a miracle worker in Judea who is preaching about the Kingdom of God (Hom. 1.6). Later that year, he hears the preaching of one of the miracle worker’s followers (Hom. 1.7.1–6). The unnamed man’s discourse inspires Clement to travel to Caesarea (Hom. 1.7.7–8.3), and, after a brief diversion in Alexandria (Hom. 1.8.3–14.7),\(^\text{18}\) he arrives there (Hom. 1.15). Clement is greeted by the Apostle Peter, another disciple of the miracle worker, who kisses and welcomes him (Hom. 1.16).

Clement asks Peter his questions (Hom. 1.17), and Peter explains why he has been unable to find the answers he seeks (Hom. 1.18) and how he can find them through the teaching of the True

\(^{15}\) The “Pseudo-Clementine Literature” gets its title from its protagonist.

\(^{16}\) Readers do not know this about Clement yet; they will not learn that he is a relative of Caesar until Appion addresses him as such in Hom. 4.7.2.

\(^{17}\) On the Homilies’ general dissatisfaction with Greek paideia, see chapters 3 and 4.

\(^{18}\) During which Clement meets Barnabas.
Prophet (Hom. 1.19). After this, Clement becomes thoroughly convinced by Peter and declares his unshakeable faith in the proclamations of the True Prophet (Hom. 1.21).

**Sojourn in Caesarea (Hom. 2–3)**

Having become Peter’s disciple, Clement remains with him in Caesarea for a time. Over the course of the next two days, Peter delivers three discourses to his circle of disciples. The first concerns the True Prophet and his relationship to female (i.e., false) prophecy (Hom. 2.5–18, 33–34). This speech is interrupted by a discussion about Simon Magus, a figure borrowed from Acts 8:9–25 (and, in all likelihood, from the Acts of Peter) and Peter’s primary antagonist throughout the novel, who is presented as the (feminine) opposition to Peter’s proclamation of the (masculine) truth. Two of Peter’s disciples who grew up with Simon, Nicetas and Aquila, provide Peter with valuable information regarding their and Simon’s history in order to prepare him for an upcoming debate with Simon (Hom. 2.19–32). This debate was supposed to transpire that day, but after his discourse, another of Peter’s disciples, Zacchaeus, informs him that Simon has requested that the debate be deferred to the next day (Hom. 2.35). The delay allows Peter to

---

19 On Peter’s answer, see chapter 4.


21 The Homilies seems to know the Acts of Peter, and it seems to position its narrative between the events of the gospels and those of the Acts of Peter. Because of this, scholars have tended to date the composition of the Peter-Simon narrative preserved in the Homilies to after the composition of the Acts of Peter. See chapter 1 below.
embark on a second discourse on the presence of false scriptures within the Torah (*Hom. 2.37–52*), and, after resting for the night, Peter delivers a third discourse in which he brings together the previous day’s themes by explaining the utility of false scriptures and the role of the True Prophet in distinguishing between true and false scriptures. He also debunks some false scriptures (including, importantly, the narrative of Adam’s sin), and concludes with the opposition between male and female prophecy (*Hom. 2.2–28*).

At the end of this discourse, Peter is summoned to begin his debate with Simon. Simon attacks God’s oneness, goodness, and providence, as well as Adam’s goodness and capacity to foreknow, and Peter defends both God and Adam by acknowledging the existence of false scriptures and the necessity to learn to distinguish between true and false scriptures through the teaching of the True Prophet (*Hom. 3.30–57*). After three days of debate (only the first of which is related to the reader), Simon flees to Tyre (*Hom. 3.58*). Peter concludes his sojourn in Caesarea by delivering a final speech to the crowds, in which he appoints Zacchaeus to succeed him as bishop and describes the duties of church leaders and members (*Hom. 3.60–72*).

**Clement’s Debates with Appion in Tyre (Hom. 4–6)**

Since Peter is detained for a week baptizing the inhabitants of Caesarea, he decides to send Clement, Nicetas, and Aquila ahead of him to Tyre to learn what Simon is doing there.

---

22 This teaching is commonly known as the “Doctrine of the False Pericopes.” I will discuss it in greater detail in chapter 3.

23 See chapter 3 on Peter’s defense of Adam as the True Prophet.

24 By contrast, the Recognitions relates all three days of debates in Caesarea. Because of this, some have argued that the Recognitions preserves the outline of the Grundschrift better than the Homilies. See also n. 36.

25 This section has much in common with EpCl; Strecker argues that they were both written by the Grundschrift author. On the section, see Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum*, 97–116.
(Hom. 3.73). The trio are told of Simon’s deeds in the city (Hom. 4.4–5), but before they can send a letter to inform Peter, Simon moves on to Sidon. He leaves behind a few of his disciples, Appion Pleistonices,26 Annubion the Diospolitan, and Athenodorus the Athenian (Hom. 4.6), all of whom Clement knows, since they are friends of his family. When they meet, Appion greets Clement warmly but mocks him for becoming a disciple of Peter (Hom. 4.7). Clement chastises him for this, and the two decide to debate their views before a crowd (Hom. 4.8–9). Clement then delivers a discourse on the ill effects of Greek paideia (Hom. 4.11–22).27 Incensed at Clement’s arguments, Appion promises to return the following day to defend the Greek myths against Clement’s accusations (Hom. 4.24).

However, Appion does not appear the next day. Clement is informed by the crowd that Appion fell ill after their discussion the previous day (Hom. 5.1). Clement suggests that they go visit him, but before doing so, they ask Clement to discourse to them again. He obliges and tells them about a trick that he had once played on Appion when he was younger. Clement, who was distressed by his questions about the eternity of the soul and the world, fell ill during one of Appion’s visits, and Appion asked after the nature of his ailment (Hom. 5.2). Clement, wanting to trick his friend, pretended to be lovesick, having fallen in love with a married Jewish woman (Hom. 5.3). After rejecting Appion’s suggestion to win her over by magic (Hom. 5.4–8), Clement convinced Appion to write her a letter defending adultery (Hom. 5.9–19). Clement then wrote


27 On this, see chapter 3.
back pretending to be the fictitious woman, defending chastity and angering Appion before revealing the ruse (Hom. 5.20–29). After Clement concludes his story, he and the crowds go to visit Appion, who promises to meet with them the next day (Hom. 5.30).

Appion keeps his word this time. He argues that the myths of the Greek gods are not meant to be taken literally, but are metaphors for deeper truths (Hom. 6.1–10). Appion becomes upset when he sees that Clement is not paying attention, but Clement states that he is distracted simply because he is already familiar with Appion’s arguments; to demonstrate, he continues them (Hom. 6.11–16). Afterward, Clement attacks the myths as unethical and argues further that the gods are either not real or were human magicians (Hom. 6.17–25). Before Appion can respond, Peter arrives in Tyre, and thus Appion withdraws with Annubion and Athenodorus (Hom. 6.26).

**Peter’s Discourses along the Syrian Coast (Hom. 7)**

In Hom. 7, the narrative attention turns to Peter, and the reader is presented with visits to several cities in quick succession. First, Peter preaches to the people of Tyre, describing how they, by feasting with Simon, have submitted themselves to the power of demons, and that they can be saved by turning to God. The people respond to Peter’s discourse by repenting and being baptized (Hom. 7.2–5). Peter then proceeds to Sidon, once again missing Simon, who had already left for Beirut. Peter delivers a speech to the Sidonians similar to the one he had given in Tyre, and the people respond by repenting (Hom. 7.6–8).28

When Peter pursues Simon to Beirut, he is met with an earthquake. Simon blames the earthquake on Peter, and Peter, rather than denying it, uses Simon’s accusation to his advantage

---

28 There is no explicit mention of baptism here, but based on Peter’s counsel to be baptized (cf. Hom. 7.8.1) and his establishment of a church in the city (cf. Hom. 7.8.3), baptisms are implied to have occurred.
by convincing the people of Beirut of his power. The inhabitants respond by casting Simon and his followers out of the city. Peter then delivers a brief speech contrasting himself and Simon, at the conclusion of which the people repent and are baptized (Hom. 7.9.1–12.2). Homilies 7 concludes with a final stop in Byblos, where Peter heals and teaches before pursuing Simon to Tripolis (Hom. 12.2–3).

**Tripolis Discourses (Hom. 8–11)**

Peter arrives in Tripolis in pursuit of Simon (Hom. 8.1), but Simon once again flees shortly afterward (Hom. 8.3). Nevertheless, Peter stays and discourses, and in this instance four days of discourses are narrated to the reader. The first occurs the day after Peter arrives; though Peter had promised a day earlier to speak to the crowd in two days’ time, the crowd could not wait that long and arrives a day early (Hom. 8.2–3). The eagerness of the crowds inspires Peter to make a brief comment to his disciples about the relationship between the teachings of Moses and Jesus (Hom. 8.4–7).

Peter then goes out to the crowd, and, over the next two days, teaches about primordial history in a way that is inspired by the Watchers narratives of 1 Enoch and Jubilees (Hom. 8.9–23, 9.2–7), as well as about demons (Hom. 9.8–23). On the third day, Peter gives a brief comment to his disciples about the moral difference between ignorance and error (Hom. 10.2) before going out to the crowd and arguing against many apologies for idolatry (Hom. 10.3–25).

---

29 This will not be the only time that Peter uses one of Simon’s ruses to his own advantage; see the discussion of Hom. 20 below.

30 Again, no baptisms are narrated here. In this instance, it is possible that the author omitted them because of how rushed Peter is to leave Byblos; he remains in Byblos “only a few days” (μιᾶς ἡμέρας, Hom. 7.12.3).

31 On this speech, see chapter 5.
He continues this subject on the fourth day (Hom. 11.2–18) and concludes by discussing the necessity and efficacy of baptism (Hom. 11.22–27) and the importance of maintaining bodily purity (Hom. 11.28–33). The stay in Tripolis concludes with the baptism of its inhabitants, as well as that of Clement himself (Hom. 11.35–36).

**Clement’s Recognition of his Mother and Brothers (Hom. 12–13)**

At this point, the narrative focus returns to Clement. Peter and his disciples travel from Tripolis to Antaradus, with the goal of pursuing Simon to Antioch. Before making their way there, however, Peter takes note of the crowds that are following him, which have grown significantly since he first set out from Caesarea. He expresses concern that approaching a city with such a sizeable crowd would spark envy in its inhabitants, and he thus decides to send a few smaller contingents ahead of him to stagger their entry. He chooses Nicetas and Aquila to lead two contingents into their next destination, Laodicea (Hom. 12.1–3). Clement is relieved that he was not chosen for this task, as he does not want to leave Peter’s side, and he expresses gratitude that he is able to have Peter in the place of his parents (Hom. 12.4–7).

This mention of Clement’s family causes Peter to ask about his family history. Clement tells him that he does not know where they are or whether they are still alive. His mother, Mattidia, had received a vision that she and Clement’s twin brothers, Faustinus and Faustinianus, had to leave Rome, or else suffer a terrible fate (Hom. 12.8). His father, Faustus, immediately sent them to Athens (Hom. 12.9), but when Faustus and Clement did not hear from their family for four years, when Clement was twelve years old, Faustus decided to travel to Athens himself to check on them. Clement has not heard from any of them since (Hom. 12.10).
After telling this story, a few of Peter’s disciples ask to travel to the nearby island of Aradus to do some sightseeing (Hom. 12.12). Instead of enjoying the sights, Peter interacts with a woman who is begging on the island. He asks why she is begging and not working, and she tells him that she has gnawed on her hands to the point that she can no longer use them (Hom. 12.13). She then reveals her misfortune to him: She was once married and had three children, but, when her brother-in-law began to make advances on her, she resolved to flee, thinking that this course of action was better than either submitting to his demands or exposing him to her husband (Hom. 12.15). Thus, she feigned having a vision that demanded that she leave and embarked for Athens with two of her sons. Before they could reach Athens, they suffered a shipwreck, and she was separated from her children (Hom. 12.16). She washed up on Aradus, where she was taken in by a woman who had lost her husband at sea (Hom. 12.17). Since then, her host had begun to suffer a debilitating illness, and she has been begging to support both of them (Hom. 12.18).

The parallels between the beggar’s story and that of Clement are not lost on Peter, and he asks her for more details. Unfortunately, the details between her and Clement’s stories end up not matching. Peter then recounts the details of Clement’s story to her (Hom. 12.19–20), and after hearing about Clement, the woman reveals that she had been lying about some of the details of her story, and that she is, in fact, Clement’s mother, Mattidia (Hom. 12.21). Mother and son are subsequently reunited (Hom. 12.22).

Mattidia asks that she bid farewell to her host before they leave, and Peter heals both of them of their ailments (Hom. 12.23). Before leaving, he tells the crowd that had witnessed the healings to meet him in Antioch, where he plans to preach about salvation. Clement gives Mattidia’s host some money, and they return to Antaradus (Hom. 12.24). Before they turn in for the night, Peter delivers a discourse to his disciples on the virtue of philanthropy (Hom. 12.25–33).

The next morning, the company proceeds toward Laodicea. When they reach the city, they are met by Nicetas and Aquila, who ask about the woman (Hom. 13.1). Peter tells the twins what had happened, and once they hear the story, they reveal that they are Clement’s twin brothers, Faustinus and Faustinianus. They wish to see their mother immediately, but she has since fallen asleep, and Peter asks that they wait until she has woken up, and then he will introduce them to her (Hom. 13.2–3). When she awakens, Peter begins informing her about some of the peculiarities surrounding their mode of worship (Hom. 13.4). Mattidia, having already undertaken a belief system similar to what Peter is describing, asks to be baptized right away (Hom. 13.5). Before Peter can respond, the twins, who can no longer contain their excitement, reveal themselves to their mother. They then explain what happened to them following the shipwreck: They had been abducted by pirates and sold to a woman named Justa, a Jewish proselyte, before becoming disciples of Simon and then of Peter (Hom. 13.6–8; cf. Hom. 3.19–32). The family then pleads with Peter that she be baptized, but Peter convinces them to wait until the following day to do so (Hom. 13.9–12). The day concludes with a discourse from Peter about the virtue of chastity (Hom. 13.13–21).

33 On the ambiguity of this term, see chapter 5.
Clement’s Recognition of his Father (Hom. 14–15)

The next morning, Peter baptizes Mattidia, the men bathe and pray together, and then Peter sends her and her sons ahead of him before, after a few hours, returning to have a meal with them (Hom. 14.1). Peter then explains the delay in his return: After they had prayed together, Peter was approached by an old man who claimed that praying to God was a waste of time; the world is not controlled by a god, but by fate (Hom. 14.2–3). Peter argued against him (Hom. 14.4–5), but the old man remained unconvinced due to his personal experience. He claimed that he was an astrologer who was able to accurately predict the lives of a married couple, relatives of Caesar, that he knew in Rome. Based on when they were born and the position of the stars, he was able to ascertain that the wife would commit adultery with one of her slaves and perish while travelling by sea. The husband’s brother confirmed that this is what happened, and, indeed, that she had approached him as well, before feigning a dream to justify leaving with her sons for Athens and subsequently perishing in the sea. When the husband had not heard from them, he and the astronomer went after them, only for the husband to die of a broken heart (Hom. 14.6–7).

Again, the parallels between the old astronomer’s narrative and those of Clement and Mattidia were not lost on Peter, and he asked for the names of this family. The astronomer confirmed their names, and Peter then returned to eat and share the news that their father had passed (Hom. 14.8). Soon, however, the astronomer arrives, and Mattidia recognizes him as her

---

34 The phrase in Hom. 14.1.4, “breaking the bread after thanksgiving” (τὸν ἄρτον ἐπ’ εὐχαριστίᾳ κλάσας), is sometimes interpreted as a reference to the Eucharist; see, e.g., ANF 8:305n3. However, εὐχαριστία can simply refer to “giving thanks,” and this seems to have been the interpretation adopted by the Syriac translator: “Peter said a blessing and broke the bread” (ܐܬܝܡܐ ܓܘ ܠܓܐ ܘ ܙܐ ܝܐ ܡܠܐ). For his part, Andrew Brian McGowen has argued that the Pseudo-Clementine Literature lacks the Eucharist, or indeed “any one meal radically distinguished from all others in sacral quality”; see Andrew Brian McGowen, Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 121.
husband Faustus (Hom. 14.9). Peter asks Faustus why he had lied about his identity, and Faustus explains that he did not want people to recognize him as a relative of Caeser and force him to return to Rome (Hom. 14.10). Despite this happy reunion, Faustus is still convinced of the power of fate (Hom. 14.11–12). The next day, Peter expresses his eagerness to convince Faustus of their religion (Hom. 15.1), and the two engage in discussions, particularly focusing on the temporary reign of the Evil One and the eternal reign of God (Hom. 15.2–11).

**Peter’s Debates with Simon in Laodicea (Hom. 16–19)**

Simon Magus hears of this initial discussion that Peter has with Faustus and arrives from Antioch to challenge Peter (Hom. 16.1). Over the next four days, a series of debates transpire between them, of which Faustus volunteers to be the arbiter (Hom. 16.3–4). On the first day, the two dispute scripture’s perspective on the unity of God; Peter argues that scripture claims God is one, while Simon argues that scripture claims that there are many gods. As he had done in Caesarea, Peter once again argues that the scriptures to which Simon appeals should either be interpreted differently or are false (Hom. 16.5–14). The discussion then moves to Christ; Peter argues that Christ is not God, but is the Son of God (Hom. 16.15–16). The first day concludes with a discussion of two aspects of God, God’s form (Hom. 16.17, 19) and God’s name (Hom. 16.18). Peter laments Simon’s ability to lead people astray after he leaves (Hom. 16.21).

The next day, Simon arrives early to make accusations against Peter before he arrives (Hom. 17.1). Zacchaeus reports these accusations to Peter: Simon charges Peter with being a

---

35 Some scholars point to this as an Arian influence, which assists in the dating of the text. See below.

36 According to the narrative of the Homilies thus far, Zacchaeus should be in Caesarea; his presence in Laodicea thus likely reflects the editorial activity of the Homilies’ redactor(s). This is confirmed by parallels between Hom. 16–19 and Recog. 2–3, which take place in Caesarea. Based on this evidence, it has been common to argue that the Recognitions preserves the narrative structure of the Grundschrift better that the Homilies (even if the Homilies
magician (Hom. 17.2) and with believing that God has a form (Hom. 17.3) and that God is both good and just (Hom. 17.4–5), both of which Simon considers impossible. Simon has not mischaracterized Peter’s beliefs here, and Peter goes out to defend the former (Hom. 17.6). Peter argues, among other things, that God must have a form both because human beings have been made in the image of that form (cf. Gen 1:27), and so that the pure of heart can see God (Hom. 17.7–11; cf. Matt 5:8). From this, Peter proceeds to discuss the importance of fearing God for leading an ethical life (Hom. 17.11–12) and the superiority of first-hand experience to visions (Hom. 17.13–19).

The third day’s debate begins with a discussion of the goodness and justice of God. Simon argues that one cannot be both good and just, while Peter maintains that one is good because one is just (Hom. 18.1–3). By making his argument, Simon is preparing to argue that there is a (good) god higher than the (just) Creator, and that he has been sent by that higher god to reveal him to the people. Peter, of course, argues vigorously against him (Hom. 18.4–20).

Peter’s concluding argument on the false material of scripture provides Simon with a pretext to leave (Hom. 18.21), but before he does, Peter gives one final remark that prompts Simon to ask about the origin of evil (Hom. 18.22–23). The Evil One thus becomes the center of the discussion on the final day of debates. Simon asks about the origin of the Evil One, and, though he is reticent to broach the subject at all, Peter ultimately decides to speculate on the matter (Hom. 19.1–8). After weighing some of the options, Peter concludes that God mixed the

preserves the Grundschrift’s perspective better); see F. Stanley Jones, “Introduction to the Pseudo-Clementines,” in Pseudoclementina, 37, 40.

elements that compose the Evil One,\textsuperscript{38} and that the Evil One’s choice to engage in evil was part of God’s plan for creation, but he nevertheless locates the Evil One’s decision to do evil squarely within his free will (\textit{Hom.} 19.9–16). Simon proposes some other explanations for the origin of the Evil One, each of which Peter rejects (\textit{Hom.} 19.17–22).\textsuperscript{39} After a brief digression on inequalities between people (\textit{Hom.} 19.23), Simon requests three days to prepare a response to Peter’s arguments about the Evil One, but he is stopped by Faustus, who rebukes him and declares Peter the victor of the debates (\textit{Hom.} 19.24). Defeated, Simon gnashes his teeth and leaves (\textit{Hom.} 19.25).

\textit{Conclusion to the Novel (Hom. 20)}

The final section of the \textit{Homilies} can be divided in two. First, there is a private discussion between Peter and his disciples. After his debate with Simon, one of Peter’s disciples, Sophonias, tells him that their discussion about the Evil One has left him with a few questions, and he requests that he be permitted to ask them the following morning (\textit{Hom.} 19.25). Peter agrees, and, the next morning, Sophonias asks Peter to restate his position on the Evil One, this time in a more orderly fashion than he had with Simon. In his response, Peter establishes an opposition between two beings, the Evil One, who rules this world, and the Good One (\textit{Hom.} 20.2–3).\textsuperscript{40} Another disciple, Micah, then asks why people sin, and Peter attributes this to ignorance (\textit{Hom.} 20.4).\textsuperscript{41} Sophonias asks whether God can beget something unlike himself, and Peter

\textsuperscript{38} Note the word “mixed”; the \textit{Homilies} is very careful not to attribute God with the direct creation of the Evil One.

\textsuperscript{39} I go into greater depth about the Evil One in chapter 3.

\textsuperscript{40} The Good One, it should be noted, is the True Prophet, not God himself.

\textsuperscript{41} Peter rarely charges anyone other than Simon with intentionally engaging in evil. On the significance of knowledge and ignorance to purity of the heart, see chapters 3 and 4.
acknowledges that God cannot; when God begets, he can send forth something that is of the same substance (ὁμοούσιον) as himself, but of unequal power (ἰσοδύναμον δὲ οὖ, Hom. 20.7.6; cf. Hom. 20.5–7).\(^{42}\) Micah asks if the Evil One and the Good One came to exist in the same way, and Peter flatly denies this; the Evil One is a combination of elements, while the Good One is begotten of God. Peter hedges his bets here, however, stating that, since these things are unwritten, his speculations are merely that—speculations (Hom. 20.8). Another disciple, Lazarus, then asks why the Evil One is sent to the lower darkness for doing God’s will. Peter argues that the lower darkness is not a punishment for the Evil One; since the Evil One is composed of fire, he rejoices in the darkness, but human souls, which are composed of light, are tortured by it (Hom. 20.9).\(^{43}\) The final question comes from Joseph, who asks why not everyone receives their gospel. Peter states that it is because people have free will, and his discourses are not magical spells. This section concludes with the disciples blessing Peter (Hom. 20.10).

In the remainder of Hom. 20, Faustus becomes the central character. He receives word that Appion and Annubion had just arrived and are staying with Simon, and he requests that Peter grant him leave to visit them (Hom. 20.11). When Faustus returns, he bears Simon’s visage, and his family is dismayed (Hom. 20.12).\(^{44}\) At the same time, Peter receives report that, while Simon was in Antioch, he had spread many slanders about Peter, to the point that it would be unsafe for Peter to enter the city. Peter is also told that Simon had fled Antioch due to a report

---

\(^{42}\) Another possible Arian influence. See below.

\(^{43}\) This differs from the portrayal of hell that Peter had given to the people of Tripolis, where he describes it as a “purifying fire” (Hom. 9.9.4). See chapter 3.

\(^{44}\) Though his family is affected, the Homilies notes that Peter is unaffected by this magic and can see Faustus plainly.
of an imperial crackdown on magicians, a report that was contrived by Cornelius, a Roman
centurion sympathetic to Peter (Hom. 20.13; cf. Acts 10:1–33). Peter deduces that Simon has
changed Faustus’s visage to his own in order to escape the authorities (Hom. 20.14). Annubion
confirms this deduction when he arrives shortly thereafter, and also informs Peter of Simon’s
flight to Judea (Hom. 20.15–17).

Since Peter knows that the imperial crackdown is fictitious and that Simon is not actually
being hunted, he decides to use Faustus’s new visage to his advantage. He commands Faustus to
go to Antioch and, as Simon, to repent of Simon’s slanders against Peter so that he can then enter
the city safely (Hom. 20.18–20). While they are gone, Appion and Athenodorus then come in
search of Faustus, and Peter and Clement pretend that they have not seen him (Hom. 20.21–22).
The novel concludes with the success of Faustus’s mission and Peter’s departure to Antioch
(Hom. 20.23).

Excursus: Parallels with the Recognitions

The Homilies is the focus of this dissertation, but before moving on to a discussion of its
manuscript tradition, I want to highlight some of the significant narrative differences between the
Homilies and the Recognitions. The Recognitions can be split into five sections: (1) Introduction
to Clement (Recog. 1), (2) the Sojourn in Caesarea (Recog. 2–3), (3) the Tripolis Discourses
(Recog. 4–6), (4) Clement’s Recognition of his Mother and Brothers (Recog. 7), and (5) the
 Debates with the Old Man in Laodicea (Recog. 8–10). The most obvious differences are the
elements in the Homilies missing from this outline. The Recognitions does not contain Clement’s
debate with Appion in Tyre, nor does it contain a second debate with Simon in Laodicea.

The first and fourth sections are the closest to their parallels in the Homilies, though in
general the Recognitions’ narrative is more streamlined: Clement is not diverted to Alexandria
on his way to Caesarea, there is no speech on philanthropy after the reunion of Clement and Mattidia, and the speech on chastity following Mattidia’s reunion with her sons is much briefer than its parallel in the *Homilies* (cf. *Recog.* 7.37–38). The most significant difference in these sections is the inclusion of *Recog.* 1.27–71, in which Peter gives an account of history from creation to the present moment. This section has some overlaps with Peter’s speeches in *Hom.* 8–9, but the unique perspective provided by *Recog.* 1.27–71 has led many scholars to conclude that it comes from an independent source.45

In contrast with the *Homilies*, the debate with Simon is a larger focus of the Caesarea narrative in the *Recognitions*. While only the first day of their debate was reported in the *Homilies*, the *Recognitions* reports the events of all three days. Because some of the material contained in this section overlaps with *Hom.* 16–19, and because Zacchaeus is present in *Hom.* 17, it is likely that at least some of *Hom.* 16–19 was contained within the Caesarea episode in the *Grundschrift*.46

The Tripolis discourses are also streamlined in the *Recognitions*. They take place over three days, as opposed to the *Homilies*’ four; the material of *Hom.* 8–9, spread over two discourses, appears in a single discourse in *Recog.* 4. *Recognitions* 4 also differs from *Hom.* 8–9 in that it does not contain any of the influences from *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*. It is unclear whether these differences are due to the editorial work of the redactor(s) of the *Recognitions*, those of the *Homilies*, or some combination of both.47 In addition, the arguments against idolatry, which are

---

45 This source is sometimes referred to as the *Anabathmoi Jakobou*. See chapter 1.

46 See nn. 24 and 36.

47 See the discussion in Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum*, 70–72.
spread across *Hom.* 10–11, appear in a single discourse in *Recog.* 5. *Recognitions* 6 is thus much shorter, only covering the material that is in *Hom.* 11.19–35.

The greatest number of differences between the *Homilies* and the *Recognitions* appear in the last section, *Recog.* 8–10. Rather than having a second debate with Simon, Peter and his disciples instead debate an old man who who is, at the conclusion of their second day of debates, revealed to be Clement’s father (called Faustinianus in the *Recognitions*). This section contains some overlap with the material in Clement’s debates with Appion in *Hom.* 4–6, but it also draws on its own sources (including the only extant source of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature, Bardaisan’s *Book of the Laws of Countries*). There is also a possibility that the original Greek *Recognitions* did not contain the transformation of the visage of Clement’s father. In a letter presenting his translation to the bishop Gaudentius, Rufinus states that, of the two editions of the Clement narrative that are known to him, one lacks that story entirely; based on the strong similarity between the narrative in both recensions, Bernhard Rehm has argued that Rufinus supplied *Recog.* 10.52.2–65.5 from the narrative in the *Homilies*, while *Recog.* 10.65.a–72.5 is derived from another composition entirely.\(^48\)

**Manuscript Tradition**

Only two manuscripts preserve (almost) the whole narrative of the *Homilies* in its original Greek. The older of the two, Codex Parisinus gr. 930 (henceforth P), has been variously dated from the tenth to the twelfth centuries.\(^49\) P contains most of the *Homilies*, but the last few pages have been lost; the text breaks off in *Hom.* 19.14.3. The younger manuscript, Codex

---


Vaticanus Ottobonianus gr. 443 (henceforth O), was copied in 1562–1564 CE by Nikolaos Turrianos and an assistant.\textsuperscript{50} O contains the whole text, and thus is our only witness to Hom. 20. Additionally, there are two Greek epitomes of note. The first (henceforth E) was likely made in the fifth or sixth century to supplement the \textit{Martyrdom of Clement}. The text mainly preserves the narrative portions of the \textit{Homilies} and removes much of the didactic material. A shorter epitome (henceforth e), put together by Symeon Metaphrastes in the tenth century, is essentially a further epitomization of E.\textsuperscript{51} These four texts serve as the basis for the most recent critical edition, which was worked on by a number of scholars, most especially Bernhard Rehm, and was initially published in 1953 before undergoing two further editions.\textsuperscript{52} E has also recently received a critical edition, put together by Francis Xaver Risch.\textsuperscript{53}

Though full versions of the \textit{Homilies} are rare, portions of the novel have been preserved across a variety of languages, including Syriac, Arabic, Georgian, Slavonic, and Ethiopic.\textsuperscript{54} The most significant of these is the Syriac translation of \textit{Hom.} 10.1–12.24, 13.1–14.12 preserved in British Museum add. 12,150. This manuscript is not only the oldest extant version of the \textit{Homilies}, but is the oldest manuscript bearing a date; the scribe copying the manuscript reports

\begin{footnotes}
\item[52] Bernhard Rehm, ed., \textit{Homilien}, 3rd ed., vol. 1 of \textit{Die Pseudoklementinen}, GCS (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1992; 2nd ed: 1969; 1st ed: 1953). In the forward, Georg Strecker describes how work passed from Franz Xaver Funk to Gerhard Loeschcke, then to Werner Heintze, and then to Josef Svennung, before finally being completed by Bernhard Rehm; and even then, final edits were required after his passing. See Georg Strecker, forward to \textit{Homilien}, v–vi.
\end{footnotes}
that he was working in Edessa in 411 CE. The Syriac text is not a straightforward translation of the extant Greek, and its translator (or, perhaps, the text from which that translator works) makes some significant deviations from the Greek. Most obviously, the translation of Hom. 12.1–13.7 frequently draws from, and sometimes is based on, the parallel text in the Recognitions, Recog. 7.1–33. Additionally, as I will show, the Syriac translator’s ideology sometimes compels him to alter the text, particularly when dealing with questions of purity. Because of these alterations, I prioritize the Greek in the dissertation. A critical edition of Syriac, as well as an attempt at a Greek retro-translation, was published by Wilhelm Frankenberg in 1937. When I compare the Greek to the Syriac text, I also check it against F. Stanley Jones’s English translation of the Syriac, which is based on his yet unpublished edition.

Date and Place

Though earlier scholarship had located the composition of the Homilies in Rome, after the work of Gerhard Uhlhorn, most scholars have opted to locate it in Syria. This locating is

---


56 In particular, the Syriac omits any reference to intercourse as defiling, as well as the need for baptism to occur in “living” (i.e., flowing) water. See the discussion of the former in chapter 3 and the latter in chapter 4.


58 Jones, The Syriac Pseudo-Clementines, 46.

59 Such was the opinion of, for example, F.C. Baur, Adolph Schliemann, and Adolph Hilgenfeld. See my analysis of their works in chapter 1.

60 See Gerhard Uhlhorn, Die Homilien und Recognitionen des Clemens Romanus nach ihrem Ursprung und Inhalt dargestellt (Göttingen: Dieterichsche Buchhandlung, 1854), 381–429. Uhlhorn only located the Homilies in Syria, but his arguments for doing so would eventually be used to justify locating the Recognitions in Syria as well. For a summary of those arguments, see Jones, “The Pseudo-Clementines: A History of Research,” 58n44. Palestine has also been suggested as a possibility; see, e.g., Joseph Langen, Die Klemensromane. Ihre Entstehung und ihre Tendenzen aufs neue untersucht (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perths, 1890), 102–4.
usually justified through its Jewish-Christian perspective, which would have been more at home in Syria than in Rome. Though I question the utility of the category of “Jewish Christianity,” the similarities between the Pseudo-Clementine Literature and other ancient Syrian works are undeniable. In particular, the use of Bardaisan’s *Book of the Laws of Countries* in the *Grundschrift* and/or the *Recognitions*, as well as the similar themes that exist in the Pseudo-Clementine Literature, the *Didaskalia apostolorum*, and the *Acts of Thomas*, are decisive in this regard. While most scholars opt not to get more specific, a few scholars have; Jan Bremmer, for example, argues that the *Grundschrift* and its revisions were composed in Edessa, and F. Stanley Jones suggests Antioch its place of composition.

In early scholarship, there was a tendency to date the *Homilies* to the second century, because it was thought to represent the positions of the “Jewish-Christian” community in Jerusalem. However, starting with the work of Charles Bigg, the date of the *Homilies* was moved to the fourth century. Bigg’s argument revolved, in part, around the presence of Arian perspectives within the text (cf. *Hom.* 16.15–16; 20.5–7), which would not allow for a date before the fourth century. This date was subsequently widely adopted in scholarship, even

---

61 In addition to Uhlhorn’s work cited in the previous note, see, e.g., Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum*, 255–68.

62 See the discussion in chapter 1.


66 These are the positions of Baur, Schliemann, Hilgenfeld, Uhlhorn, and Langen. See chapter 1.

among those who objected to the characterization of the *Homilies* as Arian, and forms the consensus today. If Eusebius’s reference to the “Dialogues of Peter and Apion” (Πέτρου δῆ και Ἀπίωνος δίδαξαι) in his *Ecclesiastical History* (*Hist. eccl.* 3.38.5) is a reference to the *Homilies*, then we can narrow the date of its composition further, as it provides a *terminus ante quem* of 324–325 CE. As a result, Jones dates the date of the novel to 320–324 CE. Whatever the exact date, the first quarter of the fourth century seems likely for the completion of the *Homilies*.

**Plan for the Dissertation**

Before I proceed to my own analysis of purity in the *Homilies*, I begin in the first chapter by looking back to prior scholarship on the matter. Most of this work was performed under the assumption that Judaism and Christianity were disparate, mutually exclusive entities in the ancient world. Thus, the presence of “Jewish” elements in the otherwise “Christian” Pseudo-Clementines required explanation. In the search for these explanations, scholars proposed a number of source-critical reconstructions for the texts, in which its “Jewish” elements were accounted for by being attributed either to “Jewish” or “Jewish-Christian” layers of the text, or, in some cases, to the use of a literary device. These approaches to the Pseudo-Clementines dominated much of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but, starting in the 1970s, they were criticized both for their prioritization of ideology in the differentiation of sources and, later, for their underlying assumptions about the history of the development of Judaism and Christianity.

---


This dissertation takes its cues from those critiques and approaches the subject of purity in the *Homilies* differently. I do not assume, for example, that the “Jewish” and “Christian” elements of the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* are mutually exclusive; rather, I argue that the novel was formed in a context in which a distinction between “Judaism” and “Christianity” had not yet occurred. I also do not analyze the *Homilies* as a collection of sources, but as a unity that reflects the point of view of its final editor(s), who compiled and edited their sources in harmony with their worldview. Because I focus on the *Homilies*, I limit my comments to that text, only looking to the *Recognitions*—a text compiled and edited by a different set of editors with a different set of goals—when doing so would be illustrative for understanding the *Homilies*.

In the second chapter, I begin my analysis of purity in the *Homilies*. I start with what I consider to be the center of the *Homilies*’ understanding of purity, *Hom.* 11.28–29. In this passage, Peter argues that purity can be divided into two kinds: purity of the body and purity of the heart. This twofold conception of purity is, I argue, very similar to the way that other ancient Jews understood purity, as has been argued by scholars such as Tikva Frymer-Kensky, David Wright, Jonathan Klawans, Christophe Nihan, and Mila Ginsburskaya. Despite agreeing with many of the critiques that have been levelled against these scholars’ proposals, I nonetheless find their theories useful, not as a way of explaining the origin of purity laws but instead as describing a common hermeneutical tool used by ancient Jews to understand these laws, particularly during and after the Second Temple period. I then embark on an analysis of the two kinds of purity in the *Homilies*. I begin by noting the differences in vocabulary that each kind of purity employs. In this section, I find that, with some exceptions, καθαρσίς and its cognates are used for terms related to purity of the heart, while ἁγνεία and its cognates tend to be used for bodily purity.
In chapter three, I move on to discuss another significant difference between bodily purity and purity of the heart: the sources of its defilement. The sources of bodily defilement are different depending on the version that one reads. In the Greek text of the Homilies, the body is defiled by menstrual blood and seminal emission. In the Syriac translation, however, only menstrual blood is considered defiling; the translation contains no reference to the defilement of seminal emission. I argue that this difference is no accident, but is due to an ideological disagreement between the Greek and its Syriac translator. This can be seen particularly by how the Syriac translator alters the Greek’s text; it does not merely omit the reference to seminal emission, but it replaces it with a call to avoid intercourse except for the production of children, an exhortation that the Syriac translator got from the parallel in the Recognitions. The sources of heart defilement, by contrast, do not vary between versions. These are grave sin, the demons that invade one’s person as a result of that sin, and one’s carnal conception. The Homilies dedicates the most attention to sin, defining these grave sins and describing their consequences: the loss of the “likeness” of God from one’s soul and the granting of permission to demons to possess the person. In this chapter, I dedicate space to the discussion of demonic motivations for possessing a person and their tactics for encouraging them to sin, as knowing these are significant for understanding the Homilies’ method of purification from heart defilement. However, baptism, the culmination of the purification process, not only has the power to cleanse a person of sin and grant them power over demons, but also replaces their first, earthly conception with a reconception through water. By doing this, the person becomes totally purified, and they can then, provided they continue to engage in good works after their baptisms, enter the Kingdom of God upon their death.
In chapter four, I analyze four other characteristics of defilement: its durability, its transmissibility, the limitations it imposes on those who have contracted it, and the methods by which it is removed. With respect to durability, the *Homilies* argues that both bodily defilement and heart defilement remain until they are removed by their respective purification rituals, but rituals for the former can be repeated while rituals for the latter cannot. If one contracts sins following one’s baptism, one can only be purified by God’s punishment.

The *Homilies* says little about the transmissibility of bodily defilement, and thus not much about it can be said for certain. The defilement of seminal emission likely spreads to both partners participating in intercourse, and menstrual defilement likely spreads via contact, but even these are only speculations. By contrast, heart defilement, though often discussed using the metaphor of disease (particularly rabies), cannot spread; rather, one must choose to sin themselves in order to contract it.

When one contracts defilement, they become limited in certain ways. For bodily defilement, the most obvious of these limitations is the prohibition of intercourse during menstruation. Other limitations might be present as well; based on similar, but ultimately distinct, rituals that are performed by Peter and his disciples in the narrative, one can speculate that a person would have been barred from community meals and prayers when their body was defiled. What is speculation with respect to bodily defilement, however, is certain with respect to heart defilement. Prior to one’s purification through baptism, one is not permitted to engage in community meals or prayers with the baptized, and Clement and Mattidia are frequently portrayed as being prohibited from these activities prior to their baptisms.

Chapter four concludes with a discussion of the means of purification from defilement. For purification from bodily defilement, we once again can only speculate based on the washings
performed by Peter and his disciples. Thus, while it is certain that washings were required after intercourse and menstruation, it is uncertain whether these washings needed to occur in flowing water or if this was merely an ideal. Purification from heart defilement, by contrast, is an extended process that involves education, ascetic practices, and, ultimately, baptism. Even after one’s baptism, good works are expected to be performed by the purified person in order to maintain their purified state.

Though the *Homilies* employs a Jewish framework for purity, in chapter five, I argue that its exhortations are not intended for Jews, but for Gentiles. The *Homilies*, like some other ancient Jews, does not consider Gentiles to be bound by the entirety of the Jewish Law; that Law was given to Jews specifically. However, it does believe that there is a subset of Jewish Law that was given to the whole of humanity, and it is this subset that the *Homilies* advocates its Gentile audience to follow. That the *Homilies* understood the Law in this way can be seen when it is compared to two other texts that sought to determine Gentile legal requirements, the Apostolic Decree and the rabbinic Noahide Laws. Though these three texts come to different conclusions, the significant overlap between them suggests that the *Homilies* was taking part in a broader conversation among Jews and Christians regarding the Gentile legal expectations. Thus, the *Homilies* does not consider the defiling power of corpses, leprosy, or childbirth, nor does it advocate for the observance of the Sabbath or circumcision, not because it rejected such practices, but because it considered them irrelevant for its Gentile audience. I conclude this chapter with a discussion of Holger M. Zellentin’s recent thesis that ancient Jews generally drew from the double prohibition on consuming and shedding blood in Gen 9:4–6 and on the Torah’s

---

70 See n. 3 above.
gerim laws when determining their Gentile legal requirements. While I have a few qualms with his thesis, I nonetheless agree that it largely explains the origin of these Gentile legal requirements, and suggest that the Syriac translator’s removal of the defilement of intercourse may be due to its absence from the gerim laws.

CHAPTER 1

PURITY IN THE PSEUDO-CLEMENTINE LITERATURE: A HISTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP

Before I begin my analysis of the concept of purity in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies, I first want to look back and discuss prior work on the subject.¹ In this history of scholarship, I begin with the work of Ferdinand Christian Baur and proceed through four broad periods: (1) nineteenth-century scholarship, (2) the rise of the Kerygmata Petrou, (3) the fall of the Kerygmata Petrou, and (4) current scholarship.

In the first two periods, which lasted through the mid-twentieth century, studies of the Pseudo-Clementines were informed by models of history in which Judaism and Christianity were understood to have become separate and mutually exclusive religions early in the latter’s history, if not during the ministry of Jesus itself. These models were often explicitly supersessionist; particularly prior to the Second World War, many scholars understood Judaism and Christianity to be “categorically opposed,” and the former to have been excessively legalistic and “ripe for replacement” by the latter.² In this context, the Pseudo-Clementine Literature, in which elements

---

¹ This history of scholarship will focus especially on the study of purity in the Pseudo-Clementine Literature. For broader histories of scholarship, see Strecker, Das Judenchristentum, 1–34; Jones, “The Pseudo-Clementines: A History of Research,” 50–113; and Frédéric Amsler, “État de la recherche récente sur le roman pseudo-clémentin,” in Nouvelle intrigues pseudo-clémentines, 25–45. I am particularly indebted to Jones’s work for this history of scholarship.

of Judaism and Christianity were juxtaposed, proved a challenge, and thus scholars set about attempting to solve the historical puzzle that the texts proposed.

For some scholars, this puzzle was simply unsolvable. A few thus argued that the novels reflected the idiosyncratic belief of a small group or lone individual, 3 or were perhaps composed with the intention of scandalizing its audience. 4 Other scholars, however, considered the texts representative of a larger, if still marginal, contingent of “Jewish Christians,” a third religious category outside of both Judaism and Christianity that was composed of Christians who had permitted Jewish, and even Gnostic, elements to enter their worldviews.

One effect of this categorization was the quarantining of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature outside the histories of both Judaism and Christianity. Among scholars of ancient Judaism, the texts were virtually ignored, 5 and while they received more attention among scholars of ancient Christianity, they were treated as marginal, a mere “bypath” in the history of Christianity rather than a part of it. 6 When “Jewish Christianity” was studied, its investigators

---

3 A.C. Headlam, e.g., writes that the texts represent “not so much a sect as an individual, although an individual brought up under peculiar conditions…. It is the product of a curious, versatile, unequally developed mind.” A.C. Headlam, “The Clementine Literature,” JThS 3 (1901): 58. John Chapman agrees with Headlam on this point; see Chapman, “On the Date of the Clementines,” 155. See also Carl Schmidt, who argued that the Grundschrift’s perspective could only arise “out of very specific circumstances of a personal and local nature” (“auf ganz bestimmte Verhältnisse persönlicher wie lokaler Natur”); see Schmidt, Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen, 251.

4 Such is the opinion of Eduard Schwartz; see Schwartz, “Unzeitgemässe Beobachtungen,” 187–88.


6 The word “bypath” comes out of Headlam, “The Clementine Literature,” 41. Also note how, at the beginning of his article, Headlam actively apologizes to his audience for discussing the texts at all.
tended to seek the fork of its bypath, asking how such a bastardization of true Christianity could have come about.

In this project, the Pseudo-Clementines were vital, and the texts were endlessly divided and sifted through in the search for the root cause of its error. As I will show, purity played a significant role in these searches, especially as source-critical approaches to the texts began to predominate. These were not in vogue initially; two nineteenth-century scholars, Adolph Schliemann and Gerhard Uhlhorn, argued that the Homilies should be analyzed as a unity, with the latter’s arguments for doing so approaching my own. However, after the work of Adolf Hilgenfeld, source-critical studies came to dominate the field, with the theories of Hans Waitz, Carl Schmidt, and Oscar Cullmann being particularly influential. These scholars presupposed the unity of the original Christianity, and thus viewed at least one of the Pseudo-Clementine sources as tainted by Gnosticism and/or Judaism. Indeed, the presence or absence of Gnostic and Jewish-Christian beliefs became a primary means by which the layers could be separated. In this process, purity, and particularly a source’s perspective on baptism, was pivotal. For most of these scholars, the earliest—and most Jewish-Christian—layer of the novels was typically the one that viewed baptism as a replacement for sacrifices. The later layers, by contrast, viewed baptism in a more stereotypically “orthodox” way, i.e., as a prerequisite for salvation.

The aftermath of the Second World War saw a shift in the paradigm for understanding the relationship between Judaism and Christianity in the ancient world. Rather than viewing the two as “categorically opposed” and the latter as superseding the former, scholars instead began to view the two as having mutually “parted ways” in the late first or early second century. While this change would have significant effects elsewhere in the study of Christianity and Judaism in
antiquity, it meant little for the study of Jewish Christianity and the Pseudo-Clementine Literature. Whether Christianity superseded Judaism or the two parted ways, the result was a separation of the two religions, and thus the Pseudo-Clementines continued to be viewed as marginal texts that were out of step with mainstream Christianity. This was the case for Georg Strecker’s study of the novels, which arose in this time and would become the definitive study of the Pseudo-Clementines until the 1970s.

This situation began to change in the last quarter of the twentieth century, at which point we enter the third stage of scholarship outlined above. At this time, significant criticisms of prior approaches to the study of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature began to mount. The first challenged prior methods of separating out its sources. Two scholars in particular, Josep Rius-Camps and Jürgen Wehnert, argued against the use of historical and theological criteria to separate the layers of the texts. Wehnert in particular argued that, by importing their own understanding of the development of early Christianity, earlier scholars of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature had simply confirmed those understandings. Rius-Camps and Wehnert instead argued that source-critical investigations should begin by using literary and philological criteria, and only after that work was done could the layers then be analyzed for their ideological perspectives.

At the same time, scholars began to challenge the Parting of the Ways model for understanding the history of Judaism and Christianity. As these scholars noted, the literary and archeological evidence did not reflect a separation of the two religions, but an ongoing

---

7 See Reed and Becker, “Introduction,” 12–16, for a summary of these.

8 See the discussion in Jackson-McCabe, *Jewish Christianity*, 100–121.
interaction between them. Indeed, in some locales, the supposed boundaries between the two remained quite fuzzy indeed, even up through the fourth century. In this context, the collection of Jewish and Christian elements in the Pseudo-Clementines, once considered unimaginable, began to look more like a representation of one of the myriad ways that the God of Israel could be worshipped in the ancient world.

These challenges to the study of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature led to the final stage of the history of scholarship outlined above. While Rius-Camps and Wehnert still sought to divide the text into its sources, in the last twenty-five years or so, scholars have begun to recognize the importance of analyzing the final forms of the texts in their historical context. Not content with merely mining the Pseudo-Clementine Literature for evidence of Jewish Christianity, these scholars turned their attention to other aspects of the texts, including their literary techniques and attitudes toward philosophy and epistemology. Significant works in this regard have been those of M.J. Edwards, Meinvolf Vielberg, Dominique Côté, Nicole Kelley, and Patricia Duncan.

This is not to say that interest in the novels’ relationships to Judaism and Christianity has waned, of course. However, this interest has shifted. The Pseudo-Clementines are no longer studied as deviant, a mere “bypath” of Christian history, but instead as a part of the histories of both Christianity and Judaism. The goal of studying the purity regulations in the novels has

---

likewise shifted, being used less frequently as tools for differentiating the texts’ layers and instead being read together as reflecting a coherent outlook. In this context, the purity regulations were no longer viewed as means of transgressing the separation between Judaism and Christianity, but instead as boundary markers that separate the author(s) and their communities from non-believing Gentiles. This is the conclusion that has been reached in recent years by Annette Yoshiko Reed, Karin Hedner Zetterholm, and Holger M. Zellentin. Zellentin has also looked in the other direction, seeking not only the origins of the Pseudo-Clementine purity legislations but also tracking their development through the early medieval period to the rise of Islam. In his estimation, the purity regulations encouraged by the Homilies are based on the double prohibition of consuming and shedding blood in Gen 9:4–6 and the Torah’s gerim laws, and thus reflect the expectations that are placed upon Gentiles who join the community.

This dissertation takes its cues from this last stage in the history of the study of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature. I read the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies as a unity, presuming that its final editor(s) were intentional with the material that they chose to include. In chapter two, I argue that the Homilies works from an ancient Jewish framework for understanding purity, and I do not see the adoption of this framework as being at odds with its reverence for Jesus. Finally, in chapter five, I argue that, though the framework it adopts is Jewish, the Homilies’ purity regulations are nevertheless directed at Gentiles, allowing its audience to join the people of God while still remaining Gentiles, without needing to become Jews first.

Because the source-critical theories surrounding the Pseudo-Clementine Literature can be quite complex, I have also included an appendix that provides a summary of the most prominent theories, including those of Hilgenfeld, Waitz, Schmidt, Cullmann, Strecker, and Wehnert. The reader can find this in Appendix B below.
The Nineteenth Century

It is perhaps best to begin this survey of scholarship with the work of Ferdinand Christian Baur in the mid-nineteenth century. By starting with Baur, I do not mean to imply that there was no interest in the Pseudo-Clementine Literature prior to his contributions; Baur’s own discussions of the texts are peppered with references to the previous works of Johann Salomo Semler, K.A. Credner, and August Neander, to name but a few.\(^\text{10}\) However, F. Stanley Jones is not incorrect when he states that, prior to Baur, “The dominant opinion … was that the PsCl were full of errors and were thus useless.”\(^\text{11}\) Investigations into them were therefore few and far between.

Baur changed this when he granted the Pseudo-Clementine Literature, and particularly the *Homilies*, a significant role in his study of early Christianity. He argued that the novels were some of the few traces left by an important segment the early church, that of Jewish Christianity. This segment, centered in Jerusalem and led by James and Peter, stood in opposition to Gentile Christians, another segment of early Christianity that had been brought into the faith through the missionary work of the apostle Paul. According to Baur, despite their ideological disagreements, the two segments would end up uniting to form the nascent Catholic Church. Because the *Homilies* elevated James and Peter and attacked Paul,\(^\text{12}\) Baur argued that its author(s) stood in

\(^{10}\) For an overview of some of Baur’s influences not just on his reading of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature but also on his conception of Jewish Christianity, see F. Stanley Jones, “From Toland to Baur: Tracks of the History of Research into Jewish Christianity,” in *The Rediscovery of Jewish Christianity: From Toland to Baur*, ed. F. Stanley Jones, HBfSt 5 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 123–36.


\(^{12}\) See nn. 10 and 37 in the introduction for sections of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature that scholars have considered anti-Paul.
historical continuity with the Jewish Christians and that much could be learned about this early movement from it.\(^\text{13}\)

The opposition between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians that Baur set up was no mere description of history. Rather, at the heart of this thesis was an apologetic project. As Matt Jackson-McCabe has noted, Baur sought to defend Christianity as “an ontological reality transcendent of mere human culture.”\(^\text{14}\) For Baur, this reality, initially promoted by Jesus, was fundamentally misunderstood by his apostles but comprehended and spread by Paul. In this way, Baur divided “two distinct types of Christianity: a Pauline one correlated with the true, transcendent religion of Jesus; and a Jewish one that failed, precisely as a result of its Jewishness, to really grasp that true religion.”\(^\text{15}\)

Baur’s thesis received much criticism at the time, but his critics almost never attacked the dichotomy between Jewish and Gentile Christianity that he proposed; rather, they disputed his placement of the apostles and much of the New Testament writers in the former camp.\(^\text{16}\) Investigations into the Pseudo-Clementine Literature at this time were much the same; they attempted to place the texts outside the circle of the apostles, usually by attributing them to a sect outside of, and rejected by, the Catholic Church.


\(^{14}\) Jackson-McCabe, *Jewish Christianity*, 51.

\(^{15}\) Jackson-McCabe, *Jewish Christianity*, 51.

\(^{16}\) Jackson-McCabe, *Jewish Christianity*, 78.
Though these investigations of the Pseudo-Clementines would soon be dominated by source criticism, this was not the case initially. Two of the earliest scholars to work on the texts after Baur, Adolph Schliemann and Gerhard Uhlhorn, did not yet divide the texts into sources; they argued that the *Homilies*, which they believed preceded the *Recognitions*, should be studied as a complete whole. For Schliemann, this position was based on his contention that the *Homilies* had been composed by a single author.\(^{17}\) Uhlhorn was less committal, but nevertheless chose to treat the *Homilies* as a unit, arguing that, despite possibly being formed of multiple sources, it was still important to consider the perspective of its final redactor.\(^{18}\) The two scholars came to very similar conclusions regarding the text’s sectarian outlook. They both attributed the *Homilies* to a group of Jewish Christians who had been influenced by Gnosticism\(^{19}\); Schliemann argued that it had been written in the second century\(^{20}\) by a member of the “Gnostic Ebionites,”\(^{21}\) while Uhlhorn dated it to the second half of the second century\(^{22}\) and attributed it to a sect of Elchesaites.\(^{23}\)

For both scholars, these Gnostic influences affected how these communities understood their bodily purification practices. Schliemann argued that the *Homilies’* promotion of strict


\(^{18}\) Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien und Recognitionen*, 153. Uhlhorn’s position here is similar to my own.

\(^{19}\) Importantly, this was a Gnosticism that had tainted the pure Christianity. See Schliemann, *Die Clementinen*, 362–552, and Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien und Recognitionen*, 383–98.

\(^{20}\) Schliemann, *Die Clementinen*, 548–49.


\(^{22}\) Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien und Recognitionen*, 434–35.

\(^{23}\) Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien und Recognitionen*, 399.
ascetic practices, including fasting, abstention from wine and meat, and bodily purification, were grounded in the fact that the material world is ruled by Satan. Thus, for Schliemann, the performance of bodily purification practices reflected a Gnostic contempt of the material world.24 Uhlhorn was essentially in agreement with Schliemann on this point, 25 though he tied the bodily purification rituals to the Elchesaites more specifically.26

By contrast, neither scholar connected the Homilies’ perspective on baptism to its Gnosticism, but argued that it was more in keeping with those of other ancient Christians. Both scholars found this strange. They argued that the text’s adoption of baptism, and indeed its repeated emphasis of its necessity, did not comport neatly with Homilies’ theological system; for the Homilies, a person should be free to follow God’s Law and thus to not sin or require a purification from sin.27 To remedy this contradiction, Schliemann argued that the Homilies believed that every person has a sinful tendency,28 and that baptism removed this tendency. This is the “rebirth” that the Homilies explicates in Hom. 11.26.29 For Schliemann, the connection of the conferral of salvation and rebirth with baptism is very much in keeping with the ancient Church, but the Homilies diverges from the wider Christian understanding of baptism in locating this salvation not in Christ’s death and resurrection but in his revelation of the Truth to his

26 Uhlhorn, Die Homilien und Recognitionen, 399.
27 Schliemann, Die Clementinen, 226–27; Uhlhorn, Die Homilien und Recognitionen, 213.
28 Schliemann, Die Clementinen, 181–85.
29 See the discussion of the carnal conception in chapter 3.
disciples; salvation is thus to be found in Christ’s teaching, and not in his sacrificial death.\(^{30}\) Unlike Schliemann, Uhlhorn did not believe that this contradiction could be resolved. Instead, he argued that the *Homilies* grounds the necessity of baptism not in its ethics but in its metaphysics. The water of baptism extinguishes not any tendency toward sin as Schliemann understood it, but the fire of the demonic. Despite this, Uhlhorn ultimately concluded that the *Homilies* encourages baptism as a concession to the rest of Christianity, which had become powerful enough by that point that rejecting baptism would not have been an option.\(^{31}\)

Schliemann’s and Uhlhorn’s approach of reading the text as a unity was quickly overshadowed by the source-critical approach taken by Adolf Hilgenfeld. Hilgenfeld argued, in contrast to Schliemann and Uhlhorn, that the *Recognitions* preceded the *Homilies*, and that the former could be divided into its sources with some degree of accuracy. Much of Hilgenfeld’s source-critical theory was based on a brief sketch proposed by Henry Dodwell in the seventeenth century. Dodwell had argued that the *Recognitions*, which he also believed preceded the *Homilies*, had developed in stages, beginning its existence as the *Kerygma Petrou* (*Preaching of Peter*)\(^{32}\) before being expanded into the *Periodoi Petrou* (*Circuits of Peter*),\(^{33}\) the

---


\(^{32}\) The name for this source is taken from the *Epistula Petri* and the *Diamartyria*, which discuss “books of my/his preachings” (αἱ βιβλία μου/αὐτοῦ τῶν κηρυγμάτων; cf. *EpPt* 1.2, 2.1, 3.1; *Diam.* 1.1, 2.1, 3.2, 4.1), as well as from Origen’s quotation of Heracleon in *Comm. Jo.* 13.17.104, which Dodwell believed referred to this work. The title also appears in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 2.15.68.2.

\(^{33}\) This title is also taken from Origen (*Philoc.* 23).
Anagnorismoi, and finally the Recognitions. After the Recognitions’ completion, the text was redacted to form the Homilies.

Hilgenfeld adopted this thesis and expanded upon it by defining the contents of each of these sources and attributing them to different stages in the development of Jewish Christianity. First, he reconstructed the Kerygma Petrou by appealing to Recog. 3.75, which contains a list of books that he argued was the source’s table of contents. The result was a Kerygma Petrou

34 This is a transliteration of the Greek word for “recognitions.” To avoid confusion with the Recognitions, I will refer to this text by its Greek title and to the Recognitions by its English title.


36 In Recog. 3.75, Clement gives the titles of ten books of Peter’s preachings that he had previously sent to James. These include: (1) “Concerning the True Prophet and the Peculiarity of Understanding the Law, according to that which the Tradition of Moses Teaches” (De vero propheta et de proprietate intelligentiae legis, secundum id quod Moysei traditio docet); (2) “Concerning the Beginning, Whether There is One Beginning or Many, and that the Law of the Hebrews is Not Ignorant of What Immensity is” (De principio, utrum unum sit principium an multa, et quia non ignoret Hebraeerum lex, quid sit inmensitas); (3) “Concerning God and What Has Been Ordained by Him” (De deo et his quae ab eo statuta sunt); (4) “That Though Many are Called Divine, There is One True God according to the Testimony of the Scriptures” (Quod cum multi dicantur dii, unus sit verus deus secundum testimonia scripturarum); (5) “That There are Two Heavens, of which One is that Visible Firmament that Will Also Pass Away, but the Other is Eternal and Invisible” (Quod duo sint caeli, quorum unum sit istud visibile firmamentum quod et transibit, aliud vero aeternum et invisibile); (6) “Concerning Good and Evil, and that All Things are Subjected to Good by the Father, and Why, How, and Whence Evil Exists, and that it Indeed Cooperates with the Good, but Not with Good Intention; and What Things are Signs of Good, What of Evil, and What the Difference is between Duality and Conjunction” (De bono et malo et quod bono cuncta subiciantur a patre, malum autem quare et quomodo et unde sit et quod cooperetur quidem bono, sed non proposito bono; et quae sint signa boni, quae vero mali, et quae sit differentia dualitatis et coniugationis); (7) “What are the Things that the Twelve Apostles Described among the People in the Temple” (Quae sint, quae prosecuti sunt duodecim apostoli apud populum in templo); (8) “Concerning the Words of the Lord that Seem to be Contrary to Themselves, but are Not, and What Their Explanation is” (De verbis domini quae sibi videntur esse contraria, sed non sunt, et quae sit horum absolutionis); (9) “That the Law that was Appointed by God is Just and Perfect, and that It Can Only Make Peace” (Quia lex quae a deo posita est, iusta sit et perfecta et quae sola possit facere pacem); and (10) “Concerning the Carnal Birth of Men, and Concerning the Rebirth that is through Baptism, and What is the Succession of Carnal Seed in Man, and What is the Order of His Soul, and How the Freedom of Will is in it; Which, Because it is not Inborn but was Made, Could Not Have Existed If Not Moved by the Good” (De nativitate hominum carnali et de regeneratione quae est per baptismum, et quae sit in homine carnalis seminis successio et quae animae eius ratio et quomodo in ipsa est libertas arbitrii; quae quoniam non est ingenita sed facta est, inmobilib a bono esse non poterat). The Latin text of the Recognitions is from Bernhard Rehm, ed., Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung, 2nd ed., vol. 2 of Die Pseudoklementinen, GCS (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1994).
based on material from Recog. 1–3. He then argued that the source was expanded twice, first by the addition of the Periodoi Petrou (Recog. 4–7) and then the Anagorismoi (Recog. 7).

For Hilgenfeld, each of the layers represented a stage in the development of Jewish Christianity. He argued, for example, that the Kerygma Petrou was composed shortly after the destruction of the Temple, before Christianity split from Judaism and when the author’s primary opponents were non-believing Jews. According to Hilgenfeld, this was when “Christianity still appears in its simplest, most undeveloped form, as a mere belief in the messianism of Jesus.”

The Periodoi Petrou, by contrast, was completed in the final years of Trajan or the early years of Hadrian, when the community found themselves in competition with Pauline Christians. He dated the Anagorismoi to around the time of the rise of Valentinianism, when there was a stronger need to defend marriage against Jewish encratism, and he dated the Homilies, which

---


38 Hilgenfeld does not believe that either of these sources ever existed independently of the Kerygma Petrou; see Hilgenfeld, Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien, 172, 185.


40 Hilgenfeld, Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien, 172–87. At some point in this process, the text also underwent an anti-Basilidean redaction; see pp. 100–149.

41 Hilgenfeld, Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien, 92–95.

42 “Das Christenthum erscheint noch in seiner einfachsten unentwickeltsten Gestalt als bloßer Glaube an die Messianität Jesu.” Hilgenfeld, Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien, 93.

43 Hilgenfeld, Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien, 170–72.

44 Hilgenfeld, Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien, 185–86.
he called “ripest fruit of Ebionism,” to the mid-second century. Unlike Schliemann and Uhlhorn, Hilgenfeld maintained that this Ebionism was not influenced by Gnosticism.

The purity material, particularly each layer’s attitude toward baptism, played a significant role in Hilgenfeld’s dating of each layer. He argued that the *Kerygma Petrou*, containing the material from *Recog.* 1, treated baptism as a replacement for sacrifices. As such, it was a repeated ritual that effected moral purification and reconciliation with God. While the *Periodoi Petrou* retained this position, it also added that baptism was an initiation ritual that took the place of circumcision, in order to make it easier for Gentiles to join the Jewish Christians instead of the Pauline Christians. The idea that baptism was necessary for salvation appears for the first time in the *Anagnorismoi* and continues in the *Recognitions* and the *Homilies*. The *Homilies* also introduces baptism’s function as a replacement of one’s first, carnal birth with a second, spiritual one.

---


48 Specifically, by continuing to portray Peter as baptizing himself. See Hilgenfeld, *Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien*, 68–69.


50 Hilgenfeld, *Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien*, 185.

51 Hilgenfeld considers the passages emphasizing the necessity of baptism in the *Kerygma Petrou* to be later insertions; see Hilgenfeld, *Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien*, 91.

52 Hilgenfeld, *Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien*, 234.

Hilgenfeld’s comments on bodily purification practices were limited to the *Periodoi Petrou* and the *Homilies*. The former connects the practices to chastity and emphasizes that they are not commanded, but desired.\(^{54}\) Hilgenfeld argues that Peter’s repeated washings in the *Periodoi Petrou* are not bodily purification practices, but repeated baptisms.\(^{55}\) Bodily purifications are only required by the *Homilies*, which argues that bodily purity serves as the basis for spiritual purity.\(^{56}\)

Hilgenfeld’s position would end up finding more adherents than those of Schliemann and Uhlhorn. It was adopted almost in full by Albert Ritschl,\(^{57}\) save that Ritschl believed that baptism could not have served as a replacement for circumcision because circumcision would not have been expected of Gentiles at all.\(^{58}\) Johannes Lehmann modified Hilgenfeld’s source-critical theory in a few significant ways,\(^{59}\) but maintained the separation of the *Kerygma Petrou* from the rest of the *Recognitions*. Part of his argument for this were the different approaches to baptism that each section of the novel proposed, which he considered “the most striking difference in teaching” between the two sections.\(^{60}\) While *Recog.* 1–3 considered baptism as a replacement for sacrifices and not necessary for salvation, *Recog.* 4–10 repeatedly emphasized its necessity and

\(^{54}\) Hilgenfeld came to this conclusion by prioritizing the *Recognitions*, which also frames bodily purifications in this way; see *Recog.* 6.10.4. Hilgenfeld, *Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien*, 167.

\(^{55}\) Hilgenfeld, *Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien*, 68–69.

\(^{56}\) Hilgenfeld, *Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien*, 241–42.


\(^{60}\) “Die auffallendeste Lehrdifferenz”; Lehmann, *Die clementinischen Schriften*, 107.
characterized baptism as a rebirth. Thus, what Hilgenfeld considered later additions to the *Periodoi Petrou*, Lehmann argued was original.  

**The Rise of the Kerygmata Petrou**

By the end of the nineteenth century, Hilgenfeld’s approach had won the day. Analyzing the texts of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature as wholes, as Schliemann and Uhlhorn had, became almost unseen through most of the twentieth century. Instead, it was much more common for scholars to follow Hilgenfeld’s lead, not only separating the texts into sources, but also using his method to do so. The source-critical reconstructions of three scholars of the period—those of Hans Waitz, Carl Schmidt, and Oscar Cullmann—all depended on the table of contents in *Recog.* 3.75 to separate out the earliest source of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature, which they now referred to as the *Kerygmata Petrou* (as opposed to Dodwell and Hilgenfeld’s singular *Kerygma Petrou*).  

However, the approaches of these scholars differed from that of Hilgenfeld in one significant way: They did not consider the *Recognitions* to be the source for the *Homilies*. Instead, they adopted theses similar to that of R.A. Lipsius, who had argued that both the *Homilies* and the *Recognitions* were composed independently on the basis of a common hypothetical source, which he had called the *Grundschrift*. While Waitz and Cullmann adopted this outlook, Schmidt differed slightly by arguing that the redaction of the *Recognitions* was not


62 With this new name, these scholars are following the lead of R.A. Lipsius. See R.A. Lipsius, *Die Quellen der römischen Petrus-Sage* (Kiel: Schwers’sche Buchhandlung, 1872), 14.

independent, but was based on both the *Grundschrift* and the *Homilies*. Regardless, their approaches meant that Waitz, Schmidt, and Cullmann could look at both the *Homilies* and the *Recognitions* to reconstruct their sources.

Waitz and Schmidt also differed from Hilgenfeld in that they did not attribute every layer to Jewish Christians. They argued that only the *Kerygmata Petrou* could be so characterized; the other sources were, by contrast, “Catholic.” The result of this move was threefold. More immediately, Waitz and Schmidt put themselves in the position of having to explain the bodily purification practices that appeared within “Catholic” layers of the texts. They resolved this by either arguing that the rituals were a literary device (Waitz) or that the author, despite being Catholic, was influenced by his Jewish past and environment (Schmidt). Another result of limiting Jewish Christianity to the *Kerygmata Petrou* was the source’s expansion. Starting with Cullmann and continuing with the works of Joseph Thomas, Hans-Joachim Schoeps, and Einar Molland, a passage’s “Jewish-Christian” nature became the criterion by which it was included in the source. Thus, much of the purity material found its way into this source over time. Finally, this allocation of one layer to Jewish Christians and the others to orthodox groups lead to a general waning of interest in the later layers. As will become clear, much of the conversation in the early twentieth century centered around the *Kerygmata Petrou*, to the detriment of the *Homilies*, the *Recognitions*, and even the *Grundschrift*.

The final scholar treated in this section, Georg Strecker, rejected much of the hypotheses developed by Waitz, Schmidt, and Cullmann. He did away with many of the later layers of the *Grundschrift* and the use of *Recog.* 3.75 to reconstruct the *Kerygmata Petrou*. Nevertheless, he retained the *Kerygmata Petrou* itself, arguing that it could be reconstructed not from *Recog.* 3.75 but from overlaps between the novels and their introductory writings, the *Epistle of Peter to
James and the Diamartyria. Strecker also argued that the material from Recog. 1 came not from the Kerygmata Petrou but from a redaction of the Anabathmoi Jakobou. By doing this, Strecker once again separated the idea of baptism as a replacement for sacrifices that had briefly been united with the rest of the novels by Cullmann.

Hans Waitz

Much of Hans Waitz’s source-critical reconstruction of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature was reminiscent of Hilgenfeld’s thesis. Like Hilgenfeld, he separated its earliest source, which he called the Kerygmata Petrou, by appealing to the table of contents in Recog. 3.75. Unlike Hilgenfeld, however, Waitz looked beyond the Recognitions to find its contents. He found them in Recog. 1–3 and in Hom. 2–3, 16–20. He then argued that a second source, the Praxeis Petrou (Acts of Peter), containing all the material of Peter’s pursuit of Simon, was added to it. Unlike Hilgenfeld’s Periodoi Petrou, Waitz did not consider the Praxeis Petrou to be a mere extension of the Kerygmata Petrou, but an independent source in its own right. He argued similarly for the Anagnorismoi, which contained Clement’s reunion with his family. To these, Waitz added a spattering of other sources, including the Dialogue between Clement and Appion

64 Again, notice the new name; see n. 62.


66 The new name is due to Waitz’s connection of this source with the extant Acts of Peter. See Waitz, Die Pseudoklementinen, 188–202. To avoid confusion between this source and the Acts of Peter preserved in Codex Vercellensis, I will refer to it by its Greek name.

67 Waitz, Die Pseudoklementinen, 169–250. By proposing this source, Waitz is again following Lipsius, though Lipsius had dated this source before the Kerygmata Petrou; see Lipsius, Die Quellen, 45–46.

68 Waitz, Die Pseudoklementinen, 188–89.

69 Waitz, Die Pseudoklementinen, 250–51.
(Hom. 4–6; Recog. 10.17–51)\textsuperscript{70} and two works of Bardaisan, the Book of the Laws of Countries
(Recog. 9.17, 19–29)\textsuperscript{71} and On Fate, to Antoninus (the rest of Recog. 8–9).\textsuperscript{72} Later in his career,
Waitz would revise his position on the inclusion of the Dialogue and Bardaisan’s work in the
Grundschrift, arguing instead that the Grundschrift served as the source for Bardaisan’s works\textsuperscript{73}
and that the material in Hom. 4–6 and Recog. 8–10 had come from a Jewish apologetic source.\textsuperscript{74}

Of these sources, Waitz argued that only the Kerygmata Petrou could be characterized as
Jewish-Christian. He dated it to not long after 135 CE\textsuperscript{75} and described it as “a product of
syncretistic-Gnostic Jewish Christianity.”\textsuperscript{76} In a later work, Waitz would attribute it to an
individual who had left an Elchsaite community to form a new sect.\textsuperscript{77} The Praxeis Petrou, by
contrast, was Catholic and anti-Gnostic.\textsuperscript{78} For the Anagnorismoi, Waitz followed Wilhelm

\textsuperscript{70} Waitz, Die Pseudoklementinen, 251–56.

\textsuperscript{71} Waitz, Die Pseudoklementinen, 256.

\textsuperscript{72} Waitz, Die Pseudoklementinen, 256–59.

\textsuperscript{73} Prior to Waitz, this had been the position of Hilgenfeld; see Adolf Hilgenfeld, Bardesanes, der letzte Gnostiker

\textsuperscript{74} Hans Waitz, “Die Pseudoklementinen und ihre Quellenschriften,” ZNW 28 (1929): 268–69. Waitz’s revision of
his position was based on the work of Werner Heintze, who argued that the Grundschrift had gotten the material in
Hom. 4–6 and Recog. 8–10 not from Bardaisan, but from a book of Jewish disputations. On this, see Werner
Heintze, Der Klemensroman und seine griechischen Quellen, TU 40.2 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914), 90–110.

\textsuperscript{75} Waitz, Die Pseudoklementinen, 161, 366.

\textsuperscript{76} “Ein Produkt des synkretistisch-gnostischen Judenchristentums”; Waitz, Die Pseudoklementinen, 142.

Apokryphen, ed. Edgar Hennecke, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1924), 152.

\textsuperscript{78} Waitz, Die Pseudoklementinen, 187–88, 201.
Bousset’s argument that it had been adapted from a pagan romance novel. These sources, together with the Dialogue between Clement and Appion and Bardaisan’s works, were put together to form the *Grundschrift*, whose compiler Waitz characterized as a syncretistic Catholic working between 220–230 CE. After this, the text was revised into two independent recensions: The *Homilies*, edited by an Arian with Jewish-Christian-Gnostic sympathies, and the *Recognitions*, edited by an Arian follower of Eunomius.

The most striking differences in the purity material that Waitz highlighted could be found between the *Kerygmata Petrou* and the rest of the sources. With regard to baptism, he argued that the *Kerygmata Petrou* views it both as a replacement for sacrifices and as a rebirth, while the later sources view it as a necessary precondition for salvation. Waitz’s perspective on bodily purification practices was more complex. He was silent on whether the community of the *Kerygmata Petrou* performed them, as the practice was less emphasized in his reconstruction of the text. He did note that the text argued that only those laws remained in effect which matched up with the eternal Law, “i.e., the moral code of the Mosaic Law, to the exclusion of the


80 Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, 74–75; but see nn. 73–74.

81 Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, 369.


83 Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, 116, 128, 141. Waitz does not state how frequently he thinks these baptisms occurred.

84 Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, 143.

85 Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, 141–42.
ceremonial law,” but whether this included bodily purification practices is left unstated. As for the rest of the sources, Waitz argued that, despite the Grundschrift’s inclusion of encouragements to engage in bodily purification practices and depictions of characters doing so, none of its sources actively promoted these practices. While he granted that the washing rituals may have gone back to “Jewish-Essene customs,” by the time of their incorporation into the Grundschrift, they had lost any “sacramental character” that they had had among the Essenes and Ebionites. The Grundschrift author nevertheless decided to include them for a few reasons: They appealed to his syncretistic inclinations and correspond to his defense of Christianity as a continuation of Judaism, and they lent his text an archaic flair.

Carl Schmidt

Waitz’s portrait of the Keryg mata Petrou was essentially accepted by Carl Schmidt, but Schmidt rejected his Praxeis Petrou as a “product of fantasy.” Instead, he argued that material Waitz had attributed to the Praxeis Petrou was an expansion of the Kerygmata Petrou done by the author of the Grundschrift on the basis of the Acts of Peter. This author also incorporated a

86 “D.h. der Moralkodex des mosaischen Gesetzes unter Ausschluß des Zeremonialgesetz”; Waitz, Die Pseudoklementinen, 129.

87 “Sakramentalen Charakter”; Waitz, Die Pseudoklementinen, 387.

88 Waitz, Die Pseudoklementinen, 383.

89 Waitz, Die Pseudoklementinen, 55.

90 Carl Schmidt, Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen, 19.

91 “Phantasieprodukt”; Schmidt, Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen, 65.

Jewish apologetic source and adapted the *Anagnorismoi*, adding Clement to a preexisting pagan narrative. Thus, for Schmidt, the writing of the *Grundschrift* was a two-stage process: First, the composition of the *Kerygmata Petrou*, and then its expansion, using original material, the Jewish apology, and the *Anagnorismoi*, by the author of the *Grundschrift*. The first stage had been performed by a Gnostic Jewish Christian around 200 CE; the second, by a member of a Catholic community around 220–230 CE. Unlike Waitz, Schmidt maintained that the *Homilies* and *Recognitions* were not independent recensions of the text, but that the latter had been revised on the basis of both the *Grundschrift* and the *Homilies*. He argued that the redaction of the *Homilies* was performed by Jewish Christians who wanted to admit Gentiles into their community as Jewish proselytes, and that of the *Recognitions* was performed by opponents of Judaism.

Regarding the purity material, Schmidt focused most of his attention on the *Grundschrift*. Though he argued that its author was a member of a Catholic community, Schmidt nevertheless

---

93 Schmidt, *Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen*, 125–239. Schmidt’s conception of this source is similar to that of Heintze; see n. 74.


95 Later, Hans-Joachim Schoeps will claim that Schmidt does not consider the *Kerygmata Petrou* to be Gnostic at all, but a “purely Ebionite work” (rein ebionitisches Werk); Hans-Joachim Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1949), 57. Schoeps does not cite where Schmidt makes this claim, and I have not been able to locate it. In any case, Schmidt does not push back against the claim of the source’s Gnosticism when referring to his predecessors; see Schmidt, *Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen*, 2, 296.

96 Schmidt, *Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen*, 286, 288, 293, 302. Schmidt is more or less in agreement with Adolf von Harnack regarding the date; see Adolf von Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur von Irenaeus bis Eusebius*, vol. 2 of *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, pt. 2 of *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904), 538, but see the previous note.


noted that he had Judaizing tendencies. These included his promotion of the observance of food laws and bodily purification practices, as well as his equation of Judaism and Christianity. These were no mere literary devices, as Waitz had argued, but the real convictions of the Grundschrift author. Schmidt considered his perspective unparalleled in contemporary Christian literature, but still found it fruitful to compare it to another text, the Didascalia apostolorum. According to him, these texts share the perspective that the Jewish Law can be divided in two, and that, since the time of Jesus, one portion has been abrogated while the other remains in effect. However, they disagree regarding which laws should belong in each of these categories. For the author of the Didascalia, only the Decalogue remains in effect; the Grundschrift, by contrast, argues for the replacement of sacrifices by baptism but otherwise upholds much of the Jewish Law.

Despite the author’s Judaizing tendencies, Schmidt still considered him firmly a member of a Catholic community. This can be seen in some of his ideological positions, such as his perspective that baptism is a washing for the forgiveness of sins, as well as in his tendency to suppress the Jewish Christian perspectives of the Kerygmata Petrou. Schmidt also appealed to the Didascalia to make this point, noting how its author polemicized against members of his

---

100 Schmidt, Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen, 255–60.
101 Schmidt, Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen, 251–52.
102 According to Schmidt, this idea was already present in the Kerygmata Petrou; see Schmidt, Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen, 270–73.
103 Schmidt, Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen, 260–68.
104 Schmidt, Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen, 282.
105 Schmidt, Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen, 288.
community who continue to observe the purification rituals of Leviticus 15. For Schmidt, the perspective of the Didascalia’s opponents looks a lot like that of the Grundschrift.\(^{106}\) Schmidt argued that the Grundschrift author was a Jew who had joined a Gentile Christian community either directly from Judaism or via a Jewish Christian sect and was influenced by his environment to maintain some of his Jewish practices.\(^{107}\)

Oscar Cullmann

The next investigator, Oscar Cullmann, deviated from the portraits of the Kerygmatika Petrou proposed by Waitz and Schmidt in one significant way: He argued that it contained more material than either of the previous scholars had allowed for. Specifically, he included material from the Tripolis discourses as part of his reconstruction.\(^{108}\) He also disagreed with both scholars regarding the origin of the narrative of Peter’s pursuit of Simon. Rather than arising from an independent source or being composed by the Grundschrift author, Cullmann argued that this material was an expansion of the Kerygmatika Petrou that occurred prior to the work of the Grundschrift redactor.\(^{109}\) He called the product of the intermediate step the Itinéraire de Pierre (Travels of Peter).\(^{110}\) Finally, the Grundschrift author incorporated material from the Jewish apology and the Anagnorismoi to form his text.\(^{111}\) Cullmann placed the date of the composition

\(^{106}\) Schmidt, Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen, 260.

\(^{107}\) Schmidt, Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen, 286–93.

\(^{108}\) Including Hom. 8.2–23; 9.1–23; 11.19–35; Recog. 4.2–21, 26–36; and all of Recog. 6. See Oscar Cullmann, Le problème littéraire, 82n1.

\(^{109}\) Cullmann, Le problème littéraire, 101, 107.

\(^{110}\) Cullmann, Le problème littéraire, 107–9. Below, I will use this title if a scholar is following Cullmann, and Praxeis Petrou if they are following Waitz.

\(^{111}\) Cullmann, Le problème littéraire, 116–41.
of the *Kerygmata Petrou* much earlier than many of his contemporaries, arguing that it had been written at the beginning of the second century by a Gnostic Jewish Christian descended from the Jerusalem community.\(^{112}\) The *Itinéraire de Pierre* was also authored by a Jewish Christian, but, by the time he was writing at the beginning of the third century, Catholics had had enough of an impact on Jewish Christians that Paul could no longer be the enemy in the text, and thus the author changed it to Simon.\(^ {113}\) The *Grundschrift* was similarly composed by a Jewish Christian between 220–230 CE.\(^ {114}\) The revision into the *Homilies* was also performed by a Jewish Christian,\(^ {115}\) but, by the time of the *Recognitions*, Jewish Christianity had been absorbed into Catholicism to the extent that it would be inaccurate to call its redactor a Jewish Christian. Nevertheless, he retained some Jewish Christian beliefs, including the identification of Adam with the True Prophet.\(^ {116}\)

Since Cullmann included much of the purity material in the *Kerygmata Petrou*, his comments on the subject concern that source. He justified his inclusion of more material into the *Kerygmata Petrou* based on the subject matter covered in the table of contents of *Recog.* 3.75; specifically, he argued that much of the purity material contained in the Tripolis discourses (*Hom.* 11.19–33//*Recog.* 6.4–14) fit well with the subject of the tenth book (“Concerning the Carnal Birth of Men, and Concerning the Rebirth that is through Baptism, and What is the Succession of Carnal Seed in Man, and What is the Order of His Soul, and How the Freedom of

\(^{112}\) Cullmann, *Le problème littéraire*, 95–98.

\(^{113}\) Cullmann, *Le problème littéraire*, 111–16.

\(^{114}\) Cullmann, *Le problème littéraire*, 150–57.


\(^{116}\) Cullmann, *Le problème littéraire*, 162–64.
Will is in it; Which, Because it is not Inborn but was Made, Could Not Have Existed If Not Moved by the Good”; *Recog.* 3.75.10).\(^{117}\)

Cullmann argued that the beliefs of the *Kerygmata Petrou* were inherited from an unorthodox Gnostic Judaism.\(^{118}\) The purity material specifically was inspired by the many baptist sects that were prevalent in the Second Temple Period.\(^{119}\) As we have come to expect, Cullmann argues that the *Kerygmata Petrou* views baptism as a replacement for sacrifices.\(^{120}\) However, because of his addition to the Tripolis material to the source, he also believes that it views baptism as a rebirth and as the extinguisher of the demonic fire and the fire to come. He does not view these positions as mutually exclusive.\(^{121}\) Cullmann says little regarding bodily purity. He argues that the daily washings may be baptisms, but that one cannot say for sure.\(^{122}\)

**Studies Influenced by the Waitz – Schmidt – Cullmann Hypothesis**

The threefold division of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature into the *Kerygmata Petrou*, the Peter-Simon pursuit source (*Praxeis Petrou/Itinéraire de Pierre*), and the *Anagnorismoi* made by Waitz, Schmidt, and Cullmann had a significant impact on the next twenty-five years of the study of Jewish Christianity. The *Kerygmata Petrou* in particular became a significant source for the phenomenon, and many scholars used the source to reconstruct its history. Three scholars

\(^{117}\) Cullmann, *Le problème littéraire*, 92.

\(^{118}\) Cullmann, *Le problème littéraire*, 172.

\(^{119}\) Cullmann, *Le problème littéraire*, 176–78.


\(^{121}\) Cullmann, *Le problème littéraire*, 215–16.

\(^{122}\) Cullmann, *Le problème littéraire*, 215.
in this period are most significant for our purposes: Joseph Thomas, Hans-Joachim Schoeps, and Einar Molland.

Joseph Thomas’s goal was to chart the history of ancient baptist movements in Judaism and Christianity. He argued that the Pseudo-Clementine Literature served as a significant primary source for a group that he referred to as the “baptist Ebionites,” whom he derived from the accounts of the heresiologists.\footnote{For Thomas’s account of the history of Ebionism, see Joseph Thomas, “Les Ébionites baptistes,” RHE 30 (1934): 264–70, and Joseph Thomas, Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie (150 av. J.-C. – 300 ap. J.-C.), DGMFT 2.28 (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1935), 157–82.} According to Thomas, this group performed a number of purification rituals that were described by Epiphanius. These include: (1) washing after intercourse (\textit{Pan.} 30.2.4–5), (2) daily washings (\textit{Pan.} 30.15, 16, 21), (3) baptism (\textit{Pan.} 30.16.1), and (4) healing baths, to be taken when one falls ill or is bitten by a snake (\textit{Pan.} 30.17.4–5).\footnote{Thomas, “Les Ébionites baptistes,” 270–75; Thomas, \textit{Le mouvement baptiste}, 171–74.} Thomas argued that the Ebionite baptism was the same ritual as Catholic baptism, or perhaps a substitute for it,\footnote{Thomas, “Les Ébionites baptistes,” 272; cf. Thomas, \textit{Le mouvement baptiste}, 172.} but the other rituals came from other groups. The washings after intercourse and the daily washings came out of the influence of the Essenes,\footnote{Thomas, “Les Ébionites baptistes,” 272; Thomas, \textit{Le mouvement baptiste}, 172–73, 181–82.} and the healing baths came out of the influence of the Elchesaites, who also brought with them their rejection of sacrifices and veneration of water.\footnote{Thomas, “Les Ébionites baptistes,” 271–72; Thomas, \textit{Le mouvement baptiste}, 171.}

Thomas proceeded to analyze the Pseudo-Clementine Literature with these four washing rituals in mind. Using Cullman’s source-critical theory, he separated the Pseudo-Clementine purity material into its sources, and noted that each of the literary layers contained only two of
the four washings noted by Epiphanius: The *Itinéraire de Pierre* and the *Anagnorismoi* contained baptism and daily washings, and the *Kerygmata Petrou* contained baptism and washings after intercourse.¹²⁸ Thomas then pointed out that not only did the *Itinéraire de Pierre* and the *Anagnorismoi* describe the same washing rituals, but they were also consistent in the language they use to do so: λούω is used for daily washings, while βαπτίζω is used for baptism.¹²⁹ By contrast, the references to purification in the *Kerygmata Petrou* were not consistent, alternating between ἀπολύω and βαπτίζω to describe washing after intercourse.¹³⁰ From this, Thomas concluded that the *Itinéraire de Pierre* and the *Anagnorismoi* were composed by the same author (and thus form a single narrative unit), while the *Kerygmata Petrou* arose out of a different source altogether.¹³¹

As part of his argument, Thomas also highlighted some of the major differences between each layer’s interpretation of baptism. In the narrative unit, baptism was simply the Christian initiation ritual,¹³² but in the *Kerygmata Petrou*, baptism performed the additional functions of replacing sacrifices, exorcising demons, and healing diseases.¹³³ These functions, as well as the general veneration of water found in Peter’s speeches, caused Thomas to connect this baptism with the washing rituals of the Elchesaites.¹³⁴ By contrast, he connected the narrative unit, with

---

its daily washings and more orthodox interpretation of baptism, to an Ebionite who had been influenced by the Essenes. Thomas concluded that the *Kerygmata Petrou* must be dated later than its narrative frame. Thomas thus turned Cullmann’s source-critical theory on its head, arguing that the *Kerygmata Petrou* had been added to a preexisting narrative frame, not *vice versa*.

Thomas’s source-critical reconstruction found few adherents, and he was criticized for his uncritical use of Epiphanius to understand the Pseudo-Clementine Literature. However, Thomas is significant in the study of purity in the texts for his contention that the depictions of the daily washings performed by the characters of the text were promotions of bodily purification, rather than daily baptisms (so Hilgenfeld) or an archaizing literary device (so Waitz). Starting from this point, scholars would generally speak of three washing rituals in the Pseudo-Clementine Literature: (1) baptism, (2) washings after menstruation and intercourse, and (3) daily washings.

The work of the next scholar, Hans-Joachim Schoeps, demonstrates just how entrenched Baur’s dichotomization of Jewish and Gentile Christianity had become in scholarship in the century after he proposed it. Schoeps, a German Jew working in Sweden during the Third Reich, did not share the same apologetic concerns as Baur and those who followed him. Nevertheless, he retained Baur’s dichotomy, though he did couch it in terms of social history rather than in

---


137 Hans-Joachim Schoeps, for example, stated that Thomas “lacks any critical posture” (“jede kritische Haltung vermissen läßt”) in his approach to Epiphanius; Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte*, 204n4.

138 Prior to Thomas, Schmidt had also separated these rituals and critiqued Waitz’s characterization of the daily washings as a literary device; see Schmidt, *Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen*, 288n2.
terms of truth and falsehood.\textsuperscript{139} Thus, much like his predecessors, Schoeps argued that the 
\textit{Kerygmata Petrou} arose out of a Jewish-Christian separatist group that rejected the tenants of 
Paulinism.\textsuperscript{140}

In his book on Jewish Christianity, Schoeps focused his attention on the \textit{Kerygmata Petrou}, which he considered to be “the most important Ebionite source.”\textsuperscript{141} In general, he ignored the remaining layers of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature, arguing that they arose from other communities and thus would not be useful.\textsuperscript{142} Even the \textit{Praxeis Petrou}, which Schoeps considered an “Ebionite-Catholic mixture,”\textsuperscript{143} was only afforded a secondary position in his investigation. Like Cullmann, Schoeps expanded the material that he considered part of the \textit{Kerygmata Petrou}, arguing that anything that can be considered heterodox and that matches the table of contents in \textit{Recog. 3.75} should be considered part of the source.\textsuperscript{144} He dated it to the late second century and attributed it to the Ebionites.\textsuperscript{145}

\textsuperscript{139} Jackson-McCabe summarizes Schoeps’s position like so: “In Schoeps’s hands, describing the Ebionites as ‘Jewish Christianity’ did not signal a Jewish occlusion of some authentic Christianity…. Schoeps took over this concept, rather, simply to differentiate what he considered a sectarian form of early Christianity from the one comprised by the ‘Great Church.’” Jackson-McCabe, \textit{Jewish Christianity}, 102–3, citing Schoeps, \textit{Theologie und Geschichte}, 7.

\textsuperscript{140} Schoeps, \textit{Theologie und Geschichte}, 256–57.

\textsuperscript{141} “Die wichtigste ebionitische Quellenschrift”; Schoeps, \textit{Theologie und Geschichte}, 37.

\textsuperscript{142} Specifically, the Jewish apology arises out of Judaism; the \textit{Anagnorismoi} arises out of paganism; the \textit{Grundschrift} was written by a Catholic of Jewish origin; the \textit{Homilies} was written by an Arian; and the \textit{Recognitions} was written by a Eunomian. See Schoeps, \textit{Theologie und Geschichte}, 38–43.

\textsuperscript{143} “Ein ebionitisch-katholisches Mischprodukt”; Schoeps, \textit{Theologie und Geschichte}, 42.

\textsuperscript{144} Schoeps, \textit{Theologie und Geschichte}, 49–50.

\textsuperscript{145} Schoeps, \textit{Theologie und Geschichte}, 54–56.
A major part of Schoeps’s argument was a strong denial that the *Kerygmma Petrou* had been influenced by Gnosticism in any way. Indeed, he argued that what other scholars had attributed to Gnostic tendencies could be explained better by appealing to ancient Judaism and to anti-Gnostic polemic.\(^{146}\) This included the purity material, which he tied closely to the former; for Schoeps, both baptism and bodily purification rituals went back to Jewish practice. In the case of the former, Schoeps denied that it was a replacement for circumcision.\(^{147}\) Instead, like many of those who came before him, he argued that the *Kerygmma Petrou* viewed baptism as a replacement for sacrifices\(^ {148}\) and as a rebirth. Water had the power to effect this rebirth because of the presence of God’s spirit in it, and it freed a person from the influence of the devil. Schoeps argued that both water veneration and the association of impurity and the demonic have proto-semitic origins, and that, over time, these ideas were “Judaized”—and later, “Christianized”—thus transforming into the initiatory bath of the Essenes and the baptism of the Ebionites.\(^ {149}\)

Schoeps connected the washings after intercourse and menstruation to “biblical-rabbinic Law”\(^ {150}\) and argued that Peter’s daily washings were an intensification of the handwashing rules debated by the rabbis. Schoeps also connected these purity regulations to the missionary outlook of Jewish Christianity. He argued that, just like “Great Church” Christianity, Jewish Christians

\(^{146}\) Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte*, 56–59. This includes, for example, the theme of secrecy, which Schoeps argues is also at work in Mishnaic literature (121).


were also keen to admit new members, and thus admitted Gentiles into their ranks. However, unlike the Jewish Christians described by Justin, Tertullian, Jerome, and Augustine, the Jewish Christians who wrote the *Kerygmata Petrou* did not expect their new Gentile members to follow the entirety of the Jewish Law. Rather, they modeled their expectations for them on the Torah’s Noahide Laws. Thus, for Schoeps, Peter’s speeches on θρησκεία (worship; cf. *Hom.* 7.4.1, 8.1–2) were not summaries of the entirety of the Jewish Law; rather, they were summaries of the expectations for proselytes. With regard to bodily purity specifically, Schoeps argued that the use of πορνεία in the Apostolic Decree (cf. Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25) was interpreted positively by the *Praxeis Petrou* as requiring washings after intercourse and menstruation.

In many ways, the article of the final scholar in our survey to adopt the Waitz – Schmidt – Cullmann hypothesis, Einar Molland, was a response to Schoeps’s conclusions. Molland continued the trend begun by Cullmann and continued by Thomas and Schoeps of incorporating more material into the *Kerygmata Petrou*. In a manner similar to Schoeps, Molland argued that anything in the Pseudo-Clementine Literature that fell under Recog. 3.75’s table of contents ought to be considered part of the source. As a result, the majority of the purity material—even material that had been excluded by Schoeps—was included in Molland’s reconstruction.

151 Schoeps critiqued his predecessors for underestimating this aspect of Jewish Christianity; see Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte*, 296–97.


153 Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte*, 302–3, esp. 302n2. Schoeps’s position is thus close to my own; see chapter 5.

154 Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte*, 303. This point was strongly denied by A.F.J. Klijn, who noted that there was no ancient parallel for reading πορνεία in this way. See A.F.J. Klijn, “The Pseudo-Clementines and the Apostolic Decree,” *NT* 10 (1968): 311. See also chapter 5.

In contrast to Schoeps, Molland insisted that baptism replaced circumcision, and the majority of his article is devoted to making this case. Of course, this fact does not negate the other functions of baptism, and Molland noted particularly the recurrence of fire imagery in the *Kerygmata Petrou*’s depictions of baptism: baptism extinguishes the fires of the sacrificial altar, of idol construction, of lust, of the future punishment, and of one’s first birth.

Molland also extended of Schoeps’s thesis that some material in the Pseudo-Clementine Literature was based on the Apostolic Decree by noting formal parallels between Acts 15:29 and Peter’s exhortations of acts to avoid following one’s baptism in *Recog.* 4.36/*Hom.* 8.23, *Hom.* 7.4, and *Hom.* 7.8. Given these parallels, Molland argues that these passages and Acts derive from a common tradition, and he agrees with Schoeps that the inclusion of bodily purification practices in the latter two passages reflects the way that the Pseudo-Clementine Literature interpreted the πορνεία of the Apostolic Decree. Indeed, Molland contends that their interpretation of πορνεία would have been closer to what the apostles intended.

The daily washings, by contrast, are not part of the *Kerygmata Petrou*’s understanding of the Apostolic Decree. Molland points out their optional nature (cf. *Hom.* 10.26/*Recog.* 5.36) and

---


158 Specifically, Molland points to the interdiction on murder, adultery, idolatry, and the consumption of blood and of animals that have been strangled. What remains on these lists, such as apostacy and greed, Molland considers later additions. Molland, “La circoncision,” 26–28, 30–31. For my investigation of the matter, see chapter 5.

159 Molland rules out the possibility that these passages are based on Acts itself, as the novels “belong to a milieu that did not accept that book, of which Paul is the hero” (“appartiennent à un milieu qui n’a pas accepté ce livre dont Paul est le héros”); Molland, “La circoncision,” 28.

160 See n. 154 on Klijn’s critique of this argument.

argues that, since they are not required by the Apostolic Decree, they are not required by the Pseudo-Clementine community. They are instead a means for the elite members of the community to further their piety.\footnote{Molland, “La circoncision,” 33. See the discussion of these rituals in chapter 4.}

Georg Strecker

The conclusions of Hilgenfeld, Waitz, Schmidt, and Cullman were not universally accepted. I have already noted above that a few scholars doubted that the Pseudo-Clementine Literature reflected any real Jewish-Christian movement in antiquity,\footnote{In addition to Headlam, Chapman, and Schwartz, see also F.J.A. Hort, Notes Introductory to the Study of the Clementine Recognitions: A Course of Lectures (London: MacMillan, 1901), 91–111, 131, who attributes the Recognitions to an “ingenious Helxaite,” and Wilhelm Frommberger, De origine Pseudo-Clementinorum, part 1 of De Simone Mago (Vratislavia: Otto Gutsmann, 1886), 13, 22–27, 38, who describes it as a fable (fabula) without any connection to the Ebionites.} but there were also some who insisted that the Jewish-Christian material in the texts were the result of interpolations made by later Jewish-Christian movements.\footnote{Such was the opinion of, e.g., Langen, Die Klemensromane, 89–104, 165; Bigg, “The Clementine Homilies,” 179–84; and Rehm, “Zur Entstehung,” 154, 161.} These scholars tended to doubt the existence of the Kerygma(ta) Petrou and the authenticity of Recog. 3.75 as its table of contents. John Chapman was most forceful when he contended, “It is surely obvious that the whole chapter is merely a part of the gigantic fraud; it is calculated to assist the verisimilitude which the writer is so anxious to introduce and maintain!”\footnote{Chapman, “On the Date of the Clementines,” 148.} By the second half of the twentieth century, this position was becoming more widely accepted,\footnote{See, e.g., Schwartz, “Unzeitgemäße Beobachtungen,” 178–87; Thomas, “Les Ébionites baptistes,” 292; and Rehm, “Zur Entstehung,” 146.} and thus the reconstructions of Hilgenfeld, Waitz, Schmidt, and Cullmann began to lose favor.
In light of this critique, a new hypothesis was proposed by Georg Strecker. In his treatment of Jewish Christianity in the Pseudo-Clementines, Strecker did away with much of the Waitz – Schmidt – Cullmann hypothesis. While he maintained the existence of the *Kerygmata Petrou*, he rejected the foundation on which the previous scholars had reconstructed it, the table of contents in *Recog.* 3.75. Instead, he reconstructed it using similarities between the novels and two of their introductory writings, the *Epistula Petri* and the *Diamartyria*, which he argued were written in conjunction with the *Kerygmata Petrou* based on their references to it. Strecker also questioned the existence of the *Praxeis Petrou/Itinéraire de Pierre* and the *Anagnorismoi*. He was relatively non-committal regarding the existence of the former, arguing that the source had “not yet been conclusively clarified,” but that its existence could not be dismissed outright. He was firmer regarding the *Anagnorismoi*, arguing that the recognition motif did not come from an independent source, but that the *Grundschrift* author was using a common literary device. In addition to the use of Bardaisan’s *On Fate* and the Greek philosophical source proposed by Heintze, Strecker also postulated a few new sources. The most significant of these was the *Anabathmoi Jakobou II*, which contained much of the material in *Recog.* 1.33–71. Also proposed was a Jewish Christian salvation history source (*Recog.* 167–8). Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum*, 60–62.


“Noch nicht endgültig geklärt zu sein”; Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum*, 255n1.

Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum*, 255n2. The idea that the *Anagnorismoi* was not its own source but the adoption of a genre convention had been argued earlier by Bernhard Rehm, “Clemens Romanus II,” in *RAC* 3:200–201.

See n. 74.

The name *Anabathmoi Jakobou* comes from Epiphanius *Pan.* 30.16.6. Parts of *Recog.* 1 had been associated with this source as far back as Karl Reinhold Köstlin, review of *Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien nach*
1.27–32; Hom. 8.10–19; 9.3–7//Recog. 4.9–13, 27–30), an anti-Marcionite source (Recog. 2.47–60), an ordination account (Hom. 3.60–72//Recog. 3.65–66), and a catalogue of myths (Recog. 13–41).

Strecker considered the *Anabathmoi Jakobou II* to be the earliest source composed, attributing it to a non-Gnostic Jewish Christian in or around Pella in the second half of the second century. The *Kerygmata Petrou*, by contrast, belonged to a “Gnosticizing Jewish Christianity” at the beginning of the third century. He attributed the *Grundschrift* to a Christian with Jewish sympathies, but refused to call its author “Catholic” or “heretical,” as “these epithets presume a separation that did not yet exist for those circumstances.”

---


175 “Gnostisierenden Judenchristentum”; Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum*, 213.


177 “Diese Epitheta setzen eine Scheidung voraus, die für jene Verhältnisse noch nicht existierte”; Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum*, 260. By “Verhältnisse,” Strecker specifically means Syria, where, he argues, the separation of orthodoxy and heresy was slower. On this point, Strecker was influenced by Walter Bauer; see Walter Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerie im ältesten Christentum*, BHTh 10 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1934), for which Strecker would later write an introduction to the 1964 edition.
to sometime between 220–300 CE.\textsuperscript{178} Finally, he attributed the \textit{Homilies} to an Arian in the first two decades of the fourth century,\textsuperscript{179} and the \textit{Recognitions} to a Catholic around 350 CE.\textsuperscript{180}

The separation of the \textit{Kerygmata Petrou} and the \textit{Anabathmoi Jakobou II} meant that the ideas of baptism as a replacement for sacrifices and baptism as a rebirth, placed in the same source by Cullmann, were once again separate. This time, however, the former perspective was not attributed to the \textit{Kerygmata Petrou}, but to the \textit{Anabathmoi Jakobou II}. Strecker points out that the latter was more concerned with baptism as a purification from sin, while this problem did not exist for the \textit{Kerygmata Petrou}. The \textit{Anabathmoi Jakobou II} was also unique in its insistence that baptism be performed in the name of Jesus.\textsuperscript{181} By contrast, the \textit{Kerygmata Petrou}, which contains much of the purity material in the Tripolis discourses,\textsuperscript{182} interprets baptism as a rebirth, replacing one’s first birth through desire and extinguishing the reproductive instinct.\textsuperscript{183}

Like Schliemann and Uhlhorn, Strecker argued that baptism did not fit neatly into the \textit{Kerygmata Petrou}’s system, as those without sin would not have needed a rebirth. Strecker suggested that it may have been included not because of its significance to the author but because of its entrenched nature in the Christian tradition.\textsuperscript{184}

---

\textsuperscript{178} Strecker, \textit{Das Judenchristentum}, 267.

\textsuperscript{179} Strecker, \textit{Das Judenchristentum}, 268.

\textsuperscript{180} Strecker, \textit{Das Judenchristentum}, 269–70.

\textsuperscript{181} Strecker, \textit{Das Judenchristentum}, 229.

\textsuperscript{182} Specifically, Strecker assigns \textit{Hom.} 11.21–33/\textit{Recog.} 6.6–14 to the \textit{Kerygmata Petrou} based on the shared uses of “living water” (δωρ ζων) and “regeneration” (ἀναγέννησις/ἀναγεννάσθαι) in this passage and in \textit{Diam.} 1.2. See Strecker, \textit{Das Judenchristentum}, 196–97.


\textsuperscript{184} Strecker, \textit{Das Judenchristentum}, 204.
The Kerygma Petrou also encouraged the practice of washing after intercourse and menstruation. These practices, as well as the depictions of Peter’s daily washings added by the Grundschrift author, can be traced back to Jewish practice.\textsuperscript{185} When the Homilies adopted this material, however, it interpreted Peter’s daily washings as profane baths. The Homilies thus also has Appion, the opponent of the Jews, take a bath before a meal. In addition, the Homilies does not state explicitly that these baths took place daily.\textsuperscript{186}

**The Fall of the Kerygma Petrou**

Strecker’s hypothesis dominated much of the second half of the twentieth century and was adopted by many, either entirely or with slight modifications.\textsuperscript{187} Despite its popularity, however, the last quarter of the twentieth century would see major challenges to some of its underlying assumptions. Two scholars in particular, Josep Rius-Camps and Jürgen Wehnert, objected to the use of theological and ideological differences in the text for separating out its sources. Instead, they proposed that the separation of sources be performed on literary and philological grounds. Only when they had been separated in this way could they then be analyzed for differences in ideology. The major casualty of this approach was the Kerygma Petrou, the existence of which both scholars denied based on their findings and which would all but disappear in subsequent scholarship.

\textsuperscript{185} Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum*, 207–8, 257.

\textsuperscript{186} Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum*, 208.

\textsuperscript{187} For a few examples, see Jones, *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source*, 20–34, esp. 26n120 and 30n139.
Apparently relying on an unpublished concordance of his own making, Josep Rius-Camps analyzed the linguistic patterns of the *Homilies* and *Recognitions* in order to separate out the *Grundschrift* and its sources. Based on his criteria, he concluded much of the Jewish-Christian material did not arise out of an early *Keryg mata Petrou*, but was the result of later interpolations and came from a variety of sources. This did not include the purity material, however, which Rius-Camps considered original to the *Grundschrift*.

While Rius-Camps framed his intervention as merely bringing “new and more precise instruments” to the task of separating out sources, Jürgen Wehnert was more explicitly critical of his predecessors, arguing that the multiple source-critical theories of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature were “an expression of formally and logically incorrect approaches to their reconstruction, if not entirely the product of a hermeneutical circle, especially where the ‘sources,’ born entirely from the preconception of their reconstructors, were extracted from the Pseudo-Clementines without supporting propositions of proof on another level.” To break out of this “hermeneutical circle,” Wehnert proposed reconstructing the sources of the Pseudo-

---

188 Rius-Camps refers to “a complete Greek and Latin Concordance of terms and particles appearing in both the Homilies and the Recognitions” that he “elaborated” but never cites. See Josep Rius-Camps, “Las pseudoclementinas: Bases filológicas para una nueva interpretación,” *RCat T* 1 (1976): 89–90, 156.

189 Rius-Camps, “Las pseudoclementinas,” 147–49. In this way, Rius-Camps is similar to the scholars cited in nn. 164–66.


Clementine Literature based on literary criteria, such as shifts from the first to the third person and the relative presence or absence of the character of Clement.

Using his criteria, Wehnert divided the texts into four stages of development: (1) the Peter-Simon novella, containing all the material of the disputation between Peter and Simon, as well as the Tripolis discourses; (2) the Clementine novel, which added the first-person narration of Clement, his search for meaning, and his reunion with his family; (3) the Letter stage, in which the texts were recast as letters from Clement to James, both within the novel and through the addition the *EpPt, Diam.*, and *EpCl*; and (4) the final forms of the *Homilies* and *Recognitions* as they have survived to us.\(^{193}\) Based on the close affinities between it and the *Acts of Peter*, Wehnert dated the novella to the end of the second or the beginning of the third century. The novel and the letter frame came out of the mid-third century (220–270 CE), based on Origen’s citation of the work (*Philoc.* 23) and its use of Bardaisan. The completion of the *Homilies* occurred in the last third of the third century, and that of the *Recognitions* in the early fourth century.\(^{194}\)

Having separated the text in this way, Wehnert then addressed each layer’s theological outlook and perspective on purity in his book on the Apostolic Decree.\(^{195}\) He found the greatest importance attached to bodily purity in the material he attributed to the Peter-Simon novella


\(^{194}\) Wehnert, “Abriss,” 229–32.

(specifically, Hom. 7.4.2, 8.1–2; 8.19.1–4; and Recog. 4.36.1–5). Like Schoeps and Molland before him, Wehnert noted the parallels between these sections and the Apostolic Decree, and, like Molland, argued that they are based on a common oral tradition. However, unlike Schoeps and Molland, Wehnert did not believe that the practices of bodily purification were connected to the Apostolic Decree’s use of πορνεία; rather, he argued that the washings after menstruation and intercourse were additions to the oral tradition based on the laws of Torah. It should be emphasized that, for Wehnert, these additions were not due to some corruption of a pure Christianity, but rather arose out of a single community’s interpretations of Leviticus 17–18. Because of the similarities between the purity regulations of this text and those observed by the opponents of the Didaskalia apostolorum, Wehnert connected the novella to a Syrian Jewish Christianity.

The other layers add nothing new in relation to bodily purity; indeed, they often revised or removed this material. These changes are clearest in the case of the Recognitions,

---


197 Wehnert, Die Reinheit, 175–79.

198 Wehnert, Die Reinheit, 183–86.


200 Wehnert, Die Reinheit, 179.

201 “The Sitz im Leben of the primary and the secondary regulations is thus the same” (“Der Sitz im Leben der primären wie der sekundären Bestimmungen ist also derselbe”); Wehnert, Die Reinheit, 179. On Lev 17–18 as the basis for the Apostolic Decree, see Wehnert, Die Reinheit, 209–38, and chapter 5 below.

202 Wehnert, Die Reinheit, 179, 183.

203 Wehnert’s prime examples of this are the explanations of the faith to Mattidia (Hom. 13.4) and Faustus (Hom. 14–15), which do not contain references to bodily purity (Wehnert, Die Reinheit, 168; Wehnert, “Taufvorstellungen,” 1085).
whose final editor removed much of the material relating to bodily purity that is included in the *Homilies.* However, it is also present in the revisions made by the Clementine novelist; Wehnert pointed to *Hom.* 11.24–33 as a passage that initially treated bodily purity but that had been heavily worked over by the Clementine novelist in order to prioritize his concerns over those of the novella.  

These concerns, Wehnert argued, related to baptism, which he argued absorbed much of the significance of bodily purity. In the novella, baptism had been a purification of body and soul that removed demons, disease, and sin. It was a salvation from one’s previous sinful life, but did not guarantee the eternal reward on its own; certain ethical precepts needed to be followed after one had been baptized. Because of this limited scope, baptism was not required for those who already live an ethical life, and Wehnert argued that the text heavily implies that baptism would not be necessary for Jews who follow the Law. By contrast, baptism takes on a more significant role in the later layers. In the Clementine novel, for example, it is not just a purification from sin, but serves as a second birth, which replaces one’s first birth through sexual desire. Baptism thus becomes a prerequisite for salvation. That is not to say that the need for good works has not diminished between these layers; they are still portrayed as necessary.

---


This theology of baptism is adopted by the subsequent layers of the text,\textsuperscript{210} with the major exception of \textit{Recog.} 1.27–72, where it primarily serves as a replacement for sacrifices.\textsuperscript{211} Based on these and other disagreements that the later layers had with the Peter-Simon novella, particularly their attitudes toward Paul and Acts, Wehnert argued that the later layers arose out of a “different perspective” than the Peter-Simon novella.\textsuperscript{212} Like Strecker, Wehnert did not identify these communities.

Wehnert’s reconstruction was adopted by a few scholars, either completely or in part. The works of two such scholars, Claudio Gianotto and Giovanni Bazzana, addressed a gap left by Wehnert, namely, a discussion of the daily washings. Gianotto, with Molland, argued that the daily washings were not required, but were rather “signs of a more elevated perfection.”\textsuperscript{213} Bazzana was more detailed in his exploration. He began by locating the daily washings within Wehnert’s literary strata; he placed Peter’s washings in Tripolis within the Peter-Simon novella (\textit{Hom.} 8.2.5; 10.26.2) and Clement’s washing in Laodicea in the Clementine novel (\textit{Hom.} 14.1.2).\textsuperscript{214} He bolsters his argument for separating these two instances of washing by noting a difference between them: Peter’s washings in Tripolis occur prior to meals, while Clement’s washing in Laodicea occurs before prayer. For him, the latter purpose for washing is an

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{210} Wehnert, \textit{Die Reinheit}, 172–73; Wehnert, “Taufvorstellungen,” 1093–102.
\item \textsuperscript{211} Wehnert, “Taufvorstellungen,” 1095–99.
\item \textsuperscript{212} “Veränderte Sichtweise”; Wehnert, \textit{Die Reinheit}, 183–85.
\item \textsuperscript{214} Bazzana omits discussions of Peter’s washings in \textit{Hom.} 9.23.3, 10.1.2, and 11.1.1, arguing that, since these have no parallel in the \textit{Recognitions}, they are likely part of the additions made by the \textit{Homilies}’ final redactor(s). See Giovanni Battista Bazzana, “Il battesimo nel romanzo pseudo-clementino: contributo alla storia religiosa giudeo-cristiana,” \textit{ASTRel} 5 (2004): 394–396.
\end{itemize}
innovation; while washing prior to meals was a common practice in the Second Temple Period and in contemporary rabbinic practice, washing prior to prayer was not. Bazzana differed from Gianotto and Molland regarding the purpose of these washings; rather than a practice of piety, he contended that they were performed while the characters are in foreign lands because of the general impurity of Gentiles. In addition to these arguments, both Gianotto and Bazzana also noted that they understood the purifications after menstruation and intercourse to be related to the πορνεία of the Apostolic Decree, against Wehnert and with Molland.

**Current Scholarship**

Even if their source-critical reconstructions did not see widespread acceptance, the works of Rius-Camps and Wehnert effectively killed the *Keryg mata Petrou*. The opinion of F. Stanley Jones is representative of this point. He credits Rius-Camps with illuminating how “previous scholarship has been much too preoccupied with reconstructing this hypothetical source,” and comments that “the hypothesis of a source called the *Keryg mata Petrou* has thus unnecessarily drawn Pseudo-Clementine studies into a mire of speculation and uncertainty.” As such, Jones argues, “The time seems to have come to abandon this hackneyed hypothesis.” He instead recommends that the Pseudo-Clementine Literature be studied by “first clearly identifying the

---

215 According to Bazzana, this practice “signals a change of polarity that, through Jewish-Christian mediation, will finally lead to the new Islamic configuration” (“segna la mutamento di polarità, che, tramite la mediazione giudeo-cristiana, condurrà infine alla nuova configurazione islamica”); Bazzana, “Il battesimo,” 396. However, as Gianotto had already noted, ablutions before prayer are attested in some other ancient Jewish texts, including Judith, the *Letter of Aristeas*, and the *Sibylline Oracles*; see Gianotto, “Les bap têmes,” 231.

216 Bazzana, “Il battesimo,” 403. See chapter 3 n. 13 for my arguments against this.

work and redaction of the author of the *Klementia*, the author of the *Recognitions*, and the Basic Writer.¹²¹⁸ Jones himself has thus dedicated much of his scholarship on the texts to studying *Recog.* 1.27–71 (what Strecker had called the *Anabathmoi Jakobou II*) and the *Grundschrift*.¹²¹⁹

Though source-critical theories of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature continue to be developed,²²⁰ most scholars have sided with Jones and have thus turned their attention to the final forms of the *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, as well as the material shared by both that could reasonably be attributed to the *Grundschrift*. In many cases, these scholars have moved away from studying the “Jewish Christianity” of the texts, instead focusing on other themes significant to them. M.J. Edwards, for example, has examined the *Grundschrift*’s narrative frame in order to demonstrate that it did not appropriate its sources haphazardly, but that the chose sources reinforce the arguments within the discourses²²¹; Meinolf Vielberg has examined the literary structure of the *Recognitions* to provide a clearer image of its supposed author, Clement²²²; Dominique Côté has investigated the theme of Peter and Simon’s opposition in the final forms of...
both texts; Nicole Kelley has examined the Recognitions’ perspective on epistemology; and, most recently, Patricia Duncan has investigated the literary techniques employed by the author of the Homilies.

By noting this broadening of interest in the novels, I do not mean to imply that the novels’ attitudes toward Judaism and Christianity have seen any less interest; indeed, the novels’ insights on the relationship between Christianity and Judaism in antiquity are still a significant point of interest for scholars. In this conversation, the postulated Grundschrift and the final forms of the novels has taken on a new importance due to the recent critiques of the “Parting of the Ways” model that dominated much of the latter half of the twentieth century. Rather than viewing Judaism and Christianity as fully-formed religions that mutually “parted ways” at the end of the first or the beginning of the second century, it has become more common to view the split as having occurred much later—perhaps even as late as the fourth century in some places—and for the boundaries between the two to have been much blurrier prior to that point.

---


225 Duncan, Novel Hermeneutics.

226 That is not to say that the extraction of prior sources has lost any importance, only that scholars have become more tentative when doing so. See, e.g., Everett Ferguson, Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 248–65, who precedes his conclusions by noting: “If those students of the Pseudo-Clementines who say that at least some of the baptismal teaching and practice recorded in the Pseudo-Clementines go back to Jewish-Christian components (and are not simply a reflection of catholic redaction in the third century) are right, then some significant conclusions follow” (264).

context, the places where “Jewish” and “Christian” elements are juxtaposed in the novels no longer need to be explained by sequestering them to an early stage of their development or attributing them to a separatist community; rather, they can be read as reflective of one of the many ways in which the God of Israel was worshipped in antiquity.\textsuperscript{228}

In this context, scholars have emphasized how the purity regulations in the Pseudo-Clementine Literature, and those in the \textit{Homilies} in particular, served to differentiate the Pseudo-Clementine communities not from some “Great Church” Christianity, but from the larger Gentile world. For Annette Yoshiko Reed, for example, the purity rituals in the \textit{Homilies} function as a means of separating those Gentiles within the community from those Gentiles without it. Entrance into the community is performed through baptism, the washing away of the impurity caused by idolatry and sexual impropriety, and continued washings are performed in order to maintain “purity and monotheism in a world polluted by polytheism, idolatry, and bloodshed.”\textsuperscript{229}

Karin Hedner Zetterholm makes the same point in her work, noting that, by being baptized and joining the \textit{Homilies’} community, “The line dividing humanity has been redrawn so that it no

\textsuperscript{228} I find the metaphor that Daniel Boyarin uses in \textit{Dying for God} to be particularly helpful here. Boyarin argues that, rather than existing as discreet communities, Judaism and Christianity should instead be thought of as existing on a spectrum: “I tend to think of Judaism and Christianity in late antiquity as points on a continuum. On one end were the Marcionites, the followers of the second-century Marcion, who believed that the Hebrew Bible had been written by an inferior God and had no standing for Christians who had completely denied the ‘Jewishness’ of Christianity. On the other were the many Jews for whom Jesus meant nothing. In the middle, however, were many gradations that provided social and cultural mobility from one end of this spectrum to the other”; Boyarin, \textit{Dying for God}, 8.

longer runs between Jews and ethnē/gentiles/pagans but rather between theosebeis (Jews and baptized gentiles) on the one hand, and ethnē/pagans on the other.”

Most recently, Holger M. Zellentin has argued that the ideas surrounding purity and purification in the Homilies were a means of incorporating Gentiles into the Homilies’ community by charging them with observing a subset of Jewish Law intended for Gentiles. Like Molland and Wehnert before him, Zellentin argues that Hom. 7.4.2, 7.8.1–2, and 8.19.1–4 are based on the Apostolic Decree. However, where Molland and Wehnert limited themselves to what they considered to be the earliest form of the tradition (in Wehnert’s words, the “vorpskl. Reinheitsvorschriften”), Zellentin argues that the final form of these texts in the Homilies betrays a continued discussion surrounding the laws to be followed by Gentiles. Comparing these texts to the Apostolic Decree and the rabbinic Noahide Laws (cf. t. ‘Abod. Zar. 9:4), Zellentin argues that the Homilies’ purity regulations are based on the Torah’s laws for the gerim (םירג), resident foreigners in the land of Israel, whose laws were considered by many Jews to apply to Gentiles. Thus, prohibitions against the consumption of carrion and improperly slaughtered animals preserved in the Homilies are based on Lev 17:15–16. The only addition, Zellentin

---


231 Wehnert, Die Reinheit, 174.


233 Cf. Zellentin, Law Beyond Israel, 98. Leviticus 17:15–16 technically only require washing after consuming these things, but their prohibition to Israelites in Deut 14:21 may have been interpreted by the Homilies as extending to Gentile proselytes. See chapter 5.
argues, is the commandment to wash after intercourse, which was expected of Israelites but not of the gerim (cf. 15:18).\textsuperscript{234}

Based on these recent scholarly developments, this dissertation analyzes the Homilies as a unified whole and assumes that they come from a historical context in which Judaism and Christianity had not yet “parted ways.” Though the novels certainly used sources—the existence of two novels with such similar material would not be possible if this were not the case—their final redactors did not incorporate them haphazardly, preserving points of view with which they themselves would not have agreed. The novels were not strained “through a catholic filter but one with rather large holes,” as Everett Furgeson argues.\textsuperscript{235} Rather, the final redactor(s) of the Homilies (and, indeed, of the Recognitions) chose their sources carefully, editing them as needed to present their own perspectives, transforming all that they touched, to paraphrase William Thompson.\textsuperscript{236}

It would be fruitful, as Uhlhorn had already argued in the nineteenth century, to read and analyze the Homilies from the point of view of its final form, as reflecting a living perspective on purity from the fourth century. This dissertation argues that the Homilies presents a thoroughly Jewish understanding of purity, but one that is directed at Gentiles. The purity regulations, while deriving from Torah, are not understood as “Jewish Law,” but as natural law, law that applies to all humanity regardless of one’s ethnic origin. In this sense, the Homilies participates in a broad

\textsuperscript{234} Zellentin, Law Beyond Israel, 94, and Zellentin, “Gentile Purity Law,” 148; see also Zetterholm, “Jewish Teachings for Gentiles, 73–74.

\textsuperscript{235} Ferguson, Baptism in the Early Church, 249.

\textsuperscript{236} In speaking about the Gospel of Matthew, Thompson writes: “My basic methodological presupposition is that Matthew’s editorial activity—whether it be called redaction or composition—was so thorough-going and proceeded out of such a unique vision that it transformed all that he touched.” William Thompson, “An Historical Perspective on the Gospel of Matthew,” JBL 93 (1974): 244n2.
conversation, in which other Christians and Rabbinic Jews were also participants, regarding the legal requirements of Gentiles.

**Conclusion**

The history of the study of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature has been greatly influenced by historical models for understanding the development of Judaism and Christianity in the ancient world. During the nineteenth and most of the twentieth centuries, Judaism and Christianity were understood to have separated early, and thus the juxtaposition of “Jewish” and “Christian” elements in the novels posed a problem. The texts were thus endlessly cut apart, boiled down into “Jewish-Christian,” “orthodox,” and “Gnostic” strata, all in the attempt to make it fit into this preconception of history.

As scholars have moved away from those historical preconceptions, the novels have begun to be read on their own terms, as the unities that their final redactors intended. This is not only a better way of reading the texts, but also a better way of doing history, allowing the text to speak for itself rather than stifling and separating that voice. It is in this context that this dissertation operates. In what follows, I read the *Homilies* as a unity, starting from the presupposition that its final editor(s) incorporated and edited material that reflected their own worldview. In the next chapter, I begin this process by analyzing the *Homilies’* conception of purity and comparing it to other ancient Jewish ways of understanding purity. I do this, not conceiving the text to be “Jewish-Christian,” but instead as part of the wider Jewish and Christian religious makeup of late antiquity.
CHAPTER 2
THE *HOMILIES*’ PURITY FRAMEWORK

When we turn our attention to the subject of purity in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*, this time without separating its material into “Jewish-Christian,” “Gnostic,” and “orthodox” layers, we discover a conception of purity that is common, even standard, among contemporary Jews. This finding should not surprise us. As recent challenges to the “Parting of the Ways” model have shown, while many Jews and Christians had begun conceiving themselves as belonging to separate religions by the start of the fourth century, many others had not, and both the textual and archeological records attest to continued interactions and blurry boundaries between the two groups.¹ The use of a “Jewish” purity framework by a “Christian” text like the *Homilies*, then, need not be explained by appealing to a deviant group or to a source-critical accident, but instead can be analyzed as one of the many ways that the God of Israel could be worshipped in late antiquity.²

In the present chapter, I investigate the *Homilies*’ purity framework. This investigation is divided into three sections. In the first, I start with an analysis *Hom*. 11.28–29, the *Homilies*’ most direct description of its purity framework. We are fortunate to have this passage preserved in two forms, a Greek and a Syriac. As I noted in the introduction, the Syriac translation is a significant witness to the text of the *Homilies*, as it is much older than either of the Greek

---

¹ See nn. 9 and 227 of the previous chapter.

² See Boyarin’s spectrum metaphor in n. 228 of the previous chapter.
Nevertheless, my analysis employs the Greek as the primary witness. I have chosen to approach the text this way because, in many cases, the ways in which the Syriac deviates from the Greek betrays influence from the Recognitions. This influence is most obvious outside the passage in question, particularly in Hom. 12.1–24, 13.1–7, where the Syriac translator imports much from Recog. 7.1–32 in their rendering. However, influence from the Recognitions can also be detected elsewhere; significantly for our purposes, the Syriac borrows from the Recognitions when it removes the defilement of seminal emission in its translation of Hom. 11.30.1. Because of this, I will focus on the Greek text, pointing out differences in the Syriac as they are significant.

In Hom. 11.28–29, the Apostle Peter tells a crowd of Gentiles that purity is divided into two kinds: Purity of the body and purity of the heart. As the names imply, these two sorts of purity have different loci. The former relates to externalities. A person is pure of body when they are clean from certain physical defilements. Menstruation is singled out in the passage at hand, but elsewhere seminal emission is also highlighted as a source of bodily impurity (cf. Hom. 11.30.1, 33.4). Purity of the heart, by contrast, deals with internalities. A person is pure of heart when they have avoided engaging in sinful behaviors. Peter argues that the latter is more

---

3 For more on these manuscripts, see the introduction.

4 On this point, see F. Stanley Jones, The Syriac Pseudo-Clementines, 40–41, as well as his footnotes throughout pp. 291–319.

5 I will address this point in the next chapter.

6 As noted above, this is only the case in the Greek; the Syriac removes the references to seminal emission as a source of bodily defilement in its translation. See my analysis of the texts in chapter 3, and my case that the Syriac translator removed references to seminal emission because he did not consider it to defile Gentiles in chapter 5.

7 Though, no one is pure of heart until they have been baptized, because all possess innate defilement as a result of their carnal conception. See chapter 3.
significant than the former; it is far more important that one has a pure heart than a pure body. However, he also emphasizes that the latter is not insignificant, and indeed proceeds logically from the former. Those who are pure of heart, he claims, will necessarily care for the purity of their bodies.8

This twofold understanding was standard among Jews during and after the Second Temple period, and, in the second section of this chapter, I discuss the work of scholars who have made this case. Though these scholars have often differed in details and terminology, they generally agree that ancient Jews understood purity to be divided into two categories: one that dealt with the purity of the body, and another that dealt with sin.9 These theories have received a good deal of criticism, in particular due to the proposition that purity laws arose out of such a system. While such criticisms have provided an important corrective to the study of purity in ancient Judaism, I am not prepared to jettison the physical purity/sin purity dichotomy entirely. Rather, I argue that, as Jonathan Klawans in particular has shown,10 the near ubiquity of this understanding in ancient Judaism, particularly during and following the Second Temple Period, reflects the dichotomy’s popularity among ancient Jews as an interpretive lens for understanding their purity laws. The Homilies also employs this lens, thus showing itself to be entrenched in a Jewish milieu.

8 The reverse, however, is not true; those who care for their bodies do not necessarily care for their hearts. See the analysis of Hom. 11.28.1–3 below.

9 Some scholars have added a third category of purity, “genealogical purity,” which refers to the purity of descent, i.e., the idea that Israel had a “holy seed” that should not be mixed through marriage with Gentiles. For this position, see Christine E. Hayes, Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion form the Bible to the Talmud (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002). The Homilies does not concern itself with this sort of impurity, and thus I do not address it in this dissertation.

The rest of this dissertation addresses six characteristics of each kind of defilement: (1) its sources, (2) its durability, (3) its transmissibility, (4) the limitations it places on those who contract it, (5) the means of its removal, and (6) the vocabulary used to describe each.\textsuperscript{11} In the third and final section of the chapter, I interrogate the last of these differences. Since the Syriac translation betrays influence from the \textit{Recognitions}, I focus on the Greek terminology.\textsuperscript{12} I argue that there is a relatively consistent, but by no means uniform, utilization of vocabulary throughout \textit{Homilies} to refer to purity of the heart. Specifically, discussions of this sort of purity tend to use κάθαρσις and its cognates. Vocabulary relating to the defilement of this purity is more varied, employing words such as ἀκάθαρτος, μιαίνω, μυσαρός, μιαρός, and μολύνω. The vocabulary of purification from this defilement is again more consistent, most frequently utilizing βάπτισμα and its cognates,\textsuperscript{13} but in one instance also using ἀπολύω. Bodily purity, by contrast, only has consistent vocabulary when it is juxtaposed with purity of the heart, i.e., within \textit{Hom.} 11.28–33. In this context, the \textit{Homilies} employs ἁγνεία and its cognates. Outside of this context, words related to ἁγνεία are rare, and when they do appear, they are usually better interpreted as relating to chastity or purity of the heart. Instead, bodily purity is much more frequently discussed in practical terms. Thus, it is more common to find bodily purity referred to by its means of defilement and removal. The former includes menstrual blood and semen, which are discussed using varying vocabulary. The language for the removal of these impurities, however, is more consistent, most frequently using words related to λούω and one instance of πλύνω. These conclusions are presented in tables in Appendix C for ease of reference.

\textsuperscript{11} This list has been modified from that proposed by Klawans. See n. 62.

\textsuperscript{12} Analysis of the Syriac text will appear in footnotes.

\textsuperscript{13} In chapter four, I will argue that purification from heart defilement is a lengthy process that culminates in baptism.
In the next two chapters, I discuss the remaining characteristics of each kind of impurity: its sources, durability, transmissibility, limitations, and removal. Chapter three is dedicated to the sources of each kind of defilement, and chapter four discusses the latter four characteristics of impurity, focusing particularly on the means of its removal. These discussions will prepare us for my claims in the final chapter, where I argue that, though the Homilies employs a Jewish purity framework, its specific exhortations are directed at Gentiles.

**Purity of the Body and Purity of the Heart in Hom. 11.28–29**

The Homilies most clearly defines its conception of purity in Hom. 11.28–29. This passage occurs toward the end of Peter’s final discourse to the Gentile inhabitants of Tripolis, his fourth in as many days. The purpose of these discourses, as he explained at the beginning of the first discourse, is to argue that we “ought not find fault with the God who made all things” for the existence of evil, “so that it may be known as reasonable that many are oppressed by many demons and seized by strange sufferings, as even in this the just action of God may appear” (μὴ δεῖν μέμφεσθαι τὸν τὰ πάντα πεποιηκότα θεὸν ... ἵνα γνωσθῇ ὡς εὐλόγως οἱ πολλοὶ ύπὸ πολλῶν δαμόνων συνεσχέθησαν καὶ ύπὸ ἄλλοκτων παθῶν κατελήφθησαν, διότι καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ δίκαιον φανῆ, Hom. 8.9.1–2). To that end, Peter set about explaining where evil came from, how it currently holds sway in the minds of his audience, and what they can do to be rid of it. The subject of the first speech concerned the fall of humanity\(^\text{14}\) and the origin of demons (Hom. 8); the second concerned the origin of idolatry and the motivations of demons (Hom. 9); the third was a polemic against idolatry (Hom. 10); and the fourth continued the polemic against idolatry

---

\(^\text{14}\) This, importantly, did not occur through Adam, but through the apathy of his descendants. See chapter 3 on the Homilies’ defense of Adam in the context of the “Doctrine of the False Pericopes.”
and discussed the means by which the audience can purify themselves of the impurity that has
grown in their minds as a result of their previous actions (Hom. 11).\(^\text{15}\)

Toward the conclusion of the final day’s speech, Peter turns his attention to bodily purity,
and it is here that he more clearly defines his conception of purity. In Hom. 11.28, his language
surrounding purity begins to double:

However, at some point, it is necessary to add something to these things\(^\text{16}\) that does not
have community with people, but is unique to the worship of God. I mean\(^\text{17}\) to be pure,
not to have intercourse with one’s own wife while she is menstruating,\(^\text{18}\) because the Law
of God commands this. But what? If being pure was not dedicated to the worship of God,
would you pleasantly roll about like dung-beetles?\(^\text{19}\) Therefore, like people who have
something more than the irrational animals (that is, being rational),\(^\text{20}\) purify your heart of
evil things\(^\text{21}\) through heavenly reason, and wash your body in the bath. For, truly, it is
good to be pure, not because purity of the body precedes purification concerning the
heart, but because the pure follows the good.\(^\text{22}\) (Hom. 11.28.1–3)

---

\(^{15}\) For more on the Tripolis discourses, see the introduction and Appendix A.

\(^{16}\) The antecedent of τοῦτος is probably the rest of Peter’s speech in Hom. 11, or perhaps the series of speeches in
Hom. 8–11. The Syriac uses the more specific “to them (f)” (全资子). While this did not affect Frankenberg’s
retrotranslation of the Syriac into Greek (Die syrischen Clementinen, 279), Jones (The Syriac Pseudo-Clementines,
283) considers this to refer back to the “good works” (📸📸📸) in Hom. 11.27.2.

\(^{17}\) The Syriac adds “before all” (📸📸📸 φιλοτέχνηγε).

\(^{18}\) Frankenberg’s edition has φυλάσσετε, “in silver,” instead of φυλάσσετε, “in menstruation” (Die syrischen Clementinen,
278). I do not know whether the error rests with the manuscript or with Frankenberg.

\(^{19}\) Εἰ μὴ καὶ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ θρησκεία τὸ καθαρσεῖν ἁνέκαπτο, ἡμεῖς ὡς οἱ κάνθαροι ἥδεος ἵν ἐκκόλοπαι; Syriac: “Even
if this was not ordained by God, that a person should be clean, would it be pleasing to you to roll in the mud like
abominable pigs?” (📸📸📸 φυλάσσετε ἐν ὁμοίῳ χρυσῷ ἐν ἀθάνατοι ὡς ἐκκολοπάτησθετε γὰρ ἐν παθε ἀρρηθεῖσθε γὰρ ἀνθρώποι εὐς ἀν
καθαρήθείσθε).

\(^{20}\) Τὸ λόγικον εἶναι. Absent from the Syriac.

\(^{21}\) Τὸν κακὸν. Absent from Syriac.

\(^{22}\) Καλὸν γὰρ τὰ ἄλθητα τὸ καθαρσεῖν, οὐχ ὡς ὅτι προστείλεται τῆς κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν καθάρσεως ἢ τοῦ σώματος
ἀγνεία, ἀλλ’ ὡς ὅτι ἐπιτρέπεται τὸ ἀγαθὸ τὸ καθάριστον. Syriac: “Truthfully, purity of the body is good, but it is not
superior to the purity of the mind, but it is also required for the good” (📸📸📸 φυλάσσετε ἐν ὁμοίῳ χρυσῷ ἐν ἀθάνατοι ὡς ἐκκολοπάτησθε
τὴς κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν καθάρσεως ἢ τοῦ σώματος ἀγνείας). For the Greek text, I have adopted the
emendation of Rehm (which he adopted from Paul de Lagarde), replacing κατὰ with καλὸν. This change conforms
the Greek to both the Syriac and to its parallel in Recog. 6.11.1. If the κατὰ is retained, the syntax becomes rather
awkward, but could be rendered in a similar fashion to Peter Peterson’s translation in ANF 8:290: “For purification
The doubling of purity language happens twice in this passage. First, Peter gives his audience two commands to purify themselves: once with respect to the heart, and again with respect to the body. Afterward, Peter describes the relationship between two different kinds of purity, “purity of the body” (ἡ τοῦ σώματος ἁγνεία/καθαρσία) and “purification concerning the heart” (ἡ κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν κάθαρσις/καθαρσία). The doubling in this passage is not only theoretical, but also linguistic, at least in the Greek: Peter’s command to purify the heart uses καθαίρω, while his command to wash the body uses πλύνω; similarly, his designation for purity of the heart uses κάθαρσις, while that for purity of the body uses ἁγνεία.

Already as he introduces his twofold division of purity, Peter begins to discuss their relationship to one another. He argues that purity of the body proceeds logically from purity of the heart. Bodily purity does not “precede” (προηγεῖται) purity of the heart, but the pure (i.e., bodily purity) follows (ἕπεται) the good (i.e., purity of the heart). These ideas of “proceeding” and “following” indicate both their logical relationship and their relative importance. If one obtains a pure heart, Peter argues, they will necessarily care for their body.

According to the truth is not that the purity of the body precedes purification after the heart, but that purity follows goodness.”

23 Properly speaking, καθαίρω καθαρσία is not “purity of the heart,” but “purity of the mind.” This change is not a significant one, as the Homilies treats the heart, mind, and soul as synonymous (see nn. 63 and 70 below), and the Syriac translator had already used “heart” (قلب) in Peter’s command to “purify your heart” (قلب نذك厌恶).

24 These are also different in the Syriac; καθαίρω is translated with כסה, while πλύνω is translated with כסה.

25 The Syriac translates both κάθαρσις and ἁγνεία with כסה.

26 The Syriac of these two verbs is quite different. See n. 22.
Peter defends this point by appealing to Matt 23:25–26, in which Jesus critiques some of the Pharisees and scribes for washing the outside of the cup and bowl but neglecting the inside. Peter interprets the references to “the inside” and “the outside” as referring to the two kinds of purity:

And truly! For when the mind is enlightened with knowledge, the learner can be good, which is followed by becoming pure. For good forethought for the body without comes from understanding within, as forethought for understanding cannot come from the senselessness of the body. Thus, the one who is pure can purify both what is within and what is without, but the one who purifies what is without does this seeking the approval of the people, and through the approval of those who observe, he has nothing before God. (Hom. 11.29.3–4)

Here, Peter reiterates the logical relationship between the two kinds of purity, noting once again that “the good” is followed (παρέπεται) by “the pure.” “Understanding” (ὥσπερ), the

---

27 Both the Homilies and the Recognitions make a point to note that only some of the Pharisees and scribes are guilty of hypocrisy in this regard; see Hom. 11.28.4–29.2//Recog. 6.11.2–3. Albert I. Baumgarten and Annette Yoshiko Reed have argued that this defense of the Pharisees and scribes may betray a community more sympathetic to rabbinic Judaism; see Albert I. Baumgarten, “Literary Evidence for Jewish Christianity in the Galilee,” in The Galilee in Late Antiquity, ed. Lee I. Levine (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992), 39–50, and Annette Yoshiko Reed, “When Did Rabbis Become Pharisees? Reflections on Christian Evidence for Post-70 Judaism,” in Envisioning Judaism: Studies in Honor of Peter Schäfer on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday, ed. Ra’anan Boustan et al. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 885–93.

28 Ὁ μαθητής. Syriac: “The one who is enlightened” (ܡܕܡ=

29 Ό παρέπεται τὸ καθαρὸν γενέσθαι. Syriac: “Since purity is joined to goodness” (ܡܡܚܝܬ ܐܬܐܕ ܘܚ)}. Note the interplay between πρόνοια (“forethought”) and διάνοια (“understanding”).

30 Εξω. Absent from Syriac.

31 Ὡς ἀπὸ γε τῆς κατὰ τὸ σῶμα ἀναστηθειας τῆς διανοίας πρόνοια γενέσθαι οὐ δύναται. Syriac: “For it is not possible that care for the mind be from the body, since it does not have sense in it” (ܠܫܠܝ ܐܬܐܕ ܘܚ ܢܫܠܐ ܠܫܠܝ ܐܬܐܕ ܘܚ). Note the interplay between πρόνοια (“forethought”) and διάνοια (“understanding”).

32 Οὕτως ὁ καθαρὸς καὶ τὸ ἔσω καὶ τὸ ἔξω καθάραι δύναται. Syriac: “Thus, the one who is pure on the inside can also purify his outside” (ܡܡܚܝܬ ܐܬܐܕ ܘܚ ܠܫܠܝ ܐܬܐdependently, ܠܫܠܝ ܐܬܐdependently).

33 Syriac adds “only” (ܩܬܐdependently).

34 Ἐπαίνω τὸν ἱστοροῦντον. Absent from Syriac.
development of which is an important step in the purifying of one’s heart, necessarily produces bodily purity. However, because of the senselessness (ἀναισθησία) of the body, the other way is impossible; the body cannot understand, and thus it would be incapable of passing understanding to the mind. Thus, some of the Pharisees of Jesus’s day are condemned as hypocrites because they considered bodily purity to be more significant than purity of the heart. Peter concludes this section by arguing that purifying the body without purifying the heart, as some of the Pharisees of Jesus’s day did, arises out of a disordered desire, that being to be seen by others. By contrast, the person who is truly pure purifies both their outside and their inside, both their body and their heart.

Though Peter does not state so explicitly here, the context of this passage within a polemic against idolatry, as well as the passage’s references to purity of the heart as “the good” (τὸ ἀγαθὸν) and of the process of becoming pure of heart as becoming pure of “evil things” (τὰ κακά), makes it clear that purity of the heart has to do with ethics and sin. The proper “understanding” to which Peter refers here is a comprehension of God’s sole divine power and the uselessness of idols, and thus the “evil things” are everything related to sin against God, particularly idolatry. Purity of the body, by contrast, comes not from sin but from certain

35 Attaining the correct understanding is a significant component of purifying one’s heart. See chapter 4.

36 I should note that Matthew’s polemic against the Pharisees should not be read as reflecting historical reality. Doing so has led to misunderstanding the Pharisees of the ancient world and to stereotypes of Jews as excessively legalistic in the medieval and modern worlds. For more historically grounded reconstructions of the ancient Pharisees and analyses of how the gospels’ anti-Pharisaic polemics have been used to promote anti-Semitism in the medieval and modern worlds, see the recent contributions in Joseph Sievers and Amy-Jill Levine, eds., The Pharisees (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2021).

37 On “understanding,” see chapter 4; on the “evil things,” see chapter 3.
physical sources. Menstruation is mentioned explicitly here, but later seminal emission will also be described as a conveyer of bodily impurity.\textsuperscript{38}

\textit{The Homilies and Purity in Ancient Judaism}

This twofold understanding of purity promoted by the \textit{Homilies} fits well among contemporary Jewish purity frameworks, as a number of scholars have noted in the last forty years. In general, these scholars argue that ancient Jews had not one system of purity, but two, one that dealt with bodily defilements and another that dealt with ethics. Thus, rather than being composed of \textquotedblleft Gnostic\textquotedblright{} and \textquotedblleft Catholic\textquotedblright{} elements, as was argued by some early scholars,\textsuperscript{39} the \textit{Homilies}’ conception of purity is instead fully entrenched in a Jewish milieu. This way of understanding purity in ancient Judaism has received a fair deal of criticism, particularly because its proponents frequently argue that Jewish purity laws arose out of such a system. Some scholars have thus rejected systemic readings of ancient Jewish purity laws altogether. While I agree that it is unlikely that such a system preceded the laws, I nevertheless argue for the retention of the physical defilement/sin defilement dichotomy, not as the system undergirding ancient Jewish purity laws, but as an hermeneutical lens, a means by which many ancient Jews interpreted their purity laws. Thus, the \textit{Homilies}, much like their Jewish contemporaries, proposed a twofold purity system in order to explain the different purity laws and rituals that they followed.

For some scholars, the physical defilement/sin defilement dichotomy can be traced to the Torah itself. In his commentary on Leviticus, David Hoffmann argued that the book makes a distinction between two kinds of impurity: the \textquotedblleft defilement of the body\textquotedblright{} (תועה תאמוט) and the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[38] See chapter 3.
\item[39] See especially the perspectives of Schliemann and Uhlhorn in chapter 1.
\end{footnotes}
“defilement of holiness” (תועדויה תאמוט) / “defilement of the soul” (כמשתה תאמוט). For Hoffmann, the former derives from physical sources, particularly corpses, carrion, certain bodily fluids, certain skin diseases, and certain sacrifices, while the latter derives from sinful behavior, including idolatry and the violation of food and sexual laws. A similar distinction was made later by Adolph Büchler, who went beyond Hoffmann’s focus on Leviticus and examined Jewish texts up to the rabbinic period. From his study, Büchler determined that two kinds of impurity existed in ancient Judaism, “Levitical” defilement and “spiritual”/“religious” defilement. These two kinds of impurity ran along lines similar to those of Hoffman: Levitical defilement arose from physical sources, while spiritual/religious defilement arose from sin, particularly idolatry, murder, and adultery. In his history of scholarship on the subject, Jonathan Klawans notes that Hoffmann and Büchler were not without precedent in making their distinction; Hoffmann in particular derived both this conception of purity and his terminology for it from rabbinic and medieval Jewish literature.

Though Hoffmann and Büchler’s theories did not find much popularity in their time, they were revisited in the last quarter of the twentieth century following the publication of Mary Douglas’s Purity and Danger. In this highly influential work, Douglas argued that purity


41 The word תערצה is usually translated as “leprosy,” but it is not the same as contemporary Hansen’s disease. On this point, see n. 3 of the introduction.

42 Hoffmann, Das Buch Leviticus, 1.303–4, 2.1–80.


practices were best understood as a system; thus, impurity could be defined in relation to that system. In Douglas’s words, dirt, impurity, is “matter out of place … the by-product of a systematic ordering and classification of matter, in so far as ordering involves rejecting inappropriate elements.” Impurity, in this model, would be those things which fall outside of the categories created by a given society.

Following this insight, a number of scholars set about attempting to describe and define the system that undergirded the purity laws preserved in the Torah. Douglas herself argued that these laws (and, indeed, the purity practices of any society) were based on concerns over social boundaries that were mapped onto the body. Jacob Milgrom, by contrast, argued that these laws dealt primarily with life and death. Thus, those things that were considered defiling were those things that were associated with death. At the same time, other theses were proposed that, like those of Hoffmann and Büchler, argued that ancient Israelites had not one system of purity, but two, one that dealt with bodily functions and another that dealt with ethics. Tikva Frymer-Kensky, for example, delineated systems of “pollution beliefs” and “danger beliefs,” the former relating to bodily defilement and the latter to sin. Similarly, David P. Wright spoke of “tolerated” and “prohibited” defilements (relating to bodily and sin defilements, respectively)
Jonathan Klawans, of “ritual” and “moral” purity; Christophe Nihan, of “physical” and “moral” defilements; and Mila Ginsburskaya, of “physical” and “sin” defilements. Though differing in some details, these scholars generally agree that the Torah (or, in the case of Nihan, Leviticus more specifically) makes a distinction between two main types of defilement: one that relates to the impurity that results from physical sources, and another that relates to the impurity that results from sin.

These propositions are not without their challenges. One consists of the “reality” of ethical defilement. Jacob Neusner, writing before Freymer-Kensky, was also inspired by Douglas to sketch out the purity system of ancient Israel. However, unlike the scholars cited above, Neusner did not believe that sin was defiling in any “literal” sense, but that defilement language was used to metaphorically describe the effects of sin. For Neusner, purity and impurity are cultic matters; any use of purity language outside this context is merely metaphorical. Against Neusner, Klawans has insisted that the defilement of sin is a “literal” defilement, since it comes composed before but published after this article, Wright had used the term “permitted” impurity to refer to bodily defilement; see David P. Wright, “Unclean and Clean (OT),” *ABD* 6:729–41. However, in “The Spectrum,” he rejects “permitted” and replaces it with “tolerated.”

---


53 For example, Wright’s category of “prohibited” defilements is more expansive than Frymer-Kensky’s “danger-beliefs” and includes forgetting to purify oneself from ritual defilement and the case of a Nazirite accidentally coming into contact with a corpse. See Wright, “The Spectrum,” 158–62.

from “a physical process or event” that has a “perceived effect” and “practical legal ramifications.” As a result, Klawans argues that there is “no reason why moral impurity is any more, or less, figurative than ritual impurity.”55

Another challenge to the physical defilement/sin defilement dichotomy came from Paolo Sacchi, who questioned the extent to which physical and sin defilements were separate in ancient Judaism. Sacchi argued that, rather than one unifying conception of purity, ancient Israel instead had two competing conceptions. In one, impurity and sin were separate entities; while they were both negative forces, there was no link between them. The other conception, however, connected them; impurity and sin were related, and sin could defile someone physically. Thus, while many biblical texts maintained the boundary between defilement and sin, a few contended that physical defilement resulted from sin. Sacchi pointed to the role of the serpent in the two creation stories in Genesis as an example. In Gen 1, the serpent is declared good (Gen 1:25), and thus its impurity is not a result of any moral judgement. In Gen 3, by contrast, the serpent’s impurity is the result of a moral judgment, as it is “condemned to becoming impure through contact with the soil.”56 Sacchi argued that these conceptions of impurity competed throughout ancient Jewish history, despite the favoring of the separation model by the priestly literature.57

55 Klawans, Impurity and Sin, 34. For his part, Thomas Kazen has challenged the use of “literal” and “metaphorical” language to describe purity altogether: “The categories of ‘literal’ and ‘metaphorical’ are not ontological, however; they say nothing about the reality of the referent, but they are linguistic classifiers, i.e. tools for distinguishing different types of language”; cf. Kazen, Jesus and Purity Halakhah, 205, emphasis in original.

56 See Paolo Sacchi, The History of the Second Temple Period (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 448. Sacchi also notes that Isaiah is purified from sin—not from ritual defilement—in God’s throne room (Isa 6). Though he does not mention this, we could also add Miriam’s contraction of leprosy as a punishment for speaking against Moses (cf. Num 12).

57 Sacchi traces this history in Sacchi, The History of the Second Temple Period, 439–76.
Some scholars have gone further than Neusner and Sacchi, not only questioning the
details of the purity systems developed by these scholars but also challenging the foundation
upon which it is based: Douglas’s notion that purity regulations developed out of a system. Frank
H. Gorman, for example, criticizes Milgrom for the extent of the special pleading that he does in
order to fit the תאטח sacrifice into his system. Gorman instead suggests that the text is not
systematic, but rather a “‘thrown-together’ composition … that pulls together bits and pieces of
known rites and gestures, and constitutes a unique configuration.” 58 Similarly, T.M. Lemos has
critiqued Douglas’s structural approach for prioritizing belief over ritual. In Douglas’s schema,
there is first a system, and then rituals follow from that system. However, drawing on insights
from ritual studies, Lemos suggests that this narrative ought to be reversed; thus, rather than a
system dictating practice, practice dictates the system. She therefore contends that the compilers
of the Priestly source drew from preexisting rituals and were only systematic insofar as they
chose which rituals to include in their system. In her words, the Priestly source

may have been organizing and delineating, and in all likelihood expanding, but what the
P[riestly] writers were building upon were purity conceptions and practices seemingly
already widespread in their own culture. It does not make good sense, then, to speak of
the symbolic system underlying [the Priestly source]’s purity collection in Leviticus 11–
15, as if [the Priestly source] had invented these customs surrounding impurity. 59

These objections pose major challenges to the physical defilement/sin defilement
dichotomy set up by the likes of Frymer-Kensky, Wright, and Klawans. In spite of these
challenges, however, the case that many ancient Jews, especially during and after the Second


280–82. For further critiques of Douglas’s approach that are not addressed here, see Thomas Kazen, “Levels of
Explanation for Ideas of Impurity: Why Structuralist and Symbolic Models Often Fail While Evolutionary and
Cognitive Models Succeed,” in Impurity and Purification in Early Judaism and the Jesus Tradition, RBSt 98
Temple periods, understood their purity laws through this dichotomy is difficult to deny, and is seen throughout many ancient Jewish sources, as Klawans in particular has ably shown.\textsuperscript{60} Thus, I do not want to jettison the physical defilement/sin defilement distinction that such approaches have produced. Rather, I argue that this distinction, rather than being the origins of ancient Jewish purity laws, was instead an “interpretive posture” adopted by many ancient Jews for understanding their purity laws, to borrow a phrase from Wil Rogan.\textsuperscript{61} This includes the \textit{Homilies}, which, by making the distinction between purity of the body and purity of the heart, is entrenched in this ancient Jewish “interpretive posture.”

This dissertation, then, will proceed to analyze purity in the \textit{Homilies} through the hermeneutical lens of the twofold conception of purity. Rather than using any of the terms suggested by the scholars above, however, I will instead use the terms that the \textit{Homilies} itself employs: bodily purity and purity of the heart. The main differences between the two domains of purity have to do with the impurities that defile states of purity. I argue that these defilements have six differences: (1) their sources, (2) their durability, (3) their transmissibility, (4) the limitations they impose on those who contract them, (5) their means of removal, and (6) the terminology used to describe them.\textsuperscript{62} In the next two chapters, I will explore the sources, durability, transmissibility, limitations, and removal of these defilements. Before turning our

\textsuperscript{60} In \textit{Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism}, Klawans contends—rightly, I think—that the physical defilement/sin defilement dichotomy is maintained by the likes of \textit{Jubilees}, Philo of Alexandria, the works of the New Testament, and rabbinic literature. It is only in the Dead Sea Scrolls that the two kinds of purity are conflated, where not maintaining ritual purity is sinful and sin defiles the body.


\textsuperscript{62} This list is based on the one proposed by Klawans, who suggests (1) sources, (2) transmissibility, (3) durability, (4) means of purification, and (5) the language used to describe each. See Klawans, \textit{Impurity and Sin}, 26. Limitations also factor into Klawans’s analysis; he notes that ritual defilement prevents a person from entering the Temple, while moral impurity does no such thing (Klawans, \textit{Impurity and Sin}, 29).
attention to those, however, I want to conclude this chapter by investigating the terminology used
to describe each kind of purity in the Homilies, as doing this first will prepare us for the ensuing
discussions.

The Homilies’ Language of Purity

As noted above, the Homilies’ delineation of bodily and heart purity happens not only at
the conceptual level, but also at the terminological level. Thus, within Hom. 11.28–33, cognates
of κάθαρσις and ἁγνεία are the main words used for purity of the heart and body, respectively.
This distinction is pronounced enough that E employs καθαρός and ἁγνός when summarizing the
section; here, Peter says that it is necessary “to be pure of heart and pure of body” (καθαρός εἶναι
tῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ ἁγνός τῷ σώματι). However, the distinction is not consistent throughout the
Homilies, or indeed even within Hom. 11.28–33. Thus, while most uses of the cognates of
κάθαρσις (except, importantly, for καθαρεύω) relate to purity of the heart, the cognates of ἁγνεία
only unambiguously refer to purity of the body within Hom. 11.28–33; elsewhere, they more
likely refer to chastity or purity of the heart.

In what follows, I explore the Homilies’ use of words connected to purity. For the reasons
noted in the introduction of this chapter, I focus on the Greek text; the renderings made by the
Syriac translator will appear in footnotes. In the first section, I analyze purity of the heart,
focusing on the words that refer to purity itself, its defilements, and its means of purification. In
the second section, I analyze bodily purity, proceeding in the same manner. For reference, the
conclusions of this section are summarized in Appendix C.

Purity of the Heart

Purity of the heart is almost always referred to with κάθαρσις and its cognates. However,
within Hom. 11.28–30, these words will occasionally refer to bodily purity, likely under the
influence of the quotation of Matt 23:25–26 in *Hom.* 11.29.2. This is especially true of καθαρεύω, which always refers to bodily purity. There are also two instances where words related to ἁγνεία are employed to refer to purity of the heart. The language of sin defilement is much more varied, utilizing words related to ἀκάθαρτος, μιαίνω, μυσαρός, μιαρός, and μολύνω. However, the language surrounding the act of purification is again more consistent, most frequently using βάπτισμα and its cognates but in at least one instance also using ἀπολούω. The second instance of ἀπολούω, however, is more ambiguous and will receive dedicated treatment. I conclude, based on this passage’s parallels to another passage in the *Homilies*, that it refers to bodily purification.

**Purity Language**

Κάθαρσις

Κάθαρσις appears four times in the *Homilies*, all within *Hom.* 11. The first three instances are in *Hom.* 11.2–3, all of which refer to purity of the mind.63 Peter tells his audience, “You require much time for purification” (πολλοῦ πρὸς κάθαρσιν δεῖσθε χρόνου, *Hom.* 11.2.1), and that they should match their previous sinfulness with “a zeal for purification” (σπουδή πρὸς κάθαρσιν, *Hom.* 11.2.2 and 3.1). The last occurrence is in *Hom.* 11.28.3, where it refers to “purity according to the heart” (ἡ κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν κάθαρσις) and is contrasted with “purity of the body” (ἡ τοῦ σώματος ἁγνεία).64

---

63 Because of the *Homilies*’ contention that education is a means of purification, purity of the mind and purity of the heart is interchangeable. See chapter 4.

64 Every instance of κάθαρσις is translated with some variation of the root ἁνεῖ, including ἁνεῖ (Hom. 11.2.1), ἁνεῖ (Hom. 11.2.2), ἁνεῖν (Hom. 11.3.1), and ἁνεῖν (Hom. 11.28.3). Note that, in *Hom.* 11.28.3, both κάθαρσις and ἁγνεία are translated with ἁνεῖ, see n. 97.
Καθαρός, Καθάριος, and Καθάρσιος

The adjective καθαρός/καθάριος occurs much more frequently, 26 times over the course of the narrative. Most of these refer to some spiritual purity; thus, it is used to describe the purity of God (Hom. 2.44.2), the purity of heaven (Hom. 3.45.3–4), and the purity of spirits (Hom. 2.16.4). Purity of the heart of the individual is also frequently in view. This is especially true in Hom. 11 (cf. Hom. 11.4.1, 16.5, 28.4, 29.4), but this use also appears elsewhere. Peter describes the followers of the Prophet of Truth as pure (Hom. 3.16.1); he describes those who can see God as “the pure in heart” (οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, Hom. 17.7.4); and he argues that “the truth gushes forth in the pious, natural, and pure mind” (τῷ γὰρ εὗσεβεῖ ἐμφύτω καὶ καθαρῷ ἀναβλύζει τῷ νῷ τὸ ἀληθές, Hom. 17.17.5). I will return to one further use of καθαρός in this way, occurring in Hom. 3.26.3, in the section on ἀγνεία, ἀγνός, and ἀγνεύω below.

In Hom. 8.22.4–23.1, καθαρός is used to refer to both purity of the body and heart. Here, Peter compares the reception of baptism to the reception of a “pure garment” (καθαρὸν ἐνδυμα), and if those who are baptized perform good works afterward, they will remain “pure in body and soul” (καθαροὶ σώματι τε καὶ ψυχῇ).

In rare instances, καθαρός is used to refer to the purity of the body. Most of these occur within Hom. 11.28–29. In Hom. 11.29.3, for example, καθαρός refers to bodily purity and is contrasted with ἀγαθός: “For when the mind is enlightened with knowledge, the disciple can be good, which is followed by becoming pure” (φωτισθέντος γὰρ τοῦ νοοῦ τῇ γνώσει ὁ μαθὼν δύναται ἀγαθὸς εἶναι, ὃ παρέπεται τὸ καθαρὸν γενέσων). The sole instance of καθάριος in the Homilies is used similarly in Hom. 11.28.3: “The pure follows the good” (ἐπεται τῷ ἀγαθῷ τῷ
καθάριον). Both these uses are likely under the influence of Matt 23:25–26, quoted in Hom. 11.29.2, which uses καθαρός to describe the washing of the outside of the cup and bowl. Καθαρός is used in this way only once more, in Hom. 19.22.7, where it refers to purity from menstruation.

Outside of these uses, καθαρός can also refer to the purity of matter, including water (Hom. 4.10.2; 14.1.2), fire (Hom. 6.7.3), ether (Hom. 6.8.2), food (Hom. 8.15.4), air (Hom. 8.17.1), the world (Hom. 8.17.4), and light (Hom. 20.9.5). This last use is particularly significant, as Peter argues that light is the substance of the soul; human souls are “drops of pure light” (φωτός καθαροῦ σταγόνες). This light can become corrupted if demons, who are composed of fire, become attached to them.

Καθάρσιος appears once to describe the “purifying fire” (τὸ καθάρσιον πῦρ) to which the demon drags the soul after death (Hom. 9.13.1).

Καθάρω

Καθάρω appears nine times in the Homilies. In five of these, it refers to spiritual purification, usually of oneself (Hom. 11.2.3, 28.2; 16.21.2; 19.8.3), but in one case it is also

---

65 See the analysis of Hom. 11.28–29 above.

66 This text is only represented by O; P breaks off at Hom. 19.14.3. Friedrich Wieseler believes that the clause containing καθαρός, “whether she is clean from menstruation” (εἰ καθαρὰ ἐξ ἀφόδρου γυγήναι), is an explanatory gloss and not original to the Homilies. See Friedrich Wieseler, “Adnotationes criticae ad Clementis Romani quae feruntur Homilies,” in Clementinorum Epitomae Duae, ed. Albert Rud. Max. Dressel (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1859), 320.

67 See the discussion of demons in chapter 3.

68 In almost every instance in which the Syriac is extant, καθαρός is translated with ד (Hom. 11.4.1, 16.5, 28.4, 29.2, 29.4; 14.1.2). The sole exception is Hom. 11.29.3, where the cognate ד appears. The use of καθάριος in Hom. 11.28.3 is not translated in the Syriac.

69 There may also be a tenth use of καθάριος. See n. 92.

70 The last instance is rather obscure, but I still think that it refers to purity of the heart. Essentially, Peter is making a caveat to his subsequent teaching on the origin of the Evil One (Hom. 9.9–18) by saying that it would be better not
used to describe the purifying power of the fire of eternal punishment (*Hom.* 9.9.4). It is also used this way in *EpCl* 12.2, where Peter encourages deacons to correct those who leave the community by encouraging them hear the word, “so that they can be purified … of discouragements that always fall upon the heart” (ὅπως τὰς ἐκάστοτε τῇ καρδίᾳ προσπιπτούσας ἀθυμίας … καθαίρεσθαί δύνανται).

In three instances, the use of καθαίρω veers from this pattern; it is used once to describe purifying both the heart and the body and twice to describe the purification of the body alone. These three uses are concentrated in *Hom.* 11.29.4–30.1, and, as with the uses of καθαρός in this section, these may be the result of the influence of Matt 23:25–26.

Outside of these instances, καθαίρω is also used to describe the washing of idols, as part of Peter’s polemic against idolatry (*Hom.* 10.23.4).\(^{71}\)

**Καθαρεύω**

Unlike most of the cognates of κάθαρσις, καθαρεύω always refers to purity of the body. Three of its four appearances occur in *Hom.* 11.28.1–3, where it refers to being pure from menstruation and the importance of bodily purity in God’s Law. The fourth occurs in *Hom.* 13.16.5, during Peter’s speech on chastity (*Hom.* 13.13–21), where he describes a woman who to speculate on it because it is unwritten. However, he ventures to do so anyway, because Simon has brought up the question and it would be better for the crowd to hear his own speculations than those of Simon. Peter states that he will pick the most pious speculations, especially when, “having been purified of all other conjectures, another opinion remains that is sufficient and safer” (πασῶν ὑπονοιῶν καθαρθεῖσαι καὶ ἄλλης ἰκανῆς καὶ ἀκινδύνωτερᾶς παρακείμενης ὑποψίας). As we will see in chapter 4, purifying the mind of these sorts of conjectures is very much a part of purifying one’s heart, and *Hom.* 19.8.3 fits this context quite well.

---

\(^{71}\) Where the Syriac is extant, it translates καθαίρω with ܢܐ (*Hom.* 11.2.3, 28.2, 29.4–30.1).
obeys God as someone who “is chaste in her soul and purifies her body” (τὴν ψυχὴν σωφρονεῖ καὶ τὸ σῶμα καθαρεύει).

Other Instances of the Cognates of Κάθαρσις

Καθαρίζω appears twice in the quotation of Matt 23:25–26 in Hom. 11.29.2.

Other words related to κάθαρσις are not concerned with either purity of the heart or body. For example, Appion uses καθαρότης to refer to the purity of air (Hom. 6.7.4) and of women (Hom. 6.8.2). Κατεκκαθάριζομαι appears in Hom. 8.17.4 to refer to the purification of the earth by the Flood.

Defilement Language

Ἀκάθαρτος and Ἀκαθάρτως

The opposite of καθαρτός, ἀκάθαρτος, appears six times. In most cases, it refers to spiritual impurity, either to impure spirits (Hom. 2.16.4; 8.23.1; 11.15.6) or actions (Hom. 9.10.5). It can also refer to unclean food (Hom. 8.19.1). Outside of these, it is used to refer to the impurity of air (Hom. 8.17.1).

---

72 In three out of four instances, καθαρεύω is translated with ἄς (Hom. 11.28.1–2; 13.16.5). It is not translated in Hom. 11.28.3.

73 Homilies 6.7–8 is the only instance in which purity language is placed into the mouth of one of the novel’s antagonists. Here, Appion defends the proposition that the myths of the gods should be understood metaphorically to describe the creation of the world. Most of Appion’s comments concerning the purity of air, fire, and ether are irrelevant to the subject of this dissertation and need not be rehearsed here. However, he also compares the purity of men and women; he argues that air (ἄηρ) is below ether (αιθήρ) because it is less pure, “just like a woman in comparison to her superior with respect to purity” (ὡς θήλεια τὴν καθαρότητα πρὸς σύγκρισιν τοῦ κρείττονος). The Homilies does not share Appion’s sentiment regarding the purity of women; while the novel uses masculinity and femininity as metaphors for truth and falsehood and pits the True Prophet against the Prophetess (see introduction n. 20), it also paints all human beings as mixtures of masculinity and femininity, who can choose between their masculine drive to seek the truth and their feminine drive to indulge in falsehood (cf. Hom. 3.27 and chapter 3). Both men and women are thus capable of seeking purity of body and heart. Outside of Hom. 6.7 – 8, the novel’s antagonists do not discuss purity directly, but nevertheless encourage their audience to engage in sin. Cf., e.g., Hom. 5.10–19, in which Appion composes a letter defending adultery; Hom. 7.3.1, in which Peter argues that Simon’s actions in Tyre have caused its inhabitants to become infested with demons; and Hom. 18.11.3, in which Simon promotes the existence of a god higher than the Creator. Cf. also Hom. 5.30.2, where Appion is described as “having washed” (λελουμένος) before eating. It is not stated whether Appion’s bath was for purification or hygiene.
The adverb ἀκαθάρτως appears three times. In two instances, it refers engaging in sin as “living impurely” (ἀκαθάρτως βιοῦν, Hom. 8.19.3; 13.4.3), and thus unambiguously refers to heart defilement. The last instance, Hom. 7.8.2, is more ambiguous, as the command not to live impurely is sandwiched between calls to refuse idolatry and observe food laws, on one side, and to wash after intercourse and menstruation, on the other. Even if bodily impurity is implied here, however, heart impurity certainly has the stronger valence.

Μιαίνω, Μιάνω, Μιασμός, and Ἀμιαντος

Apart from ἀκάθαρτος and ἀκαθάρτως, the Homilies employs a number of terms to refer to defilement and pollution. The most frequent of these is μιαίνω/μιάνω, which appears twelve times over the course of the narrative. In most cases, it refers to the defilement arising from adultery (Hom. 5.22.5; 12.15.3; 13.19.3 [3x], 20.5–6; 14.7.2; 17.17.1). The three instances in Hom. 13.19.3 are particularly significant; here, Peter argues that a person is able to live because of the breath of God within them, and adultery is a particular danger to this breath: “The breath of God is defiled only by adultery” (ὑπὸ μοιχείας μόνης μιαίνεται ἡ θεοῦ πνοή). Outside of

---

74 Food laws have been a notorious problem for the twofold theory of purity in ancient Judaism. As noted above, Hoffmann considered their violation to fall under the category of “holiness defilement” (Hoffmann, Das Buch Leviticus, 303–4, 340) while David Wright groups them under the category of “tolerated impurity” (Wright, “The Spectrum,” 165–69). Klawans, by contrast, comes to the following conclusion: “But perhaps the best option is for the dietary laws to seen (sic) on their own terms: as a set of restrictions which overlap in some ways with each of the impurity systems laid out here” (Klawans, Impurity and Sin, 32). Whatever their categorization in the Hebrew Bible, in the Homilies violating food laws is seen as belonging to heart impurity. On this, see chapters 3 and 5.

75 In Hom. 11.15.6, ἀκάθαρτος is translated with ἀσκρα. The Syriac in Hom. 13.4.3 is closer to its parallel in the Recognitions (Recog. 7.29.3), which does not contain the reference to Gentiles “living impurely.”

76 The Homilies understands the “breath of God” to be a sort of garment worn by the soul. See the discussion of this passage in the next chapter.
these uses, it is used once to refer to the defilement of both body and soul (*Hom.* 8.22.2), and it can also refer to the defilement of the air and the earth (*Hom.* 8.17.1–2).\(^{77}\)

A cognate of μιάνω/μιάνω, μιασμός, occurs twice in the *Homilies*, both in the context of the defilement of the angels through intercourse with human women that the *Homilies* adopts from *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* (*Hom.* 8.13–14). Also appearing here is a rare instance of a word for purity unrelated to either κάθαρσις or ἀγνεία, ἀμίαντος. This word describes the previously undefiled nature of the angels prior to their intercourse with women.\(^{78}\)

Μυσαρός

Μυσαρός appears four times. In the first two instances, it forms part of Peter’s defense of Adam. Peter argues that the spirit of foreknowledge had to be bestowed onto Adam, as it would not have been able to abide in someone born “from a defiled drop” (ἐκ μυσαρᾶς σταγόνος; *Hom.* 3.17.1, 20.1). This “defiled drop” is a reference to semen. Because Adam was formed by God’s hands and not by intercourse (cf. *Hom.* 3.20.1), he must be the first instantiation of the True Prophet and thus could not have sinned. Even though the referent is semen, the word has a stronger valence than mere bodily impurity. Later in the *Homilies*, Peter will discuss how a person’s first birth, which occurred out of lust and intercourse, needs to be replaced by a second one, a rebirth from God through baptism (cf. *Hom.* 11.24–26). Though baptism does not lead to the reception of the spirit of foreknowledge, these two passages share the idea that one’s first

\(^{77}\) Μιάνω/μιάνω is almost always translated with some variation of ἁμαρτα (Hom. 12.15.3; 13.19.3 [3x], 20.6; 14.7.2). The instance in *Hom.* 13.20.5, however, is translated with ἁμαρτα.

\(^{78}\) On this demonic etiology, see chapter 3.
conception is defiled. The other two instances of μυσαρός occur in Hom. 19.19.6, where Peter condemns the act of incest (specifically, having intercourse with one’s mother) as μυσαρός.

Μιαρός

Μιαρός also appears four times. It always refers to sin. Thus, in Hom. 6.18.1, “abominable lewdnesses” (μιαραὶ ἁρρητουργίαι) appears in a list of the sins of the gods; in Hom. 8.23.1–2, it is used to describe the “foul garment” (μιαρὸν περίβλημα) that must be removed prior to baptism, as well as the “unclean table” (τράπεζα μιαρά) of idolatry; and in Hom. 12.15.4, it describes “the impure love” (ὁ μιαρὸς ἔρως) that Mattidia’s brother-in-law felt toward her.

Μολύνω

Μολύνω appears once, in Hom. 3.24.1. Here, Peter describes the counterpart to the Prophet of Truth, the Prophetess, who misleads and distorts the truth. The Prophetess promotes idolatry and even considers herself a god; as such, she “is stained with blood, like a woman in menstruation at the occasion of sacrifices” (ὡς θήλεια ἐνμηνίοις γινομένη προφάσαι θυσιῶν αἰμάσσεται) and “defiles whoever touches her” (τοὺς ψάλοντας αὐτὴς μολύνει). The metaphor is a strong one, incorporating elements of both sin (idolatry) and bodily impurity (menstruation).

Purification Language

Βάπτισμα, Βαπτίζω, Αβάπτιστος, Συμβαπτίζομαι, and Ἑμεροβαπτιστής

As I will argue in chapter four, baptism is the culmination of the process for removing heart impurity, and most instances of βάπτισμα and its cognates refer to this ritual. All thirteen

---

79 See the discussion of conception defilement in chapter 3.

80 In the last instance, μιαρός is translated with ζυζανή.

81 See further discussion of this passage, particularly on its implications for the transmissibility of menstrual defilement, in chapter 4.
uses of βάπτισμα itself refer to it (Hom. 3.29.3; 8.22.4; 11.26.3, 27.1; 13.10.3, 10.7 [2x], 11.2, 11.4, 12.2, 20.4; 14.2.1, 8.5),\(^{82}\) as do all three uses of ἀβάπτιστος (Hom. 11.25.2; 13.21.2–3) and the sole use of σωμβαπτίζομαι (Hom. 13.10.2).\(^{83}\)

For the most part, βαπτίζω follows this pattern; in 32 of its 35 appearances, it refers to baptism (Hom. 1.22.5; 3.73.1–3; 7.5.1, 8.1, 12.2; 8.23.1; 9.23.2; 11.25.3, 26.1, 26.3 [2x], 27.1 [2x], 35.1, 36.2; 13.4.3, 5.1, 9.1–3, 10.4 [2x], 11.2, 12.1, 13.2, 21.3; 14.1.1–2; 17.7.1; 20.23.5).

However, within Hom. 11.28–33, it is used three times to refer to ritual washing, specifically of washing after menstruation (Hom. 11.30.1) and intercourse (Hom. 11.30.1, 33.4).

One further word relating to baptism, “day-baptist” (ἡ μεροβαπτιστής), is used in Hom. 2.23.1 to refer to John the Baptist.\(^{84}\)

Ἀπολούω and Λάμα

The use of ἀπολούω in the Homilies deserves some special attention. The word appears at least once, in Hom. 9.19.4. Here, the clear referent is baptism; Peter states that, by “being washed with thrice-blessed invocation” (ἀπολούσαμοι ἐπὶ τῇ τρισκαρίᾳ ἐπονομασίᾳ), one will be able to drive out the demons that inhabit them. It thus refers to the purification of heart defilement.

\(^{82}\)O and e contain one further instance of βάπτισμα in 13.10.4.

\(^{83}\)This is the case in P, E, and e. O contains βαπτίζω.

\(^{84}\)Most instances of βάπτισμα and its cognates are translated with some variation of ἀπολούω. For βάπτισμα itself, this is predominantly ἀπολούσαμοι (Hom. 11.26.3, 27.1; 13.10.3, 10.7 [only the first instance; the second is untranslated], 11.2, 11.4, 12.2, 20.4; 14.2.1, 8.5). The Syriac also includes one further appearance of βάπτισμα from O and e at Hom. 13.10.4 (see n. 82), which it translates with ḫulūṣ. For ἀβάπτιστος, the Syriac translator uses ḫulūṣ ḫalā (Hom. 11.25.2; 13.21.2) ἄλλων ἢ ἀπολούσαμοι (Hom. 13.21.3). Σωμβαπτίζομαι appears as ἄλλων (Hom. 13.10.2). Finally, when βαπτίζω is used to refer to baptism, some variation of ἀπολούω is used, usually ἀπολούω itself (Hom. 11.25.3, 26.1, 26.3 [only the first instance; the second is untranslated], 35.1, 36.2; 13.4.3, 5.1, 9.1–2, 10.4 [2x], 11.2, 12.1, 13.2, 21.3; 14.1.1–2), though ἀπολούσαμοι appears in two places as well (Hom. 11.27.1 [only in the first instance; the second is untranslated]; 13.9.3). In the instances in which βαπτίζω refers to bodily purification, however, the Syriac removes such references entirely (Hom. 11.30.1, 33.4). See chapter 3 on the Syriac translation of Hom. 11.30.1, 33.4.
There is one further possible use of ἀπολούω in *Hom.* 7.4.2. This instance deserves special attention, as how we read ἀπολούω in *Hom.* 7.4.2 has implications for our discussion of the sources of bodily and heart defilement in the next chapter. Its potential use of ἀπολούω presents some interpretive difficulties, both because of the variants in the manuscript tradition and because of its context. With respect to former, P and O render the text differently. Bernhard Rehm adopts O’s reading, which uses ἀπολούω, “to purify.” Rehm was probably right to prefer ἀπολούω; it is the better choice, given that its object is λῦμα, “defilement,” and thus O gives us “to be purified from every defilement” (ἐκ παντὸς ἀπολούωσιν λῦματος). However, P’s use of ἀπολύω, “to release” (and thus, “to be released from every defilement”) cannot be dismissed out of hand, especially considering the *Homilies’* contention that heart defilement leads to demonic possession.65 Unfortunately, there is no parallel against which to make a determination between these two possibilities, either in the Syriac translation or in the *Recognitions*. The epitomist is also of no help here; E contains “to keep yourselves stainless from every pollution” (ἐκ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ ἀσπίλους ἑαυτοὺς διατηρεῖν), shifting the emphasis from removing defilement to avoiding defilement altogether.

If we decide, with Rehm, that ἀπολούω is the preferred reading, then we must consider its context in order to determine whether it and λῦμα refer to bodily purification, heart purification, or both. Its immediate context suggests heart purification. It appears in a speech that Peter delivers to the inhabitants of Tyre (*Hom.* 7.2–4), in which he tells his audience to repent of their dealings with Simon Magus by doing “the things that please God” (τὰ θεῶν ἀρέσκοντα, *Hom.* 7.4.1). “To be purified from every defilement” is one such action. Given that everything else

---

65 See chapter 3.
listed in *Hom. 7.4.2* as pleasing to God has to do with avoiding sin (idolatry, murder, adultery, theft, and eating unclean foods\(^{86}\)), then we may expect “being purified from every defilement” to refer to being purified of heart defilement.

However, I prefer to read it as a reference to bodily defilement for two reasons. First, as Jürgen Wehnert has already noted, there is no reference to baptism within the passage itself.\(^{87}\) If “to be purified from every defilement” were supposed to refer to being purified through baptism, we might expect Peter to exhort his audience to do so. Though baptisms do take place after the speech (*Hom. 7.5.1*), they do not form any part of the speech proper, unless ἐκ παντὸς ἀπολογεσθαι λύματος is an oblique reference to them. Second, the speech to the people of Tyre contains some formal similarities to the one that Peter later gives to the inhabitants of Sidon in *Hom. 7.8.1–2*, and when he arrives to the equivalent place in that speech, his commands are much more directed toward bodily purity:

\footnotesize

---

\(^{86}\) See n. 74 and chapter 3 concerning the defilement of unclean food.

\(^{87}\) Wehnert, *Die Reinheit*, 152.
to expect eternal life from the God who is able
to do all things, asking with prayer and
continual supplications that they may receive
it.

The parallels are suggestive: both passages begin with a call to pray to/worship God, both
contain an injunction against idolatry (here phrased as refraining from the “table of demons”
[τράπεζα δαιμόνων]\textsuperscript{88}), and both encourage the observance of certain food laws, including
avoiding carrion and blood. If these passages are based on a common tradition and Hom. 7.4.2 is
an abbreviation of Hom. 7.8.1–2, as Wehnert argues,\textsuperscript{89} then the command “to be purified from
every defilement” in Hom. 7.4.2 would be equivalent to the recommendations to wash after
intercourse and to watch over menstruation in Hom. 7.8.2. This case becomes stronger when one
compares the Greek words in these two passages: the command to wash after intercourse in
Hom. 7.8.2 uses λούω, the root of ἀπολύω.

Thus, it seems likely that Hom. 7.4.2 is an abbreviation of Hom. 7.8.1–2 and ἐκ παντὸς ἀπολύωσθαι λύματος would refer to bodily purity.\textsuperscript{90} Of course, there is a possibility that
ἀπολύω and λύμα refer to both bodily and heart purity, but, given the parallels to Hom. 7.8.2
and the lack of any other reference to baptism in the passage, I would follow Wehnert’s
contention that the Homilies employs these two words to refer to bodily purity.

Bodily Purity

Bodily purity is rarely discussed in the abstract in the Homilies. The only place this
occurs is in Hom. 11.28–33, where it is contrasted with purity of the heart. Within that passage,

\textsuperscript{88} For more on the “table of demons,” see chapter 3.

\textsuperscript{89} Wehnert, Die Reinheit, 165–67. The common tradition, in this case, is the “pre-Pseudo-Clementine purity
regulations” (“vorpskl. Reinheitsvorschriften”), which also produced the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25.

\textsuperscript{90} This is the position taken by Molland, “La circoncision,” 30, and Wehnert, Die Reinheit, 152.
the favored words for bodily purity are ἁγνεία and its cognates. Outside of this passage, however, ἁγνεία and its cognates are rare, and when they do appear, they usually refer to chastity or heart purity. A discussion of Hom. 3.26.3–4, the only other instance where words related to κάθαρσις and ἁγνεία appear, makes this clear. Outside of Hom. 11.28–33, bodily purity is much more frequently discussed in practical terms by referring to its sources and its means of removal. The former are menstruation and seminal emission, which are discussed with varying vocabulary. For the latter, the preferred language is λούω and its cognates, though πλύνω is also used.

**Purity Language**

Ἁγνεία, Ἁγνός, and Ἁγνεύω

Ἁγνεία and its cognates appear fourteen times throughout the Homilies. Seven of these occur in Hom. 11.28–33, where the words unambiguously refer to bodily purity ( ActionTypes:  ActionTypes: Hom. 11.28.3, 30.2–3 [3x], ἁγνεύω: Hom. 11.28.4). In one further instance, in Hom. 11.1.2, ἁγνεύω may be used to refer to bodily purity. At the beginning of Peter’s fourth day in Tripolis, Peter gives a discourse to his disciples “on the necessity of purifying” (περὶ τοῦ δεῖν ἁγνεύειν). The context sheds little light on which sort of purity is in mind here. Peter had just washed his body (Hom. 11.1.1), but he would then go on to discourse on the necessity of purifying the mind (Hom. 11.2–3) and the body (Hom. 11.28–33). Based on the uses of ἁγνεία and ἁγνεύω in the rest of Hom. 11, I would suggest that Peter’s discourse to his disciples was on bodily purity, but this is not certain.

---

91 Where ἁγνεία first appears in Hom. 11.30.2 in O, P instead has ἁγνοία (“ignorance”). Thus, in P, Peter chastises his audience for following “the parts of ignorance” (tà τῆς ἁγνοίας μέρη), rather than “the parts of purity” (tà τῆς ἁγνείας μέρη), while they were Gentiles. While the former would make sense given the Homilies’ conception of the ignorance of idolators (see chapter 4), the context demands the latter.
Outside of this context, the meaning of ἁγνεία and its cognates is clearly different. In
_Hom._ 3.26.3–4, for example—the only place outside of _Hom._ 11.28–33 where cognates of
κάθαρσις and ἁγνεία appear together—the words are best read as referring to chastity. At this
point in the narrative, Peter is teaching his disciples about the Prophet of Truth, and he describes
what this Prophet teaches:

He [the True Prophet] says to make requests only to the one God; he does not say “gods,”
 nor does he believe in another who speaks of them. He watches over the good that he has,
 and he increases it further. He hates sacrifices, bloods, libations; he loves the chaste
(ἁγνοῦς), the pure (καθαροῦς), the pious. He extinguishes the fire of altars. He ends wars;
he teaches peace. He commands self-control. He destroys\(^\text{92}\) sins. He enacts marriage; he
grants self-control; he leads all to chastity (ἁγνείαν). (_Hom._ 3.26.3–4)

In this passage, the grouping of ἁγνοῦς, καθαροῦς, ὀσίους should be read in light of the grouping
of “sacrifices, bloods, libations” (θυσίας, αἵματα, σπονδάς) that immediately precedes it. Since
these are all conveyors of heart defilement,\(^\text{93}\) ἁγνοῦς, καθαροῦς, and ὀσίους should be read as
states free from heart defilement. The use of καθαρός here, then, would conform to the majority
of its other uses in the _Homilies._\(^\text{94}\) The translation of ἁγνός as “chaste” in this instance is
informed by the use of ἁγνεία in _Hom._ 3.26.4. There, ἁγνεία appears at the end of a sequence
that includes enacting marriage (γάμον νομιτεύει) and granting self-control (ἐγκράτειαν
συγχωρεῖ). Both marriage and self-control are promoted by the _Homilies_ as methods of avoiding

\(^{92}\) This may be a further instance of καθάρω. Rehm renders the verb as καθαρεῖ, “he destroys,” in his critical
edition. However, given that the difference between “he destroys” and “he purifies” is only an accent (καθαρεῖ vs.
καθάρω), I think that “he purifies sins” is possible, especially since learning the teachings of the True Prophet is
part of the process of purifying the heart, as I will discuss in chapter 4. Since I do not have access to the
manuscripts, however, I defer to Rehm’s judgment.

\(^{93}\) See chapter 3 on the defilement of idolatry and blood.

\(^{94}\) See the discussion above and Appendix C.
sexual immorality, and though ἁγνεία is not the Homilies’ preferred word for chastity, it is likely here that, when the True Prophet leads one to ἁγνεία, he is leading them to chastity. ἁγνεία and its cognates can also refer to purity of the heart. There are two such cases where this meaning is intended. In Hom. 9.10.5, for example, Peter explains that the one who is possessed by demons must reach out to God to have them exorcized, so that God’s hand can touch him and heal him, “as being pure and faithful” (ὡς ἁγνὸ καὶ πιστεῦοντος). The pairing of ἁγνός with πιστεύον likely means that purity of the heart is in mind here. Similarly, ἁγνεία refers to purity of the heart in Hom. 9.23.2. Peter tells his audience in Tripolis that, after their baptism, “You can devote yourselves to the perfection of purity” (δύνασθε ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον τῆς ἁγνείας ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιδοῦναί). As we will see in chapter four, Peter emphasizes the need for continued good works after one’s baptism, and this is likely what the Homilies has in mind here; thus, this ἁγνεία probably refers to purity of the heart.

One further instance is more ambiguous. In Hom. 2.45.1, Peter praises God in a number of ways, including by stating that he “advises purity” (ἀγνείαν συμβουλεύων). Given its context, it is unclear whether the meaning of ἁγνεία is “purity” or “chastity” (and if it is the former, which kind of purity is in mind here). Outside of the Homilies proper, there is an ambiguous use of ἁγνός in EpCl 2.3. The word appears in a list of virtues that Peter attributes to Clement; given its context in this list, it likely means either “chaste” or “pure of heart.”

Outside of these uses, ἁγνός is also used in Hom. 7.8.1 to refer to baptism as “the purest dipping” (ἡ ἁγνότατα βαφή).

---

95 See chapter 3.

96 That would be σωφροσύνη. Cf. esp. Appion and Clement’s letters in Hom. 5 and Peter’s speech on chastity in Hom. 13.13–21.
Before moving on to defilement language, I want to mention one possible use of ἁγνίζω in *Hom.* 13.9.3. At this point, Peter is arguing that Clement’s mother, Mattidia, only needs to fast for one day before being baptized. Normally, she would need to wait for at least a few days, but she had demonstrated her faith to Peter in such a way that he thinks that her preparation period can be abridged. In P and E, it is stated that this waiting period is due to education: “Since it would be necessary for her to be educated for many days” (ἐπεὶ πολλῶν ἡμερῶν αὐτήν ἀφελληνισθήναι ἔδει). In O and e, however, the verb is not ἀφελληνισθήναι but ἁγνισθήναι; thus, “it would be necessary for her to be purified for many days.” The Syriac agrees with O and e, and adds to them, being even more specific about what Mattidia needs to be purified from: “But many days would be necessary for her, that she be purified from impiety” (ܐܬܒܚܕܬܒܗܬܝܢܐܕܚܡܬܒܗܬܝܢܐܕܚܡܬܒܗܬܝܢܐ). However, given the preparation process described by the rest of the *Homilies*, the difference between “educate” and “purify” here is actually quite minimal. As I will argue in chapter four, purifying the heart involves unlearning one’s old conceptions of the gods and taking on the right ideas about God, received via the teachings of the

---

97 The Syriac does not make a lexical distinction between purity of the heart and bodily purity. Thus, ἁγνεία and its cognates, much like κάθωρεις and its cognates, are translated with some variant of ἅγα. ἁγνεία itself is translated with ἁγνισθάναι (*Hom.* 11.28.3, 30.2–3 [3x], 33.4–5), and ἁνέσειο is translated with ἁγρία (*Hom.* 11.1.2) and ἅγα (*Hom.* 11.28.4).

98 Patricia Duncan translates ἀφελληνισθήναι as “de-hellenization,” rather than as “education”; see Duncan, “Eve, Mattidia, and the Gender Discourse,” 181. The *Homilies* views education as a sort of “de-hellenization,” so either translation would work; see my comments on the *Homilies*’ opposition to Greek paideia in chapters 3–4. The use of the word is rare among extant literature, but cf. Philo of Alexandria, *Legat.* 147, and Dio Chrysostom, *Cor.* 26, both of whom uses the term to mean “Hellenize.”

99 Jones translates this as, “Otherwise, it would be required that she be cleansed from impurity for many days.” See Jones, *The Syriac Pseudo-Clementines*, 321. It is not clear if he is translating ἁγνισθάναι as “impurity” (in which case, he would be mistaken), or if the manuscript itself contains something different (in which case, Frankenberg would be mistaken, and he would be correcting Frankenberg).
Prophet of Truth. The Syriac, then, provides a good middle way between ἀφελλήνιζω and ἁγνίζω; “purifying from impiety” is, according to the Homilies, precisely what occurs in one’s preparations for baptism.\(^\text{100}\)

**Defilement Language**

Menstruation

One of the two sources of bodily defilement described by the Homilies, menstruation, appears six times. The most common word used to describe it is the technical term ἄφεδρος (Hom. 7.8.2; 11.28.1, 33.4; 19.22.7). It is also referred to as “the monthlies” (τὰ ἐμμηνία, Hom. 3.24.1) and “the womanlies” (τὰ γυναικεῖα, Hom. 11.30.1).\(^\text{101}\)

Seminal Emission

The Homilies rarely discusses seminal emission directly (though cf. Hom. 19.22.2), instead commanding that people wash after intercourse and leaving it to the reader to infer the reason for this. These commands occur at Hom. 7.8.2, 11.30.1, and 11.33.4. The first refers to intercourse with κοίτη, and the latter two use κοινωνία.\(^\text{102}\)

**Purification Language**

Λούω and Λουτρόν

The most used term for bodily purification is λούω, which appears nine times. Most frequently, it describes one of the characters bathing, usually Peter (Hom. 8.2.5; 9.23.3; 10.1.2, 11.3.3).

\(^{100}\) I will return to this passage in the discussion of the need for ascetic practices prior to baptism in chapter 4.

\(^{101}\) In the Syriac, ἄφεδρος is translated with ṣaṣs (Hom. 11.28.1 [but see n. 18], 33.4), and γυναικεῖα is translated with ṣiš ṣaša (lit., “in the way of women”; Hom. 11.30.1).

\(^{102}\) The Syriac removes the commands to wash after intercourse, replacing them with commands to abstain from intercourse except for begetting children. This change was probably done under the influence of the Recognitions; see the discussion in chapter 3.
26.2; 11.1.1), but also Clement and his brothers (Hom. 14.1.2, 3.1) and even Appion (Hom. 5.30.2).\textsuperscript{103} In one instance, the word forms part of a command to wash after intercourse (Hom. 7.8.2).

A noun related to λούω, λουτρόν, appears once, in Hom. 11.28.2. It forms part of Peter’s command to “wash your body in the bath” (λουτρό δὲ πλύνατε τὸ σῶμα).\textsuperscript{104}

Πλύνω

Πλύνω appears twice. In one instance, it refers to washing the body (Hom. 11.28.3); in the other, it refers to washing an idol (Hom. 10.23.4).\textsuperscript{105}

Conclusion

The Homilies is quite clear about its conception of purity. It divides it into two dimensions, those of the body and the heart. The former relates to washing the body after coming into contact with certain bodily fluids, particularly menstrual blood and semen. The latter relates to sin. Though the Homilies considers the latter more important than the former, it does not consider the former unimportant. For the Homilies, the former naturally proceeds from the latter; one who is pure of heart will by necessity care for their body.

The Homilies’ purity framework is quite similar to the theories of many scholars who have divided purity in ancient Judaism into two spheres, one dealing with physical impurity and another dealing with sin. This way of understanding purity was a common way that ancient Jews, particularly during and after the Second Temple period, understood their purity laws. Rather than

\textsuperscript{103} The Homilies depicts these washings as supplemental practices, not required ones; see chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{104} Unlike the terms for purity, the Syriac translator does make a distinction between baths of bodily purification and baptism. Thus, it translates λούω with <Z6 (Hom. 10.1.2, 26.2; 11.1.1; 14.1.2, 3.1). However, this distinction is not maintained for λουτρόν, which it translates with (the same word as baptism).

\textsuperscript{105} In both instances, πλύνω is translated with .
being a clumsy amalgamation of Jewish, Christian, and Gnostic ideas, the *Homilies*’ theory of purity is very much at home among other ancient Jewish texts.

This distinction is not only conceptual, but also lexical; the different kinds of purity tend to employ different vocabulary, especially when they are discussed together. Thus, the *Homilies* is relatively consistent about its use of κάθαρσις and its cognates to describe purity of the heart, while it employs ἁγνεία and its cognates for bodily purity, at least where it is juxtaposed with purity of the heart. Elsewhere, bodily purity is discussed not in the abstract but in very practical terms: what causes its defilement, and how that defilement is removed.
CHAPTER 3

SOURCES OF DEFILEMENT

In this chapter, we turn our attention to the characteristic of impurity that receives the greatest attention in the Homilies: its sources. While the other characteristics of impurity receive so little discussion that indirect evidence must be used to even speculate about them, the ways by which the body and heart become defiled are described in exacting detail. This is especially true for the defilement of the heart, which is addressed in the majority of Peter’s speeches throughout the Homilies, whether directly or indirectly. In his speeches to the Gentiles, Peter describes how his audience has come to be defiled and how, by the will of God, they can be purified from that defilement and thus found worthy to enter God’s Kingdom.

This chapter is divided into two sections. I begin with a discussion of the sources of bodily defilement proposed by the Homilies. On this subject, there is some disagreement between the Greek and the Syriac iterations of the text. In three places (Hom. 7.8.2; 11.30.1, 33.4), the Greek text of the Homilies delineates two sources of bodily defilement, intercourse and menstruation. The Syriac translator, however, disagreed with the Greek concerning the defiling power of intercourse and removed the Greek’s references to it, replacing them with blanket prohibitions of intercourse except for procreation, which he likely got from the parallel in the Recognitions. I argue that this change was made by the Syriac translator based on his own

---

1 This is especially true for the transmissibility of bodily defilement and the limitations such defilement places on those who contract them. See chapter 4.
ideological disagreement with the Greek text, furthering the case that the Syriac text should be considered secondary despite its antiquity.

In the second section, I identify the sources of heart defilement discussed by the *Homilies*, which are the same in the Greek and the Syriac. The *Homilies* argues that there are two major sources of heart defilement: grave sin and the demons that invade the body as a consequence of committing grave sin, and one’s carnal conception. Though sin is a major defiling power for the *Homilies*, not all sins lead to heart defilement. Indeed, no one can avoid sin entirely, as merely existing in the material world results in it. These incidental sins, however, are punished lightly by God if one leads an otherwise righteous life. By contrast, more grave sins, including idolatry and blasphemy, adultery and other sexual sins, murder, violating certain food laws, practicing magic, hatred, theft, greed, swearing falsely, and lying, result in the contraction of heart defilement.

The main consequences of committing grave sin are twofold: First, one loses God’s likeness (ὁμοίωσις/_costs) from one’s soul, and second, one grants permission to demons to possess oneself. For demons, this is a desirable outcome, though their motivations for possessing a person vary. Some demons, who are the souls of the giants who perished in the Flood, wish to acquire human organs in order to fulfill their desires for food, drink, and sexual

---

2 At least, where the Syriac is extant.

3 The *Homilies*’ presentation of this light punishment is similar to the rabbinic notion of “chastisements of love” (רומם יש אמת). On this, see Wayne Allen, *Thinking about Good and Evil: Jewish Views from Antiquity to Modernity*, JPS Essential Judaism Series (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2021), 70–72.

4 The locus of this possession is both the body and the soul, as *Hom*. 9.9.2 notes: “For the demons, having power through the food rendered to them, enter your bodies by your own hands. For, lying hidden for a long time, they also mix with the soul” (οἱ γὰρ δαιμόνες διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀποδοθετῆς τροφῆς ἐξουσιάζουσιν ἐγχώντες ὑπὸ τῶν ὑμετέρων χειρῶν εἰς τὰ ὑμετέρα εἰσκρίνεται σώματα. Ἐνδομοιχθάντες γὰρ πολλῷ τῷ χρόνῳ καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ ἀνακάρνανται).
intercourse. Other, more powerful demons, however, who are not antagonistic towards God but instead desire to do God’s will, seek the eradication of evil from the earth.\(^5\) Thus, they possess people in order to facilitate their deaths and their subsequent eternal torture. Not content with merely punishing those who do evil of their own accord, these demons also lay traps for people and encourage them to do evil. They do this by spreading disinformation about God and the world and promoting polytheism. In chapter four, I will discuss how the *Homilies* understands its purification process to work against such tactics: prior to baptism, one must be educated, so that one can unlearn what they had been taught by the demons, and one must engage in ascetic practices, so that one can force out the demons who seek to use one’s body to fulfill their own desires.

However, the *Homilies* argues that living righteously is not sufficient in itself; even if one has never sinned, one still requires baptism for the purification of the heart. This is due, the novel argues, to the stain that one has as a result of their carnal conception through desire, semen, and blood. The stain of one’s earthly conception, which is present for all, needs to be removed before one can enter the Kingdom of God; thus, even if one has lived a righteous life, one still requires baptism.\(^6\) Despite the stain that results from carnal conception, the *Homilies* does not discourage sexual activity and procreation; indeed, the novel frequently encourages it, provided that such activity takes place within the confines of a marital union.

---

\(^5\) The *Homilies* attempts to present a universe in which God has total control, and thus the creation of demons is intentional, if indirect. See n. 73.

\(^6\) A likely exception to this is Jews, who have other means for removing the stain of carnal conception. See n. 109.
Sources of Bodily Defilement

Bodily Defilement in the Greek *Homilies*

In the Greek version of the text, the *Homilies* argues that there are two sources of bodily defilement: menstrual blood and semen. These appear three times throughout the narrative. The first instance occurs at *Hom. 7.8.2*, in a discourse that Peter delivers to the people of Sidon on his way from Caesarea to Tripolis in pursuit of Simon Magus. The Sidonians had sent for Peter while he was in Tyre, as they had been overcome with diseases and could not make the journey themselves (cf. *Hom. 7.5.2*). Peter tells them that their diseases have been inflicted on them by “the ruler of evil” (ὁ τῆς κακίας ἠγεμόν), whom God has permitted to torment those who commit evil deeds.\(^7\) In order to recover, Peter encourages his hearers to repent and engage in God’s “worship” (θρησκεία, *Hom. 7.8.1*), so that God will heal them (*Hom. 7.6.3*). This “worship” involves worshiping God, avoiding sin, being baptized, and engaging in practices of bodily purification, specifically “washing after intercourse with a woman” (ἀπὸ κοίτης γυναικὸς λούσθαι) and “keeping watch over menstruation” (ἀφεδρον φυλάσσειν, *Hom. 7.8.2*).

The same two sources of bodily defilement appear in two further instances, both of which take place during Peter’s speech on bodily purity in *Hom. 11.28–33*. As noted in the last chapter, this section occurs toward the end of Peter’s four-day long speech in Tripolis. After Peter explains the difference between purity of the body and purity of the heart (*Hom. 11.28.1–3*) and their relationship to one another (*Hom. 11.28.4–29.4*),\(^8\) he moves on to discuss bodily purity more specifically. He opens this section of the discourse with a rhetorical question that contains

---

\(^7\) See below on the role of the Evil One and his demons in causing disease.

\(^8\) On which, see chapter 2.
the same two sources of bodily impurity noted in *Hom.* 7.8.2: “But to whom is it not apparent that it is better not to have intercourse with a woman when she is menstruating, but purified and immersed? But also after intercourse it is necessary to immerse” (τίνι δὲ οὐ φαίνεται ὅτι κρεῖττόν ἐστιν γυναικὶ ἐν γυναικείῳς οὐσίᾳ μὴ συνελθείν ἀλλὰ καθαρθείς καὶ βαπτισθείς; Ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ κοινωνίαν βαπτίζεσθαι δὲ, *Hom.* 11.30.1). The emphasis here, at least with regard to menstruation, is on avoiding the act of intercourse with a menstruating woman; men are to wait until women are “purified and immersed.” Peter then quickly adds another source of bodily defilement, intercourse, after which it is necessary to immerse.

The last instance of a discussion of the sources of bodily defilement appears at the conclusion of the same speech. In the interim, Peter has chastised his audience for wanting to avoid practices of bodily purification, pointing to their willingness to perform such practices when they worshipped idols (*Hom.* 11.30.2)9 and asking them to consider who might be “casting hesitation with respect to purity upon you” (ὄκνον πρὸς ἁγνείαν ύμῖν ἐμβάλλων, *Hom.* 11.30.3)—i.e., the Evil One. He has also answered a potential objection to his promotion of bodily purification, “Thus, is it necessary for us to do the things we did among idols?” (χρὴ οὖν ἡμᾶς ποιεῖν ὅσα ἐν εἰδώλοις ἑποιοῦμεν, *Hom.* 11.31.1), by arguing that some things, including bodily purification practices, are inherently good, regardless of the context in which they are performed. Indeed, Peter argues that his hearers must not reject good things done by Gentiles,

---

but exceed them (cf. *Hom.* 11.31–32), as, on the day of judgment, they will be judged against them (cf. *Hom.* 11.33.1–3). He concludes:

The speech was poured into me, taking the occasion from the necessity of watching over menstruation and immersing after intercourse, not neglecting such purity, even if those who err do the same, when those in error who do well without being saved are for the condemnation of those in the worship, because their honor for purity is through error, and not through the worship of the one who is the Father and God of all. (*Hom.* 11.33.4–5)

Just like *Hom.* 7.8.2 and 11.30.1, *Hom.* 11.33.4 highlights two sources of bodily defilement, menstruation (“watching over menstruation,” φυλάσσειν τὴν ἄφεδρον) and intercourse (“immersing after intercourse,” ἀπὸ κοινωνίας βαπτίζεσθαι). For Peter, this purity ought not be rejected just because Gentiles also perform it, but instead ought to be observed for the right reasons, i.e., for the worship of God. Thus, in all three of the passages analyzed above, two clear sources of bodily defilement emerge: menstrual blood and seminal emission.\(^{10}\)

By identifying menstruation and sexual intercourse as sources of bodily defilement, the *Homilies* sits comfortably among contemporary Jewish literature, which generally agreed that menstrual blood and seminal emission defiled the body. This idea is based on the laws of Leviticus 15. The laws surrounding seminal emission appear first, in Lev 15:16–18, which states that a man who has an emission of semen, as well as his sexual partner and anything that the semen touches, must be washed afterward and are considered unclean until the evening. This is followed by Lev 15:19–24, which contains the laws surrounding menstrual blood. These laws are similar to those of seminal emission, with one potentially important difference: while a person to which her impurity transfers must wash, the menstruating woman herself, as well as what she sits

---

\(^{10}\) The references to semen as the “defiled drop” (μυσαρᾱ σταγών) in *Hom.* 3.17.1 and 3.20.1 is part of conception defilement and will be discussed below.
or lies on, need only wait for seven days to be considered pure, without any mention of washing.¹¹

Though it is not mentioned in Lev 15, by the time of the *Homilies*, washing after menstruation seems to have become commonplace, at least among some Jewish communities.¹²

The *Homilies* itself may attest to a change in perspective over time. Of the three passages discussed above, only *Hom.* 11.30.1 mentions a requirement for washing after menstruation; *Hom.* 7.8.2 and 11.33.4 only ask that women “watch over” (φυλάσσω) menstruation. If *Hom.* 11.30.1 comes from a different source than the other two, or if the final editor added the need for washing to *Hom.* 11.30.1, then the variation may attest to a change in perspective over the *Homilies*’ editorial history. Regardless of whether a change in ritual is reflected in the *Homilies*, its naming of menstrual blood and seminal emission as bodily defiling and its requirement of washing after contacting them puts it very much in line with contemporary Jewish literature and practice.¹³

¹¹ Though, cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 667, who argues that any time the phrase “and he/she will be impure until evening” (ברעה דע אמטו) appears in Leviticus, ablations are implied.

¹² Shaye J.D. Cohen has argued that washing after menstruation was uncommon in the Second Temple period, based on the practice being unknown to Josephus (Ant. 3.11.3), Justin Martyr (Dial. 46.2), the Didascalia apostolorum, and the Mishnah; see Shaye J.D. Cohen, “Menstruants and the Sacred in Judaism and Christianity,” in Women’s *History and Ancient History*, ed. Sarah B. Pomeroy (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 277, 293n12. However, since Cohen’s work, a number of scholars have noted that washing after menstruation seems to have been presupposed in Jewish texts from during and after the Second Temple period, including the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Mishnah; for one such argument, see Thomas Kazen, *Issues of Impurity in Early Judaism*, CB.NT 45 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 41–61, and the works referenced therein.

¹³ Giovanni Battista Bazzana’s contention that the Peter-Simon novella (on which, see Wehnert’s source-critical reconstruction in chapter 1 and Appendix B) considers Gentiles to be defiling (Bazzana, “Il battesimo,” 403) is unlikely. Though there were certainly ancient Jews who held this position (see 403n38 for Bazzana’s collation of such sources), the *Homilies* itself (including the material that Bazzana attributes to the novella) never indicates that its authors thought this. Bazzana’s evidence for the defilement of Gentiles is Peter and/or his disciples’ washings, which, in the reconstructed novella, only occur in Gentile cities (in Tripolis: *Hom.* 8.2.5; 10.26.2; in Laodicea: *Hom.* 14.1.2). However, *Hom.* 10.26.2 notes that these washings are optional; Peter washes “with those who wished” (σὺν τοῖς θελήσασι). Their optional nature indicates that these are supplemental washings and not required
Bodily Defilement in the Syriac Homilies

The Syriac translator makes one significant change to Hom. 11.30.1 and 11.33.4: he removes reference to the defiling power of intercourse. This difference should likely be attributed to the Syriac translator himself (or, perhaps, to the copy of the Homilies that the Syriac translator was working from), since, rather than omitting the reference to the defilement of intercourse altogether, he instead replaces it with a general prohibition against intercourse except for procreation. This general prohibition was likely not invented, but borrowed from the parallel passage in the Recognitions. Thus, while the Syriac translator agrees with the Greek Homilies regarding the defilement of menstrual blood, he does not consider seminal emission to be defiling.

Let us first consider how the Syriac translator has altered Hom. 11.30.1: “To whom is it not apparent that it is good for a man, that they not have intercourse with a woman who is in the way of women, but when she is purified? But also you should enter into intercourse for the bearing of children” (ܠܐ ܡܢܚܐ ܢܒܘܬܐ ܕܡܢܚܬܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܠܡܫܝܚܝܐ ܡܘܠܚܝܐ ܕܡܘܠܚܝܐ ܡܝܢܚܬܐ ܡܠܝܢܚܬܐ, Syriac Hom. 11.30.1). In the Syriac, the concern surrounding intercourse has shifted from the need to wash afterward to its purpose, i.e., the production of offspring. The translator makes a similar change in Hom. 11.33.4, though here there is a general exhortation to refrain from intercourse altogether, regardless of one’s intentions: “For I have extended our discourse on the occasion that I have found, that a man should guard against a woman in her menstruation, and that a man should...
refrain from intercourse” (لا تجعل لنا نغسل من جسدك فإن كان من العيفة عينك، Syriac Hom. 11.33.4).

In his edition of the Syriac, Wilhelm Frankenberg argued that both these changes were not intentional but the result of scribal error (“Schreibfehler”). Specifically, he believed that the verbs in each sentence had been mistakenly replaced. His argument for Hom. 11.33.4 is straightforward; he maintained that the manuscript’s “refrain from” (لا تجعل لنا نغسل من جسدك) had replaced an original “wash from” (لا تجعل لنا نغسل). وغسل and نغسل are composed of the same letters, so this is plausible; if a scribe had accidentally scrambled the verb, he or a later scribe may also have changed the subsequent preposition in order to conform it to that verb. Frankenberg was confident enough that this was the case that he emended the text in the body of his edition. Frankenberg’s argument for Hom. 11.30.1, however, was more strained. There, he claimed that “wash” (لا تجعل لنا نغسل) had been mistakenly replaced with a completely different word, “enter into” (انصبر). Rather than changing a single preposition, the introduction of the new verb required its completion with an entirely new phrase, “intercourse for the bearing of children” (لا تجعل لنا نغسل من جسدك بذل السرطان للسبالة السليمة), which “was then added accordingly based on the opinion of the time.” In this instance, Frankenberg did not emend the text.

In his English translation of the Syriac, F. Stanley Jones did not adopt Frankenberg’s emendations. Instead, he noted that the change in Hom. 11.30.1 reflects the parallel text in the

---

14 Frankenberg, Die syrischen Clementinen, 344.
15 Frankenberg, Die syrischen Clementinen, 284.
16 “Wurde dann aus der Anschauung der Zeit sinngemäß ergänzt”; Frankenberg, Die syrischen Clementinen, 344.
17 Frankenberg, Die syrischen Clementinen, 280.
Recognitions (Recog. 6.12.1). Given that the Syriac translator used the Recognitions as the basis for the translation of Hom. 12.1–24, 13.1–7, I consider it likely that he also looked to the Recognitions while making the changes in Hom. 11.30.1. We unfortunately do not have the Recognitions’ original Greek text, but Rufinus’s Latin translation is quite similar to the Syriac version of Hom. 11.30.1: “But also this kind of chastity ought to be observed, that one not have intercourse with women indiscriminately and by reason of pleasure alone, but for the sake of gaining posterity” (sed et illa species castimoniae observanda est, uti ne passim et libidinis solius causa feminis coeatur, sed posteritatis reparandae gratia, Recog. 6.12.1). It should be noted here that, in addition to not containing a reference to the defilement of seminal emission, the Recognitions also does not contain any reference to the defilement of menstruation in this instance. Thus, the Syriac translator employs elements both from the Greek Homilies and the Recognitions in his rendering of Hom. 11.30.1.

The changes made by the Syriac translator are not merely an attempt to harmonize the Homilies and the Recognitions; rather, he has changed the text of the Homilies based on his own ideological position. This becomes clear when we consider his rendering of Hom. 11.33.4. The parallel to this in the Recognitions, Recog. 6.14.5, is completely different than the Homilies, lacking any explicit mention of menstruation or intercourse. Nevertheless, in keeping with the

---


19 Whether the Recognitions considers menstruation defiling at all is an open question. The Recognitions does exhort its readers to refrain from intercourse during menstruation, arguing that “God’s Law considers this accursed” (hoc enim execrabile ducit lex dei). Nevertheless, the Recognitions frames this as a practice of “chastity” (castimonia), not purity (Recog. 6.10.5).

20 “From all these things, the discourse which we put forward is proved, that chastity, which is maintained to a certain extent even by those who are in error, should be kept more purely and carefully and in each of its individual forms (as we declared above) by us who follow the truth, all the more since the eternal rewards are placed before us for its observance” (ex quibus omnibus sermo quem proposuimus aprobatur, ut castimonia, quae aliquatenus etiam ab his qui in errore sunt positi custoditur, multo purius ed adientius et per singulas quasque, sicut supra
changes made to *Hom.* 11.30.1, the Syriac translator has altered this text to an injunction against having intercourse generally.\(^1\) Thus, the Syriac translator accepts the defilement caused by menstrual blood, but rejects that caused by seminal emission.

The reasoning behind the Syriac translator’s acceptance of menstrual defilement and rejection of seminal defilement may be connected to larger conversations surrounding the legal expectations of Gentiles. I will return to this point in chapter five. Before ending this section, however, I want to note that the conclusions that I have arrived at here bolster the case for the primacy of the Greek text over the Syriac translation. As I noted in the introduction, despite the greater antiquity of the Syriac manuscript, I use the Greek as the primary text in all my translations. The reason for this is that the Syriac translation is not a pure translation of the *Homilies,* but instead betrays influence from the *Recognitions.* While this influence is most obvious in *Hom.* 12.1–24, 13.1–7, it is also detectable here. Rather than simply removing the reference to the defiling power of seminal emission, the translator instead looked to the *Recognitions* to fill in the gap, as he will do with greater frequency in *Hom.* 12–13. Thus, the Greek text should be considered primary.

\(^1\) Given the probable influence of the *Recognitions,* the inclusion of this injunction is likely an exhortation to asceticism. It is possible, however, that the Syriac translator did not believe that conception was possible during menstruation, and thus his redaction was not an exhortation to asceticism but an extension of the prohibition against intercourse during menstruation. If this is the case, the Syriac translator would disagree with *Hom.* 19.22, where Peter argues not that it is impossible to conceive during menstruation, but that diseased offspring would result from such intercourse. On this, see the discussion of the prohibition on intercourse during menstruation in the next chapter.
Sources of Heart Defilement

The Homilies defines two major sources of heart defilement: sin and the demons that infest the person as a result of sin, and one’s carnal conception. While the Homilies does not consider all sins to defile the person, more severe sins, including idolatry, adultery, and murder, among others, are more dangerous, causing the person to lose God’s likeness (ὁμοιότητας) in their souls and granting permission to demons to possess and punish them. For the demons, this is a desirable outcome, and thus they have shaped the world in order to facilitate human sin. However, even if one were to avoid committing any sin, one still possesses heart defilement, because one has been born with a stain thanks to their carnal conception through desire, semen, and blood. This defilement makes baptism a requirement, even for those who have lived otherwise virtuous lives.

Sin Defilement

Sin

While sin is a major source of heart defilement and a significant concern for the Homilies in general, we ought to begin by noting that the novel does not believe that all sins lead to heart defilement. In a conversation with Clement’s father, Faustus, Peter argues that minor sins, particularly the sin of possession, can be forgiven if one leads an otherwise pious life. He begins making this case by informing Faustus that there are two kingdoms, the present, evil kingdom ruled by the Evil One (ὁ πονηρός), and the eternal kingdom ruled by the Good One (ὁ ἀγαθὸς)22:

When the Prophet of Truth was present, he taught us that the Creator and God of all things assigned two kingdoms to two, the Good One and the Evil One, giving to the bad one the kingdom of the present world along with a law so that he would have the

---

22 The “Good One” is the True Prophet.
authority to punish those who behave unjustly, but to the Good One the future eternal age. *(Hom. 15.7.4)*

The authority of the Evil One over the present world means that everything in it belongs to him. Those who belong to the future kingdom, therefore, should not partake in the things of this world, as they are his property. Unfortunately, this is impossible, since this world provides necessities for survival, and committing suicide or forsaking clothing are greater sins than stealing from the present kingdom:

But those who have chosen to receive the things of the future kingdom are not permitted to appropriate the things here for themselves (as they are the property of a foreign king), except only water and bread, and those things which are procured for living with sweat (since it is not permitted to die willingly), and besides one garment, for it is not allowed to stand naked because of the heaven that sees all. *(Hom. 15.7.6)*

Despite their necessity for survival, the *Homilies* nevertheless considers eating, drinking, and wearing clothing sinful; indeed, Peter goes so far as to argue that, “For all, possessions are sins” *(πᾶσι τὰ κτήματα ἁμαρτήματα, Hom. 15.9.3).*

Because merely surviving in the material world necessarily results in sin, it is impossible for a person to be totally without it. However, the sin of possessions does not lead to the contraction of heart defilement. Instead, as Peter explains to Faustus, God punishes his citizens while they are in this kingdom, so that they can be made ready for the next:

For since the limit of the saved is, as I said, that nothing is owned by anyone, but many possessions (i.e., sins) are owned by many, for this reason, misfortunes are introduced by the surpassing philanthropy of God on those who do not live simply, so that they may be saved from eternal punishments through temporary retributions because of a certain extent of piety. *(Hom. 15.9.5–6)*

For the one who is pious (literally, “God-loving”; φιλόθεος), the grace of temporary punishment is extended. This punishment is not inflicted by demons, but “by the surpassing philanthropy of God” *(ἐξ ὑπερβαλλούσης θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας)*, whose concern for his citizens leads him to prepare them for their reception into the eternal kingdom.
The sinner’s intention is significant in this instance. Earlier, when he was addressing the people of Sidon, Peter had argued that the sin of those who try to please God and fail is less than those who do not have the same intention:

Those who attempt to understand well and fail sin much less than those who do not strive after good things at all. Because it seems good to God that the one who erred in the knowledge of good things be saved after being moderately punished, according to the account of human error. (Hom. 7.7.5–6)

By contrast, those who shrink from learning the truth are punished severely, even if they engaged in a multitude of other good works (cf. Hom. 7.7.7). Thus, as Peter argues in Tripolis, one’s good works must be done well (i.e., by being baptized\textsuperscript{23}; cf. Hom. 11.25.2).

For more serious sins, or when one fails to do good works well, God’s grace is not extended, and the result is the defiling of one’s heart and the incursion of demons therein. Peter addresses the sins that inflict heart defilement throughout the Homilies, but it is perhaps best to begin with Hom. 7.4.2, 7.8.1–2, and 8.19.1, 3, since these three parallel passages contain the greatest concentration of sins and explicitly connect them with demonic possession. The first two take place in Hom. 7, in which Peter visits several cities inhabited by Gentiles that have been visited by Simon and subsequently inflicted with disease. These diseases are the result of their possession by demons, who have been given permission to enter their bodies because of the sins that they had committed.\textsuperscript{24} Peter charges two of the cities, Tyre and Sidon, to repent and engage

\textsuperscript{23} See below on the necessity of baptism, even for the righteous.

\textsuperscript{24} See the discussion of demons below.
in what pleases God. I focus here on the speech Peter gives to Sidon, as it has much overlap with the Tyre discourse but contains greater detail:\footnote{As I argued in the previous chapter, Hom. 7.4.2 is likely an abbreviation of Hom. 7.8.1–2. For a comparison of the two discourses, see the previous chapter.}

The worship ordained by him [God] is this: To worship him alone, and to believe in the Prophet of Truth alone, and to be baptized for the forgiveness of sins, and thus, through this most holy dipping, to be reborn to God by saving water, to not share of the table of demons (I mean of meat sacrificed to idols, dead things, strangled things, things caught by wild beasts, blood), to not live impurely, to wash after intercourse with a woman, for women themselves, to also keep watch over menstruation, for all to be chaste, to do good, to not do evil, to expect eternal life from the God who is able to do all things, asking with prayer and continual supplications that they may receive it. (Hom. 7.8.1–2)

Within this description of God’s “worship” (θρησκεία), there are recommendations for certain beliefs and practices, as well as prohibitions against certain sins. Peter highlights two sins in particular: idolatry and violating certain food laws, including eating carrion, “strangled things” (πνικτά), “things caught by wild beasts” (θηριάλωτα), and blood.\footnote{On the ambiguous status of food laws in the Hebrew Bible, see n. 74 in chapter 2. In any case, their location here as belonging to “partaking in the table of demons” puts them squarely in the purview of heart defilement.}

These two are grouped under the heading of “sharing of the table of demons” (τραπέζης δαιμόνων μεταλαμβάνειν),

The next list, Hom. 8.19.1, 3, appears as Peter is concluding his etiology of demons, an etiology that is based on the narratives of 1 Enoch and Jubilees.\footnote{For the overlaps between this etiology, 1 Enoch, and Jubilees, see Eibert Tigchelaar, “Manna-Eaters and Man-Eaters: Food of Giants and Men in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies 8,” in The Pseudo-Clementines, ed. Bremmer, 92–114.}

According to Hom. 8, demons are the souls of giants, the offspring of humans and angels, who perished in the Flood. At first, after their birth, God attempted to placate the giants, whom the earth could not support, by providing them with enough manna for survival. Despite having this manna, however, the giants were not satisfied and began to kill and eat animals and human beings. The defilement of the air
and land that resulted from the bloodshed caused God to kill the giants with a flood (Hom. 8.12–17). While this flood destroyed their bodies, their souls survived, and since their souls are more powerful than human souls, God sent an angel to restrict their actions with a law:

These things seem good to the all-seeing God, for you to rule over none of the humans, or annoy anyone, unless he purposely enslaves himself to you, worshipping you, sacrificing, pouring libations, and partaking of your table, or doing any other of the things that he ought not—either shedding blood, tasting dead flesh, or filling himself with a remnant of an animal, something cut, something strangled, or any other unclean thing…. But if any of those who are devoted to me err, either committing adultery, practicing magic, living impurely, or doing any other of the things that do not seem good to me, then it will be necessary for them to suffer something, by you or another, at my command. (Hom. 8.19.1, 3)

In this passage, the angel sent by God recounts the sins that, when performed by human beings, permit demons to possess them. These include idolatry; murder (“shedding blood,” αἷμα χέων); violating certain food laws, including eating carrion, “a remnant of an animal” (θηρίου λείψανον), “something cut” (τμητόν), and “something strangled” (πνικτόν); committing adultery; and practicing magic.

Of course, the sins identified in Hom. 7.4.2, 7.8.1–2, and 8.19.1, 3 do not form complete lists, as the elliptical phrases that conclude each one indicate. Luckily, the Homilies does not leave us in the dark regarding other defiling sins, as elsewhere Peter is eager to discuss them. At

On this defilement, see the excursus at the end of this section.

In this instance, the reference to “shedding blood” likely signifies only the shedding of human blood, i.e., murder. However, “shedding blood” is used elsewhere in the Homilies to signify the slaughter of both humans and animals. See the discussion of the Homilies’ ambivalent attitude toward the consumption of meat in the excursus at the end of this section.

In Hom. 7.4.3, Peter concludes the list he gives to the people of Tyre as follows: “And the rest, in one word: As the Jews who worship God heard, hear you also, all adopting one thought in many bodies” (τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ἐνὶ λόγῳ ὑμᾶς ὑπάκουσαν ὑοῦδαίοι, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀκουστε ἀπαντες ἐν πολλοῖς σώμασιν μίαν γνώμην ἀναλαβόντες). Similarly, Peter tells the Sidonians “to not do evil” (μὴ ἀδικεῖν, Hom. 7.8.2), and God extends permission for demons to invade people who “do any other of the things that do not seem good to me” (ἄλλο τὶ τῶν ἐμοὶ μὴ δοκοῦντων πράξαντες, Hom. 8.19.3).

---

28 On this defilement, see the excursus at the end of this section.

29 In this instance, the reference to “shedding blood” likely signifies only the shedding of human blood, i.e., murder. However, “shedding blood” is used elsewhere in the Homilies to signify the slaughter of both humans and animals. See the discussion of the Homilies’ ambivalent attitude toward the consumption of meat in the excursus at the end of this section.

30 In Hom. 7.4.3, Peter concludes the list he gives to the people of Tyre as follows: “And the rest, in one word: As the Jews who worship God heard, hear you also, all adopting one thought in many bodies” (τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ἐνὶ λόγῳ ὑμᾶς ἀκουστε ἀπαντες ἐν πολλοῖς σώμασιν μίαν γνώμην ἀναλαβόντες). Similarly, Peter tells the Sidonians “to not do evil” (μὴ ἀδικεῖν, Hom. 7.8.2), and God extends permission for demons to invade people who “do any other of the things that do not seem good to me” (ἄλλο τὶ τῶν ἐμοὶ μὴ δοκοῦντων πράξαντες, Hom. 8.19.3).
the conclusion of the speech in *Hom.* 8, for example, Peter exhorts his audience to avoid sin, including, in addition to idolatry, murder, and adultery, also theft and hating inappropriately:

“Therefore, do not believe in idols, do not share in their unclean table, do not murder, do not commit adultery, do not hate those whom it is not right to hate, do not steal, do not undertake any evil deeds at all” (μὴ ὑπείκων εἰδώλων πιστεύετε μὴ τραπέζης αὐτοῖς κοινωνεῖτε μιαρᾶς, μὴ φονεύετε, μὴ μισήσητε οὖς μὴ δίκαιον, μὴ κλέπτετε μηδὲ κακάς τισιν ὁλως πράξεσιν ἐπιβάλλεσθε, *Hom.* 8.23.2). Theft, together with murder, is also tied to demonic worship in *Hom.* 11.15.5. Hatred, this time without an object, appears again in a list of sins that Peter exhorts his audience to avoid following their baptism, a list that also includes greed: “The will of the Righteous One [i.e., God] is to do no wrong. But wrong is murdering, committing adultery, hating, being greedy, and things similar to these” (δικαίου δὲ θέλημα τὸ μὴ ἀδικεῖν. Ἄδικα δὲ ἐστὶν φονεύειν, μισεῖν, πλεονεκτεῖν καὶ δὰ τούτοις ὁμοία, *Hom.* 11.27.3). 31

Finally, during Peter’s conversation with Faustus, Peter argues that, while an impoverished person might not sin by owning anything, it is still possible for him to sin in other ways: “For he may worship idols, blaspheme, fornicate, or live indiscriminately, swearing falsely, lying, or living unfaithfully” (ἡ γὰρ εἴδωλα σέβεται ἢ βλασφημεῖ ἢ πορνεύει ἢ ἀδιαφόρως ζῆ, ἢ ἐπιορκόν ἢ ψευδόμενος ἢ ἀπίστως βιούς, *Hom.* 15.10.3). This list adds many more sins that can defile the heart, including blasphemy, fornication, and living indiscriminately by swearing falsely, lying, and living unfaithfully.

---

31 “Hatred” (ܚadelphia) and “greed” (ܚا全资子) are reversed in the Syriac.
From the sin lists noted above, we can compile a relatively full, if still incomplete, list of sins that, according to the Homilies, defile the heart. These include idolatry and blasphemy, adultery and other sexual sins, murder, violating certain food laws, practicing magic, hatred, theft, greed, swearing falsely, and lying. Committing any of these grave sins, unlike the sin of possession, results in the defiling of one’s heart and the granting of permission for the incursion of demons therein.

Excursus: Sins that Defile in Unique Ways

Before moving on to a discussion of demons, I want to turn our attention to two of the above sins that the Homilies considers to be defiling in unique ways. The first of these is adultery. Next to idolatry, the Homilies considers adultery to be the single worst sin that one can commit. Its danger is due to its ability to spread; it can infect a large number of people while nevertheless remaining hidden (cf. Hom. 3.68.2–3; 4.20.3–21.4). Because of this, the Homilies argues that adultery is worse than murder, since, when a murder has occurred, there is evidence—a body—that it happened, whereas an act of adultery can occur without anyone but the adulterers being aware of it:

---

32 Because the Homilies does not treat this topic systematically, there may be sins that its author(s) considered defiling but that do not appear in the text. Additionally, there are a few evils that are not easily categorized as “sins.” In Hom. 1.18.3, for example, Peter describes a few means by which God’s will has been kept hidden from Clement. These include fearlessness (ἀφοβία), faithlessness (ἀπιστία), sexual immorality (πορνεία), greed (φιλαργυρία), and vanity (κενοδοξία). It is debatable whether these evils, and particularly fearlessness, faithlessness, and vanity, should be considered sins in themselves or vices that lead to sin.

33 Homilies 3.68.2 even suggests that adultery may be worse than idolatry, as God hates it “more than every sin” (ὑπὲρ πάσαν ἁμαρτίαν). Cf. also Hom. 3.8.1, in which people who believe in many gods die “as in the crime of adultery” (ὡς ἐπὶ μοιχείας ἐχθρήματι), and Hom. 3.28.2, where listening to anyone other than the True Prophet is tantamount to “spiritual adultery” (ψυχική μοιχεία).

34 See Duncan, “Eve, Mattidia, and the Gender Discourse,” 179–80. It should be noted that this “spreading” is a metaphor, and should not be read as indicative of any passive transmission of heart defilement. See chapter 4.
God as my witness, one act of adultery is equivalent to many murders, and the terrible thing is that the fearfulness and impiety of its murders are not seen, because, when blood is shed, there is a dead body and the terribleness of the offense strikes all, but the murders of the soul caused by adultery, though they are more frightful, since they are not seen by men, grant the impulse to those who would dare without hesitation. (Hom. 13.19.1–2)

In addition, the *Homilies* argues that adultery is uniquely defiling; while other sins defile the heart, adultery also defiles “the breath of God” (ἡ θεοῦ πνοή):

Know, man, whose breath you have in order to live, and you will not want it to be defiled. The breath of God is defiled by adultery alone, and because of this it pulls down the defiler into the fire. For it hastens to hand over the insolent man to eternal punishment. (Hom. 13.19.3)

The *Homilies*’ anthropology here is rather obscure. Based on other references to God’s breath in the novel, it appears to be distinct from the soul; Peter refers to God’s breath as the “unbroken garment of the soul” (ψυχῆς ἀῤῥηκτόν περιβολήν, Hom. 3.20.3) and states the soul “is clothed

35 Μάρτυς θεοῦ, πολλοὶ φόνοι μοιχεία μια. Syriac: “God is a witness that many terrible things come from one adultery” (ܝܗ ܡܐ ܡܐ ܛܒܐ ܡܠܡܐ ܡܐ ܡܠܡܐ). Frankenberg speculates that ἐν ταῖς (“terrible things”) is a translation of φόνοι (“fears”) instead of φόνοι (“murders”); see Frankenberg, *Die syrischen Clementinen*, 325, 345.

36 The Syriac adds: “While it is more evil and terrible than murder” (ܘܗ ܒܘܗ ܐ ܒܘܗ ܚ ܒܘܗ ܐ ܒܘܗ ܒܘܗ).

37 Τὸν φόνον αὐτής. Absent from Syriac.

38 Νεκρὸν κεῖται σῶμα καὶ τὸ τῆς συμφορᾶς δεινὸν πάντας ἐκπλήσσει. Syriac: “A body is lying as dead, and it causes everyone to marvel at the cruel end” (ܠܒܘܗ ܠܒܘܗ ܐ ܠܒܘܗ ܐ).

39 Instead of “murders,” the Syriac has “pains” (ܟܫܝܬܐ). Frankenberg suggests that the Syriac is translating πόνοι (“toils”) rather than φόνοι—an error that, oddly enough, I also made when first translating the Greek. See Frankenberg, *Die syrischen Clementinen*, 325, 345.

40 Τοῦ τολμῶσιν ἄοκνον τὴν ὀρμήν παρέχουσιν. This translation is based on the Syriac, which understood οὗκνον as an accusative of manner describing “those who would dare”: “They grant more violence to those who dare without fear” (ܟܫܝܬܐ ܠܒܘܗ ܠܒܘܗ).

41 Instead of “adultery” (μοιχεία), the Syriac has the more general “fornication” (ܟܫܝܬܐ).

42 Κατασπᾶ. Absent from Syriac. Frankenberg supplies ḫד; see Frankenberg, *Die syrischen Clementinen*, 324. Jones translates the Syriac without Frankenberg’s conjecture: “It is also like fire for the one who defiles it” (ܘܗ ܒܘܗ ܒܘܗ ܚ ܒܘܗ ܒܘܗ ܒܘܗ ܒܘܗ ܒܘܗ).
with the breath of God” (τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πνοὴν ἡμιφιεσμένη, *Hom.* 16.16.4). Thus, while other sins are capable of defiling the heart, adultery is unique in its ability to defile God’s very breath, the clothing of the soul that grants a person with life.

Like adultery, the shedding of blood is also capable of bringing about unique defilements. Because blood is such a potent source of impurity, it can defile the natural world. Peter discusses this in his first speech to the people of Tripolis, where he delivers the etiology of demons influenced by *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*. Though God attempted to placate the giants with manna, they nonetheless began to kill and eat animals, and human beings soon followed their example. Unsatisfied with the flesh of animals, however, the giants then began to kill and eat human beings (*Hom.* 8.15–16). The result of all this slaughter was the poisoning of the environment, both the air—causing people to become sick—and the ground—causing the creation of poisonous creatures:

> The pure air, having been defiled with impure vapor through much shedding of blood, and ailing those who inhaled it, made them sick, so that finally people died prematurely. And the earth, having been exceedingly defiled from these things, then first cast forth venomous and destructive animals. (*Hom.* 8.17.1–2)

For the *Homilies*, then, natural evils—defiled air and earth, poisonous creatures, etc.—result from the spilling of blood.

It should be noted that this defilement comes about not only through murder, but also through the slaughter of animals more generally. For the most part, the *Homilies* disapproves of animal slaughter. This attitude appears most strongly in the novel’s polemic against sacrifice, which the *Homilies* argues vehemently against, claiming that the Torah was never intended to contain laws promoting sacrifice and that sacrificial laws were added by the Evil One in order to
encourage its readers to error.\textsuperscript{43} Despite the Evil One’s interventions, however, there are still hints in Torah that God dislikes both sacrifice and the slaughter of animals more generally. Peter makes this case during his first debate with Simon in Caesarea, in which he appeals to Num 11 to argue that God dislikes both sacrifice and slaughter:

That he [God] does not desire sacrifices is apparent by the fact that those who desired meats were killed as soon as they tasted it and were buried in the tomb, so that it was called the “hill of desires.” The one who was at first angry at the slaughter of animals, not wanting them to be sacrificed, does not command sacrifices as if he wanted them, and he does not require first fruits.\textsuperscript{44} For sacrifices are not performed, nor can first fruits be given, without slaughter. (\textit{Hom.} 3.45.1–2)

Here, the \textit{Homilies} contends that God does not want sacrifices (\textit{θυσία}) because God does not want slaughter (\textit{θύσις}) at all. This aversion to animal slaughter is reinforced later in the demonic etiology, where God attempts to placate the giants with manna precisely because he does not want them to be blameless when they consume animals:

Therefore God, knowing that they [the giants] were made savage with respect to brutality and that the world was not sufficient for their satisfaction (for it was created in proportion to human beings and for human use), in order that those who turn to the eating of animals, contrary to nature, might not seem to be innocent because of a lack of food, since they undertook this out of necessity, the Almighty God rained manna on them from their manifold desires, and they enjoyed everything they wanted. (\textit{Hom.} 8.15.2–3)

God, then, provided the giants with manna so that, when they ultimately turn to the consumption of animals, they would not appear to have done so innocently, but would be guilty of the subsequent pollution of the land and air.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{43} The \textit{Homilies}’ contention that certain elements of the Torah were added by the Evil One is often referred to as the “Doctrine of the False Pericopes.” We will explore this doctrine in more detail in the next section.

\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Ἀπαρχάς}. P contains \textit{ἅπαρχάς}, “from the beginning.”

\textsuperscript{45} This may be in reaction to \textit{1 Enoch} 7.3–5, in which the giants begin to consume human beings because the earth could not sustain them.
Despite the Homilies’ distaste for animal slaughter, the novel never prohibits it outright. Indeed, the food regulations analyzed above imply that eating meat was permitted, as long as the slaughter was performed correctly. Georg Strecker has suggested that the contrasting perspectives come out of different sources, but the Homilies’ “latent vegetarianism” may simply be an ideal for its author(s). Indeed, it seems to have been common among ancient Jews to consider humanity to have been vegetarian prior to Noah, and a future vegetarian ideal was upheld among many of the Homilies’ Jewish contemporaries. The Homilies’ allowing for animal consumption despite its distaste for it thus may not have been unusual for its time and place.

**Demons**

The main consequences of committing the sins listed above, as Peter describes at the beginning of his third speech in Tripolis, are twofold: first, one loses the “likeness” (ὁμοιότης/חֵאֵצָא) of God from one’s soul and becomes a mere animal; second, one allows oneself to become infested with demons:

> Therefore, being of good courage, approach God, you who in the beginning were made for ruling and lording over all things; you, who have his image in your body, likewise have the likeness of his thought in your mind. Therefore, since you, by doing things

---


47 Jones, “Jewish Christianity,” 143.


befitting irrational animals, have lost the soul of a person [from your soul], you, having become like swine, have become prey of demons. Therefore, if you accepted God’s Law, you would be human beings. For it is not possible to say to irrational animals, “You shall not murder, you shall not commit adultery, you shall not steal,” etc. (Hom. 10.6.1–3)

In the Homilies, the image and likeness of God, according to which humans were created (cf. Gen 1:26), have different loci; God’s image resides in the body, while God’s likeness resides in the mind/soul. When a person sins, they behave animalistically, and, though they retain God’s image, they lose God’s likeness, becoming nothing more than animals. This point is reinforced the following day, when Peter argues that those who have sinned do not bear the likeness of God, “but the pure mind of the good soul [does]” (ἀλλὰ ἁγαθῆς ψυχῆς ὁ καθαρὸς νοῦς/ ἀλλὰ ἁγαθῆς ψυχῆς, Hom. 11.4.1). Engaging in this animalistic behavior causes them to become the “prey”—or, more literally, the “things demanded” (αἰτήματα/αἰτήματα) of demons; i.e., in accordance with the

---

50 ἑοικότα. I have adopted the emendation of Cotelier, who loosely conforms the Greek to the Syriac’s “something like” (something like). The Greek manuscripts instead have ἑοικότα.

51 Τῆς ψυχῆς. Present in P; O has τῆς ψυχῆς, with a third of the row left blank. This is absent from the Syriac. I have interpreted P’s text as a genitive of separation. If P’s text is original, the Homilies may reflect an Aristotelian understanding of the soul, in which the souls are either nutritive, sensitive, or rational (cf. De anima 413a–414b). Committing sin, then, would result in the loss of the rational soul, leaving behind a sensitive soul, which is able to sense but not able to reason. Cf. Hom. 3.5.4, where Peter compares the impious to “irrational animals” (ἄλογα ζώα), as well as Hom. 11.28.2, in which Peter appeals to human’s possession of “something more than the irrational animals (that is, being rational)” (τι πλείον τῶν ἄλογων ζώων [τὸ λογικό εἶναι]) to justify his exhortation to purify the body and soul.

52 See n. 56.

53 Οὐ κλέψεις. Absent from Syriac.

54 In one instance in the Homilies, the word “image” (εἰκόνα) is used to describe the soul instead of the body; there, the soul is “clothed with his image for immortality” (ἡν ἁγαθοῦ εἰκόνα πρὸς ἀθανασίαν ἠμφίεστα, Hom. 16.10.5)

55 These words are used interchangeably in the Homilies. See chapter for on the importance of purifying the mind.

56 My choice of “prey” to translate αἰτήματα is based on Peter Peterson’s translation in the ANF; see ANF 8:281.
law that they were given in Hom. 8.19, demons are allowed to take possession of the sinner.57 This possession is not necessarily total, as Peter had explained earlier to the people of Tripolis, but is in proportion to the amount of faith in God that a person harbors; thus, “They [the demons] remain with the unfaithful, and they dwell with the weak in faith, but they cannot be with those who believe and do good at all, not even for a moment of an hour” (τοῖς ἀπιστοῦσιν ἐπιμένουσιν, τοῖς δὲ δυσπίστοις ἐνβραδύνουσιν, τοῖς δὲ παντάπασιν πιστεύσασι καὶ εὖ πράττουσιν οὖδὲ πρὸς ῥοπὴν ὃρας συνεῖναι δύνανται, Hom. 9.11.2). With faith, Peter argues, the soul becomes like water that is able to extinguish the fire of the demons (Hom. 9.11.3). The use of a water metaphor here is intentional and suggests baptism, which, for the Homilies, is the fullest expression of faith that grants the baptized the ability to exorcize their demons.58

If a person does not have enough faith in God, however, the demon that is within them is able to convince them to sin further, and the person thus falls further under the demon’s control. Those who do not know the truth about their possession follow the demon’s suggestions as though they were the desires of their own soul:

For, being mixed with souls, they [the demons] suggest conceptions for what they want into their minds, so that they [the possessed person] might neglect their salvation. For this reason, many who do not know whence they are influenced agree to the evil conceptions suggested by the demons as the reasoning of their own soul. (Hom. 9.11.4–12.1)


58 See the next chapter on a baptized person’s ability to exorcize demons.
These “evil conceptions” (κακαὶ ἐπίνοιαι), as we will see below, consist of false ideas about God and the world,\textsuperscript{59} as well as encouragements to sin.\textsuperscript{60}

One false idea about the world involves the origin of illness. The \textit{Homilies} attributes illness to demonic possession in Peter’s speeches to the people of Tyre (\textit{Hom.} 7.2–3), Sidon (\textit{Hom.} 7.6), Beirut (\textit{Hom.} 7.11.4), and Tripolis (\textit{Hom.} 9.12), and the Sidonians are depicted as sending for Peter in order to heal them (\textit{Hom.} 7.5.2).\textsuperscript{61} However, demons have attempted to conceal their role in causing illness by developing various medical theories. In \textit{Hom.} 9, Peter takes aim against the Hippocratic theory of the four humors\textsuperscript{62} by arguing that, even if disease is caused by an imbalance of humors, this imbalance is nevertheless the result of demonic interference:

Therefore, it is given to them by the demons who lurk in their souls to conclude that it is not a demon that troubles them, but a bodily illness (such as an excess of either bitter matter, bile, phlegm, blood, an inflammation of a membrane, or something else). But even if it were this, it would not be dismissed from being a kind of demon. For also the whole and earthly soul that enters because of all meats, having been taken to more by more food, is itself united with the spirit, which is the soul of man, as akin, but the materiality of the food that is united to the body is left behind like a terrible poison.  

\textit{(Hom.} 9.12.3–4\textit{)}

\textsuperscript{59} See below on demonic involvement in Greek \textit{paideia} and the defenses of idolatry proffered by the “serpent” in \textit{Hom.} 10–11.

\textsuperscript{60} Cf. \textit{Hom.} 11.15.5, where Peter argues that, when people become possessed, “some turn themselves [or are turned] to behaving licentiously, others to thefts and murders” (οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄσσελγαίνειν τρέπονται, οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ κλοπὰς καὶ φόνους).

\textsuperscript{61} By attributing illness to demons, the \textit{Homilies} is likely following the Enochic tradition; cf. \textit{1 Enoch} 15:11 and \textit{Jub.} 10:12.

\textsuperscript{62} According to Hippocrates, illness is caused by an imbalance of one of the four humors: blood, black bile, yellow bile, and phlegm. For an introduction to the medical ideas of Hippocrates, see Vivian Nutton, “Medicine in the Greek World, 800–50 BC,” in \textit{The Western Medical Tradition 800 BC to AD 1800}, ed. Lawrence I. Conrad et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 23–26.
In other words, Peter argues that, even if the demons themselves were not the ones inflicting diseases, the diseases can still be connected to their actions; by encouraging excess, demons influence the person to indulge, and “the materiality of the food” (τὸ τῆς τροφῆς ὕλωδες) poisons the body and sickens it. Giovanni Battista Bazzana has suggested that this may be a reference to animal blood, which, when ingested by human beings, “disrupts the vital functions of the body,” according to the ancient “pneumatists.”

The consumption of animal blood may also contribute to the soul’s “animalization”; the divine spark in the human soul is replaced incrementally by “the whole and earthly soul” (ἡ καθόλου και γεώδης ψυχή).

The possession of a person to demons endures beyond death, and if the demons are not removed prior to that point, they drag the soul to the “purifying fire” (τὸ καθαίρον πῦρ), where it is punished for eternity:

On the other hand, since you are insulted by demons with strange diseases in the current life, you will also have your souls punished forever upon their removal from the body—not by God condemning the true things, but by your evil deeds having such a judgment. For the demons, having power through the food rendered to them, enter your bodies by your own hands. For, lying hidden for a long time, they also mix with the soul. And through the negligence of those who do not think, or even want, to help themselves, upon the dissolution of the body, the soul, having been united with the demon, is by necessity borne by it to whatever place it wishes. But the worst thing of all, when the demon is first returned to the purifying fire at the end of all things, the soul itself, having been mixed with it, is by necessity punished in an inexpressible manner, but the demon is pleased. For the soul, being made of light, not bearing the foreign flame of fire, is torturéd, but the

---

63 It does this by obstructing the regular flow of πνεῦμα throughout the body; see Giovanni Battista Bazzana, “Healing the World: Medical and Social Practice in the Pseudo-Clementine Novel,” in Rediscovering the Apocryphal Continent, 363.

64 Cf. also Hom. 13.18.4, where Peter exhorts the chaste wife to be moderate in her consumption: “The chaste wife practices moderation of food and drinks, so that, not pampering the body, she might not pull down the soul by its weight to unlawful desires” (ἡ σώφρον γυνὴ αὐταρκείᾳ βρομάτων καὶ ποτῶν χρήσαι, ἵνα μὴ λατρεύῃ τοῦ σώματος τὸ βάρει πρὸς ἐπιθυμίας ἀνόημος καταστάσει τὴν ψυχήν, Syria: “The chaste woman uses the food and drink that is sufficient for her, lest, when the body increases through the weight of the desires of iniquity, it throws down the soul,” ἐφελτεὶ εἰσεχθαί τοῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ἀνόημος καταστάσει τὴν ψυχήν).
demon, being in the essence of its kind, is greatly pleased, becoming the difficult-to-break bond of the soul absorbed by it. (*Hom.* 9.9.1–5)

As was the case in the demonic etiology of *Hom.* 8, demonic spirits are understood to be stronger than human souls. As a result, once the body has been lost, the human soul is taken wherever the demon wishes—in this case, to the “purifying fire.” This is torturous for the soul because they are composed of dissimilar material; instead of fire, the soul is composed of light. Demons, by contrast, are also composed of fire, and thus the fire is pleasing to them.65

Demonic Motivations

For the demons, this is a desirable outcome; demons want to possess people and, in some cases, to torture them. The *Homilies* gives a few motivations for this desire. First, some demons possess people purely out of self-interest. During the second speech in Tripolis, Peter argues that these demons want to obtain use of human bodies in order to fulfill their own desires:

> But this is the reason that demons strive to enter the bodies of human beings. Since they are spirits and have the desire for meats, drinks, and intercourse, but are unable to partake because they are spirits and require organs suitable for use, they enter into the bodies of human beings, so that, obtaining organs as assistants, they are able to get what they want—either meats, through the teeth of a person, or intercourse, through their genitalia. (*Hom.* 9.10.1–2)

The motivation of employing human bodies to satisfy their desires makes sense in the context of the story of the giants that Peter had recounted on the previous day. The giants, who once had bodies to indulge their desires, can no longer do so. The only way for them to indulge themselves, then, is to find other bodies to use—those of people. Because of this, Peter argues

---

65 Contrast this with *Hom.* 20.9.3–5, where the soul is dragged to “the darkness of Tartarus” (τὸ τοῦ Ταρτάρου σκότος). Whether the soul is dragged to a fire or to darkness, the effect is the same; the soul is tortured, but the demons are pleased.
that one way to be rid of these demons is to engage in asceticism, denying them their desires and thus forcing them to relocate.\footnote{On these demons and their connection to the Enochic literature, see also Silviu N. Bunta, “Dreamy Angels and Demonic Giants: Watcher Traditions and the Origin of Evil in Early Christian Demonology,” in The Fallen Angels Traditions: Second Temple Developments and Reception History, ed. Angela Kim Harkins, Kelley Coblentz Bautch, and John C. Endres (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2014), 116–38.}

Shortly thereafter, however, Peter notes that ascetic practices on their own are not sufficient for totally ridding oneself of demonic incursion. That is because, in addition to the self-serving demons, there are a “more powerful” (δεινότερα) set of demons who are willing to endure the suffering inflicted on them through asceticism:

However, since some\footnote{The gender here is changed; while the text had been using δαίμονες to refer to the demons (cf. Hom. 9.10.1, 3), it here employs ἦνα. The ANF explains the change thusly: “I suppose the author forgot that in the preceding sentences he had written δαίμονες (masc.) and not δαίμονα (neut.).”; ANF 8:227n1. This could serve as evidence that one of the editors of the Homilies added this section about more powerful demons to a preexisting work.} who are more powerful wait, persisting and indeed being punished with the body that is punished, because of this it is necessary to flee to God with prayers and petitions, refraining from every occasion of impurity, so that the hand of God can touch him for his healing, as being pure and faithful. (Hom. 9.10.5)

Unlike the self-serving demons, these more powerful demons are not motivated purely by pleasure, but seek to invade the body in order to destroy their host and lead their soul to eternal punishment:

But some of the evil-working demons ensnare differently, at first not showing that they are there, so that there may not be effort against them, but, at the opportune moment, on the occasion of anger, love, or some other thing, they suddenly insult the body, either by sword, noose, cliff, or something else, and they finally bring down the souls of those deceived by them, which were mixed up with them and will be punished, withdrawing into the purifying fire. (Hom. 9.13.1)

Because of this, faith in God and good works are also necessary for the purification of the heart. We will return to this point in the next chapter.
The desire of these latter demons to punish their host is more in line with the motivations that the *Homilies* attributes to the Evil One (ὁ πονηρός) over the course of its narrative. The Evil One, ruler of the present world and of demons, is portrayed as attempting to deceive the masses for their destruction, not because he is at war with God, but because he loves God and destroying the wicked comports with God’s will. Peter makes the former case in the context of a discussion of the Doctrine of the False Pericopes (cf. *Hom.* 2.38.1). Here, he argues that the Evil One inserted false material into the Torah not out of malice but for a “just reason” (δίκαιος λόγος).

Peter describes this just reason on the following day:

The false things of the scriptures were permitted to be written for a certain just reason, at the request of evil, and with good reason. I mean this: In theologies, the Evil One, who does not love God any less than the Good One, is inferior to the Good One in just one way, that he, not even pardoning the impious on account of ignorance, desires the destruction of the impious out of love for the one who is sinned against, without offering them a remedy. For the Good One wants to heal all through repentances, but he saves only those who know God. (*Hom.* 3.5.1–3)

Here, Peter claims the Evil One “does not love God any less than the Good One” (τοῦ ἅγαθοῦ τὸν θεὸν οὐκ ἔλαττον ἁγαπῶν), and his actions are understood as coming out of that motivation. Thus, he introduces false scriptures for the (just) reason of condemning those who would believe them and thereby insult God. In this sense, Peter argues that those who insult God are worse than the Evil One; in their debate in Laodicea, Peter charges Simon Magus in this way: “For no one can prove that the Evil One spoke against God, but all of us present observe you boldly

---


69 On the content of these false scriptures, see the next section.
speaking against him” (τὸν γὰρ πονηρὸν σοῦ δεῖξαι δύναται, σὲ δὲ τολμηρὸς καταλέγοντα οἱ πάντες παρόντες ἱστοροῦμεν, Hom. 19.6.5).

Not only are the Evil One’s actions depicted as coming out of the love of God, but they are also depicted as conforming to God’s will. This case is made in the final two books of the Homilies (Hom. 19–20), in which two discussions of the Evil One take place. The first of these is the fourth and final day of Peter’s debate with Simon Magus in Laodicea, in which Simon attempts to use the existence of the Evil One to argue that God is the author of evil (cf. Hom. 19.1.3, 6.1, 9.2). Here, Peter answers Simon’s challenge to God’s blamelessness by arguing that God is not responsible for the actions of the Evil One, as he acts out of his own free will (cf. Hom. 19.12.4–5, 13.2). However, in a private discussion with his disciples the following day, Peter argues that the Evil One’s desire to punish evildoers actually conforms to God’s will:

But if anyone does base things, he becomes a servant of the present Evil One, who, having received authority over him through a just judgment because of his sins, and wishing before the coming age, is pleased when he punishes him in the present life, and, as if he were gratifying his own desire, accomplishes the will of God.… But these two leaders70 are the swift hands of God, desiring to anticipate accomplishing his will. That this is so has even been said in the Law, by the character of God: “I will kill and I will make to live, I will smite and I will heal.” For truly, he kills and he makes alive; he kills through the left hand (i.e., through the Evil One, who was mixed71 to delight in the suffering of the impious), and he saves and does good through the right hand (i.e., through the Good One, who was created to delight in the well-doing and salvation of the righteous). (Hom. 20.3.2, 4–6)

Peter goes so far as to argue that the Evil One has served God “blamelessly” (ἀμέμπτως, Hom. 20.3.9) in destroying evildoers, and “does no evil in this respect, insofar as he accomplishes the

70 That is, the Good One and the Evil One.

71 Note the use of “was mixed” (κραθείς). The Homilies goes to great lengths to absolve God of the direct creation of evil.
law that was given to him” (πονηρὸν οὐδὲν ποιεῖ κατὰ τοῦτο, καθὼ τὸν δοθέντα αὐτῷ νόμον ἐκτελεῖ, Hom. 20.9.2).

Despite arguing that the Evil One does no evil, however, the Homilies nevertheless considers the Evil One to be evil (cf. Hom. 20.3.10, 9.2), particularly due to his opposition to the Good One, i.e., the True Prophet.72 The novel thus looks forward to the end of time, when the Evil One will be converted to a good disposition: “Therefore, the Evil One, having served God blamelessly to the end of the present world, can become good by being reconstituted, insomuch as now he is not of one sole substance for evil” (ὁ οὖν πονηρὸς πρὸς τῷ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος κόσμου τέλει ὑπουργήσας ἀμέμπτως τῷ θεῷ, ἄτε δὴ οὐ μίας οὐσίας ὄν τῆς πρὸς κακίαν μόνης, μετασυγκριθεὶς ἄγαθὸς γενέσθαι δύναται, Hom. 20.3.9).73

Demonic Tactics

Whether motivated by self-interest, a desire to punish the wicked, or the love of God, demons employ a number of tactics to deceive people into sinning so that they can be punished. Most of these deceptions are aimed at Gentiles; because they had not been taught by an instantiation of the True Prophet until the advent of Jesus, Gentiles are particularly vulnerable to

---

72 Cf. Hom. 20.3.1, which (likely) states that the Evil One “acts violently” toward the Good One “because God commands it” ([ὁ ἐτερος τὸν ἐτερον ἐκβιαζεται, θεοῦ κλεισαντος).

73 Frédéric Amsler argues that these varying motivations attributed to demons arise out of varying explanations for the existence of evil. In his article on the subject, he discusses three such etiologies: the Doctrine of the Syzygies (i.e., the opposition between the True Prophet and the Prophetess) of Hom. 2–3, the Enochic narrative of Hom. 8, and the mixing of the Evil One in Hom. 19–20. Amsler argues that these three explanations likely arose out of different sources, but nevertheless considers it important to interrogate their coexistence in the final redaction of the Homilies. He concludes that the Homilies’ editor(s) brought all three explanations together because they all absolve God of the creation of evil, a significant conviction for the Homilies: “Thus, it is less the contradictions between the different explanations for the origin of evil that should be emphasized, than the primacy of the theme of divine justice that resists all the attacks seeking to undermine it” (“Ce sont alors moins les contradictions entre les différentes explications de l’origine du mal qu’il convient de souligner, que la primauté du thème de la justice divine qui résiste à toutes les attaques visant à l’écorner”). See Frédéric Amsler, “Qui a dit qu’Adam avait péché? Adam et Ève dans les Homélies pseudo-clémentines,” Apocrypha 25 (2014): 210.
suggestions of polytheism and idolatry. As such, demons have spent centuries shaping Greek education, *paideia*, to encourage idolatry from a young age. In his first debate with Appion, Clement calls *paideia* “a most dangerous suggestion of an evil demon” (*κακοῦ δαίμονος χαλεπωτάτη ύπόθεσις, Hom. 4.12.1), and since Gentiles are taught from childhood to believe in and worship the gods, these beliefs and practices are not easily removed, even for those who become convinced of monotheism. Clement laments this later in the debate with Appion:

For those who learned letters through such myths in childhood, while their soul was still tender, unite the unholy deeds of the so-called gods to their minds. For this reason, when they grow to adulthood, like evil seeds that were sown in the soul, they bear fruit, and the worst thing of all is that the rooted impieties are not easily cut down when they are deemed to be grievous by them when they are grown up. For among the things that one is accustomed to in their childhoods, they are pleased to cleave to them, and thus, since custom can be something not much worse than nature, they become difficult to alter to the good things that were not sown in the soul for them from the beginning. (*Hom. 4.18.2–4*)

For the *Homilies, paideia* is not only dangerous for promoting belief in many gods, but also in the model of behavior that those gods exemplify. Greek gods are “wicked and subject to all passions, so that the one who wants to do similar things may not be ashamed (though it is appropriate for a person), having as an example the wicked and undignified lives of the gods described in mythology” (*κακοὺς καὶ παντοπαθεῖς, ἵνα ὁ τὰ ὁμοία πράττειν θέλων μηδὲ αἰδήται [ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων ἱδιόν], παράδειγμα ἔχων τῶν μυθολογουμένων θεῶν τοὺς κακοὺς καὶ ἁσέμνους βίους, *Hom. 4.12.2*).74 Because of the consequences of this education, the *Homilies* argues that it is better for those who live out in the country (cf. *Hom. 4.18.1, 19.2*), because they have avoided the ramblings of the philosophers, “for, being full of evil learnings and breathing them forth, they transmit them like rabies to those nearby who associate with them, whom they

74 This wicked behavior, according to Clement, is not entirely fabricated; in *Hom. 6.20*, Clement will argue that some of the narratives of the gods are based on the lives of ancient magicians.
subject to suffering” (κακῶν γὰρ μαθημάτων γέμοντες καὶ πνέοντες τοῖς συναμµλωµένοις ὀσπερ λύσαν τοῖς πλησίον μεταδιδόσαιν ὰν πεπόνθασιν αὐτοί, Hom. 14.19.3).75

This paideia is reinforced by demons, both through argumentation and apparitions. Peter addresses some of the common arguments for idolatry in his third and fourth speeches in Tripolis, characterizing them as the deceits of “the deceiving serpent in you” (ὁ ἐν ύμῖν ἀπατῶν ὀφις, Hom. 10.10.2). This “deceiving serpent” is never explicitly called a “demon,” but I do not think it is unreasonable to conceive it as such, since it shares much in common with demons: like demons, the serpent places much stock in deceiving its host, and the result of its deception is the consumption of the host and their confinement to “his belly of fire” (ἡ τοῦ πυρὸς αὐτοῦ γαστήρ, Hom. 10.11.2). The suggestions that Peter addresses in Hom. 10–11, then, appear to come from demonic influence. These include, among other things, that one will remain safe from judgement if one remains ignorant (Hom. 10.12.1); that God exists, but the gods also exist, and thus it is permitted to worship them (Hom. 10.14.1); and that God spiritually inhabits idols, and thus it is permitted to worship them (Hom. 10.21.1).76 Peter argues against each proposition, unmasking

75 This disease metaphor should not be over-literalyzed; as I will argue in chapter four, the Homilies does not believe that heart defilement can transmit passively but is the result of willingly committed sin. For more on the Homilies’ perspective on Greek paideia, see chapter 4, as well as Annette Yoshiko Reed, “Hellenism and Judaism in ‘Jewish-Christian’ Perspective,” in Jewish Christianity and the History of Judaism, 117–41, and Côté, “Rhetoric and Jewish-Christianity,” 369–89.

76 Peter also addresses the following suggestions of the serpent:
Idols are the image of God. (Hom. 11.4.1)
Idolatry is permitted because God has not removed idols. (Hom. 11.6.1)
Idolatry is permitted because God has not removed the people worshiping idols. (Hom. 11.7.1)
God ought not to have made human beings capable of thinking idolatrous thoughts. (Hom. 11.8.1)
People are not free, but idolatrous thoughts and actions are determined by God. (Hom. 11.8.4)
We ought to thank both God and the gods. (Hom. 11.9.1)
God is not concerned with human beings. (Hom. 11.12.1)
Forsaking the traditions of one’s ancestors would be impious. (Hom. 11.13.1)
One worships idols so as not to trouble God. (Hom. 11.13.2)
Festivals of the gods exist to boost the morale of those who participate in them. (Hom. 11.13.5)
their unreasonableness. At the conclusion of this portion of the speech, Peter tells his audience that they must “contend with” (προσφυλονεικέω/Ἤχη) and “charm” (ἐπαείδω/ܐ3X) the serpent, in order that they might be free of its influence (Hom. 11.18.1–2).

The false paideia of the Greeks is also reinforced by the apparitions that demons give their would-be hosts. Peter addresses these twice. The first instance occurs in the second of his speeches to the people of Tripolis. According to Peter, when people fall ill by the demon’s hand, the demon will then appear to them in order to promote certain remedies:

But these are they whom the demons terrify, appearing according to whatever forms they please. Sometimes, they even prescribe medical treatments to those who are sick, and thus are rendered the glory of the gods by those who were first deceived and escape the notice of many that they are demons—but not us, who know their mystery, for what reason they do such things, disguising themselves in a dream for those over whom they have power. And they terrify some, but for others they give oracles and demand sacrifices and urge feasting together, so that they may drink their souls. (Hom. 9.14.2–4)

In order to reinforce their ruse, the demons frequently take the forms of the idols that their hosts worship, or otherwise fit themselves to a person’s preconceptions of what the divine should be (cf. Hom. 9.15–16). By doing so, they cause the person, either through fear or by giving premonitions, to worship them as gods.

Demonic apparitions appear a second time in Peter’s debate with Simon in Laodicea. Here, Simon challenges Peter’s claim to have better knowledge of Jesus than he does, because, though Peter followed Jesus and heard him with his own ears, Simon claims to have received an apparition of Jesus. He argues: “He who hears someone clearly is not altogether assured of what was said. For the mind has to consider whether the man was mistaken, if he is what he seems. But the vision, together with the assurance of what is seen, grants the viewer that it is the divinity” (ὁ ἐναργῶς ἀκούων τινὸς οὐ πάντως πληροφορεῖται ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις· ἔχει γὰρ ὁ νοῦς αὐτοῦ λογίσασθαι μὴ άρα ψεύδεται ἀνθρώπος ὃν τὸ φαινόμενον. Ἡ δὲ ὀτασία ἀμα τὸ φθῆναι
πίστιν παρέχει τῷ ὀρθῶτι ὁτι θειότης ἐστίν, Hom. 17.13.2). Peter challenges Simon’s last assumption, that visions necessarily come from God: “For he [the one receiving the vision] does not know whom he believes. For it is possible that it is either an evil demon or a deceiving spirit, pretending in what it said to be what it was not” (ἀγνοεῖ γὰρ τίνι πιστεύει· ἐνδέχεται γὰρ αὐτὸν ἢ δαίμονα κακὸν εἶναι ἢ πνεῦμα πλάνον ἐν τῷ λέγειν ὑποκρινόμενον εἶναι ὁ μὴ ἐστίν, Hom. 17.14.4). As a result, visions are to be treated with suspicion, and not immediately believed; and, indeed, Peter’s experience with the True Prophet is a greater seal of authority than Simon’s vision of him.\(^{77}\)

A mode of deception that, in a way, reverses idolatry, is practicing magic. Like idolatry, the practice of magic constitutes a direct relationship with demons; however, rather than worshipping them (or, in addition to worshipping them), magicians believe that they are able to control demons through magical arts. Such is the case made by the antagonists of the novel, both Simon (cf. Hom. 2.30.1, 30.3, 31.1) and Appion (cf. Hom. 5.5). This, the Homilies argues, is a lie; the demons feign subservience to the magicians in order to deceive both them and those who witness their magical deeds. Once these people have been deceived in this way, the demon can possess them, and then can lie in wait to destroy them upon their deaths—or even cause their deaths.

The most dramatic example of this process is Peter’s description of Zoroaster, which occurs at the beginning of his second speech in Tripolis. Peter tells the crowd that, generations after the flood, a descendant of Ham decided to take up magic:

From this family a certain one arose in succession who received the name Nebrod and, like a giant, chose to consider things opposed to God, whom the Greeks call Zoroaster.

\(^{77}\) A number of scholars have interpreted these polemics against visions as polemics against Paul specifically. See n. 37 of the introduction.
After the Flood, he, desiring kingship and being a great magician, compelled, through magical arts, the ascendant star of the bad one who now reigns [i.e., the Evil One] for the portion from his kingdom. But he [the Evil One], since he is a ruler and has authority over the one who acts violently, poured the fire of his kingdom with anger, so that he might both repay the administration of the oath and punish the one who first compelled him. (Hom. 9.4.1–3)

By attempting to compel the Evil One to do his bidding, Zoroaster put himself under the Evil One’s power, and thus the Evil One was able to “pour the fire of his kingdom” (τὸ τῆς βασιλείας προσέχει πῦρ) on him—which, as the next chapter explains, means he was struck by lightning (ἀστραπή, Hom. 9.5.1).78

Because of the deception that demons work through magicians, it is important to recognize the difference between magic and miracles. Peter argues that the main difference between them is their benefit to people:

Therefore, the signs which you yourselves said Simon did are useless; I mean when he made statues walk, and was rolled on burning coals, and became a dragon, was transformed into a goat, flew in the air—and all such things that were not for the healing of people have the nature to deceive many. But the signs of the merciful truth are philanthropic, which you heard that the Lord did, and I after him accomplish through prayers. For these, most of you were present: some were set free from all kinds of diseases, others from demons; some had their hands restored, others their feet; some recovered their eyes, others their ears; and other things that a person who is of a philanthropic spirit can do. (Hom. 2.34.1–3)

While Simon’s magic is impressive, it can ultimately be dismissed because it does not help people. Causing statues to move and transforming oneself into various animals does not cure people.

---

78 According to Jan N. Bremmer, the connection of Nimrod and Zoroaster “hardly occurred in the most well know (sic) Jewish books, but in targumim or haggadic midrashim. In other words, the notice suggests a more than superficial knowledge of Jewish traditions.” Bremmer, “Pseudo-Clementines: Texts, Dates, Places, Authors and Magic,” 14.
people of their ailments. The works of Jesus and Peter, by contrast, do, and as a result, their works can be trusted.\textsuperscript{79}

Demons can feign subservience not only to magicians, but to exorcists as well. At the conclusion of Peter’s second speech in Tripolis, he argues that even wicked people can seem to perform exorcisms and thus dupe the masses. These exorcisms are not due to the power of the wicked person, but due to the power of God’s name—or, lacking that, to the wiles of the demon. By pretending to be exorcized, the demon can convince both the wicked person and those who see the exorcism that the wicked person is actually pious:

But sometimes demons flee from certain lawless men because of the honorable name, and both the exorcist and the observer are ensnared—the exorcist, as if he was honored because of righteousness, without knowing the wickedness of the demon (for it both honored the name and, casting the impious man into false notions of righteousness, deceives him from repenting); the observer, associating with the exorcist as a pious man and hastening to a similar life, is destroyed. But sometimes they even pretend to flee oaths that do not entreat God, so that, deceiving them, they may destroy them when they want. (\textit{Hom.} 9.22.4–6)

As with visions, one must be discerning regarding the exorcisms that they see. Successful exorcists need to be vetted in order to be considered trustworthy.\textsuperscript{80}

The means of deception discussed thus far—\textit{paideia}, argumentation, apparition, magic, and, to a lesser extent, exorcism—are all primarily means of deceiving Gentiles. However, the \textit{Homilies} does not consider Jews to be immune from demonic influence. In a conversation with his disciples prior to his initial speech to the people of Tripolis, Peter argues that “not even the

\textsuperscript{79} Bremmer suggests that this distinction may have been the invention of the \textit{Grundschrift} author; see Bremmer, “Pseudo-Clementines: Texts, Dates, Places, Authors and Magic,” 22–23.

\textsuperscript{80} At the end of the Tripolis discourses, Peter recommends that his hearers vet apostles, teachers, and prophets by comparing their teaching with that of James (\textit{Hom.} 11.35.4). Compare to \textit{Did.} 11–12, which installs its own set of criteria for vetting itinerant teachers. For a satirical depiction of a charlatan who has fooled Christians into accepting him, see \textit{The Passing of Peregrinus}. 
Hebrews who believe in Moses but do not observe the things said through him are saved, unless they observe the things said to them” (οὐδὲ γὰρ Ἑβραῖοι Μωϋσεὶ πιστεύοντες καὶ τὰ δι’ αὐτοῦ ῥηθέντα μὴ φυλάσσοντες σώζονται, ἐὰν μὴ τὰ ῥηθέντα αὐτῶς φυλάξωσιν, Hom. 8.5.1).

Determining the things said through Moses, however, is difficult due to another means of demonic deception: the introduction of false scriptures into the Torah.

This Doctrine of the False Pericopes,⁸¹ as it is often called, appears throughout the Homilies, particularly during Peter’s time in Caesarea (Hom. 2–3) and in Laodicea (Hom. 16–19). This doctrine argues that the Evil One was permitted to introduce false material into the Torah in order to deceive those who would believe it. As Peter tells Simon in Laodicea, these false scriptures do not cause people to err unless they were inclined to do so already:

They [the scriptures] do not lead astray, but they expose and bring to light the evil inclination against God that hides in each one like a serpent.⁸² For they lie before us as in many and different types. Therefore, each one, having their own inclination like wax, consulting them and finding all things in them, wants God to be of a certain kind, [and], laying on his inclination like wax (as I said), molds it. (Hom. 16.10.1–3)

Therefore, as Peter told his disciples in Caesarea, the wicked accept such scriptures, while the pious do not abide them:

And this [i.e., the introduction of false scriptures into Torah] happened with reason and judgement, so that those who would dare to fondly listen to the things written against God might be put to shame, and those who, out of love for him, might not only disbelieve the things said against him, but not even bear to hear them at all, even if they were true, judging it much safer to be daring with respect to faith than to live with an evil conscience because of blasphemous reasonings. (Hom. 2.38.2)

---

⁸¹ For introductions, see n. 68.

⁸² This serpent does not appear to be the same as the one who advocates for idolatry in Hom. 10–11. There, the serpent seems to be a demon; here, the serpent is defined as one’s “inclination” (προαιρεσις).
Because of the presence of these false scriptures, Peter exhorts his hearers, as Jesus had before him, to “be good money-changers” (ἐνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι, Hom. 2.51.1; 3.50.2; 18.20.4) by using the teachings of the True Prophet to guide their interpretation of the text.\footnote{83 Though the Homilies attributes this teaching to Jesus, it has yet to appear in any extant gospel, canonical or otherwise. It does, however, appear 69 times in patristic literature. See Alfred Resch, ed., Agrapha: Außercanonische Schriftfragmente (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967), 112–28.}

Unsurprisingly, Peter argues that anything in the Torah written against God ought to be rejected (cf. Hom. 2.38.2, 40.1, 40.3; 3.42.3, 43.2–3, 45.3–4; 18.19.1–2, 22.3). This includes instances of polytheism (Hom. 2.42.2–43.1; 3.9.1–10.1), as well as any defects attributed to God, such as deceit (Hom. 2.43.1), inconsistency (Hom. 2.43.2), and especially ignorance (Hom. 2.43.1, 49–50; 3.43.3; 18.19.2).\footnote{84 For other attributes falsely attributed to God by the additions to the Torah, see especially Hom. 2.43–44 and 3.54–57.} Also to be rejected are any slanders against righteous people of the past; thus,

Adam, who was brought forth by God’s hands, was not a transgressor; nor was Noah, who was found righteous beyond the whole world, drunk; nor did Abraham, who was deemed worthy of much progeny because of his self-control, cohabit with three wives at once; nor did Jacob, who was the father of the twelve tribes and indicated the coming of the presence of our teacher, commune with four, two of whom were even sisters; Moses, who preached God’s Law to every age and was testified as “a faithful steward” because of his true judgment, was not a murderer, and he did not learn to judge from a priest of idolatry. (Hom. 2.52.2–3)

The Homilies goes to great lengths to defend Adam in particular, whom the text regards as the first instantiation of the True Prophet and thus incapable of sin (Hom. 3.17–18, 20–21, 42–43). The Homilies thus does not attribute the fall of humanity to Adam, but to his later progeny, who sinned against God through their ingratitude (cf. Hom. 8.11).\footnote{85 For more on the Homilies’ defense of Adam, see H.J.W. Drijvers, “Adam and the True Prophet in the Pseudo-Clementines,” in Loyalitätskonflikte in der Religionsgeschichte. Festschrift für Carsten Colpe, ed. C. Elsas and H.G. Kippenberg (Kippenberg: Würzburg, 1990), 314–23, and Frédéric Amsler, “Qui a dit qu’Adam avait péché?”}
The falsehoods added to Torah apply not only to aggadah, but to halakha as well. During his debate with Simon in Caesarea, Peter argues that, though Jesus seemed to abrogate the Law, he was actually only removing the additions to it:

That he also said, “I have not come to destroy the Law,” and seemed to destroy it was indicating that the things that he destroyed were not of the Law. And that he also said, “Heaven and earth will pass away, but one iota or one stroke will not pass from the Law,” means the things that pass away before heaven and earth are not really of the Law. (Hom. 3.51.2–3)

Thus, Peter argues, the rejection of certain portions of the Law by the True Prophet indicates that those ordinances were never truly part of the Law. In Hom. 3.54–57, Peter gives two examples of this: Jesus rejects the practice of marrying one’s brother’s widow (Hom. 3.54.2; cf. Deut 25:5) and sacrifices (Hom. 3.56.4; cf. Matt 9:13; 12:7; Hos 6:6).

Sacrifices receive the most sustained polemic. In numerous instances, Peter argues that sacrifices are rejected by both God (Hom. 2.44.2; 3.39.5, 45.1–3; 7.3.4; 18.19.2) and the True Prophet (Hom. 3.26.3, 52.1, 56.4). Indeed, he goes so far as to argue that not only do sacrifices displease God, but so too does the slaughtering of animals more generally (cf. Hom. 3.45.1–2).

This rejection extends to the building in which they were performed. Peter takes issue with the Temple because, among other things, no building could possibly contain God:

But if he desires “the fertile mountain,” to whom do all things belong? If he lies, then who speaks truth? If he lives in a tabernacle, who is infinite? If he desires the smell of fat,

---

86 In this case, the *Homilies* conflates two narratives in the canonical gospels as we now have them. Thus, the author quotes Mark 10:5–6//Matt 19:8, Jesus’s response to the Pharisee’s question about divorce, as the response to the Sadducees’ question regarding the marrying of one’s brother’s widow in Mark 12:19–23//Matt 22:24–28//Luke 20:28–33.


88 On which, see the excursus above.
burnt offerings, sacrifices, and sprinklings, who is without want, and who is holy, pure, and perfect? If he is delighted with lamps and lampstands, who placed the luminaries in heaven? (Hom. 2.44.1–2)\(^\text{89}\)

Here, the Temple and its rites are most directly rejected, including the “fertile mountain” (τὸ πῖον ὄρος, cf. LXX Ps 67:16) on which it was built, the sacrifices that took place in it, and its various decorations. Given what Peter had noted in Hom. 3.51.3, the Temple’s passing would confirm that it never had a place in the original Torah.

In a variety of ways and for a variety of reasons, then, demons seek to cause people to sin so that they can invade them. Because of the extent to which demons have deceived their hosts, those who have committed grave sin require “much time for purification” (cf. Hom. 11.2.1). The Homilies thus advocates a process that involves reeducation, unlearning one’s prior preconceptions and replacing them with the teaching of the True Prophet; asceticism, forcing out weaker demons; and baptism, granting the baptizand the power to expel any remaining demons. This purification process will be explored in the next chapter.

Conception Defilement

Though baptism purifies a person of their sin and grants them the power to exorcize the demons that infest them, the Homilies argues that one must be baptized even if one has lived a righteous life—i.e., even if one has never sinned and thus has never given demons the opportunity to invade them. This is due to another source of defilement, one’s carnal conception, which prevents anyone who has not been reborn through baptism from entering the Kingdom of God. Peter highlights the necessity of baptism at several points over the course of the narrative.

\(^\text{89}\) Cf. also Hom. 3.56.3.
In his fourth speech in Tripolis, for example, Peter tells his audience that baptism is necessary regardless of one’s piety:

And do not think that, if you were more pious than all the pious people that have ever existed, but you were unbaptized, you could ever obtain hope. For you will all the more suffer greater punishment for this, because you did not do good works well. (Hom. 11.25.2)

Later, during the speech on chastity that he delivers to Clement’s mother Mattidia and her sons, Peter laments those Gentiles who practice chastity but refuse baptism:

Chastity is so great a blessing that, if it were not a law that not even a righteous person should enter into the Kingdom of God unbaptized, perhaps those of the Gentiles who have erred could be saved through chastity alone. Because of this, I am very disheartened on account of the chaste ones in error, because they, having chosen for themselves to be chaste without good hope, are reluctant to be baptized.

---

90 Though Peter continues to speak to a crowd, he addresses them in the second person singular, as though there were only one audience member. He had begun to do this in 11.23, and he continues to do so until Hom. 11.28, with some exceptions (cf. Hom. 11.26.2, 4). The Syriac, for the most part, follows suit, except in Hom. 11.24.1, in which the Greek ἐπίγνωθι is translated with ܝܗ!ܕܘ ,<ܪܕܬܐ. While it is possible that this change in address is indicative of a separate source, it is also possible that this is a rhetorical move; the Homilies has switched to the singular in order to personalize these exhortations.

91 Καὶ μὴ τοι νομίσῃς ὅτι, ἐὰν πάντως τῶν ποτὲ γενομένων εὐσεβῶν εὐσεβέστερος γένη, ἀβάπτιστος δὲ ἦς, ἐξαιτίας τυχέων δυνῆσαι ποτέ. The Syriac contains three major differences: First, rather than as a command, the Syriac frames this point as a rhetorical question; second, it uses “righteous” (ܕܙ) instead of “pious”; and third, the final clause contains an errant א, negating it. This errant א is most significant, as it means that the Syriac’s rhetorical question ends up making the exact opposite point from that of the Greek: “But why do you think that, if you are more righteous than everyone who has ever existed, but you are without baptism, it is not possible for you to receive hope?” (ܐܡܐܐ ܐܝܐܐ ܐܐ �� ��, �� �� �� �� �� �� �� �� ��). This, of course, does not fit the context, and to resolve this, Jones breaks this sentence up: “But why will you consider whether you might be more just than all those who ever came into being? But you are without baptism. You are unable to receive hope.” See Jones, The Syriac Pseudo-Clementines, 281–82.

92 The Syriac adds: “That was ordained” (ܐܡܐܐ).

93 Σωθῆναι ἑδύνατο. Syriac: “could live” (ܐܠܐ ��).

94 Μόνον. Absent from Syriac.

95 Λίγων ὑπημὸν. Syriac: “It pains me greatly” (ܐܡܐ).

96 Πρὸς τὸ βαπτισθῆναι ὀκνηρῶς ἔχουσιν. Syriac: “They are reluctant to come to baptism” (ܐܡܐ ��).
they are not saved, because God’s decree is ordained, that an unbaptized person will not enter into his Kingdom. (Hom. 13.21.2–3)

The necessity of baptism even in the face of perfect righteousness indicates that, for the

Homilies, baptism does not merely purify a person from sin. Peter addresses another function of

baptism in his fourth speech to the people of Tripolis:

But perhaps someone will say, “What does being baptized in water contribute to piety?”

First, because you do what seems good to God. Second, being reborn to God from

water, by reason of fear, you exchange your first generation, which was born from

desire, and thus you can attain salvation. But otherwise it is impossible. For thus the

Prophet swore to us, saying, “Amen I say to you, unless you are reborn by living water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, you will not enter the Kingdom of Heaven.” (Hom. 11.26.1–2; cf. Hom. 7.8.1)

As he does for Mattidia in Hom. 13.21.2–3, Peter first appeals to the arbitrariness of God’s will

in order to justify baptism. However, he then provides a second reason for baptism: its function

as a reconception. In addition to purifying a person from sin, baptism also replaces their carnal

conception, a conception “from desire” (ἐξ ἐπιθυμίας), with a rebirth from water. Whether one is

righteous or unrighteous, then, baptism is necessary for entry into God’s Kingdom (cf. Hom.

11.27.1–2).

97 Οὐ σῶζονται. Syriac: “They do not even live” (םיהלע ספב).

98 Peter uses the second-person singular here. See n. 90.

99 The Syriac does not contain “by reason of fear” (αἰτία φόβου), instead having “from above” (חנ לנד).

100 Instead of “you exchange” (καταλαλάσσομαι), the Syriac has “you remove” (חנ ססוע).

101 Instead of “attain” (τυχεῖν), the Syriac has “inherit” (חנ לנד).

102 The Syriac translator has removed the reference to the water as “living.” For the Greek Homilies, it is important that baptism take place in running water; apparently, the Syriac translator disagreed. See Jones, The Syriac Pseudo-Clementines, 282n12 and 283n13, and chapter 4.
In her analysis of this passage, Karin Hedner Zetterholm argues that this reconception is necessary for Gentiles because of their “sinful nature.” However, the Homilies emphasizes that baptism is necessary for all, even for those without sin. The reconception, then, does not exchange a sinful nature for a non-sinful one, but instead exchanges one’s human origin for a divine one. As Peter stated earlier in the fourth speech in Tripolis, by being baptized, “you become an heir of the parents who begot you to incorruption” (κληρονόμος καταστῆς τῶν πρός ἀφθαρσίαν γεννησάντων σε γονέων/κληρονομεῖς καταστής τῶν πρός ἀφθαρσίαν γεννησάντων σε γονέων, Hom. 11.24.2).

The key phrase for understanding one’s carnal conception is ἐξ ἐπιθυμίας, “from desire.” Ἐπιθυμία often stands for sexual desire in the Homilies, and thus it is the process of intercourse itself, the mixing of semen and blood, that creates this stain on the child produced from it. On this point, Peter’s defense of Adam as the True Prophet in Caesarea is illustrative. According to Peter, the spirit of prophecy is unable to endure being with “one who was begotten from a defiled drop”—i.e., by semen—and thus it could only have been received by someone who was formed by God himself—i.e., Adam: “Since God made all things, who would he allow to have the great and holy spirit of his foreknowledge, except for a man birthed from his hands? How still does the one who renders it to another begotten from a defiled drop not sin greatly?”

\[\text{Zetterholm, “Jewish Teachings for Gentiles,” 74–75. Zetterholm describes this “sinful nature” as “intrinsic to all who worship many gods.” By this, I do not think that Zetterholm means that Gentiles have sinful natures from the moment of their own conceptions, but that they acquire sinful natures when they first choose to commit idolatry.}\

\[\text{Peter uses the second person singular; see n. 90.}\

\[\text{In addition to the instances in the letters about adultery in Hom. 5 and Peter’s speech on chastity in Hom. 13, see also Hom. 4.23.2; 8.13.1, 13.3; 9.10.2; 19.21.1, 21.3–5; 20.4.3–4.}\]
Because Adam “was birthed” directly from God’s hands, he has one major advantage over other human beings: he was not conceived through the “defiled drop.” As such, he is able to receive “the great and holy spirit of his foreknowledge,” whereas the average person, conceived by semen, would not be able to do so.

The defilement of conception is compounded by the mother’s contribution to it. According to the Homilies, the free will that makes human beings unique among God’s creatures comes from the union of the first people, Adam and Eve, the latter of whom the Homilies never refers to by name but instead as the “Prophetess” (προφητίς). Unlike the True Prophet, the Prophetess spreads lies and deceives many, and her spirit of deceit passes down to “those born of women” (γεννητοί γυναῖκῶν, cf. Hom. 3.22.2, 23.2). Therefore,

The one who is born from the male and the female lies about some things and tells the truth about others. For the female, surrounding the white seed of the male with her own blood like red fire, solidifies her weakness with foreign supports of bones; she, both being pleased with the temporary blossom of flesh and gradually removing the strength of reason with small pleasures, leads the greater part into adultery, and therefore is robbed of the coming good bridegroom. (Hom. 3.27.1–2)

In addition to the external threat of demonic powers, then, the Homilies also conceives of an internal threat, the spirit of the Prophetess that exists within each of us as a result of our carnal conception.

---

106 Cf. also Hom. 3.20.1.

107 On the Prophetess, see n. 20 of the introduction.

108 Cf. the “inclination” (προαίρεσις) that causes people to misinterpret scripture in Hom. 16.10.1.
Thus, the *Homilies* believes that all unbaptized persons other than the True Prophet carry some degree of impurity as a result of their conception through semen and blood. This defilement is the most enduring of all the defilements that will be discussed in the *Homilies*; every unbaptized person carries it, and it can only be remedied through baptism. Only by replacing one’s first conception through desire, semen, and blood with a new conception through water can one enter the Kingdom of God.\(^\text{109}\)

Despite its position on the defilement of conception, the *Homilies* does not display a negative attitude toward sexuality and procreation. Indeed, in a number of places, the *Homilies* actively defends sexual desire, arguing that it is a good with which human beings were created in order that the species could be promulgated (cf. *Hom.* 5.24.5, 25.1; 13.16.4; 19.18.4, 21.3–5; 20.4.2–4). Sexual desire can be dangerous if it is indulged outside the bounds of marriage,\(^\text{110}\) but it is not dangerous within it, and the *Homilies* frequently promotes marriage so that one’s sexual desires can be indulged safely (cf. *Hom.* 3.68.1–4; 5.24.5, 25.3; 19.21.4; cf. also *EpCl* 7.1–2).\(^\text{111}\)

\(^{109}\) This may not be entirely true. Though the *Homilies* never says so explicitly, its author(s) seem to have believed that Jews are not required to undergo baptism; instead, they are saved by observing the Law of Moses (cf. *Hom.* 8.5.1). See the discussion of *Hom.* 8.7.1–2 in chapter 5.

\(^{110}\) On the dangers of adultery, see the excursus above.

\(^{111}\) Luigi Cirillo sees these defenses of desire (ἐπιθυμία) as being at odds with the portrayal of desire in *Hom.* 11.3.2 and 11.26.1, and thus contends that they came from different sources; see Luigi Cirillo, “Le baptême, remède à la concupiscence, selon la catéchèse ps.-clémentine de Pierre: *Hom.* XI 26 (Rèc. VI 9; IX 7),” in *Text & Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honor of A.F.J Klijn*, ed. Tjitze Baarda (Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij J.H. Kok, 1988), 79–90. However, Cirillo’s argument depends on the idea *Hom.* 11.3.2 and 11.26.1 consider sexual desire to be evil, and that baptism is a removal of that desire. I see neither idea in these texts. In the case of *Hom.* 11.3.2, when Peter encourages his audience to burn “the things of desire” (τὰ κακὰ ἐπιθυμίας) from their minds, he does not encourage them to remove desire itself—he only wants them to remove “evil desires” (κακαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι, see earlier in the same verse)—nor does he suggest that they do so by being baptized, but instead by being educated. See chapter 4 below for a more in-depth analysis of this passage. In *Hom.* 11.26.1, the conception “from desire” refers to the intercourse of one’s parents and the mixing of semen and blood that occurred as a result. While this conception is defiling, it is not evil; the *Homilies* does not condemn married people for acting upon ἐπιθυμία, as long as any children produced from such a union are baptized.
Given this position, “impurity of the heart,” as the *Homilies* understands it, is not exactly the same as the “moral impurity” defined by Klawans. While there is a moral judgement with respect to the defilement of sin and demons, there is none here. The person who is born of normal, natural intercourse is considered defiled, and defiled with a stain that cannot be removed except through baptism. However, this defilement neither condemns them nor their parents. Nevertheless, it can be dangerous if it is not washed off prior to one’s death.

**Conclusion**

The *Homilies*’ two kinds of purity are defiled in different ways. In the Greek, bodily purity is defiled by seminal emission and menstrual blood; the Syriac removes references to the defiling power of seminal emission altogether. By contrast, the heart is defiled by grave sin and the demons that infest the person as a result of that sin, and by one’s carnal conception. Heart defilement is the more significant of the two kinds of defilement for the *Homilies*, and thus the novel devotes greater attention to delineating the sins that result in heart defilement and the ways that demons deceive their hosts into committing such sins. However, even being purified of sin is not enough for the *Homilies*; one must also be purified of their initial conception, coming out of desire, semen, and blood. Once all these defilements have been removed, one’s name is written in heaven (cf. *Hom. 9.22.1*), and one can enter the Kingdom of God. Therefore, the purification from these defilements is of the utmost importance, and it will occupy much of our discussion in the next chapter.

---

112 Unless, of course, this intercourse was done during menstruation. See chapter 4 below.
CHAPTER 4

STATES OF DEFILEMENT AND PROCESSES OF PURIFICATION

In chapter 2, I argued that there were six main differences between bodily defilement and heart defilement as presented by the Homilies: (1) their sources, (2) their durability, (3) their transmissibility, (4) the limitations they impose on those who contract them, (5) their means of removal, and (6) the terminology used to describe them.¹ I discussed the first and the last of these in the preceding two chapters, and in this chapter I will cover the remaining four. We can limit the rest of the differences to one chapter because, for many of them, there is simply not much that can be said based on what is preserved in the Homilies. For the transmissibility of bodily defilement, for example, we must rely totally on speculation, because the Homilies says nothing about it directly. Because of the meager testimony for the other characteristics of defilement, the bulk of this chapter will focus on the means for removing defilements, as these receive the most dedicated treatment.

In what follows, I explore each of these characteristics in turn. I start with the durability of each defilement. The Homilies argues that both bodily defilement and heart defilement remain until they are washed off. However, the removal of the latter is a much more involved process than the removal of the former, involving education and asceticism prior to receiving the ritual of baptism. Additionally, baptism cannot be repeated, whereas bodily purifications can. If one sins following one’s baptism, one cannot be purified again except through God’s punishment.

¹ This list is based on the one developed by Jonathan Klawans; see n. 62 in chapter 2.
As I have already noted, the Homilies says very little directly regarding the transmissibility of bodily defilement. However, in a few instances, the novel implies that bodily defilement can be transferred to third parties. While the Homilies contains more detailed discussions of the transmissibility of heart defilement, these discussions are metaphorical; the Homilies often speaks of sin “spreading” throughout a community like a disease (particularly rabies). This “spreading,” however, should not be interpreted literally; one cannot become infected with heart defilement by touching a sinner or being in proximity with one. Rather, sin “spreads” in the sense that sinners in a community can influence others to sin, either by convincing them to engage in sin themselves or to assist them in covering up the sin. Because of this danger of influence, Peter encourages his audience to cut off associations with those who sin.

When one becomes defiled with either sort of defilement, the defilement imposes certain limits on those who contract it. As with the transmissibility of bodily defilement, the Homilies says little with regard to the limitations imposed on those who have defiled bodies. Only one limit is clear: one is not to engage in sexual intercourse if one of the parties is menstruating. Other possible limitations, such as being barred from communal meals and prayer, can be postulated based on narratives of washings that Peter and his disciples engage in. This evidence must be used with caution, however, as these washings are depicted as optional and may be idealized. What is speculation with regard to bodily defilement, however, is certain with respect to heart defilement: those with heart defilement are barred from eating or praying with those without heart defilement. Thus, Clement and his mother are prevented from eating or praying with the baptized until they themselves have been baptized.
Finally, we look at the means of purification. As with many of the other characteristics of bodily defilement, the Homilies is light on detail regarding its purification. We are told that one should wash after contracting bodily defilement, but how one is to do so is unstated. In the optional washings—whose use is, again, limited—Peter and his disciples wash in flowing water, and thus it is possible that flowing water was required for bodily purification. It is also possible, however, that flowing water was an ideal for the Homilies. By contrast, there is much more detail about purification from heart defilement. This is an extensive process, one that involves education and ascetic practices and finally culminates in baptism. However, one is not done once one is baptized; one must also engage in good works in order to maintain the purity of one’s baptism.

**Durability**

We begin with a brief note on the durability of bodily and heart defilement. The Homilies believes that both sorts of defilement are impermanent and can be removed through a purification ritual. However, the two rituals contain some significant differences. First, the removal of heart defilement is much more involved than that of bodily defilement, requiring a process of education and ascetic practices that culminates in the reception of baptism. Second, while the washings for bodily purification can be repeated as needed, baptism cannot. If one sins following one’s baptism, one must rely on the punishment of God in order to become pure.

---

2 See the discussion of baptism below.


4 See the discussion of sin in the prior chapter, as well as n. 3 there.
The preparation time and repeatability for each ritual reflects the sources of the defilement they purify. Since bodily defilement comes from seminal emission and menstruation, normal and recurring bodily functions, it requires a ritual that can be repeated. Heart defilement, by contrast, comes from sin and one’s carnal conception. The latter is replaced at one’s baptism and does not return afterward, and, at least ideally, one does not sin following their baptism. Baptism thus not only reflects a purification from one’s past sins, but is also a commitment to not sin again, insofar as one is able.5

Transmissibility

Transmissibility of Bodily Defilement

The Homilies says almost nothing about the transmissibility of bodily defilement. Only a few assertions can be made. First, we can note that the defilement of seminal emission probably extends to both participants in intercourse. Even though the intended audience of Hom. 11.28–33 is men,6 the commands to wash after intercourse in Hom. 11.30.1 and 11.33.4 are phrased in an impersonal way, and thus it is likely that both participants are considered defiled afterward. This lines up well with Lev 15:18, which states that both participants in the act of intercourse must wash after a seminal emission. Unfortunately, the Homilies says nothing beyond this. There is no discussion regarding the need to wash after an emission of semen outside of intercourse (such as in a nocturnal emission) or of the washing of items that come into contact with semen (cf. Lev 15:17). We may speculate that the Homilies would have agreed with Leviticus on these matters and required washing afterward, but this claim cannot be defended with any certainty.

5 Strictly speaking, sin is not avoidable; see the discussion of the sin of possession in the previous chapter.

6 Indeed, most of the Homilies, except for Hom. 13.13–21, is directed at a male audience.
The transmissibility of menstrual defilement appears in one place, and there it exists entirely within a metaphor. In Hom. 3.24.1, Peter contrasts the True Prophet, the guarantor of truth, with the Prophetess, who spreads lies and misdeeds. In his description of the Prophetess, Peter uses the metaphor of the spread of heart defilement (specifically from idolatry) and menstrual defilement to explain the evil that she brings into the world:

Yet, not only daring to speak of and to hear many gods, but also believing herself to be one, and in the hope of becoming what she is not by nature, and destroying what she is, she is also stained with blood, like a woman in menstruation at the occasion of sacrifices, and thus she defiles those who touch her. (Hom. 3.24.1)

The metaphor here is a strong one, incorporating elements of both bodily and heart defilement. By rejecting her own nature and attempting to become masculine, the Prophetess adopts idolatry and becomes stained with blood, both her own and that of the sacrifice. The result of this is her own defilement, which is transmitted “to those who touch her” (τοὺς ψαύοντας αὐτῆς).

While we could use this passage to argue that the Homilies considers menstrual defilement transmissible by contact, and I think that we would be on safe ground in doing so—the Homilies would be in agreement with Lev 15:19 on this point—we should nevertheless be wary of over-literalizing Peter’s metaphor. The image is meant to conjure strong feelings of disgust, ones that would not necessarily conform to the Homilies’ purity system. Indeed, as I will argue in the next section, the Homilies does not believe that heart defilement is transmissible through contact, but the text does not shy away from implying that in the service of the polemic against the Prophetess. Thus, while I consider it likely that the Homilies believes that menstrual impurity is transmissible by contact, I do not consider it certain.

7 On the Doctrine of the Pairs, see n. 20 of the introduction.
Transmissibility of Heart Defilement

As far as the *Homilies* is concerned, the only way to obtain heart defilement is through the means discussed in chapter three: by committing sin or by being conceived with it. Thus, heart defilement is not “transmissible” in the sense that it can passively transfer from someone who has it to another who does not. In spite of this, the *Homilies* sometimes talks about sin as though it were transmissible, spreading through the community like a disease. This is particularly the case for adultery, which the *Homilies* often compares with rabies (λύσσα). In *Hom.* 3.68, for example, Peter argues that all should engage in marriage, lest adultery become a dangerous plague on the community:

> Let them [the elders of the community] hasten marriages not only of the young, but also of those who have aged, lest boiling desire bring forth a plague of sexual immorality and adultery in the church. For, beyond every sin, the impiety of adultery is detested by God, because it destroys not only the sinner himself, but also those who live and contend with him. For it is like rabies, because it has the nature to transmit its own madness. For the sake of chastity, therefore, let not only the elders, but also everyone, hasten to accomplish marriages. For the sin of the one who commits adultery violently comes upon all. (*Hom.* 3.68.1–3)

The danger of adultery, Peter notes here, is its ability to spread; it not only “destroys” (ἀναρεῖ) those who participate in it, but also “those who live and contend with him” (οἱ συνεστιώμενοι καὶ συναμιλλόμενοι); indeed, it “violently comes upon all” (ἐπὶ τούς πάντας ἐλθεῖν βιάζεται).

This spreading, however, does not happen passively; adultery’s “madness” (μανία) still requires that its participants actively choose to engage in sin. In Clement’s first discussion with Appion, the *Homilies* makes the case that the initial emotions that one experiences when they discover their spouse’s adultery are not sinful in themselves, but can become so if they are acted on irrationally:
For do not the termination of lives, the desolations of houses, magical practices, wiles, perplexities, and more other evil things⁸ emerge from adultery? But why is it said that a man, if he does not know that his wife committed adultery, is not envious, not angry, not confused, does not fight? Therefore, such things are not evil by nature, but the irrational opinion of people makes them terrible. (*Hom.* 4.20.3–21.1)

Feeling envy (ζηλόω), anger (θυμόω), confusion (θορυβέω), and even fighting (πολεμέω) are not evil in themselves (“by nature,” τῇ φύσει), Clement argues, but they can become so if they are not guided by reason. The spread of adultery’s “madness,” he implies, can be curtailed if those affected by it act with reason.

The sin of adultery impacts the community not only in providing temptation for other parties to sin, but also through the confusion of inheritance. Clement argues that, if the adulterous union produces a child, that child can end up illegitimately inheriting the possessions of the adulteress’s husband:

But if her husband is with her when she begets by an adulterer, the child, as he grows up, does not know his father, and believes one who is not his father to be his father, and thus the one who is not the father bequeaths his life to a foreign child when he dies. And how many other evil things love to emerge naturally from adultery! And we do not know the hidden things among the evil things. For just as the rabid dog destroys those things that he touches, transmitting the most unseen rabies, thus also the hidden evil of adultery, even if it is unknown, accomplishes the erasure of posterity. (*Hom.* 4.21.3–4)

Here, no one (except for the adulteress) is guilty of sin, but the consequences of adultery still spread; the unwitting “father” ends up bequeathing his possessions to a child that is not his, one who, as Clement explains the following day, is incapable of loving him: “Therefore, those conceived from adultery cannot do this [cherish their father in old age], not having the nature of love for those who begot them” (ὁπερ ποιεῖν οἱ ἐκ μοιχείας γεγονότες οὐκ ἂν ἐδόναντο, φύσιν στοργῆς πρὸς τοὺς γεννήσαντας οὐκ ἔχοντες, *Hom.* 5.24.6). As in *Hom.* 3.68, *Hom.* 4.21.4

---

⁸ “The desolation of houses, magical practices, wiles, perplexities, and more other evil things” (οἴκων ἀναστάσεις, μαγεία, δόλοι, ἀπορία καὶ ἄλλα πλεῖο κακά) is absent from P.
employs the analogy of rabies to describe the transmission of adultery. The evils that it spreads are particularly dangerous, as discussed in the last chapter, because they can remain “hidden” (κρύφω, cf. Hom. 13.19.1–2).

While the metaphor of rabies is most frequently used in the context of adultery, it also appears in the context of Clement’s critique of Greek paideia (cf. Hom. 4.19.3). Like adultery, paideia also causes sin to spread; those who worship false gods spread that worship to others through education. These false gods also serve as bad exemplars of behavior, so that those who wish to justify their desire to sin can do so by appealing to the actions of the gods.9

The spread of heart defilement, whether through adultery or paideia, is not due to heart defilement’s capacity as a contagion. While someone can convince someone else to commit adultery or idolatry, their heart is not defiled until they themselves commit idolatry (except with the defilement of one’s carnal conception). Thus, the Homilies’ metaphor of rabies to describe the spread of sin is just that: a metaphor. Heart defilement cannot passively transmit from one person to another; rather, one’s heart can only be defiled by their carnal conception and by committing sin. As Peter notes during his speech on philanthropy, “It is right that each one be punished for their own sins, and is rewarded for their own virtuous actions” (δίκαιον δὲ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτήματιν τιμωρεῖσθαι ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων καταρθώματιν εὕρηκετεῖσθαι, Hom. 12.28.1).10

9 See the comments on paideia in the section on education below, in the previous chapter, and in Reed, “Hellenism and Judaism,” 133.

Limitations

Limitations on Those with Bodily Defilement

Once one has come into contact with seminal emission or menstrual blood and contracted bodily defilement, one becomes limited in what they do and where they can go. The most obvious of these limitations is the ban on intercourse during menstruation. Within Hom. 11.28–33, Peter twice justifies the need to watch over menstruation by arguing that it is inappropriate to have intercourse at that time. He defends this point in two ways. First, he states “the Law of God commands this” (τοῦτο ὁ θεὸς κελεύει νόμος, Hom. 11.28.1). The Homilies here alludes to Lev 18:19 and 20:18, both of which prohibit intercourse by and with menstruating women. Second, Peter appeals to reason, arguing that avoiding intercourse during menstruation is a logical conclusion that anyone endowed with reason would come to:

But what? If being pure was not dedicated to the worship of God, would you pleasantly roll about like dung-beetles? Therefore, like people who have something more than the irrational animals (that is, being rational), purify your heart of evil things through heavenly reason, and wash your body in the bath. (Hom. 11.28.2)

Peter considers those who would engage in intercourse during menstruation as not only “irrational animals” (ἄλογος κακοκάστως), but dung-beetles (κάνθαροι)/pigs (κακοκάστως) more specifically, pleasantly rolling about in filth. Instead of behaving like animals, Peter asks that his audience use their reason and come to the natural conclusion: intercourse during menstruation ought to be avoided.

---

11 Importantly, this prohibition is directed at both the Israelites and at the gerim, the foreign residents of the land of Israel. See the next chapter.

12 For my analysis of this passage and the Syriac parallel, see chapter 2.
The prohibition reappears in Hom. 11.30.1, and again Peter appeals to reason to defend it:

“But to whom is it not apparent that it is better not to have intercourse with a woman when she is menstruating, but purified and immersed?” (τίνι δὲ οὐ φαίνεται ὅτι κρεὶπτόν ἐστὶν γυναῖκι ἐν γυναικεῖοις οὐσί μὴ συνελθεῖν ἄλλα καθαρθείσῃ καὶ βαπτισθείσῃ). He also appeals to their former practices as idolators. If they even performed such practices when they were idolators, Peter argues, they should do so all the more now. By appealing to reason, the Homilies argues that intercourse during menstruation offends the natural law, which his audience would be able to discern if not for the sins and deceits that obscure their vision.

Later in the Homilies, Peter goes beyond appealing to the natural law to defend the practice of abstinence during menstruation by arguing there could be dire health consequences for a child conceived during menstruation. The context for this argument is Peter’s second debate with Simon Magus in Laodicea. Simon is in the midst of asking Peter about the existence of evil, particularly of the Evil One. At one point late in the discussion, Simon asks: “For what reason do some also die too early, and recurrent diseases exist, and, moreover, that there are demons, madnesses, and sufferings of every kind that can greatly punish?” (διὰ τί δὲ καὶ ἄροι τελευτῶσι καὶ περιοδικαὶ νόσοι γίνονται, ἐτὶ μὴν καὶ δαίμονες καὶ μανίαι καὶ πάθη παντοδαπά, κολάζειν μεγάλως δυνάμενα, ὑπάρχει; Hom. 19.22.1). Peter responds to his question by arguing that those

---

13 See chapter 3 on the differences between the Greek and Syriac renditions of this verse.

14 On Gentile purification practices, see chapter 3 n. 9.

15 See the conclusion of the dissertation for a discussion of the Homilies’ perspective on natural law.

16 See the discussion of this section in chapter 3.
who suffer these things were conceived by “the unseasonable sowing of seeds,” i.e., by intercourse that took place during menstruation:

Because men, gratifying their desire respecting all things, have intercourse carelessly, and therefore the sowing of seeds, being administered unseasonably, naturally begets myriads of evil things. But it was necessary for them to reason that, just as a suitable time has been determined for planting and sowing, thus also appropriate days have been assigned for having intercourse. (Hom. 19.22.2–3)

In a pseudo-medical way, Peter argues the presence of illness in and the premature death of children is the result of reckless intercourse. He uses an agricultural analogy: just as there is a time to plant crops, so also is there a time to “plant” children. This time is when the woman has purified herself after menstruation, as Peter will note in Hom. 19.22.7. Before making that statement, however, the Homilies provides a reinterpretation of John 9:3:

Thus also our teacher, having been asked about the man blind from birth and recovering his sight, whether it was because he or his parents sinned that he was born blind, he answered, “Neither he nor his parents sinned, but so that, because of this, the power of God might be revealed,” healing the sins of ignorance. And truly, such things exist because of ignorance, certainly by not knowing when it is necessary to have intercourse with one’s wife, when she is pure from menstruation. (Hom. 19.22.2–7)17

Rather than leaving the connection of sin and physical deformity ambiguous as it is in John, the Homilies instead interprets John 9:3 as God demonstrating his ability to heal those things that result from the “sins of ignorance” (τῆς ἁγνοίας τὰ ἁμαρτήματα).18 The physical deformity of children results from such sin; those who have intercourse during menstruation are unaware that they must not do so.

---

17 The text of Hom. 19.22 only appears in O, and there it is fragmentary in places. In places where lacunae exist, I have adopted the suggestions of Bernhard Rehm.

Two other limitations, those of participating in prayer and in meals, may be implied by the descriptions of the washings performed by Peter and his disciples over the course of the narrative. For the most part, these washings take place during the Tripolis episode. Peter is usually depicted as performing them (or, at least, the narrative does not indicate that anyone goes with him; cf. *Hom.* 8.2.5; 9.23.3; 10.1.1–2; 11.1.1), but in one instance he is described as washing “with those who wished” (σῶν τοῖς θελήσασιν, *Hom.* 10.26.2). One further narrative account of washing, performed by Clement and his brothers either with or without Peter,\(^{19}\) takes place in *Hom.* 14.1.2. These accounts bear some commonalities that may be significant to our discussion, both regarding the limitations placed on those with bodily impurities, as well as the means of removing those impurities.

However, we must exercise caution when using these narrative accounts as evidence for bodily purification practices in the *Homilies*. As many scholars have noted, these washings are not the same as those promoted by Peter in *Hom.* 11.28–33, but are supplemental acts of piety.\(^{20}\) While the washings after intercourse and menstruation are mandatory, the narrative washings are optional; Peter either performs these rituals alone or “with those who wished.” Their optional nature signifies that they are an additional practice, not a required one. Nevertheless, these optional washings may share some parallels with the mandatory ones and are worth considering as part of our investigation.

All the supplemental washings that Peter undertakes occur in one of two instances, either before morning prayer (*Hom.* 10.1.1–2; 11.1.1) or before the evening meal (*Hom.* 8.2.5; 9.23.3;

---

\(^{19}\) See the analysis of *Hom.* 14.1 below.

10.26.2). Clement and his brothers’ washing in *Hom.* 14.1.2 similarly occurs prior to morning prayer, though the morning had been more eventful than usual; Peter had tasked the men with finding a secluded spot for the baptism of Clement’s mother, Mattidia, and after having done so, they leave,\(^{21}\) bathe, and meet back up with the group of women who were present at Mattidia’s baptism for prayer. Given the consistency of the narrative events, we can say that the *Homilies*’ supplemental washings are intended to take place prior to morning prayer and the evening meal.

If these supplemental washings are based on the mandatory ones, then it is possible that the *Homilies* required that communal prayer and meals take place in a state of bodily purity. If this is the case, then communal prayers and meals may have served as substitutes for the Temple in the *Homilies*’ ideology.\(^{22}\) However, given the *Homilies*’ negative attitude toward both sacrifices and the Temple,\(^ {23}\) the novel’s author(s) likely would not have considered such a substitution necessary.\(^ {24}\) Instead, the *Homilies* may have been taking its cues from other groups in its Jewish milieu. The Pharisees and those at Qumran, for example, seem to have eaten their meals in a state of ritual purity,\(^ {25}\) and some degree of washing before prayer is attested in the

\(^{21}\) It is unclear whether the brothers leave before, during, or after their mother’s baptism, and whether Peter goes with them. Regardless, they do so “because of the women” (τῶν γυναικῶν γάρ), and the shame surrounding being around women during baptism may imply that the ritual was performed in the nude. See below.


\(^{23}\) About which, see chapter 3.

\(^{24}\) Compare this to Recog. 1.27–72, which considers baptism as a replacement for sacrifices.

Letter of Aristeas, the third Sibylline Oracle, Judith, and at Qumran. The presence of miqwa’ot attached to synagogues may also attest to the continuation of the practice beyond the Second Temple period, and if that is the case, the Homilies may reflect contemporary Jewish practices surrounding bodily purification before meals and prayer. However, just as with the Homilies, evidence that purifying oneself before prayer was an option for ancient Jews is not the same as evidence that it was required for ancient Jews. Thus, while Peter and his disciples’ supplemental washings in the Homilies may reflect their mandatory washings, they may also reflect the supplemental practices of other Jews of their era.

Thus, with regard to the limitations the Homilies places on those who contracted bodily impurity, we may conclude that intercourse during menstruation is expressly forbidden, but other restrictions are less certain. If the narrative washings, which are supplemental acts of piety not required by the Homilies, reflect the mandatory washings, then it is possible that those who had contracted bodily defilement would have been barred from morning prayer and evening meals. However, such a practice is far from certain. The Homilies is unfortunately silent regarding other possible limitations imposed on those with bodily defilement.

Limitations on Those with Heart Defilement

What is speculation with regard to bodily defilement, however, is certain with regard to heart defilement; the Homilies is explicit that the contraction of heart defilement prevents the person from engaging in table fellowship or prayer with baptized persons. The former is clear


from teachings delivered to Clement, Mattidia, and Faustus prior to their baptisms. Though Clement became a disciple of Peter shortly following their first encounter, the two are portrayed as eating separately at the end of that day; Peter withdraws to eat in private (ἰδίᾳ, Hom. 1.22.3). Once they had both finished eating, Peter tells Clement: “May God grant you to become like me in all things, and, having been baptized, to partake of the same table with me” (δῶθη σοι ὁ θεὸς κατὰ πάντα ἐξομοιωθήναι μοι καὶ βαπτισθέντα τῆς αὐτῆς μοι μεταλαβεῖν τραπέζης, Hom. 1.22.5). The separation sees more detailed discussion in the case of Mattidia, whose reunion with her sons occurs following Clement’s baptism. After her reunion with Clement but prior to her reunion with her other children, Peter addresses her to warn her that she will not be able to eat with her son until she is baptized:

In addition to these things, not living indiscriminately, we do not enjoy the table of Gentiles, inasmuch as we cannot eat with them, because they live impurely. But when we have persuaded them both to comprehend and to do the things of the truth, baptizing them with a certain thrice-blessed invocation, then we eat with them. For otherwise, be they father, mother, wife, child, brother, or anyone else who has our love by nature, we cannot dare to eat with them. For we do this differently for worship. Therefore, do not consider it an outrage that your son does not eat with you until you comprehend and do the same things as him. (Hom. 13.4.3–5)²⁸

The inability for even family members to eat together is emphasized one final time in the case of Clement’s father Faustus, when Peter expresses his desire for Faustus to learn the truth: “I am eager for you to be in agreement with your wife and children, so that you may both be a table-fellow²⁹ with them here, and there you will be with them without pain after the separation of the

²⁸ This passage is part of the section for which the Syriac translator looked to the Recognitions instead of the Homilies. The Syriac translation thus comports better with Recog. 7.29.3–5.

²⁹ The word that I translate here as “table-fellow” is ὁμοιτατος, which can signify not only “eating together” but also “living together.” Choosing the latter rendering would imply a greater separation between the baptized and unbaptized than I think is present in the Homilies. Outside of this text, there is no explicit command that the baptized should not live with the unbaptized, and indeed, Hom. 13.10.4, Peter admonishes husbands and fathers of the unbaptized for not striving to have their families baptized—without commanding them to leave their unbaptized
soul from the body’ (σπεύδω ὁμόφρονά σε γενέσθαι γυναικὶ καὶ τέκνοις, ὡς αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐνταῦθα ὁμοδίαιτος ἤς κάκει μετὰ τὸν χωρισμὸν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σῶματος συνόντα ὄλυπον ἔσεσθαι, Hom. 15.1.2). Like his children and his wife before him, Faustus is currently barred from eating with his wife and children, and this prohibition will remain until he is baptized.

While the didactic sections of the novel make this point clear, the novel’s narrative is more ambiguous regarding the separation of the baptized and the unbaptized during meals. After Peter’s second day of teaching Clement, for example, the narrative notes that the two “partake of food” (τροφῆς μεταλαβόντες), without explicitly noting that they do so separately (Hom. 2.53.3). Similarly, Clement and his compatriots Nicetas and Aquila “partake of salt” (ἅλων μεταλαβόντες) after their arrival in Tyre, again without explicit mention that they do so separately (Hom. 4.6.1). Nevertheless, the Homilies is clearer in depicting Peter as eating without Clement on other occasions prior to his baptism (cf. Hom. 6.26.5; 8.2.5, 24.3; 9.23.3; 11.34.1), and the need for their separation seems to be in mind when Peter orders his disciples to arrange themselves “according to worth” (κατ’ ἄξιαν/ἀξιωματικά) at mealtime (Hom. 10.26.2). Even in Mattidia’s briefer pre-baptismal narrative, there is some ambiguity regarding whether she eats with the baptized. After Clement recognizes her, it is stated that they “partake of food” (τροφῆς μεταλαβόντων), but it is unclear whether “they” includes Mattidia or is limited to Peter and Clement (Hom. 12.25.1). In any case, Mattidia’s participation in the meal following her relatives. Additionally, in the other two instances that ὁμοδίαιτος is used, the word clearly refers to table fellowship (cf. Hom. 7.3.2; 8.20.3). Thus, I have opted to interpret ὁμοδίαιτος as referring simply to table fellowship.

30 “Partaking of salt” is a common euphemism for eating in the Homilies; cf. Hom. 6.26.5; 11.34.1; 13.8.4, 11.4; 14.1.4, 8.4; 15.11.2; 19.25.5; 20.16.5; cf. also EpCl 9.1.

31 Which may be a Eucharist; see n. 34 of the introduction.
baptism is treated as a climactic moment in which the whole family (sans Faustus, who as of yet has not been recognized) can finally share meals and bless God together (Hom. 14.1.4).

In addition to being prohibited from eating with the baptized, unbaptized persons are also not permitted to pray with the baptized. Explicit mention of this prohibition occurs only once, prior to Peter’s debate with Simon in Caesarea. When Zacchaeus tells Peter that Simon is ready, he commands Clement to withdraw while he and “those who were already perfect” (οἱ ἡδή τέλειοι) pray, “as I had not yet received the baptism of salvation” (ὡς μὴ τῶν εἰληφῶς τὸ πρὸς σωτηρίαν βάπτισμα, Hom. 3.29.3). As with the prohibition on table fellowship, there are a few ambiguous narrative instances in which an unbaptized person may be depicted as praying with a baptized person. In one instance, Clement is depicted as praying with those with whom he had bathed, but Peter is not included among them, and it is unstated whether the people with whom Clement bathes have already been baptized (Hom. 11.1.1–2). As noted earlier, Mattidia may be present at the meal in Hom. 12.25.1, and if she is, then she is also present when they “give thanks” (εὐχαριστήσαντων). Faustus may also participate in “giving thanks” (εὐχαριστῆσαντες) in Hom. 14.12.4, though this is never stated explicitly, and it is also unclear whether this should be considered an instance of formal prayer. In most instances prior to Clement’s baptism, however, Peter is depicted as praying alone (cf. Hom. 1.22.4; 3.1.1; 9.23.3; 10.1.2, 26.1; 11.1.1), maintaining at least a separation between himself and Clement prior to the latter’s baptism.

Other than these two activities, baptized and unbaptized people have a lot of freedom to interact. Peter travels through Gentile lands, discourses to the unbaptized, and heals those possessed by demons. Before being baptized, Clement becomes part of Peter’s inner circle, travelling with him and transcribing his sermons. Contact between the baptized and the unbaptized presents no problem; the first thing Clement and Peter do when they meet is kiss
καταφιλέω), and Peter shows no hesitation in doing so (Hom. 1.16.1). The same is true for Clement and his brothers, who kiss both their mother (cf. Hom. 12.22.2, 23.1; 13.6.1) and father (Hom. 14.9.7) when they recognize them. Thus, table fellowship and communal prayer seem to be the only limitations placed on the unbaptized in their interactions with the baptized.

The only justification provided for prohibiting table and prayer fellowship between the baptized and unbaptized is Peter’s explanation to Mattidia: Gentiles are not permitted to eat with the baptized “because they live impurely” (διὰ τὸ ἀκαθάρτως αὑτοῦ βιόν, Hom. 13.4.3). The phrase “live impurely” appeared in two other places in the Homilies, within the sin lists contained in Hom. 7.8.2 and 8.19.3. In those contexts, the phrase was used as a summation of the sins that preceded it. The Homilies, then, bars the unbaptized from eating with the baptized due to their sinful lifestyle.

The danger that the Gentile’s sinful lifestyle posed for the baptized person is not explained in any greater detail. It most likely did not involve the passive transmission of heart defilement; as I argued in the previous section, the Homilies does not believe that heart defilement can transmit passively, but instead can only arise through one’s carnal conception and through sinning. Rather, the danger seems to have been the possibility that the presence of an unbaptized person at a meal or in prayer may encourage those with them to engage in sin. The concern was probably with idolatry and the violation of food laws specifically. This was a concern for much of ancient Jewish literature, which generally did not allow for table fellowship

---

32 The Syriac follows the parallel in the Recognitions in omitting this justification (cf. Recog. 7.29.3).

33 Cf. the response that Jesus initially gives when asked by Justa the Canaanite to heal her daughter: “It is not lawful to heal the Gentiles, who are like dogs because they enjoy various foods and practices, while the table of the Kingdom was given to the sons of Israel” (οὐκ ἔχεσθαι ἰάσθαι τὰ ἑθη, ἐοικότα καυσίν διὰ τὸ διαφόρος χρῆσθαι τροφὰς καὶ πράξεις, ἀποδεδομένης τῆς κατὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τραπεζῆς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, Hom. 2.19.2)
with Gentiles unless it could be guaranteed that food was prepared according to Jewish Law.\textsuperscript{34} The \textit{Homilies} likely shares this concern.

\textbf{Purification}

Purification from Bodily Defilement

Finally, we come to the last characteristic of impurity to be discussed in this dissertation: its removal. As with many of the characteristics of bodily defilement, the \textit{Homilies} has little to say on its removal. From the passages that have already been analyzed, we know that the \textit{Homilies} encourages washing, but it says very little regarding the ritual for doing so. Thus, in order to potentially learn more about this ritual, we must look to the narrative instances of the washings of Peter and his disciples. The problems with this have already been discussed in the previous section; as an optional ritual, these may be merely idealized depictions of bodily purification. Nevertheless, these narrative episodes may still be able to provide information about the mandatory bodily purification ritual.

Every description of the location of Peter’s baths places them in a source of “living” (i.e., flowing) water. This point is most clearly emphasized in \textit{Hom.} 10.1.1, which goes to great lengths to emphasize the fact that Peter washes in flowing water: “Therefore, on the third day in Tripolis, Peter, rising very early from sleep, went into the garden, where there was a great cistern into which ample water continuously flowed” (τῇ μὲν οὖν ἐν Τριπόλει τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ὀρθρίτερον ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθείς ὁ Πέτρος εἰς τὸν κῆπον εἰσῆγεν, ἔνθα ἦν ὑδροχοεῖον μέγα, εἰς ὃ δηνεκώς

Peter washes in (presumably) the same cistern at the end of the day (Hom. 10.26.2) and at the beginning of the following day (Hom. 11.1.1). The location of the Peter’s bodily purification in Hom. 9.23.3 and that of Clement and his brothers in Hom. 14.1.2 are not stated explicitly, but Peter is described as bathing in another body of flowing water, a sea (θάλασσα), at the end of his first day in Tripolis (Hom. 8.2.5). Emphasizing that these baths take place in living water thus seems to be significant to the Homilies.

However, emphasizing that the supplemental washings take place in flowing water does not necessarily mean that this was a requirement for the mandatory washings. Bathing in living water may have been an ideal, one that is followed by Peter because of his great piety but not required of common folk. Other contemporary Jewish communities also established flowing water as the best site for bodily purification, but nevertheless allowed for still water to be used. The rabbis, for example, identified six degrees of water for purification, and while flowing water was considered the best, a miqweh (a pool containing 40 seahs of collected rainwater) was considered sufficient for most purification needs (cf. m. Miqw. 1:1–8). The use of flowing water for bodily purification may similarly be an ideal practice in the Homilies.

When Peter tells the audience in Tripolis to maintain bodily purity, he is not explicit regarding whether they must wash in living water; he merely tells them to “wash your body in the bath” (λούστρον δὲ πλύνατε τὸ σῶμα, Hom. 11.28.2).

---

35 The Syriac does not contain the reference to the “large cistern”: “On the third day in Tripolis, when it was early, Peter rose from sleep and entered the garden, the place where much water flowed continuously” (On the third day in Tripolis, when it was early, Peter rose from sleep and entered the garden, the place where much water flowed continuously).

is, unfortunately, a hapax legomenon in the *Homilies*, and thus we cannot look within the text to discern whether it refers to a pool of still or flowing water. Outside of the *Homilies*, the word can be used to refer to either, and thus we cannot be certain whether the *Homilies* requires flowing water or if it allows for still water to be used in bodily purification.\footnote{The Syriac does not help us here, as *ܐܒܪܐ* (usually used for baptism) could likewise refer to a pool of flowing or still water.}

Outside of location, the *Homilies* says nothing about the ritual of washing. Thus, all that can be stated for certain is that the *Homilies* requires washing after contracting bodily impurity in order to be purified of the defilement. Little else can be said regarding where or how this washing was to take place.

**Purification from Heart Defilement**

By contrast, much can be said about the purification from heart defilement. This process is an extensive one, involving education, to remove the false ideas about God and the world learned from Greek *paideia* and replace them with the teachings of the True Prophet; asceticism, to begin driving out demons from one’s person; and baptism, to grant the baptizand power to exorcize any remaining demons, forgive sins, and remove the stain with which one was born. Though baptism is its culmination, this process does not conclude with baptism; even after baptism, the pure of heart must engage in good works in order to maintain their heart purity. In what follows, I will explore each of these components of this purification process in turn.

**Education**

The themes of truth and knowledge are of utmost importance for the *Homilies*. Indeed, they commence the narrative; Clement’s wrestling with questions of truth, the eternity of the world, and the eternity of the soul is what initially causes him to find Peter. Before learning of
Peter, however, Clement initially sought answers to his questions among the philosophers. He soon becomes frustrated with them, as “it is not by the proposals being defended that apprehension comes, but opinions are proved by their defenders” (οὐ παρὰ τὰς ἐκδικομένας ὑποθέσεις ἢ κατάληψις γίνεται, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοὺς ἐκδικοῦντας αἱ δόξαι ἀποφαίνονται, Hom. 1.3.4); in other words, Clement realizes that the strength of an argument is not necessarily based on its veracity, but the rhetorical ability of its proponent (cf. also Hom. 1.19.2). When Clement’s quest for truth finally does lead him to Peter, Peter informs him that he has been unable to find the truth because of the false teachings of Greek paideia and the sin that comes as a result:38

The will of God has existed in an obscure place by many means. First, through evil teaching, wicked society, awful custom, bad instruction, false preconception. Because of these things, error, then fearlessness, faithlessness, sexual immorality, avarice, vanity, and myriads of other such evil things, [fil] the world as a great quantity of smoke fills a house, and, obscuring the eyes of the men living within, does not allow them, looking up, to consider the God who created by decree and to discover what is pleasing to him. (Hom. 1.18.1–3)

The solution to this current situation, Peter argues, is not to seek answers among the philosophers, but instead to put one’s trust in a single teacher, the Prophet of Truth, who can open the door and let out the smoke:

Therefore, it is necessary for those inside who love truth, crying out from their breasts, to call for aid with truth-loving reason, so that someone who is outside the house filled with smoke, approaching, may open the door, so that the light of the sun outside may be admitted into the house, while the smoke of the fire within is driven out. Therefore, I call the man who helps us the True Prophet, who alone can enlighten the souls of people, so that we can see with our own eyes the way of eternal salvation. (Hom. 1.18.4–19.1)

38 Scholarly discussions of the role of paideia in the Homilies have tended to focus on Clement’s interactions with Appion in Hom. 4–6, but combatting paideia is present throughout the novel, as I show in this section. See also Reed, “Hellenism and Judaism,” 133.

39 ἔπλησεν is supplied by Rehm on the basis of the parallel in Recog. 1.15.3.

40 The Greek manuscripts actually contain ἐντός, “inside,” but Rehm opted to change the word to ἐκτός, “outside,” based on the parallel in Recog. 1.15.4.
In this context, Peter’s later command to the people of Tripolis to “purify your hearts of evil things through heavenly reason” (τὴν καρδίαν τῶν κακῶν οὐρανίω καθάρατε λογισμῷ, Hom. 11.28.2) has a very specific method: the people of Tripolis are to unlearn what they thought they knew through Greek paideia and to learn the actual truth via the teachings of the True Prophet. While “heavenly reason” can be accessed via one’s own reason (cf. Hom. 7.4.3–5; 8.5.4), for those who have lost their access to reason—those who are trapped in the smoke-filled house and have been animalized—it can also come through the teachings of the True Prophet, the “words that can purify the soul” (οἱ τὴν ψυχὴν δυναμένοι καθαίρειν λόγοι, Hom. 16.21.2). Heavenly reason combats the deceptions of demons and those who work with them, who, as we noted in the last chapter, eagerly strive to deceive the people into engaging in sin and thereby defiling their own heart.

Thus, the first step for purifying oneself of heart defilement is the removal of the misconceptions about God and the world planted by demons through paideia, and to replace them with the teachings of the True Prophet. This process is not just a preliminary step to the purification of the heart, but the beginning of it; by engaging in this purification of knowledge, one has already begun to purify themselves. Peter makes this point at the start of his fourth speech in Tripolis. There, he compares the minds of his audience to fields that have lain fallow for some time. Due to their negligence, Peter’s listeners have allowed themselves to believe false

---

41 The Syriac does not contain “of evil things”: “Purify your hearts with heavenly reason” (*Դܘܗ ܘܗ ܚ ܦ*).  

42 By losing God’s likeness from their souls; see the previous chapter.  

43 “Heavenly reason” can also come through direct revelation, without instruction; see Hom. 17.17.5–18.3; 18.6.3.
conceptions about God and about the world. These false conceptions, Peter argues, must be
removed, so that they can receive the truth shared by the True Prophet:

Since, through much negligence that occurred through you—to your detriment\(^{44}\)—your
mind has produced many and harmful conjectures about the means of worship\(^{45}\) and you
have become like a barren land in need of a husbandman, you require much time for
purification,\(^{46}\) so that your mind, receiving the true word that is transmitted to you like a
good seed, may not choke it with evil concerns and render it fruitless with respect to the
works that can save you. For this reason, it is necessary for those who have been anxious
about their salvation to hear more continuously, in order that the offenses\(^{47}\) that have
been multiplying for a long time can, in the short time that remains, be matched with
continuous zeal for purification. Since, therefore, everyone has the end of their time
unknown, hasten to remove the many thorns of your hearts, not little by little, for you
cannot be purified, for you have laid barren for a long time. (Hom. 11.2.1–3)

The best way to do this, Peter continues, is education: learning about the blessings from which
they have been barred because of their ignorance. In this way, they can become angry with
themselves, and that anger can burn away the weeds of false conception:

In no other way will you endure to accept the greater part of haste for your purification,
unless, becoming angry with yourselves, you rebuke yourselves for those things which you,
like useless slaves, became ensnared, agreeing to your evil desires, so that you can
let your righteous [anger\(^{48}\)] into the mind, like a fire upon a barren land. Therefore, if you
do not have the righteous fire (I mean anger against your evil desires\(^{49}\)), learn from what
good things you have been obstructed, and for which punishment you are prepared, and
by whom you have been deceived, and thus your mind, having become sober and having
been inflamed to anger by the teachings of the one who sent us, can, like fire, also

\(^{44}\) This rendering of the difficult phrase καθ’ ὑμῶν ὑφ’ ὑμῶν is based on the Syriac, which has “by you for your
injury” (καθ’ ὑμῶν ὑφ’ ὑμῶν).

\(^{45}\) Τὰς πολλὰς καὶ βλαβερὰς τῶν θρησκειῶν. The Syriac is similar: “Many conjectures about injurious forms of
worship” (חֲבֵרוֹת הַכְּלָלִים וְהַזְּכָּרִים).

\(^{46}\) Πολλοὺς πρὸς κάθαρσιν δείσθε χρόνον. The Syriac keeps this phrase within the field metaphor; thus, “which needs
a great amount of time for purification” (חֲבֵרוֹת וְהַזְּכָּרִים).

\(^{47}\) Ατοπήματα. Syriac: “evils” (חֲבֵרוֹת).

\(^{48}\) “Anger” is absent from the Greek, but present in the Syriac (חֲבֵרוֹת). From the next sentence, however, it is clear
that “your righteous thing” (τὴν δικαιὰν ὑμῶν) refers to the anger.

\(^{49}\) Τὴν κατὰ τῶν κακῶν ἐπιθυμίων ὀργὴν λέγω. Absent from the Syriac.
consume the things of desire.\textsuperscript{50} Believe me, that you who want to can accomplish all things. (\textit{Hom.} 11.3.1–2)

By removing their misgivings about God and the world, the person thus begins the process of purifying themselves and exorcizing their own demons. As Peter noted earlier, demons are only able to remain in a person in proportion to their unbelief; thus, the more the person knows and puts their faith in God, the less the demon is able to abide in them (cf. \textit{Hom.} 9.11.2–4).\textsuperscript{51} Because the demons’ hold over a person is not total, there remains a chance for them to escape demonic possession. The process of ridding oneself of demons requires a turning to faith, which requires knowing the truth about God and “doing good” (ἐὖ πράττοντες). Those who come to believe fully can finally be rid of demons and thereby become pure of heart.

Peter states that anyone, regardless of their origin, can do this; there is nothing inherently different between those who believe and those who do not, other than education:

Therefore, do not think that we do not fear demons because of this, that we are of a different nature. For we are of the same nature as you, but not of the same worship. For this reason, since we are not much, but completely superior to you, we do not even grudge for you to become like us, but rather advise it, knowing that all these things honor and fear those who associate with God without thinking about it. (\textit{Hom.} 9.20.1–2)

Peter and his comrades are not inherently superior to his Gentile audience, he argues, but they are able to drive out demons because they engage in a superior form of worship (θρησκεία). This worship is not limited to Peter and those like him, but anyone can learn and engage in it—and indeed, Peter encourages this education process.

While the content of this education comes from the teaching of the True Prophet, Peter repeatedly emphasizes that it is ultimately something that can be reached through right reason.

\textsuperscript{50} Τὰ κατὰ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας. The Syriac contains “the thorns of desires” (שׁוֹדֵךְ אֶלֶף).

\textsuperscript{51} See the discussion of this text in the previous chapter.
He makes this case, for example, the first time he addresses a crowd larger than his disciples:

“And truly we tell you, it will be more bearable to live in the land of Sodom and Gomorrah on the day of judgment than in the place of disobedience … because you do not apprehend for yourselves what is reasonable” (καὶ ἀληθῶς ὑμῖν λέγομεν, ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται γῆ Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας ἐν ἡμέρα κρίσεως ἦ τῷ τῆς ἀπειθείας τόπῳ ἐνδιατελεῖν ... ὅτι τὸ εὖλογον ἀφ’ ἕαυτῶν οὐκ ἐνοῆσατε, Hom. 3.31.1–2). In Hom. 8.5.4, Peter goes so far as to say, “For there would not have been a need for the arrival of either Moses or Jesus, if they were determined to apprehend for themselves what is reasonable” (οὔτε γὰρ ἦν Μωυσέως οὔτε τῆς τοῦ Ἡσσοῦ παρουσίας χρεία ἦν, εἶπε γὰρ ἕαυτῶν τὸ εὖλογον νοεῖν ἐβούλοντο). What the True Prophet teaches, then—the unique rulership of God, the appointment of the Evil and Good Ones over the kingdom of this world and the next, the use of sin as a means of becoming subservient to the Evil One, etc.—is essentially equivalent to the natural law, attainable through reason. If it were not for the many deceptions that the Evil One and his minions place in front of humanity, the teachings of the True Prophet would be clear to anyone with God-given reason.52

**Asceticism**

In the *Homilies*’ narrative, visits to a city tend to conclude with the inhabitants of that city being baptized in a mass baptism.53 In the first of these visits, the mass baptism is preceded by a command to fast for a few days. The amount of time is not stated explicitly, but Peter begins

52 See further in the conclusion to the dissertation.

53 The exceptions are Byblos and Antaradus. In Byblos, Peter is rushed, and so there is no narrative of baptisms occurring there (Hom. 7.12.3). In Antaradus, rather than baptizing its inhabitants, Peter invites them to meet him in Antioch, where he will teach them further about God and the proper way of performing God’s will (Hom. 12.24.1–2). Baptism is also not explicitly mentioned at the end of Peter’s trip to Sidon, but the occasions of repentance, healing, and the establishment of a church very much imply that baptisms took place (Hom. 7.8.3).
baptizing the Caesareans three days after he commands them to fast (Hom. 3.73.1–2), so one may presume that the fasting period is at least a few days. Prior to his baptism, Clement is also commanded to fast “for several days” (ἡμέρας/ἡμερῶν, Hom. 11.35.1). Though none of the other mass baptisms contain explicit commands to fast, the author(s)’ repeated refrain that Peter stayed in each city for at least a few days (cf. Hom. 7.5.1, 8.3; 11.36.3; 20.23.5) may imply that such fastings took place.

The importance of fasting prior to baptism comes to the fore in the case of Mattidia, who, after learning that she would not be able to eat with Clement until she has been baptized, asks, “What, then, prevents me from being baptized today?” (τί οὖν κωλύει σήμερόν με βαπτισθῆναι; Hom. 13.5.1). The obstruction, Peter reveals after she recognizes Nicetas and Aquila, is the need to fast. However, rather than fasting several days, like the inhabitants of Caesarea and her son did prior to their baptisms, Peter abridges the fasting period to one day:

What do you think? Am I alone heartless,54 that I do not want you to eat with your mother, baptizing her today?55 But it is necessary for her to fast at least one day before being baptized. And this is the case because, in a word,56 she said a certain [word]57 on

54 Ἀσπλάγχος. Syriac: “without compassion” (חסן חסן).
55 Ὅτι μὴ βούλομαι ὑμᾶς συνεστιασθῆναι τῇ μητρὶ βαπτίσσας αὐτὴν σήμερον; The Syriac puts the clauses into a more explicit causal relationship: “I do not want to baptize your mother today, so that you might partake in bread with her?” (אלא יאלחכתי רצתי '?א רצתי אָּרָּתָה אָּרָּתָה יִרְאָה יִרְאָה).56 Ἀπλῶς. Absent from Syriac. Rehm notes that it “seems corrupt” (“scheint verderbt”).
57 Τινα. The use of ὅν to introduce the next clause makes it likely that this is meant to be masculine singular, not neuter plural. The Syriac and Latin parallels use the word “word” (sermo, cf. Recog. 7.34.3) here, suggesting that the missing word is likely λόγος.
her behalf, which I understood to be a sufficient interpreter of her faith; otherwise, it would have been necessary for her to be instructed for many days. (*Hom.* 13.9.2–3)

This “sufficient interpreter of her faith” (τῆς πίστεως αὐτῆς ἰκανός ἐρμηνεός), Peter explains, is that she not only wanted baptism for herself but also for her hostess in Aradus: “She would not have entreated that this be given to the one loved by her, unless she was thus first disposed to the great gift of baptism” (οὐκ ἂν δὲ τοῦτο τῇ ὑπ’ αὐτῆς ποθουμένη δοθῆναι παρεκάλει, εἰ μὴ πρότερον αὐτὴ διετέθη ὡς ἐπὶ μεγάλη τῇ τοῦ βαπτίσματος δώρεα, *Hom.* 13.10.3).60 Because of Mattidia’s esteem for baptism, then, Peter is willing to abridge the fasting period, as this esteem indicates that she is already well along in the process of purifying her heart.

While Peter is willing to abridge Mattidia’s fasting period, he is not willing to do away with it entirely; Mattidia, despite the greatness of her faith, still requires some preparation for baptism. As Mattidia and her sons are attempting to convince Peter to baptize her that very day, it comes to light that Mattidia had already fasted for two days; caught up in the excitement of recognizing Clement, she had neglected to eat anything (*Hom.* 13.11.1). This fast is still not sufficient for Peter, however; the pre-baptismal fast, according to Peter, must have the express purpose of preparing for baptism, and cannot merely be incidental fasting (*Hom.* 13.11.2). After a few more protests from her children, Peter puts his foot down: “Let wickedness not overpower us, finding providence and the love of the one who bore you as a pretext, but rather, let us, you

---

58 Ὄν ἐγὼ τῆς πίστεως αὐτῆς ἰκανόν ἐρμηνεύσαι συνειδον. Syriac: “Which informed me about her faith” (ܐܡܐܢܓܡܐܝܠ ).

59 Ἀφετῆναι ἀπὸ τὴν ἡγομένην. From P. O uses ἀγνωσθῆναι, “to be purified,” and the Syriac has “that she be purified from impiety” (ܕܬܬܕי). See the discussion of ἀγνωσθῆναι in chapter 2.

60 Syriac: “But she would not have requested this for the one whom she loved, unless she first understood baptism to be a matter of greatness” (ܕܗܬܘܗ ܬܘܗ $ܬܘܗ \ast Y \#_ܐ V * # 5 3 \* ,+!ܪ #!ܨ ܝܗ ܡ IN ] * IHI# ,+/ܕܐ P 3 $ܬ). Mattidia had done this in *Hom.* 13.9.1.
and I with you, endure today, and she will be baptized tomorrow. For it is not even the time of
day today suitable for baptism” (μὴ ἡμᾶς νικάτω ἡ κακία, πρόφασιν εὑροῦσα τὴν πρόνοιαν καὶ
tεκούσις στοργῆς, ἄλλα μᾶλλον ὡμεῖς κἀγὼ σὺν ὑμῖν τὴν σήμερον διαμείνουμεν, καὶ αὐριον
βαπτισθῆσεται. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ ὥρα τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας ἐπιτήδειος ἐστὶν εἰς βάπτισμα, Hom.
13.12.1–2). With this back-and-forth, the Homilies highlights the importance of fasting prior to
baptism. It must be done for several days, and though an authority figure can abridge its
duration, they cannot abolish it entirely; even if a person has already been fasting for other
reasons, they nevertheless must participate in a fast specifically for baptism.

As with education, ascetic practices are framed as an active part of the purification
process. We noted in the last chapter that demons are variously motivated for possessing human
beings, and while those who do so in order to eradicate evil are of a more dangerous sort, the
demons who wish to indulge their own pleasures still require addressing. Peter argues that the
best way to do away with these demons is to deprive them of what they want; if one does not
give the demon the food, drink, or sexual activity that it wishes to indulge in, it will depart (cf.
Hom. 9.10.1–2). Additionally, since Peter argues that possessions are sins in Hom. 15.9, he states
that depriving oneself of possessions also effects a forgiveness of sins by itself (Hom. 15.9.1).
The Homilies thus views ascetic practices positively and gives them a pivotal role in the
purification of the heart.

---

61 The Syriac is essentially the same in meaning, but differs on a few grammatical points: “Let wickedness not
overpower you on the pretext that it happened to her by the providence of God and out of love for your mother. But,
therefore, let us do this, you and I with you: Thus, let us endure today, and tomorrow she will be baptized. For the
time today is not even appropriate for baptism” ( porno ἐκείνης ἐκείνης ἡ κακία ἐπίθεται ἐκ τῆς ἐν γυναῖκι ἐκ
λόγῳ ἐκ τῆς φιλίας μητρὸς καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς νικάτω, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ὡμεῖς κἀγὼ σὺν ὑμῖν τὴν σήμερον διαμείνουμεν,
καὶ αὐριον βαπτισθῆσεται. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ ὥρα τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας ἐπιτήδειος ἐστὶν εἰς βάπτισμα, Hom. 13.12.1–2).
As we noted in the last chapter, ascetic practices in themselves are not sufficient to expel all demons from one’s person, since some are more powerful and are willing to endure one’s asceticism (cf. *Hom.* 9.10.5). The only true way to remove demons, then, is to be granted the power to do so by being baptized at the end of one’s education and pre-baptismal fast. This baptism has the added benefit of effecting a reconception, causing one’s previous carnal conception, which had occurred through desire, semen, and blood, to be replaced by a new one through water. By doing so, the person then becomes pure of heart, knowing how to serve God and thus being able to do so effectively.

The actual ritual of baptism is not described in very much detail, but there are two characteristics that are repeatedly emphasized. First, the Greek *Homilies* requires that baptism take place in flowing water; second, the *Homilies* emphasizes that this baptism must take place with “the thrice-blessed invocation” (ἡ τρισμακάρια ἐπονομασία), i.e., in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Peter addresses both these components of baptism incidentally, at a point in which his main thesis is that baptism grants power over demons:

But in the present time, you, having been purified with the thrice-blessed invocation in an ever-flowing river, fountain, or even the sea, will not only be able to expel the spirits that lie hidden within you, but, you yourselves no longer sinning and unhesitatingly having faith in God, will expel evil spirits and cruel demons, along with terrible diseases, from others. (*Hom.* 9.19.4)

Unlike with bodily purification, where the *Homilies* employed the more ambiguous λουτρόν, the bodies of water included here are all unambiguously bodies of flowing water—“river” (ποταμός), “fountain” (πηγή), and “sea” (θάλασσα)—whose flowing nature is emphasized with

---

62 See the discussion in chapter 3.
the adjective “ever-flowing” (ἀέναος). This adjective is repeated in the context of Clement’s baptism, again highlighting the need for flowing water in this ritual (Hom. 11.35.1). This is an important element of baptism for the Greek Homilies; this ritual requires flowing water to be effective.63

This was not the case for the Syriac translator. Though Hom. 9 is outside the bounds of the translation, other instances in which flowing water is mentioned in the Greek are omitted or altered by the Syriac translator. This happens twice in Hom. 11.26, at a point when Peter is attempting to persuade his audience of the merits of baptism. In the course of this argument, he quotes John 3:5, which the Greek Homilies renders as such: “Amen I say to you, unless you are reborn by living water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, you will not enter the Kingdom of Heaven” (ἀμήν ύμιν λέγω, ἐὰν μὴ ἀναγεννηθήτε ὑδατί ζώντι, εἰς ὅνομα πατρός, νεοῖ, ἀγίου πνεύματος, ὦ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, Hom. 11.26.2).64 The Syriac is almost identical, but, very importantly, does not contain the word “living”: “Amen, amen, I say to you, unless you are born by water in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, you will not enter the Kingdom of Heaven” (ܐܡܢܐ ܡܠܐ, ܐܡܢܐ, ܠܐ ܗܰܐܝܡܐ ܒܠܐܝܡܐ ܒܠܐܒܨܠܐܢܢ ܒܠܢܐܒܥܕܡܕܨܠܐܢܢ ܒܠܢܐܒܨܠܐܢܢ, ܠܐ ܗܰܐܝܡܐ ܒܠܐܒܨܠܐܢܢ, ܘܡܒܢܘܟܡܐ ܒܠܢܐܒܥܕܡܕܨܠܐܢܢ). Given that the parallel in the Recognitions also renders the quotation with “living water” (aqua viva, Recog. 6.9.2), it is likely that this element originated in their shared source and thus it is the Syriac translator who made the decision to remove the reference to “living.”

63 Wehnert attributes this need for flowing water to ensuring the presence of God’s spirit therein (cf. Hom. 11.22.1); Wehnert, “Taufvorstellungen,” 1088.

64 This is not the same version of John 3:5 as the one reconstructed in NA28. The latter does not have any reference to the “Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,” nor does it require that the water be “living”; instead, John’s Jesus states that people need to be born “of water and spirit” (ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος).
The Syriac translator makes a similar move later in *Hom.* 11.26, while Peter is condemning those who refuse to undergo baptism. In the Greek, he again uses the phrase “living water” to describe the ritual: “For this reason, the one who does not yet want to approach still bears the spirit of rabies, because of which he does not want to approach the living water for his salvation” (τούτῳ ὁ μήπω προσελθεῖν θέλων ἐτι τὸ τῆς λύσσας φέρει πνεῦμα, οὖ ἐνεκα ἐπὶ τῇ αὐτοῦ σωτηρίᾳ ὑδατὶ ζ̄όντι προσελθεῖν οὐ θέλει, *Hom.* 11.26.4). Rather than completely omitting “living,” however, this time the Syriac translator opts to replace the word with the similar “life-giving”: “But the one who does not want to approach them, until now the spirit of rabies dwells within him; because of this, he cannot approach the life-giving waters for his salvation” (But the one who does not want to approach them, until now the spirit of rabies dwells within him; because of this, he cannot approach the life-giving waters for his salvation). The replacement of “living” with “life-giving” reflects a reticence on the part of the Syriac translator to require that baptism take place in flowing water.

In one final instance, the Syriac translator removes the reference to flowing water during Clement’s baptism. After Clement has fasted for a few days, Peter brings him “to the fountains near the sea, so that he might baptize [him] in ever-flowing water” (εἰς τὰς ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ πλησίον οὕσας πηγάς, ὡς εἰς ἄνεαον ἐβάπτισεν ὕδωρ, *Hom.* 11.35.1). The Syriac translation retains the references to the fountains and the sea, but removes the “ever-flowing” from “water”: “He baptized us with water in the springs that are near the sea” (He baptized us with water in the springs that are near the sea). Thus, in every instance where “living” or “flowing” water occurs in *Hom.* 10–14, the Syriac translator omits or alters it.

---

65 See above on the metaphorical use of “rabies” (λυσσάς) to describe the transmission of sin.
By removing the requirement that the waters of baptism be flowing, the Syriac translator may be rolling back a stipulation that he viewed as being too harsh. Not everyone has ready access to flowing water, but baptisms are no less necessary for them; as a result, some concessions had to be made. The Syriac translator may have a similar perspective to that preserved in the Didache, which establishes a preference for using flowing water in baptism but ultimately allows for other water sources to be used if flowing water is unavailable:

Concerning baptism, baptize like so: Having declared all these things beforehand, baptize in living water in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. But if you do not have living water, baptize in other water. If you cannot do so in cold water, do so in hot. If you do not have either, pour water on the head three times, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. (Did. 7.1–3)

While the Didache establishes a preference for flowing water, the author allows for other sorts of water to be used. Above, I noted that, in rituals for bodily purification, flowing water was the most potent means of purification among the rabbis, but still water could also be used for removing certain bodily impurities. A similar principle is at work in the Didache; while flowing water is the ideal, baptism can occur elsewhere. A similar motivation may lie behind the Syriac translator’s decision to remove all instances of “living water” to describe baptism. However, this is uncertain, as the Syriac translator does not note whether he considers baptism in flowing water to be an ideal or to be unnecessary altogether.

The other major component of baptism discussed in the Homilies is the use of the “thrice-blessed invocation” (ἡ τρισμακάρια ἐπονομασία, cf. Hom. 9.19.4, 23.2; 11.26.3; 13.4.3). The Homilies’ use of its version of John 3:5 defines what is meant by this: baptism must occur in the

---

name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. By performing baptism in this way, the *Homilies* follows Matthew’s Great Commission, which encourages the disciples to do the same (cf. Matt 28:19).67

Other than these two elements, very little can be said with certainty regarding the ritual of baptism in the *Homilies*. However, a few speculations can be made. First, the novel may prefer that the ritual take place in the morning. In addition to the requirement to fast, one of the reasons that Peter does not allow Mattidia to be baptized when she asks is that it is not an appropriate time of day for baptism (*Hom. 13.12.2*). She is then baptized early the next morning (*Hom. 14.1.1–2*); this may thus be the *Homilies*’ preferred time of day for the ritual.68 However, outside of this, there is no indication regarding the time of day in any of the other baptisms performed, and thus the meagerness of the evidence makes this far from certain.

The narrative surrounding Mattidia’s baptism may also indicate that baptism was performed in the nude. On the morning of the event, Peter commissions her sons to find a spot for her baptism (*Hom. 14.1.1*), but the *Homilies* then states that, “We brothers, withdrawing with the brother and some others because of the women and washing, and then coming back, we took the women and then, after walking to a hidden place, we prayed” (ἡμεῖς δὲ οἱ ἄδελφοι, τῶν γυναικῶν χάριν ἄμα ἄδελφοι καὶ ἄλλοις τισὶν ὑποχωρήσαντες καὶ λουσάμενοι, ἐλθόντες ἔπειτα τὰς γυναῖκας παρελάβομεν καὶ οὕτως ἐν κρυφῷ τόπῳ προευθέντες εὐχόμεθα, *Hom. 14.1.2*).69

67 Within the scope of his translation, the Syriac translator translates this phrase in two different ways. In the first, they employ the phrase “threefold and glorious invocation” (*ܬܢܵܐܕܝܗܘ &ܬ#,*; *HWND 11.26.3*), and in the second, they use “the Trinity that is glorious” (*ܐܕ ܝܗ &ܬ#,*; *HWND 13.4.3*).

68 Wehnert argues that the ritual takes place at sunrise to symbolize its function as a “new birth” (“Neugeburt”); see Wehnert, “Taufvorstellungen,” 1088n52.

69 The Syriac does not contain “with the brother and some others,” but is otherwise close to the Greek: “We brothers departed because of the women and washed, and then we came and took the women, and after we found a hidden
This sentence is rather opaque with respect to the timing of Clement and his brothers’ departure, as well as whom they depart with.\textsuperscript{70} First, it is unclear whether Clement and his brothers withdraw before, during, or after Mattidia’s baptism; second, it is unclear if “with the brother” (ἓμα ἀδελφός) is an error\textsuperscript{71} or if it is meant to refer to another character, such as Peter. The only reason given is that they withdraw “because of the women.” Because they are later portrayed as praying with them, the problem does not seem to be the women themselves, but being around women either during Mattidia’s baptism or during their own ritual purification. The most likely explanation for this is that one or both of these was being performed in the nude; Clement and his brothers leave out of a sense of shame surrounding nudity. There are ancient and early medieval examples of baptisms being performed in the nude,\textsuperscript{72} and thus that the ritual was performed in such a way by the Homilies’ community is not impossible.

This case is bolstered by one final possibility, that baptism involved removing one’s old clothes and donning new ones. Such a ritual is never explicitly described in the Homilies, but in Hom. 8, Peter uses the metaphor of changing clothes to describe the process of heart purification in a way that suggests that it may be part of the baptismal ceremony:

\begin{quote}
place, we prayed” (οὐκ ἔστιν ὑμῖν οὐδὲ ἐπήρθεν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἓπειρον ἡμῖν οὐδὲ ἔχετε ἐν τῷ καιρῷ Ἴδε ἀρπάζοντες ἐν ἀθροίσει).
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{70} The “rather tedious sequence of comings and goings” in Hom. 14.1–2 causes Duncan to argue that the Homilies has redacted this section quite significantly; see Duncan, “Eve, Mattidia, and the Gender Discourse,” 183–84.

\textsuperscript{71} Its absence from the Syriac and E caused Rehm to put ἀδελφός in brackets in his critical edition.

\textsuperscript{72} See, e.g., Hippolytus, \textit{Apostolic Tradition}, 21.3, 11; \textit{Acts of Thomas} 121, 133; Cyril of Jerusalem, \textit{Lectures on the Mysteries} 2.2; Ephraem the Syrian, \textit{Hymns on Faith} 82.10, 85.3–4; John Chrysostom, \textit{Baptismal Instructions}, 11.28–29; Maximus of Turin, \textit{Sermon} 48.3; Narsai, \textit{Homily} 22, p. 38–39, 362–63; and John the Deacon, \textit{Letter to Senarius} 6. For discussions, see Ferguson, \textit{Baptism in the Early Church}, 330, 432–33, 477–78, 507, 541, 652, 703–4, 767, and John E. Farrell, “The Garment of Immortality: A Concept and Symbol in Christian Baptism” (PhD diss, Catholic University of America, 1974). However, it is also possible that these instances of nudity are exaggerated, and only outer garments were doffed for this occasion; see Laurie Guy, “’Naked’ Baptism in the Early Church: The Rhetoric and Reality,” \textit{JRH} 27 (2003): 133–42.
But instead of those who disobeyed because of preconception, the Father, performing the marriages of his Son, commanded us, through the Prophet of Truth, to go to the outlets of the roads (that is, to you) to clothe you with a pure wedding garment (that is, baptism, which is for the forgiveness of the evil deeds done by you), and to lead the good to God’s meal by repentance, if also at first they were absent from the feast. Therefore, if you want to become the garment of the divine spirit, first become eager to remove your filthy presupposition (which is an unclean spirit) and foul garment. But this cannot otherwise be removed, unless you are first baptized into good works, and thus, becoming pure in body and soul, you will enjoy the future eternal kingdom. (Hom. 8.22.4–23.1)

The most immediate intertext for Peter’s metaphor here is the parable of the wedding feast in Matt 22:1–14, but that does not mean that baptismal practice is not also in view here. If that is the case, then it is possible that the Homilies’ baptism involved removing one’s clothes, being baptized naked, and then receiving a new garment upon exiting the water. Without any material explicitly describing this practice, however, this must remain a speculation.

While the ritual of baptism is not described in very much depth, the Homilies is much more explicit regarding its effects. These are threefold: Baptism (1) forgives sins, (2) grants the baptizand power over demons, and (3) replaces one’s carnal birth with a new spiritual one. With regard to the first effect, baptism is explicitly described as being “for the forgiveness of sins” (εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν) on a few occasions (Hom. 7.8.1; 9.23.2; 17.7.1). Variations of this phrase also appear elsewhere; baptism is described as being “for the forgiveness of the evil deeds done by you” (εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν πεπραγμένων ύμῶν κακῶν, Hom. 8.22.4) and “for the forgiveness of the

73 Πρόλημμα. Wieseler contends that this ought to be προκάλυμμα, “cloak,” to remain within the garment metaphor.

74 “The outlets of the roads” (αἱ διὰ ξύλων τῶν ὁδών), for example, is taken directly from Matt 22:9 and interpreted here as referring to Peter’s Gentile audience.

75 Wehnert rejects this possibility; see Wehnert, “Taufvorstellungen,” 1080n27.

76 Εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν is also used in Hom. 15.9.1, though there it does not refer to baptism but to the self-deprivation of possessions. See chapter 3.
things done in ignorance” (εἰς ἀφεσιν τῶν ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ πεπραγμένων, *Hom*. 11.27.1),77 with “in ignorance” referring to one’s pre-educated state. Baptism, then, removes the stain of sins that defile the heart, granting one a purified heart and a clean slate from which one can begin to serve God rightly.

Baptism also removes any demons that remain in one’s person following their fasting period. The ritual does not do so by exorcizing them directly, but by granting the person the power to remove them on their own; as Peter tells the people of Tripolis, after their baptism, “You will be able to expel the spirits that lie hidden within you” (τὰ ἐνδομυχοῦντα ὑμῖν πνεύματα ἀπελάσαι ἤνεγκρεν, *Hom*. 9.19.4). This ability to expel demons extends beyond the person themselves; those who have been baptized are also capable of exorcizing demons from, and thereby healing the diseases of, others. This happens not because the person has become superior to demons, but because demons obey God and flee from those who serve God. Peter compares this to captains in Caesar’s army:

For in the same way the soldiers subject to a captain of Caesar know to honor the one who received so great a thing through the authority of the one who gave it, so that when the commanders say to one, “Come,” and he comes, and to another, “Go,” and he goes,78 thus also the one who gives himself to God, when he is faithful, is heard only when he speaks to both demons and diseases, and the demons withdraw, though they are much stronger than the one who commanded them. For, with inexpressible power, God subjects the mind of everyone to whomever he wills. For just as many commanders, along with all companies and cities, fear Caeser even though he is a man, since everyone’s heart is eager to honor the image of all (for all things, having been enslaved by fear by the will of God, do not know the reason), thus also all the disease-inflicting spirits, fearing in a certain natural way, honor and flee from the one who takes refuge in God and, as his image, bears righteous faith in his heart. (*Hom*. 9.21.1–3)

77 The Syriac translator simplifies “things done” to “sins” (*οἱματα*).

78 Cf. Matt 8:9//Luke 7:8
The demons obey the commands of the baptized not because the baptized are superior to them, but because they are given the authority to do so by God (cf. also Hom. 8.19.2). This power over demons is not only taught but is also reflected in Peter’s actions; following his speeches, Peter demonstrates his God-given authority to exorcize demons and heal those whom he addresses (cf. Hom. 7.5.1, 5.3, 8.3, 12.1, 12.3; 8.24.1–2; 9.23.3; 10.26.1; 12.23.7–8; 15.11.2; 18.23.6; 19.25.1; 20.23.5). Peter is under no delusion that he performs these miracles on his own, and he understands that it is due to serving God and being a disciple of the Prophet of Truth that he is able to do so (cf. Hom. 7.11.3).

Finally, baptism replaces the impurity of one’s carnal conception, which came about through desire, semen, and blood, and replaces it with a new one through water. Baptism’s ability to do this occurs through the work of God’s Spirit, “the merciful one that was laid there upon the water from the beginning” (τι ἐκεῖ ἀπ’ ἁρχῆς ἔλεημον ἑπιφέρόμενον τῷ ὦδατι, Hom. 11.26.3), which allows the water to move in the first place. Peter argues that baptism’s ability to replace one’s carnal conception is manifest from its role in creation:

And now, from inferior things, recognize the cause of all things, reasoning that water makes all things, water receives the beginning of motion from the Spirit and the Spirit has its beginning from the God of all things. And thus it was necessary to reason, so

---

79 The Syriac translator interpreted ἔλεημον as an adverb: “The one who mercifully hovers over the waters from the beginning” (ܐܕܘܢ ܡܣܘܒ ܒܣܘܒ ܒܫܡܐ ܒܒܓܒܒ ܒܒܓܒܒ, ܗܝܡ).

80 Ἐπίγνωθι. The Syriac splits this verb in two, transforming them to second person plurals in the process: “March forward from these small things and know the one who is the cause of all” (ܡܡܓܡܡܐ ܡܡܓܡܘܗܘܟ ܡܡܓܡܡܐ ܡܡܓܡܘܗܘܟ ܡܡܓܡܡܐ ܡܡܓܡܘܗܘܟ ܡܡܓܡܡܐ ܡܡܓܡܘܗܘܟ ܡܡܓܡܡܐ ܡܡܓܡܘܗﻮܒ, ܗܝܡ).

81 Τὸ πάντα τὸ ὄνομα ποιεῖ. The Syriac translator renders this passively, perhaps to remove agency from the water: “Everything was brought forth from water” (ܝܗܘܟ ܡܡܓܡܡܐ ܡܡܓܡܘܗܘܟ ܡܡܓܡܡܐ ܡܡܓܡܘܗﻮܒ).

82 Τὸ δὲ ὄνομα ὑπὸ πνεύματος κινησίως τὴν γένσιν λαμβάνει. This is also rendered passively: “Water is moved to generate by the Spirit” (ܒܟܐܢܐ ܡܡܓܡܥܟ ܡܡܓܡܘܗܘܟ ܡܡܓܡܘܗﻮܒ).
that, by reason, you can arrive to God, when, recognizing your origin and being begotten anew in first-born water, you might become heir of the parents who begot you incorruptibly. (Hom. 11.24.1–2)

Just as water played a central role in creation, water continues to play a central role in re-creation, one that is self-evident to the author(s) of the Homilies. This is a necessary step for the author(s) of the Homilies; without it, one cannot enter the Kingdom of God, regardless of how righteously one leads their life. Because of this, one requires baptism, regardless of one’s righteousness; even those who lead righteous lives require baptism, so that the stain of their carnal conception can be removed and replaced with a new, pure conception.

Though baptism is the culmination of one’s heart purification, it is important to note prior to concluding that the purification process is not truly complete after baptism. Rather, one is expected to engage in a life of good works. Peter repeatedly emphasizes the need to practice good works after one’s baptism (cf. Hom. 7.8.2, 11.5; 8.7.5, 23.1; 10.6.4; 11.17.2, 26.3; 13.10.4), and argues that these works need to be done in proportion to one’s previous impiety: “For the unrighteous person, in addition to being baptized for the forgiveness of the things done in ignorance, there remains doing good after baptism in proportion to their impiety” (ἀδίκω δὲ πρὸς

83 Καὶ σοῦ δὲ λόγος ἔδει λογίσασθαι, ἵνα. Absent from Syriac.

84 Ἐπὶ λόγῳ. Syriac: “And with this idea” (_roll up_tongue).

85 Πρωτογόνῳ ὅδε. Syriac: “Water that is from the beginning” (water coming out of the earth).

86 There are two exceptions to this. First, Jews are likely not required to be baptized, provided the follow the Law of Moses; see n. 109 of chapter 3. Second, Peter also argues that Mattidia herself, had she perished in the shipwreck that she endured while she was fleeing her brother-in-law, would have been saved: “If you had died, the depth itself would have become, when you died, a baptism for the salvation of the soul, because of your chastity” (εἰ τετελεσθείη σας ὁ βυθὸς δὲ σωφροσύνης θηρακύσιν βάπτισμα ἐγένετο πρὸς ψυχῆς σωτηρίαν, Hom. 13.20.4; Syriac: “But even if you had died, since you would have died because of chastity, the sea would have become a baptism for the salvation of your soul,” (σωτηρίαν...).
Merely avoiding evil, thus, is not sufficient after baptism; one still needs to perform good works in order to maintain one’s pure heart.

**Conclusion**

For much of this chapter, the conclusions are preliminary and rely on speculation. Thus, it is likely that the *Homilies* considered bodily defilement to be transmissible, but this is not certain. The bodily purifications that Peter and his disciples perform may indicate that one needed to wash one’s body in flowing water before communal meals and prayer, but such a conclusion is not certain.

However, there are other elements of defilement that are more certain. Both defilements endure until they are washed off, but bodily purifications can be repeated while baptism can only be performed once. Heart defilement is not transmissible, at least passively; one must actively engage in sin in order to be defiled. One cannot participate in communal meals or prayer until one has been baptized. Finally, the process of heart purification involves education, asceticism, and culminates in baptism. Once one has completed this process, one is finally prepared to enter the Kingdom of God.

---

87 Syriac: “But if you are unrighteous, this is needed, after baptism for the forgiveness of the sins that were done by you in ignorance, to repay good works according to your impiety” (*D ܢܐ ܕܗ T ܪ V/3 $ ܕܗ $ ܪ $ ܕ ܢܐ ܕܗ ܝ ܕ).
CHAPTER 5

JEWS LAWS, GENTILE CONVERTS

In the last three chapters, I argued that the Homilies understands purity through a common ancient Jewish framework that divided purity into two domains, one concerning bodily purity and another concerning ethics. I highlighted a number of differences between these two kinds of purity as understood by the Homilies, the most significant of which involved the sources of its defilement and the means by which those defilements could be removed. Bodily defilement, the Homilies argues, comes from menstrual blood and seminal emission,¹ and is removed with a ritual washing; heart defilement, by contrast, comes from sin, demons, and one’s carnal conception, and can only be removed by an extensive process involving education, asceticism, and baptism.²

If the Homilies understands purity through an ancient Jewish framework, then we might expect the novel to promote adherence to the Jewish Law. The novel does do this, but only in part. For example, the Homilies is quite limited in what it considers defiling the body compared to other ancient Jewish traditions. The Torah considers the sources of bodily impurity to go beyond menstrual blood and seminal emission to include childbirth (Lev 12:1–8), “leprosy” (Lev 13:1–14:32),³ and human corpses (Num 19:10–22). Among rabbinic Jews, the last of these was

¹ At least in the Greek; cf. chapter 3 on the differences between the Greek Homilies and its Syriac translation.
² Unless, perhaps, one is Jewish; see chapter 3 n. 109.
³ Again, ancient leprosy is not the same as modern-day Hansen’s disease. See n. 3 in the introduction.
considered the most defiling, being able to defile not just by contact, but also by proximity (cf. *m. Kelim* 1:4). Its absence from the *Homilies* is thus striking. Beyond purity, the *Homilies* also never advocates for a few other Jewish practices, including the observance of the Sabbath⁴ and circumcision.⁵ The absence of these practices is also striking and has caused some scholars to argue that they were either left unmentioned in the *Homilies*’ sources, that they were lost in the compiling and editing of those sources, or that other practices had come to replace them.⁶

One possible explanation for these absences is the *Homilies*’ attitude toward the Torah. As I noted in chapter three, the *Homilies* believes that false material has been inserted into the Torah over time, and that Jesus had not come to abolish the Law itself, but its accretions. Thus, the *Homilies* rejects certain legal precepts, especially sacrifices, by arguing that they were never part of the Law of Moses. The rejection of sacrifices may have played a role in the rejection of certain bodily defilements, as the process of becoming pure of those defilements often involved sacrifices.⁷ It is possible, then, that the *Homilies* rejects these bodily defilements, as well as the practices of Sabbath observance and circumcision, as accretions to the Torah.⁸

---

⁴ The word *σαββατον* only appears twice in the *Homilies*. The first instance is *Hom*. 2.35.3, where it is used to describe Simon Magus’s practice of observing the Sabbath every eleven days. The second is *Hom*. 19.22.4, in the context of Peter’s polemic against intercourse during menstruation, where it is used to reference Amos 8:5: “Indeed, from this, a certain man who had learned from the teachings of Moses, when he accused the people of sins, called them sons of new moons according to the moon and of sabbaths” (ἐνθεν γονὶς ἡς ἐκ τῆς Μωυσεῖου παραδόσεως μεμαθηκώς, αἰτώμενος τὸν λαὸν ἐπὶ ἁμαρτίας, ὑιὸς νεομηνίων τῶν κατὰ σελήνην καὶ σαββάτων ἀπεκάλει).

⁵ Circumcision is never mentioned in the *Homilies* itself, but it does appear as a requirement for teachers in *Diam.* 1.1. See the discussion of the *Diamartyria* in the Introduction.

⁶ Einar Molland, for example, argues that baptism is a replacement for circumcision. See Molland, “La circoncision,” 8–25. See also the various source-critical theories discussed in chapter 1.

⁷ On the sacrifices required after childbirth, see Lev 12:6–8; for cleansing from leprosy, Lev 14; after contact with a corpse, Num 19. Sacrifices are also required for people with irregular discharges (for men, see Lev 15:14–15; for women, see Lev 15:29–30).

⁸ Two alternative explanations are also possible: First, the *Homilies* omits these practices because it assumes that its audience is familiar with them already; second, the *Homilies* omits these practices because they are not part of the
Recently, however, a few scholars have argued that these practices are absent from the Homilies not because they were rejected or replaced, but because they were not considered relevant to its primary audience, i.e., Gentiles. For some ancient Jews, Gentiles were not expected to abide by the whole of the Jewish Law, because that Law had been given to Jews specifically. However, there were elements of that Law that were given not just to Jews but to the whole of humanity, and it was these laws that Gentiles were expected to follow.\(^9\) The parallels between the Homilies’ legal requirements and those of two other texts that delineated the legal requirements for Gentiles, the Apostolic Decree (Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25) and the rabbinic Noahide Laws (t. ‘Abod. Zar. 9:4), suggest that the Homilies was taking part in a conversation occurring among Jews and Christians regarding the legal requirements for Gentiles. Thus, the defilements of corpses, leprosy, and childbirth, as well as the practices of circumcision and Sabbath observance, are omitted not because the Homilies had replaced them or rejected them outright, but because such practices were not deemed relevant to its intended audience—i.e., Gentiles.\(^{10}\)

This chapter is divided into two sections. In the first, I compare the Homilies’ legal requirements to those of the Apostolic Decree and the rabbinic Noahide Laws, two other Jewish texts of late antiquity that delineated Gentile legal requirements. The legal requirements of

---

\(^{9}\) This outlook represents just one of the many perspectives on Gentile legal requirements for ancient Jews. For an overview, see Donaldson, Judaism and the Gentiles, 467–506.

\(^{10}\) This argument is indebted to recent scholarly work on the letters of Paul, particularly Pamela Eisenbaum, Paul Was Not a Christian: The Original Message of a Misunderstood Apostle (New York: HarperCollins, 2009. See also the works cited in n. 12.
Apostolic Decree are particularly close to those of the Homilies, even sharing formal elements, and thus it is probable that the Homilies either used the Apostolic Decree as its source or that Acts and the Homilies relied on a common source. Also significant, however, are the ways in which the Homilies differs from the Apostolic Decree, particularly in its more expansive nature. Since some of these expansions have overlaps with the rabbinic Noahide Laws, I argue that the Homilies was taking part in a conversation that was occurring among Jews and Christians in late antiquity regarding Gentile legal requirements.

In the second section of this chapter, I discuss the recent thesis of Holger M. Zellentin, who argues that ancient Jews drew on two main sources in determining their Gentile legal requirements: the double prohibition of consuming and shedding blood in Gen 9:4–6, and the Torah’s laws for the gerim (םירק). I argue that Zellentin’s thesis is generally correct, though there were likely other considerations that Jews and Christians used when determining their Gentile legal requirements in late antiquity, particularly in their inclusion of certain laws from Lev 19 (which did not apply to the gerim) and their omission of corpse defilement (which did apply to the gerim; cf. Num 19:10). Despite my qualms with Zellentin’s thesis, I believe that it can explain the Syriac translator’s omission of the Greek Homilies’ requirement to wash after intercourse, since such a law is never given to the gerim in the Torah.

**Jewish Laws for Gentiles**

Most of the speeches in the Homilies are directed at a Gentile audience. After Simon Magus flees following their first debate in Caesarea, Peter states that it is his intention to pursue him, while also teaching the Gentiles: “I am going forth to the Gentiles, who say there are many gods, to proclaim and teach that there is one God who created heaven, earth, and all things in them, so that those who come to love him can be saved” (ὁρμώντός μου εἰς τὰ ἔθνη τὰ πολλοὺς
Peter then proceeds to do just this, travelling to the cities of Tyre, Sidon, Beirut, Byblos, Tripolis, and Laodicea, all the while preaching God’s oneness and the proper means of “loving” him to the Gentiles living there.

This means of loving God is not the observance of the Jewish Law, at least not entirely; rather, it is the observance of the teachings of the True Prophet, i.e., Jesus. Peter preaches to the Gentiles and not to the Jews because, according to him, Jews already have a divine teacher in Moses. In a brief discussion with his disciples prior to his first speech in Tripolis, Peter affirms that Jews and Gentiles have their own dedicated teachers:

Therefore, the Hebrews are not condemned for their ignorance of Jesus, because of the one who concealed him [i.e., God], if, doing the things [said] by Moses, they do not hate him whom they do not know. Nor, moreover, are those from the Gentiles who are ignorant of Moses condemned because of the one who concealed him, if they also, doing the things said by Jesus, do not hate him whom they do not know. (Hom. 8.7.1–2)

In other words, Peter argues that Jews and Gentiles have different teachers that are dedicated to them, and, though their teachings are “one teaching” (μία διδασκαλία, Hom. 8.6.2), they are nonetheless different, containing different legal expectations for their different audiences.11 Those who follow the teachings of one teacher are not condemned for not knowing the other, provided that they do not hate the other.

The means of loving God that Peter promotes to his Gentile audience, which appear in the greatest concentration in speeches to the Gentiles of Tyre, Sidon, and Tripolis in Hom. 7.4.2, 7.8.1, and 8.19.1, 3 respectively, are thus those legal requirements that have been proclaimed by

---

11 It is for this reason that Jews likely do not need to be baptized, according to the Homilies. See chapter 3 n. 109.
Jesus as necessary for Gentiles. The worship (θρησκεία) promoted by these sections bears much resemblance to another set of teachings directed at a Gentile audience, that of the Apostolic Decree (Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25). The middle chapters of the Acts of the Apostles describes a conflict present among the members of the Jesus movement around the question of the legal requirements for its new Gentile members. Some in the community argued that they should be circumcised and instructed to keep the whole Torah (cf. Acts 15:1, 5), while others argued that they could be admitted into the community as Gentiles, without requiring them to observe the Jewish Law. According to Acts, the proponents of these various positions were called to Jerusalem to defend their cases. At the conclusion of discussions, James, the leader of the Jerusalem community, advocates a compromise: “Therefore, I judge that we should not bother those from the Gentiles who are turning to God, but to send to them, that they abstain from the pollutions of idols, and from sexual immorality, and from anything strangled, and from blood” (διό ἐγὼ κρίνω μὴ παρενοχλεῖν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἑθνῶν ἐπιστρέφουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ἀλλὰ ἐπιστεύλαι αὐτοῖς τὸ ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἀληθινῶν τῶν εἰδώλων καὶ τῆς πορνείας καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος, Acts 15:19–20).

Parallels between the Apostolic Decree and the passages of the Homilies noted above have long been observed by scholars. These parallels are not only in content, but also in form.


This becomes apparent when they are presented beside one another. Consider, for example, the parallels between Acts 15:20 and Hom. 7.8.1–2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts 15:20</th>
<th>Hom. 7.8.1–2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>But to send to them, that they abstain from the pollutions of idols, and from sexual immorality, and from anything strangled, and from blood.</td>
<td>The worship ordained by him is this: To worship him alone, and to believe in the Prophet of Truth alone, and to be baptized for the forgiveness of sins, and thus, through this most holy dipping, to be reborn to God by saving water, to not share of the table of demons (I mean of meat sacrificed to idols, dead things, strangled things, things caught by wild beasts, blood), to not live impurely, to wash after intercourse with a woman, for women themselves, to also keep watch over menstruation, for all to be chaste, to do good, to not do evil, to expect eternal life from the God who is able to do all things, asking with prayer and continual supplications that they may receive it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general outline is the same in both texts: Both prohibit the consumption of meat sacrificed to idols, “anything strangled” (πνικτόν), and blood. The Apostolic Decree’s use of “blood” may not only be a reference consuming blood, but also to shedding human blood, based on the double prohibition of consuming and shedding blood given to Noah after the Flood (Gen 9:4–6).14

Another parallel, which is not present in Hom. 7.8.1–2 but is present in Hom. 7.4.2, is the use of the same verb, ἀπεχω, for “abstain” (cf. also Hom. 9.23.2). These overlaps have caused some

---

14 This is the case made by Zellentin, Law Beyond Isreal, 63. See the next section.
scholars to argue that the Apostolic Decree and these passages from the *Homilies* are based on a common tradition. If that is the case, then the intention of the two is also likely the same: both the passages from Acts and from the *Homilies* delineate the legal requirements for Gentiles joining the Jesus movement.

The main difference between the Apostolic Decree and the passages of the *Homilies* is their scope. The *Homilies*’ material is much more expansive. In addition to the prohibitions of the Apostolic Decree, *Hom.* 7.4.2 also contains a prohibition on eating carrion and an exhortation to observe practices of ritual purification; *Hom.* 7.8.1–2 does the same while expanding the lists of prohibited foods even further; and *Hom.* 8.19.1, 3 is the most expansive, adding the practice of magic to the list of actions that allow for demonic possession.

These expansions, however, may be less extensive than it appears at first glance, at least with respect to the speeches in *Hom.* 7. Regarding food laws, Jürgen Wehnert has argued that Acts’ πνικτόν is meant to encompass all the food laws that are given to the *gerim* in Lev 17:15. If Wehnert is right, the πνικτόν of Acts would include not just strangled animals, but also carrion and that which has been torn by wild beasts (cf. Lev 17:15)—both of which are included in the *Homilies*’ list of food laws (see *Hom.* 7.8.1 above).

---

15 See Molland, “La circoncision,” 28, and Wehnert, *Die Reinheit*, 183–86. Both Molland and Wehnert reject the possibility that the *Homilies* is based on Acts directly because, they argue, the authors of the *Homilies* and its sources would not have accepted Acts and its elevation of Paul. On the *Homilies*’ attitude toward Paul, see nn. 10 and 37 in the Introduction.

16 See the discussion of ἀπολοίω and λῆμα in chapter 2 above.

17 See Wehnert, *Die Reinheit*, 221–28. Wehnert argues that the use of “strangled,” which does not appear in Lev 17:15, is based on material preserved in the corresponding verse of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. (See Wehnert’s discussion of the dating of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan in Wehnert, *Die Reinheit*, 216–19.) See below on the laws for the *gerim* as the basis for the Apostolic Decree.
Additionally, a number of scholars have argued that the Apostolic Decree’s πορνεία is not absent from Hom. 7.4.2 and 7.8.1–2, but has instead been interpreted positively to include washing after menstruation and intercourse.18 In his analysis of these passages, Einar Molland goes so far as to argue that the Homilies’ interpretation of πορνεία in this way would have been closer to its intended meaning in the Apostolic Decree.19 Several scholars have challenged this proposition, most forcefully A.F.J. Klijn, who argues that “The meaning of πορνεία in the sense of sexual impurity has no parallel.”20 However, as we noted in the last chapter, one of the reasons that the Homilies promotes washing after menstruation is to prevent the violation the law against engaging in intercourse during menstruation (cf. Hom. 11.28.1; Lev 18:19; 20:18). Intercourse during menstruation very much fell under the category of πορνεία,21 and thus it is not unreasonable to consider the Homilies’ command keep guard over menstruation as a necessary means of preventing πορνεία. The command to wash after intercourse is more difficult to fit into the category of πορνεία, but may have been included due to the similarity of its means of purification with washing after menstruation.22

Thus, the expansions to the Apostolic Decree in the speeches of Hom. 7 are not expansions, but elaborations. The Apostolic Decree’s πυκτόν likely encompassed the

---


22 Because a command to wash after intercourse was never given to the gerim in the Torah, its inclusion among laws intended for Gentiles is likely an innovation by the author of the Homilies. See the next section.
consumption of any animal that was slaughtered improperly, and thus, by including more food laws, the Homilies would have been making explicit what was already implicit in πνικτόν. Similarly, the Apostolic Decree’s πορνεία would likely have included intercourse during menstruation, and thus, the Homilies would have exhorted purifying oneself after menstruation in order to prevent intercourse from happening during that time. The inclusion of washing after intercourse is unusual in this context, as it does not fit the category of πορνεία, but it may have been included based on the similar purification rituals employed to be purified of menstrual defilement.

However, while everything in Hom. 7 (except washing after intercourse) can be accounted for by a comparison to the Apostolic Decree, there are still other legal expectations that the Homilies places on its Gentile audience that do not appear in the Apostolic Decree. In Hom. 8.19.1, 3, for instance, God allows demons to possess not only those who commit idolatry, violate food laws, murder, and commit adultery, but also anyone who practices magic. Outside of these three passages, as I noted in chapter three, the Homilies also considers other grave sins to lead to demonic possession, including blasphemy, hatred, theft, greed, swearing falsely, and lying. The Homilies is not unique in considering abstaining from these actions a legal requirement for Gentiles; a few of them also appear in another list of Gentile legal expectations, that of the rabbinic Noahide Laws. The parallels between the Homilies and the Noahide Laws are not formal, as they were with the Apostolic Decree, but their overlaps in content support the suggestion that the Homilies was determining its legal requirements for Gentiles, just like the apostles and the rabbis.

The rabbinic Noahide Laws differ from the Apostolic Decree and the Homilies in that they delineate legal requirements for Gentiles outside the community. In other words, while the
Apostolic Decree and the *Homilies* determine the legal requirements for Gentiles joining the Jesus movement, the Noahide Laws instead look outward, considering those laws that apply to Gentiles outside of rabbinic Judaism.\(^{23}\) Despite this difference, all three texts nevertheless make a distinction between the legal requirements for Jews and for Gentiles, and thus the Noahide Laws provide a valuable point of comparison.

In *t. 'Abod. Zar.* 9:4, the rabbis describe seven laws that they determined to apply to “the sons of Noah,” i.e., to Gentiles: “The sons of Noah were commanded concerning seven commands: concerning courts, foreign worship, cursing the name, uncovering nakedness, shedding blood, theft, and [consuming] the limb of a living animal” (על שם מתוות מב נמה לע).\(^{24}\) This list contains most of the elements of the Apostolic Decree, though it is more lenient on some counts; it contains idolatry (“foreign worship”), the violation of sexual laws (“uncovering nakedness”),\(^{25}\) the violation of certain food laws (here, only consuming “the limb of a living animal”), and “shedding blood” (without a reference to consuming blood).\(^{26}\) Two of the remaining three items

---


\(^{24}\) This text is based off the Erfurt manuscript; see Moses Samuel Zuckerman, ed., *Tosephta: Based on the Erfurt and Vienna Codices*, new ed. (Jerusalem: Wahrmann Books, 1970), 473.

\(^{25}\) “To uncover nakedness” (חללות רשיה) is used euphemistically throughout Lev 18 and 20 to describe prohibited sexual practices, and the rabbis adopted the phrase to refer to all the transgressions of Lev 18; see Zellentin, *Law Beyond Israel*, 71 and 71n74.

\(^{26}\) The absence of consuming blood in the seven main Noahide Laws may be due to its interpretation of the phrase שָׁם וְשָׁפַנְבִּין רשׂבָךְא, which appears in Gen 9:4. While the Apostolic Decree, likely working from the Septuagint’s “But you will not eat flesh with the blood of life” (*πλὴν κρέας ἐν σώματι ψυχῆς οὐ φάγεσθε*), interpreted this phrase to refer to the consumption of blood, the rabbis interpreted this phrase as referring to consuming the limb of a living being. See the next section, as well as Zellentin, *Law Beyond Israel*, 71 and 71n74. However, it seems that at least some rabbinic authorities held the consumption of blood to be prohibited for Gentiles; see the position of R. Hananya ben Gamliel below.
on the list of Noahide Laws are suggestive when compared to the *Homilies*. Though the *Homilies* nowhere mentions the establishment of a legal system, both the *Homilies* and the Noahide Laws bar Gentiles from blasphemy (“cursing the name”; cf. *Hom.* 11.9.6; 14.5.5; 15.10.3; 16.20.4) and from theft (cf. *Hom.* 7.4.4; 8.23.2; 10.6.3; 11.5.1).

After the delineation of these seven laws, the Tosefta continues by discussing further prohibitions attributed to individual authorities, two of which also overlap with the *Homilies*. In the first of these, Rabbi Hananya ben Gamliel argues that consuming “the blood of a living animal” (ְם על) is also forbidden for Gentiles. Rabbi Hananya is thus in agreement with both the Apostolic Decree and the *Homilies* in prohibiting the consumption of blood for Gentiles. Later in the Tosefta, Rabbis Simon and Yosei forbid the practice of sorcery (סיפשכה) among the Gentiles, the latter appealing to Deut 18:10–12 in making this case. On this point, these rabbis agree with the *Homilies* in forbidding the practice of magic among Gentiles (cf. *Hom.* 4.20.3; 8.19.3; 9.4.1–2, 7.2; 17.12.6).

Though there are significant differences between the three, the overlaps between the Apostolic Decree, Noahide Laws, and the *Homilies* suggest that the *Homilies* does not promote the observance of the entirety of the Jewish Law among its readership, but, like those other texts, only encourages the observance of those laws that are relevant for Gentiles. As argued by Karin Hedner Zetterholm, the *Homilies*

preserves and transmits a Pauline–Acts position on non-Jews in including them in the people of God without requiring them to become Jews. Like Paul and the author of Acts, the *Homilies* stand in continuity with a strand of tradition from Second Temple times that saw the salvation of non-Jews as a Jewish mission and responsibility, but maintained that they could be saved as gentiles, provided they abandon the worship of many gods and turn to the God of Israel.  

Though it comes to different conclusions than both the Apostolic Decree and the Noahide Laws, then, the Homilies seems to have been participating in a conversation that was taking place among Jews and Christians in late antiquity concerning the legal requirements of Gentiles.

**Precedents for Gentile Legal Requirements in the Torah**

Though the Apostolic Decree, the Rabbinic Noahide Laws, and the Homilies are united in their attempts to delineate Gentile legal requirements, they differ concerning the content of those legal requirements. That there was some debate surrounding this is demonstrable from the discussion in t. ‘Abod. Zar. 9:4, which, while seven laws are listed as the commandments for the sons of Noah, includes additional material from various authorities.\(^{28}\) However, the substantial overlap between them suggest that there was a common basis for each of their laws, even if each community (and indeed, individuals or schools within those communities) interpreted that basis differently. In a recent publication, Holger M. Zellentin has suggested that this relatively consistent set of “gentile laws”\(^{29}\) that was put forth by Jews and Christians between the time of the Torah and the Qur’an were based on two passages of the Torah in particular: the double prohibition of consuming and shedding blood in Gen 9:4–6, and the Torah’s gerim (םירג) laws.

The double prohibition of Genesis occurs at the conclusion of the Flood narrative in Gen 9:4–6. God tells Noah and his sons to be fruitful and multiply, and gives them permission to consume the earth’s animals. However, God forbids them from engaging in two actions. First,

---

\(^{28}\) Cf. also b. Sanh. 56b, in which the “school of Manasseh” provides a different set of seven Noahide commandments: idolatry, illicit sexual relations, murder, theft, a limb torn from a living animal, castration, and “mixed kinds” (םיאלכ). See Hayes, *What’s Divine About Divine Law?*, 362–63.

\(^{29}\) Zellentin defines “gentile law” as “the observances of non-Israelites whose salvation, according to Jews, Christians, and early Muslims, depended on following a specific ‘gentile’ subset of biblical law that shaped late antique legal thought and thereby contributed to the foundation of Islamic law”; Zellentin, *Law Beyond Israel*, 3.
they are not permitted to consume blood: “However, you shall not eat flesh with its life, i.e., its blood” (אָרְבְּשָׁל בֵּיתְשָׁר דֶּמֶר לא אַעְכל, Gen 9:4). This command is immediately followed by a note that, if a person is killed, their death must be avenged:

    But I will require a reckoning for the blood of your life, from every beast I will require it, and from human beings, each one for the blood of another, I will require a reckoning for the human soul. Whoever sheds the blood of a person, that person’s blood will be shed by a person, for God made humanity in his own image. (Gen 9:5–6)  

Because these laws are given to Noah and his sons, they can be, and have been, understood to apply to all humanity, not just to Jews. Indeed, Zellentin argues that the Apostolic Decree’s exhortation for Gentiles to “abstain from … blood” is a reference to this double prohibition, meaning that it would prohibit both the consumption of blood and the spilling of (human) blood.  

This double prohibition is not the only basis for later Gentile legal expectations; Zellentin argues that the laws for the gerim, particularly those of Leviticus 17–26, were also drawn on for this purpose. The Torah used the term gerim to describe foreigners, non-Israelites, who were living in the land of Israel, and applied some laws to them as well as to Israelites.  

By the Second Temple period, however, the meaning of ger had shifted to refer to Jewish proselytes, and thus the gerim laws, or some portion thereof, were frequently considered to apply to Gentiles.

---

30 This translation based on the one done by Zellentin, Law Beyond Israel, 42.

31 Zellentin, Law Beyond Israel, 63. By contrast, this was not the case for the rabbinic Noahide Laws, since the rabbis interpreted אָרְבְּשָׁל בֵּיתְשָׁר דֶּמֶר לא אַעְכל as a prohibition on consuming the “limb of a living being,” not a prohibition on consuming blood generally. See n. 26. With that said, at least one rabbinic authority, R. Hananya ben Gamliel, argued that Gentiles were also prohibited from consuming blood. See the discussion of the Noahide Laws above.

32 I will bracket the discussion of who the ger were, but for some resources on the matter, see Zellentin, Law Beyond Israel, 36n4.
who joined Jewish communities.\textsuperscript{33} This seems to have been the case for the Apostolic Decree, which bears much resemblance to the laws of Lev 17–18, as many scholars have noted.\textsuperscript{34} The Apostolic Decree’s prohibition of meat sacrificed to idols likely goes back to Lev 17:7–9; the prohibition on sexual immorality, to the various sexual prohibitions in Lev 18 (including intercourse during menstruation, Lev 18:19); the prohibition on consuming “strangled things,” to Lev 17:15–16; and the prohibition on the consumption of blood/shedding of blood to Gen 9:4–6, also given to the \textit{gerim} in Lev 17:10–14. Because Lev 17:15–16 forbids the consumption of carrion and “what has been torn” (הפרט, translated in the Septuagint as \textit{θηριάλωτον}, cf. \textit{Hom. 7.8.1}), Jürgen Wehnert has argued that the Apostolic Decree’s use of “strangled thing” (\textit{πνικτόν}) is meant to encompass all the food laws of Lev 17:15–16.\textsuperscript{35}

Though Lev 17:15–16 does not outright prohibit the consumption of carrion and “what has been torn” for Israelites or the \textit{gerim}, instead requiring them to wash afterward, by the Second Temple period, some Jews understood the consumption of carrion and “what has been torn” to be prohibited for both Jews and proselytes. This position was the result of a harmonization of Lev 17:15–16 and Deut 14:21, the former of which permitted the consumption of carrion among Israelites and \textit{gerim} but required purification afterward, and the latter which forbade the consumption of carrion among the Israelites but permitted it to be eaten by the \textit{gerim}.

\textsuperscript{33} This seems to have been the case for the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint, the latter of which translated \textit{ger} with προσήλυτος in Lev 17–26. On the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Carmen Palmer, \textit{Converts in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Gēr and Mutable Ethnicity} (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 186–90, and on the Septuagint, see Zellentin, \textit{Law Beyond Israel}, 50. To what extent “proselytes” adopted Jewish beliefs and customs is debated, but on the range of options, see Shaye J.D. Cohen, \textit{The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties}, Hellenistic Culture and Society 31 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999), esp. 1–10, 109–238.


\textsuperscript{35} Wehnert, \textit{Die Reinheit}, 213–38. See n. 17.
The legal tension between these two verses was partially alleviated by the Septuagint, which translated *ger* in Leviticus with προσήλυτος (proselyte) and *ger* in Deuteronomy with πάροικος (sojourner). The Septuagint, then, understood the consumption of carrion to be permitted for both the proselyte and the sojourner, though the proselyte would have been required to wash afterward. However, among other Jews in the Second Temple period, these two verses were harmonized further; the Temple Scroll, for example, noting that Israelites are forbidden from eating carrion in Deut 14:21 and that Israelites and *gerim* were both expected to wash after consuming carrion in Lev 17:15–16, decided that consuming carrion was forbidden for both Jews and proselytes (cf. 11QTα 6–7). It is a tradition similar to this that the Apostolic Decree seems to have been building on.

According to Zellentin, the rabbinic Noahide Laws drew from a wider base, looking throughout Lev 17–26 to determine its Gentile laws. He attributes the injunctions not included in the Apostolic Decree, blasphemy and theft, to Lev 24:16 and 19:11 and 13, respectively. For the supplements to the Noahide Laws credited to individual rabbinic authorities, he attributes Rabbi Hidqa’s prohibition on castration to Lev 22:24, Rabbi Simon’s prohibition of sorcery to

---


38 This was not the case for the rabbis, however, who did not harmonize the two verses, instead creating two categories of *ger*: the *ger tzedek*, a full convert to Judaism, and the *ger toshab*, a Gentile who adopts some Jewish beliefs and practices (though which ones depends on who is asked; cf. b. *Abod. Zar.* 64b). See Zellentin, *Law Beyond Israel*, 66–67.

39 As Zellentin admits, his explanation for the origin of the Noahide Laws differs from that of the later Amoraim, who mainly appealed to Gen 2–6. See b. *Sanh.* 56a–60b and Zellentin, *Law Beyond Israel*, 70n72.

40 Zellentin, *Law Beyond Israel*, 70–71. Zellentin does not account for the command to designate courts.
Lev 20:6 and 27, and Rabbi Elazar’s prohibition to crossbreed animals to Lev 19:19. If I were to do the same with the *Homilies’* Gentile legal requirements, I could attribute the prohibition on “hating those whom it is not right to hate” (μισεῖν οὐς μὴ δίκαιον, *Hom.* 8.23.2) to Lev 19:17–18, the prohibition on “swearing falsely” and “lying” (ἐπιορκῶν ἢ ψευδόμενος, *Hom.* 15.10.3) to Lev 19:11–12, and the prohibition on “greed” (πλεονεκτεῖν, *Hom.* 11.27.3) to the various injunctions to leave the edges of the field for the poor and the alien (Lev 19:9–10) and keeping the wages of a laborer until morning (Lev 19:13).

I would hesitate in making these attributions definitively, however, mainly due to their reliance on Lev 19. Though Zellentin draws on Lev 19 to explain the origin of some of the Noahide Laws and their supplements (particularly theft and crossbreeding), it should be noted that it is nowhere indicated that the laws of Lev 19 apply to the gerim; indeed, Lev 19:2 states that the audience is “the whole congregation of the sons of Israel” (תדע־לכ לערשׂי־ינב), with no mention of the gerim. If Lev 19 was drawn on to develop the Noahide Laws, then the rabbis would have done so without including the injunction to keep the Sabbath in Lev 19:30. That is not to say that the rabbis and the *Homilies* could not have drawn from Lev 19 when developing their Gentile legal requirements; rather, if they did, there must have been other considerations regarding the inclusion of certain legal requirements, such as the prohibitions on theft and crossbreeding, and the omission of others, such as the observance of the Sabbath.

Other considerations are also necessary to explain the common omission of corpse defilement, for which Num 19:10 necessitated purification rituals for both Israelites and gerim. Zellentin explains the disappearance of corpse defilement by arguing that the method of its

41 Zellentin, *Law Beyond Israel*, 73.
purification was no longer possible after the destruction of the Temple: “Such purification became impossible when the ashes of the Red Heifer became unprocurable at some point after the destruction of the Temple.”

Thus, by the early fourth century, it became impossible for either Jews or proselytes to become pure of corpse defilement—and it is not impossible that certain communities, like that of the Homilies, stopped having access to the ashes of the red heifer prior to that point.

Despite these issues, however, I still believe there is merit to Zellentin’s argument. While there were likely additional factors that went into determining the Gentile legal requirements, there nonetheless seems to have been a broad conversation during and after the Second Temple period regarding these legal requirements. These were not self-evident, however, and thus different communities of Jews and Christians came to different conclusions regarding its content.

This is evident from the Syriac translator’s reception of the Homilies. The Greek Homilies’ injunction to wash after intercourse is odd in the context of the gerim laws, as the Torah never instructs the gerim to wash after intercourse; this injunction is given solely to Israelites in Lev 15:18. Yet, the Homilies presents it as a requirement for its Gentile audience. If the Homilies indeed limits itself to those laws that apply to the gerim, then this one is an outlier.

Why the Homilies includes this injunction among its laws for Gentiles is uncertain. It

42 Zellentin, Law Beyond Israel, 41. This is also the explanation given by Methodius of Olympus; cf. Blidstein, Purity, Community, and Ritual, 100–101.


44 The Homilies may also have rejected the use of the ashes of the red heifer for purification as part of its rejection of sacrifices.

45 Karin Hedner Zetterholm argues that “The addition in the Homilies is restricted to extending to gentiles the commandment to wash after intercourse, prescribed in Lev 15:18 for Israelites but not for gerim.” Zetterholm, “Jewish Teachings for Gentiles,” 73–74.
may have to do with the novel’s perspective on semen; since it constitutes heart defilement for those who are conceived by it, the Homilies may also consider it defiling in body for all who contact it, including Gentiles.\footnote{See the discussion of conception defilement in chapter 3 above.}

Whatever the reason for its inclusion, its absence from the laws for the gerim may explain why the Syriac translator opted to remove it. As we noted in chapter three, the Syriac translator removed two references to the defilement of seminal emission, replacing them with general exhortations not to engage in intercourse except for procreation, but retained the defilement of menstrual blood. The reason for this, I speculate, is the relation of these injunctions to the gerim laws. Since the Torah forbids intercourse during menstruation not only for Israelites but also for the gerim (cf. Lev 18:19; 20:18), the injunction to wash after menstruation is retained to prevent this possibility. However, since the defilement of intercourse is never stipulated for the gerim, Syriac translator removed it as irrelevant for its Gentile readers.

**Conclusion**

Thus, the Homilies limits its injunctions to what it considered relevant to its Gentile audience, ignoring the bodily defilements of anything other than menstrual blood and seminal emission, including that from corpses, childbirth, and leprosy, as well as the observance of the Sabbath and circumcision. Like some Jews in the ancient world, the Homilies does not expect its Gentile audience to uphold the entirety of the Jewish Law, but only the portion of it that it considered to apply to them. By conceiving of the Law in this way, the Homilies participates in a broader conversation that was taking place among Jews and Christians in late antiquity regarding the legal requirements of Gentiles. This is reflected in the great deal of overlap that the Homilies
has with two other works that delineated Gentile legal requirements, the Apostolic Decree and the rabbinic Noahide Laws, despite their varying conclusions.

For the most part, these laws were based on the double prohibition on consuming and shedding blood in Gen 9:4–6 and the Torah’s gerim laws, as recently argued by Holger M. Zellentin. While I believe that Zellentin’s thesis is correct in broad strokes, there are some issues with it, particularly regarding his use of Lev 19 to justify some of the laws and the omission of corpse defilement for the gerim. Nevertheless, the Homilies interacts with this material in ways similar to the Apostolic Decree and the Noahide Laws, using these laws as a base, but rejecting some out of other considerations. For the most part, then, the Homilies’ legal exhortations are limited to the laws contained in Lev 17–26. The major exception is the injunction to wash after intercourse, which the Torah never commands for the gerim. Though the reason that for its inclusion in the Greek Homilies is uncertain, I would argue that its absence from the gerim laws was the likely motivation for its removal by the Syriac translator.
CONCLUSION

JEWSIH LAW, GENTILE LAW, NATURAL LAW

In this dissertation, I made three broad arguments. First, I argued that investigations of the Pseudo-Clementine Literature have been greatly impacted by broader understandings of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity, to the detriment of its study. The need to explain the coexistence of “Jewish” and “Christian” elements in the Pseudo-Clementines has led to its endless partitioning, with “Jewish-Christian” elements being sequestered to one literary layer or another, all in the service of fitting it into a predetermined historical narrative. This scholarly inclination has abetted in the last fifty years, both due to better tools of analysis, such as those used by Josep Rius-Camps and Jürgen Wehnert, and to better understandings of history, which see Judaism and Christianity not as discrete entities that “parted ways” but whose boundaries continued to be fuzzy even up to the fourth century. Based on these advancements, in this dissertation, I opted to look at the subject of purity in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies, operating under the assumption that its final redactor(s) had a unified vision and thus compiled and edited sources to fit that vision.

Building upon the work of scholars who challenged the “parting of the ways” model, I then proceeded to argue that the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies utilizes a Jewish framework for understanding purity in which purity is divided into two domains, one relating to purity of the body, and the other relating to purity of the heart. Chapters 2–4 were devoted to delineating the differences between those two domains. The most significant of these differences are the ways in which these states of purity are defiled and the means by which those defilements are removed.
Bodily defilement, the *Homilies* argues, comes from menstrual blood and seminal emission, while heart defilement comes from sin, the demons who are permitted to invade one’s person as a result of that sin, and one’s carnal conception through desire, semen, and blood. Bodily defilement is removed by a repeatable rite of purification that may need to be performed prior to community meals and prayer, but must be performed prior to intercourse in the case of menstrual defilement. Heart defilement, by contrast, is removed via an extensive process involving education and ascetic practices and culminating in baptism. If one sins following this purification, the ritual cannot be repeated, and one must rely on the possibility of purification through God’s punishment.

Finally, I argued that, though the *Homilies* interprets purity through a Jewish framework, its exhortations are directed squarely at Gentiles. Thus, the *Homilies* never advocates for observances that it considers to be irrelevant to such readers, particularly washing after being defiled by corpses, leprosy, or childbirth, observing the Sabbath, or being circumcised. The *Homilies* was not alone in advocating for the observance of only a subset of Jewish Laws for Gentiles; such a position was also advocated by the apostles and the rabbis. Thus, though its conclusions differ from those of the Apostolic Decree and the Noahide Laws, the *Homilies* nonetheless participates in a broader Jewish conversation regarding Gentile legal requirements and attempts to delineate a “Jewish Law for Gentiles.”

The research that I have undertaken here has raised a number of other questions that merit further study. The *Homilies’* inclusion of washing after intercourse among its Gentile legal requirements is an odd addition, one for which I cannot provide a satisfactory explanation. Such a practice is never given to the *gerim* in the Torah, and thus it must arise from other
considerations. What those considerations were, I can only speculate. Perhaps the *Homilies* belonged to a Jewish tradition that considered washing after intercourse necessary for Gentiles, or perhaps it was an innovation on the part of the *Homilies*. More research would need to be done on the attitudes of both the *Homilies* and late antique Syria more broadly toward sex and semen in order to address this question. At any rate, the fact that it was controversial is demonstrated by the reaction of the Syriac translator, who removed it but nevertheless retained the requirement to wash after menstruation.

This dissertation has focused on the *Homilies*’ relationship to late antique Jews and Christians, but the subjects broached here also have much to say regarding the *Homilies*’ attitude toward broader intellectual currents in Greek philosophy and medicine. The *Homilies* seems to have specific conceptions of the body, the soul/mind, and their relationship to one another, and it polemicizes against Hippocratic conceptions of disease in order to forward its own thesis that demons cause disease. One particular point of further research could regard the interpretation of *Hom.* 10.6.2, whose meaning is obscure thanks to the manuscript variants. If we retain P’s τῆς ψυχῆς in the verse, partially retained in O but omitted in the Syriac, then the human person would appear to have two souls, an animal one and a human one, and the human one departs at the moment of sin. If we accept the Syriac’s rendering, then it seems that the soul would devolve instead. Determining which option is to be preferred would require a deeper investigation of the *Homilies*’ conception of the soul and broader understandings of it in the ancient world.

Another interesting note concerns the *Homilies*’ attitude toward epistemology. The *Homilies* believes that education is necessary in the process of purifying the heart, as I argued in

---

1 See chapter 3 n. 51.
chapters 3 and 4, because of the ways that the person has been deceived into believing incorrect notions of God and of the world. While education is the means by which this knowledge is accessible to most people, Peter also notes that this knowledge can be revealed to a person. This is something that he experienced himself when Jesus asked him, “Who do you say that I am?”

He states:

> And as I was listening to others telling him another thing, it arose in my heart—I really do not know how I said it—“You are the Son of the living God.” But he, blessing me, informed me that it was the Father who revealed it to me, and afterward I learned that revelation is learning without teaching, vision, or dreams. And this is the truth. For the whole truth is in the [heart\(^2\)] that was placed in us by God when it was made, but it is covered and revealed by God’s hand, who causes each one’s knowing according to their worth. (Hom. 17.18.1–3)\(^3\)

For Peter, then, human beings already have the truth within them, but knowledge of that truth is concealed or revealed by God based on the person’s merits. The idea that one already knows the truth latent within them is reminiscent of Platonic philosophy, and thus, though the Homilies disparages Greek paideia, it nevertheless borrows from it on this point.

I conclude with a final note about the Homilies’ attitude toward the Law. The novel separates revelations between those of Moses and those of Jesus, both of which are targeted toward specific audiences, the former to Jews and the latter to Gentiles. However, the Homilies also maintains that its teachings belong to the natural law, one that a person could arrive to if they used their reason. Peter expresses a version of this at the end of his speech in Tyre:

> Thus, each of you can apprehend what is good if you reason such things with yourself: You do not want to be murdered, do not murder another; you do not want your wife to be

---

\(^2\) Heart is absent from the text, but O contains room for 5–6 letters where this word should be, and given that this word is feminine (its article is τῇ) and that Peter had just stated that the revelation “arose in my heart” (ἐπὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ ᾧ ἔστη), καρδίᾳ seems like the best option. In the ANF, James Donaldson opts for “soul,” but also lists “heart,” “breath,” and “spirit” as possibilities. See ANF 8:323 and 323n11.

\(^3\) Cf. also Hom. 18.6.3.
adultered by another, do not commit adultery with another’s wife; you do not want one of your things to be stolen, do not steal anything from another. (Hom. 7.4.4)

By reasoning in this way, one would not need the teachings of either Moses or Jesus, as Peter argues to his disciples later in Tripolis: “For there would have been no need for Moses or the coming of Jesus if they wanted to apprehend what is reasonable by themselves” (οὔτε γὰρ ἂν Μωυσέως οὔτε τῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ παρουσίας χρεία ἢν, εἴπερ ἂφ’ ἑαυτῶν τὸ εὖλογον νοεῖν ἐβούλοντο, Hom. 8.5.4). The Law that the Homilies advocates, then, is more than the “Jewish Law for Gentiles”; it is, in fact, the natural law, the determination of the εὖλογον, which would be accessible to all if not for all the sin and demonic activity that clouds the senses. As it stands, the natural law is not accessible to most, and thus they are in need of a teacher, the True Prophet, who can open the door to the smoke-filled house and reveal the truth to them. In this way, the Homilies’ readers can have their names written in the heavens and enter the Kingdom of God.
APPENDIX A

PLOT OF THE PSEUDO-CLEMENTINE *HOMILIES*
Outline

Introduction to Clement (Hom. 1)
Clement narrates his questions about the eternity of the soul and of the world (Hom. 1.1–5).
He hears about Jesus (Hom. 1.6–7).
He leaves for Caesarea, but is blown off course and spends time in Alexandria (Hom. 1.8–14).
He arrives in Caesarea and meets Peter. Peter teaches him about the True Prophet. Clement is convinced of the teaching and expresses his unshakeable faith (Hom. 1.15–22).

Sojourn in Caesarea (Hom. 2–3)
Peter delivers a discourse on the True Prophet and the Doctrine of the Pairs (Hom. 2.5–34).
This discourse is interrupted by a discussion with Nicetas and Aquila about Simon Magus (Hom. 2.18–32).
He then delivers a second discourse on the Doctrine of False Pericopes (Hom. 2.38–52).
The next day, Peter delivers a third discourse that combines elements from the previous day’s discourses (Hom. 3.2–28).
Afterward, Peter engages in a debate with Simon Magus concerning the contradictions of scripture (Hom. 3.30–57).
After three days of debate, Simon flees (Hom. 3.58).
Peter delivers a discourse to the inhabitants of Caesarea concerning church administration (Hom. 3.59–72).
Peter, detained by baptisms, sends Clement, Nicetas, and Aquila ahead of him to Tyre (Hom. 3.73).

Clement’s Debates with Appion in Tyre (Hom. 4–6)
Clement and his comrades are informed of Simon’s activities in Tyre (Hom. 4.4–5).
Simon flees, leaving behind Appion Pleistonices, an old friend of Clement’s family (Hom. 4.6).
Clement and Appion agree to engage in debate (Hom. 4.8).
Clement delivers a discourse against Greek paideia (Hom. 4.9–23).
Appion, offended by the discourse, agrees to combat it the next day (Hom. 4.24–25).
Appion does not arrive the next day due to illness (Hom. 5.1).
Clement tells the crowd that has gathered about a prank that he had pulled on Appion when he was younger (Hom. 5.2–29).
Clement had pretended to be in love with a married Jewish woman (Hom. 5.2).
Appion suggested winning her by magic, but Clement rejected this and told Appion he wanted to persuade her (Hom. 5.3–9).
Appion wrote a letter defending adultery (Hom. 5.10–19).
Clement, pretending to be the married Jewish woman, wrote a response (Hom. 5.20–26).
Clement revealed the ruse, angering Appion (Hom. 5.27–29).
In the present day, Clement and the crowd go to visit Appion. Appion promises to appear the following day (Hom. 5.30).
The next day, Appion discourses on the metaphorical nature of Greek myths (Hom. 6.1–10).
Clement, who has heard such arguments before, continues them (Hom. 6.11–16).
He then argues against them (Hom. 6.17–25).
Peter’s arrival cuts the debate between Clement and Appion short (*Hom.* 6.26).

**Peter’s Discourses along the Syrian Coast** (*Hom.* 7)
Peter discourses to the people of Tyre about how they can be delivered from evil, baptizing them afterward (*Hom.* 7.2–5).
Peter delivers a similar discourse to the people of Sidon (*Hom.* 7.6–8).
Simon accuses Peter of causing an earthquake in Beirut; Peter uses Simon’s accusation to win the people to his side (*Hom.* 7.9–11).
Peter stops in Byblos before proceeding to Tripolis (*Hom.* 7.12).

**Tripolis Discourses** (*Hom.* 8–11)
Before going out to the people of Tripolis, Peter gives a short note to his disciples regarding the equivalence of the teachings of Moses and Jesus (*Hom.* 8.4–7).
He then delivers four discourses:
- On the first day, he discusses primordial history, including the origin of (some) demons (*Hom.* 8.9–23).
- On the third and through much of the fourth, Peter focuses on common arguments for idolatry (*Hom.* 10.3–25; 11.2–18).
- Peter concludes the fourth discourse with discussions of baptism (*Hom.* 11.22–27) and bodily purification (*Hom.* 11.28–33).
After three months in Tripolis, Clement and the inhabitants of Caesarea are baptized (*Hom.* 11.35–36).

**Clement’s Recognition of his Mother and Brothers** (*Hom.* 12–13)
Peter sends Nicetas and Aquila ahead of him to stagger their entry into Laodicea (*Hom.* 12.1–3).
Clement tells Peter that his family—father, mother, and twin brothers—had disappeared when he was young (*Hom.* 12.8–10).
Peter and his disciples travel to the nearby island of Aradus to do some sightseeing (*Hom.* 12.12)
On the island, Peter meets a beggar woman with gnawed hands. She tells him how she had tried to escape the advances of her brother-in-law and, in the process, became separated from her husband and children (*Hom.* 12.15–18).
The woman turns out to be Clement’s mother, Mattidia, and the two are reunited. Peter heals Mattidia and her hostess of their ailments (*Hom.* 12.21–23).
Peter delivers a discourse on philanthropy (*Hom.* 12.25–33).
Peter, Clement, and Mattidia travel to Laodicea and meet up with Nicetas and Aquila (*Hom.* 13.1).
Nicetas and Aquila reveal themselves to be Clement’s twin brothers, Faustinus and Faustinianus (*Hom.* 13.2–3).
Peter explains their way of worship to Mattidia, and she requests to be baptized (*Hom.* 13.4–5).
Nicetas and Aquila reveal themselves to their mother (*Hom.* 13.6–8).
Peter denies Mattidia her baptism until she has performed a baptismal fast (*Hom.* 13.9–12).
Peter delivers a discourse to the family on chastity (*Hom.* 13.13–21).

*Clement's Recognition of his Father (Hom. 14–15)*
Mattidia is baptized, and Peter sends the family ahead of him before returning to celebrate the Eucharist (*Hom.* 14.1).
Peter explains his tardiness: He was detained by a debate with an old astronomer on fate. In the course of the debate, the old man reveals that Clement’s father, Faustus, is dead (*Hom.* 14.2–8).
The old astronomer then arrives, and the family recognizes him as Faustus (*Hom.* 14.9).
Faustus is still convinced of the power of fate, and Clement proposes a debate with Annubion the Diospolitan to convince his father (*Hom.* 14.11–12).
The next day, Peter and Faustus discuss the true worship (*Hom.* 15.1–11).

*Peter’s Debates with Simon in Laodicea (Hom. 16–19)*
Simon Magus appears in Laodicea to challenge Peter (*Hom.* 16.1).
Faustus volunteers to be the arbiter of the debate (*Hom.* 16.3–4).
Over the next four days, Peter and Simon debate:
On the first day, they discuss the veracity of scripture (*Hom.* 16.5–20).
On the second day, they discuss God’s form (*Hom.* 17.6–12) and the value of visions (*Hom.* 17.13–19).
On the third day, they discuss whether one can be good and just (*Hom.* 18.1–3) and the nature of revelation (*Hom.* 18.4–8). Simon professes his doctrine of a god higher than the Creator (*Hom.* 18.9 – 11), and Peter argues against it, at times appealing to the Doctrine of the False Pericopes (*Hom.* 18.12–23).
On the final day, they discuss the Evil One (*Hom.* 19.1–23).
Faustus declares Peter the winner of the debates (*Hom.* 19.24).
Peter’s disciple, Sophonias, asks for clarification regarding the Evil One (*Hom.* 19.25).

*Conclusion to the Novel (Hom. 20)*
Sophonias and the other disciples ask Peter their questions about the Evil One (*Hom.* 20.1–10).
Faustus hears of Appion and Annubion’s arrival, and asks that he be permitted to visit them (*Hom.* 20.11).
Faustus returns bearing Simon’s visage (*Hom.* 20.12).
Peter decides to use this to his advantage, and commands Faustus, as Simon, to go to Antioch and repent of the evil things Simon had said about Peter there (*Hom.* 20.18–20).
Faustus is successful, and the novel concludes with Peter and Clement travelling to Antioch (*Hom.* 20.23).
APPENDIX B

SOURCE-CRITICAL RECONSTRUCTIONS OF THE PSEUDO-CLEMENTINE LITERATURE
Adolph Hilgenfeld

Stages of the development of the Recollections

Kerygma Petrou, composed shortly after 70 CE
  Contents: Recog. 1–3, except for material related to Clement and some anti-Basilidean interventions

Periodoi Petrou, extension of Kerygma composed ~ 115–120 CE
  Contents: Recog. 4–6

Anagnorismoi, extension of Periodoi composed around the rise of Valentinianism (?)
  Contents: Recog. 7

Recognitions, extension of Anagnorismoi completed (perhaps) early third century

Hans Waitz

Stages of the development of the Grundschrift

Kerygmata Petrou, composed shortly after 135 CE
  Contents: EpPt, Diam., didactic material in Recog. 1–3 and Hom. 2–3, 16–20

Praxeis Petrou, independent work composed ~150 CE
  Contents: Peter’s pursuit of Simon

Anagnorismoi, independent pagan work adapted for the Christian novel
  Contents: Material relating to Clement and his family

Other sources: Dialogue of Clement and Appion, works of Bardaisan, other unnamed sources

Carl Schmidt

Sources for the Grundschrift

Kerygmata Petrou, same as Waitz
  Jewish apology
    Contents: Hom. 4–6 and Recog. 8–10

Anagnorismoi

Note: Schmidt attributes the material that Waitz attributes to the Praxeis Petrou to the Grundschrift author

Oscar Cullmann

Stages of the development of the Grundschrift

Kerygmata Petrou, same as Waitz, but adding Hom. 8.2–23; 9.1–23; 11.19–35; and Recog. 4.2–21; 6.1–15

Itinéraire de Pierre, extension of Kerygmata composed early third century
  Contents: Peter’s debate with Simon in Caesarea and his defeat in Laodicea (originally in Antioch)

Jewish Apology, independent source
  Contents: Much of Hom. 4–6; 10.6–11.18; Recog. 5.14–31; 8.1–10.52

Anagnorismoi, independent source
  Contents: Reunions of Nicetas and Aquila with their parents

Georg Strecker
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Sources of the *Grundschrift*

*Anabathmoi Jakobou II*, composed late second century
  Contents: *Recog.* 1.33–71

*Kerygmata Petrou*, composed early third century
  Contents: *EpPt*, *Diam.*, and didactic material conforming to these

Smaller sources, including one on salvation history (*Recog.* 1.27 – 32; 4.9 – 13), an anti-Marcionite source (*Recog.* 2.47–60), a Simon source, an ordination account (*Hom.* 3.60–72; *Recog.* 3.65–67), Bardaisan’s *On Fate*, a Greek philosophical source, and a catalogue of myths (*Recog.* 10.13–41)

**Jürgen Wehnert**

Stages of the development of the *Grundschrift*

*Peter-Simon Novella*, composed late second or early third century
  Contents: Peter’s pursuit of Simon, Tripolis Discourses

*Clementine Novel*, extension composed mid-third century
  Contents: Clement’s search for meeting and his reunion with his family

*Letter recast*, extension composed mid-third century
  Contents: Clement’s addresses to James, *EpPt*, *Diam.*, and *EpCl*
APPENDIX C

PURITY VOCABULARY IN THE PSEUDO-CLEMENTINE HOMILIES
### Κάθαρσις and its Cognates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Bodily Purity</th>
<th>Heart Purity</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κάθαρσις</td>
<td>4 instances: 11.2.1–2, 3.1, 28.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθαρός</td>
<td>3 instances: 11.29.2–3; 19.22.7</td>
<td>8 instances: 3.16.1, 26.3; 11.4.1, 16.5, 28.4, 29.4; 17.7.4, 17.5</td>
<td>2 instances: 8.22.4–23.1</td>
<td>12 instances: 2.16.4, 44.2; 3.45.3–4; 4.10.2; 6.7.3, 8.2; 8.15.4, 17.1, 17.4; 14.1.2; 20.9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθάριος</td>
<td>1 instance: 11.28.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθαίρω</td>
<td>2 instances: 11.29.4–30.1</td>
<td>4 instances: 11.2.3, 28.2; 16.21.2; 19.8.3</td>
<td>1 instance: 11.29.4</td>
<td>2 instances: 9.9.4; 10.23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθαρεύω</td>
<td>4 instances: 11.28.1–3; 13.16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκαθάρτως</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 instances: 7.8.2; 8.19.3; 13.4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Βάπτισμα and its Cognates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Bodily Purity</th>
<th>Heart Purity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βάπτισμα</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 instances: 3.29.3; 8.22.4; 11.26.3, 27.1; 13.10.3, 10.7 (2x), 11.2, 11.4, 12.2, 20.4; 14.2.1, 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀβάπτιστος</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 instances: 11.25.2; 13.21.2–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βαπτίζω</td>
<td>3 instances: 11.30.1 (2x), 33.4</td>
<td>32 instances: 1.22.5; 3.73.1–3; 7.5.1, 8.1, 12.2, 8.23.1; 9.23.2; 11.25.3, 26.1, 26.3 (2x), 27.1 (2x), 35.1, 36.2; 13.4.3, 5.1, 9.1–3, 10.4 (2x), 11.2, 12.1, 13.2, 21.3; 14.1.1–2; 17.7.1; 20.23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συμβαπτίζομαι</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 instance: 13.10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Further Purity Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Bodily Purity</th>
<th>Heart Purity</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Ambiguous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἁγνεία</td>
<td>6 instances: 11.28.3, 30.2–3 (3x), 33.4–5</td>
<td>1 instance: 9.23.2</td>
<td>1 instance: 3.26.4</td>
<td>1 instance: 2.45.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἁγνός</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 instance: 9.10.5</td>
<td>2 instances: 3.26.3; 7.8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἁγνεύω</td>
<td>1 instance: 11.28.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 instance: 11.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λούω</td>
<td>9 instances: 5.30.2; 7.8.2; 8.2.5; 9.23.3; 10.1.2, 26.2; 11.1.1; 14.1.2, 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπολούω</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 instance: 9.19.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 instance: 7.4.2, likely bodily purity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λουτρόν</td>
<td>1 instance: 11.28.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλύνω</td>
<td>1 instance: 11.28.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 instance: 10.23.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Defilement Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Bodily Defilement</th>
<th>Heart Defilement</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Ambiguous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>λῦμα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 instance: 7.4.2, likely bodily defilement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μιανός/μιάνω</td>
<td>9 instances:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 instance:</td>
<td>2 instances:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.22.5; 12.15.3;</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.22.2</td>
<td>8.17.1–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.19.3 (3x),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.5–6; 14.7.2;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μισσμός</td>
<td>2 instances:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.13.2, 14.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄμισαντος</td>
<td>1 instance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μυσαρός</td>
<td>4 instances:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.17.1, 20.1;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.19.6 (2x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μιμορός</td>
<td>4 instances:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.18.1; 8.23.1–2;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μολύνω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 instance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.24.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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