The Clementina: A Christian Response to the Pagan Novel

Author(s): M. J. Edwards

Source: *The Classical Quarterly*, 1992, 2, Vol. 42, No. 2 (1992), pp. 459-474

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/639423

Classical Quarterly **42** (ii) 459–474 (1992) *Printed in Great Britain*

THE *CLEMENTINA*: A CHRISTIAN RESPONSE TO THE PAGAN NOVEL

The *Clementine Recognitions* and *Clementine Homilies*, both of which evolved between the second and the fourth centuries after Christ, are treated all too frequently as material for historians, not for critics.[1] A book on the ancient novel is sufficiently erudite if the author shows that he has read them; the *Homilies* are omitted in a volume of translations under the title of *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*.[2] It might be said that this is as it should be, since the *Homilies* are largely what their title advertises, and even the *Recognitions* contain much that is extrinsic to the plot. By itself (it might be said) this threadbare plot holds little to engage us, and it is disposed of in a few pages in the works of Hägg and Perry.[3] My object is to show that this neglect is undeserved.

The *Clementina* share a narrative and much beside, but they differ so greatly, and both contain such manifest inconsistencies and thefts from extraneous sources that they would both appear to have undergone continual revision between the time of composition and the end of the fourth century, when they attained their present form.[4] This essay is concerned with what is common, and in particular with the narrative. It will be argued that this was not in origin, as has been held, a separate work by a pagan author, which has been arbitrarily added to an anthology of sermons; rather, it was conceived as the illustration of those doctrines which are repeatedly propounded in both the works that now survive. Directed to an audience that perhaps reserved more time for reading fiction than for sermons, this romance conspicuously neglects to use the resources of pagan novelists and finds no place for illusion, fate, deceit or erotic love.

One cannot attempt criticism of the *Clementina* without declaring some opinion as to the genesis of both works. This essay begins with a summary of the narrative and

[1] Texts and editions: T. Smith (trans.), *Pseudo-Clementine Literature*, reprinted in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, viii (Grand Rapids, 1978); B. Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, i: *Homilien*, (Berlin/Leipzig, 1969); *Die Pseudoklementinen*, ii: *Rekognitionen* (Berlin, 1965). Studies of origins include: G. Salmon, 'Clementine Literature' in W. Smith and H. Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, i (London, 1987), pp. 566–78; H. Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen, Homilien und Rekognitionen. Eine Quellenkritische Untersuchung* (Leipzig, 1906); O. Cullmann, *Le problème littéraire et historique du roman pseudo-clémentin* (Paris, 1930); B. Rehm, 'Zur Entstehung der pseudoclementinischen Schriften', *ZNTW* 37 (1938), 77–184. A recent review of scholarship is F. S. Jones, 'The Pseudo-Clementina: A History of Research', *Second Century* 2 (1982), 1–34 and 63–96. I have, however, cited a number of works here which do not appear in these articles, and have preferred not to speak of 'Pseudo-Clementine' literature: we do not ascribe the *Republic* to 'Pseudo-Socrates' or the *Satyricon* to 'Pseudo-Encolpius', and the fact that later readers took these novels for Clement's own work does not mean that the first-person voice was used with intent to deceive.

[2] B. P. Reardon, *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley, 1989), p. 3, concedes the omission.

[3] B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances* (Berkeley, 1967) pp. 285–93; T Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 154–65.

[4] The *floruit* of Rufinus, the translator of the *Recognitions*, is about A.D. 380. His preface to Gaudentius shows that two versions, the *Recognitions* and the *Homilies*, were already extant in Greek.

of some extrinsic passages, the primary object being to show that, while the works were compiled from a variety of sources, there are no grounds for supposing that the plot was independent at any time. The sentiments and aims that govern the writing of the story, it will be argued, are the same that inspired the combination of a group of homilies with the discourse of Bardesanes against the astrologers and the dialogue between Appion and Clement: the narrative mocks the laws of a certain species of pagan literature, while the more hortatory passages correct false pagan notions of the world.

SUMMARY OF PLOT

Only certain chapters of the *Recognitions* and *Homilies* contain a narrative comparable to those of pagan novels, and it is in these narrative passages that the greatest similarities between the two books are evident.[5] In the prologues we read of the education and conversion of the young Clement (*R.* 1.1–3; *H.* 1.1–6), whom readers were no doubt intended to recognise immediately as the future Bishop of Rome. From his earliest infancy his mind has been possessed by the greatest questions, those which concern the origin of the world and the nature and destiny of man. Deterred by a friend's advice from the study of magic, and rapidly disgusted with the philosophers, he acquires a sudden conviction of the truth when he hears the Christian orator Barnabas striving to preach the gospel against the jeers of a pagan crowd. When Barnabas introduces him to Peter, the great Apostle, Clement gladly receives instruction. Among his teacher's associates are Nicetes and Aquila, who have lately escaped from the snares of Simon Magus. This man, an arch-deceiver and a heretic, who lays claim to the necromantic sciences which Clement was dissuaded from employing, is about to engage with Peter in a public controversy with regard to the interpretation of Scripture and the number of the gods.

This controversy Peter carries on in a number of homilies, both public and esoteric, revealing to his intimates that he has not been wholly candid in his addresses to the mob. In an interval between two debates with Simon, he inquires as to Clement's history. The pupil is revealed to be the eldest of three brothers, who was bereaved of most of his family when his mother departed suddenly, taking with her the twins Faustinus and Faustinianus. The cause of her flight was a supernatural warning, her destination left to chance; nevertheless, Clement's father was at last compelled by his longing to go in search of her, leaving Clement an orphan who can boast of no familial relation other than that which Peter has towards him as his father in the Church (*R.* 7.8–10; *H.* 12.8–10).

With this confession fixed in his memory, Peter visits an island, where the works of Phidias, the ancient sculptor, are on display. There he meets a woman whose squalid clothes and miserable demeanour are a picture of desperation. Her appearance is borne out by her own rehearsal of her sorrows, which concurs with Clement's recollection closely enough to show that she can be no-one but his mother. This, though after some prevarication, she admits, and the result is an immediate reunion with Clement (*R.* 7.12–21; *H.* 12.12–22). Their felicity is enhanced by the unmasking of Nicetes and Aquila, who prove to be the very twins that the mother had taken with her in her precipitate departure, and had then no less precipitately mislaid (*R.* 7.28; *H.* 13.3).

[5] The following is a digest of the chief narrative passages in both the novels. In parenthetic reference an *R.* denotes the *Recognitions*, an *H.* the *Homilies*. I have used the Greek form of the name Nicetes and the Latin form of Aquila. See further n. 19.

Mattidia (for that is the mother's name) discloses that her flight was in fact occasioned by the sexual overtures of her husband's brother, which her story of a dream had been invented to conceal. Her charitable thoughts towards a woman who has provided for her convince the Apostle that she is already a convert to the faith, and, as soon as the requisite fast has been observed, she is baptised by full immersion in the sea (*R.* 7.30–8; *H.* 13.9–21). An old man then approaches, and endeavours to persuade them that no ceremony of this or any kind can release a person from his fate (*R.* 8.1–2; *H.* 14.3). His own case, he avers, is a proof of this; for many years before, his wife left home on the specious pretext of a supernatural vision, which in fact (as his brother subsequently informed him) was nothing but a cloak for illicit love. The woman, he says, has perished in a shipwreck, and with her are buried his children and his affections. All this he takes for his destiny, which was written from eternity in the stars (*R.* 9.32–7; *H.* 14.9–11).

Having already heard the true account of Mattidia's stratagem, the reader knows at once that this is false, and that not only the mother but the father of the hero has been found. In the *Recognitions*, the disclosure of these facts is anticipated when Nicetas shows respect for age by calling the old man 'Father' (8.8). The *Recognitions* also prolong the debate about astrology, even after the present circumstances would appear to have refuted the old man's doctrine. Only in this version of the *Clementina* is there a full rehearsal of the practices by which Simon, having been conquered in public argument, attempts to work an insidious revenge (Book 10). Deceived by Peter's spurious proclamation that magicians have been proscribed and are in danger of capital penalties, Simon casts his own features on to the face of Clement's father. Meanwhile he escapes to Caesarea; but his victim, though his family shrinks from his countenance with horror, remains the same man in the sight of the Apostle. Peter, who never allows himself to be burdened by an unseasonable veracity, has this false Simon publicly recant the views which the arguments between Peter and the true Simon had left almost unimpaired (*R.* 10.64–6).

Simon has two accomplices, the sorcerers Annubion and Appion, who try without success to transfer their allegiance, and are ushered out of the story a little before the principal characters. Of Appion we hear more in the *Homilies*, where the proem to the whole novel is used again to introduce a short and detachable account of his previous overtures to Clement (4–6). Clement explains that, after having learnt to despise the shallow creed of Appion, he imposed upon him with a feint of illness, which, as he intended, the charlatan attributed to unrequited love. In arguing that the passion should be indulged, Appion dilates, in the manner of those who are well instructed in the subject, on the character and genesis of Eros. His patient replies with a cogent denunciation of the conduct of the Olympians and of the subterfuge of those who try to palliate by allegories the record of divine adultery, fornication, buggery and rape. Appion is routed, and conceives an animosity against Clement which he harbours to this day (4–5).

The same tale therefore supplies the dramatic interest of both novels, but it is amplified in each by some digressions which are not found in the other. It thus appears that one at least has attained its present form by evolution from an original of somewhat different contents. The editor of the *Recognitions* (one whom it would be equally uncritical and unkind to style the author) convicts himself of incompetence when he recapitulates a series of homilies as though they occurred in the novel, though in fact he has retailed the plan and content of a rather different work (3.85). The differences are not entirely made up in the present version of the *Homilies*, and it therefore seems most reasonable to postulate a lost collection of speeches as the

ancestor of both. This, no doubt, is the work that bequeathed its name to the extant *Homilies*, but, as the Latin translator of the *Recognitions* tells us, his title is also a rendering from the Greek.

Recognitions are, of course, the mainspring of the narrative. In both cases the edifying discourse has been compounded with a moralist's romance, but while the *Homilies* promises theology in its title, the title of the *Recognitions* justly suggests a greater ingenuity of plot. Whether the plot existed at any time without the teaching, and whether it originated in pagan or in Christian circles, are questions which are addressed in the following section, though they are not so easy to answer as to raise.

ORIGINS, PAGAN OR CHRISTIAN?

Clement's lengthy case against his father's stubborn adherence to astrology is adapted from the *Book of the Laws of Countries* by Bardesanes of Edessa,[6] a polymath and Christian apologist of the later second century. The theology in the homiletic passages of both versions – which maintain that God the Father is a corporeal light, that Christ came to abolish sacrifices, and that man achieves salvation by a rigorous abstinence from fornication and idolatry – is of the type that we call (for want of a better term) Jewish Christian.[7] This type, after the end of the second century, commanded neither followers nor arguments in such numbers as to threaten the integrity of the Church. Simon is a composite intellectual of that era – a Simon, a Valentinus and a Marcion[8] – who shakes the faith of uninstructed converts by maintaining that the God of the elect is not the author of the present evil world. To

[6] For the *Book of the Laws of Countries* see the translation by H. J. W. Drijvers (Assen, 1956), and for discussion of the relation to the work *On Fate*, which is mentioned by Eusebius, see the same author's *Bardesanes of Edessa* (Amsterdam, 1966), pp. 60–75. Drijvers maintains that one work is in question, as does B. Rehm, 'Bardesanes in den Pseudo-Clementinen', *Philologus* 93 (1938), 218–47. Rehm argues that the *Book of the Laws of Countries* is an expanded version, incorporating additions by Bardesanes' pupil Philip, while the *Recognitions* preserves an earlier and shorter form. It seems to me that his arguments on pp. 232–3 are too quick to discount the capacity of the Clementine editor to omit the passages which did not conduce to his purpose. On the astrological learning of Bardesanes see H. J. Schoeps, 'Astrologisches im pseudo-klementinischen Roman', *Vigiliae Christianae* 5 (1951), 88–100.

[7] See e.g. G. Quispel, 'L'Évangile selon Thomas et les Clementins', *Vigiliae Christianae* 12 (1958), 181–96. For the view that the works originated among the Elchasaites see Salmon (1876). This hypothesis has received support from the Cologne Mani Codex, which reveals that the Mani was reared among the Elchasaites, and believed himself the latest in a succession of prophets dating back to Adam. The Manichaeans, like Peter in the *Clementina*, held that God was an extended body, although his substance was a form of light (cf. *Homilies* 17.8–10). Rehm (1938), 152–3, maintains that another Jewish Christian sect, the Ebionites, was largely responsible for the theology of these writings, and is followed by E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, ii (trans. R. McL. Wilson, London, 1964), pp. 533–4.

On Jewish Christianity see J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London, 1964) and A. F. J. Klijn and G. J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish Christian Sects* (Leiden, 1973). The term is not deprived of its utility by the fact that it denotes neither a sect nor a school, though the latter point is well made by J. E. Taylor, 'The Phenomenon of Jewish Christianity: Reality or Scholarly Invention?', *Vigiliae Christianae* 44 (1990), 313–34.

[8] For discussion see A. Salles, 'Simon le Mage ou Marcion?', *Vigiliae Christianae* 12 (1958), 197–214. The fact that Simon resembles Marcion only in some of his cardinal tenets hardly proves that the latter is not the object of the polemic, but it seems reasonable to conjecture that, since Simon was reckoned the father of all the heresies (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.23.2), the novels are intended to annihilate many foes with a single weapon. If, as Salles argues, the heresiarchs would not have acknowledged Peter as an authoritative figure, we must conclude that the novels are aimed at those who did.

the second century also belongs the Dialogue with Appion in the *Homilies*, another exercise that may initially have stood alone or belonged to a different work. Appion would appear to be, as scholars have conjectured,[9] the notorious scourge of Judaism, Apion, against whom Josephus had written in the first century A.D. At the period when this dialogue was composed, he had lived long enough in folklore to acquire a second consonant and surrender any arguments peculiar to himself. Instead he resorts to the customary arts of the pagan apologist under the early Roman Empire: like Celsus,[10] he treats the gods as personifications of natural powers, but makes no use of the Neoplatonic allegories which, after Plotinus, superseded the theories of the Stoics. We may therefore assign the dialogue – which, since it contains the words that form the prologue to both the novels, must be supposed to antedate both – to some time between the end of the first century and the middle of the third.

The history of the Clementine novels is now a little clearer. Ten homilies had been put by Jewish Christians into the mouth of the chief Apostle;[11] Clement being the Gentile who succeeded him as Bishop of Rome, was the hero of another tale which made him reveal an early intuition of the truth, while still a pagan, by his mockery of Appion. These were the ingredients initially combined to make a novel in which Clement, an unhappy pagan youth, becomes successively the audience, the neophyte and the champion of Peter's creed.[12] A more intricate narrative was then provided, interlaced in the *Homilies* with the original tale of Clement's reply to Appion. This is absent from the *Recognitions*, but the omission is repaired by a digression against astrology, which is once again put into Clement's mouth.

It is plausible, then, to speak of an original redaction at the end of the second century, using such materials as that century provided. This archetype would relate the exchange of false belief for true in the soul of Clement, as it becomes the seat of war between black magic and Christian dogma, both of which purport to know the mysteries of destiny, death and love. But when do we date the stroke that turned this story of enlightenment into one of travel, domestic separation and successive recognitions? Some scholars have seen nothing here but arbitrary conjunction of a dramatised apology with an irrelevant but more interesting romance. It is frequently assumed that in its purer form the story was a pagan one; but if that is so, the archetype has not yet been recovered, unless it be the *Story of Apollonius of Tyre*

[9] E.g. J. van Amersfoot, 'Traces of an Alexandrian Orphic Cosmogony in the Pseudo-Clementines', in M. J. Vermaseren (ed.), *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religion* (Leiden, 1981), pp. 13–30. Eusebius, *HE* 3.38.5 employs the form Apion. He seems to make Peter the other participant in the dialogue, but this may be a lapse; it is clear that he did not have a high esteem for the *Clementina*, and he may therefore not have recalled their contents very accurately.

[10] See Origen, *Contra Celsum* 6.42 and the discussion in M. Fédou, *Christianisme et religions païennes dans le Contre Celse d'Origène* (Paris, 1988), pp. 116–39.

[11] Rehm (*ZNTW*, 1938) distinguishes: (*a*) a narrative *Grundschrift*; (*b*) the dispute with Appion; (*c*) Peter's preaching in Tripolis; (*d*) his preaching in Laodicea; (*e*) the contest with Simon. A second-century work called the *Preaching of Peter* is attested: see Hennecke and Schneemelcher (1964), pp. 94–102. Portions of the *Clementina* are translated on pp. 102–28 of this collection under the title *Kerygmata Petrou* Cf. also Eusebius, *HE* 3.3, which mentions four apocryphal works purporting to contain the preaching of Peter.

[12] It is difficult to imagine any reason for the prominence of Clement in early Christian literature than his elevation to the see of Rome, from which he wrote his epistle to the Corinthians. The omission of any reference to his destiny (or Peter's) in the *Clementina* is therefore remarkable, and not the less so because, being said to be of the family of Caesar, he seems to have been taken for the executed dignitary of Domitian's household, Titus Flavius Clemens. No account of Clement's place in history and legend has superseded J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, i. Pt 1 (London, 1890), pp. 14–103.

(itself a work of uncertain date and provenance), in which the hero temporarily loses his daughter and wife.[13] Even if this or some lost book were the archetype – and of course a new discovery may enlighten us – it would still remain to ask why it is this plot, and not another, that forms the basis of the only Christian novel that we possess.

No scholar, at least in recent times, has favoured the more economic hypothesis that the plot of the *Recognitions* was invented with its title. The gestation, on this theory, might be as follows. A reader of the earlier book of *Homilies*, feeling the want of a narrative to illustrate and endorse the didactic content, substituted a new compilation of episodes for the unilinear plot of the original. He eliminated the dialogue with Appion, but maintained or even magnified the prominence of Clement with a story of domestic separations and reunions, from which the whole compilation derived the title *Recognitions*. Such was his success, we may imagine, that a conservative redactor of the *Homilies* could not resist the addition of the new plot. He did not, however, make the same expurgations, so that here the result was to duplicate the proem and to render less significant the dialogue between Appion and Clement. The discourse of Bardesanes against the astrologers was added to the *Recognitions* by one who desired to enhance the education of his readers, even if this entailed some retardation of the plot.

There were always partisan motives to be served by involving Clement in Peter's triumphs and the escapades of Simon. Clement of Rome became famous through the Letters which he wrote in his office of Bishop. A tradition which is at least as early as the second century makes Peter the first occupant of that see. He was also said to have been the Bishop of Antioch,[14] and the *Clementina*, by making Clement undergo instruction from the mouth of the great Apostle in this vicinity, would seem to be asserting the priority of the eastern province as a scene of preaching.[15] The same motive may explain why Simon appears as Peter's rival; for another tradition, also dating from the second century, describes his feats of magic in the capital, and in one account a competition with Peter before the eyes of Nero causes Simon's death.[16] A new romance has therefore been created by the translation of Simon and Clement – Peter's rival and his most illustrious pupil – from Rome to Peter's eastern diocese. The tale of Clement's loss and recognition of his household seems, however, to be new and not transplanted, and it is this for which an origin and aim must yet be found.

A COMEDY OF ERRORS?

It is argued here that the novel plot was largely or wholly devised in Christian circles, and written into the story of the match between Peter and Simon, in order to cement the combination of sound theology with an edifying narrative. The history of domestic peril endured and overcome at once corroborates Peter's teaching and adds

[13] So Perry (1967). Both novels turn on the separation of relatives, but the plots are so dissimilar as to suggest that the *Historia Apollonii* is at most an inspiration, not a source. On the evolution of the *Historia Apollonii* see the introduction to the edition of G. A A. Kortekaas (Gröningen, 1984).

[14] Eusebius, *HE* 3.36.2. For the tradition of Peter's preaching in the Asiatic provinces see ibid. 3.1.

[15] On the independence of Antioch, both in politics and in theology, see e.g. F. Millar, 'Paul of Samosata, Zenobia and Aurelian: the Church, Local Culture and Political Allegiance in Third-Century Syria', *JRS* 61 (1971), 1–17; W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (London, 1984), pp. 385–7.

[16] See for Simon's feats Justin, *1 Apol* 26; for his fatal match with Peter see Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 6.19, the *Acts of Peter and Paul* and Eusebius, *HE* 2.14.

interest to the biography of Clement, while refuting Simon's doctrines and his claims on his own behalf. Even if some material were borrowed from pagan sources, the aim of the borrowers would require examination; but first we must test the arguments on the strength of which a borrowing is assumed.

Some maintain that the text itself bears tokens of a careless adaptation from some lost original. Why should there be two brothers, with reduplicated names, if they are never to be separated and always to think and act in unison? Remembering that the narrative is a series of recognitions, and that many plays and narratives have turned upon the confusion of two persons of identical appearance, Perry has surmised an earlier comedy of innocent deceptions, which ended with the discovery that each brother had been consistently mistaken for his twin.[17]

Plausible as this conjecture is, there is another, which is superior insofar as it takes account of the theology of the editors. According to this, as Peter expresses it, Simon and the Apostle are the last in a chain of syzygies, or complementary pairs, which have appeared at certain stages of man's history to set before contemporaries two teachings or examples, one for better, one for worse (*Recognitions* 3.61; cf. *Homilies* 2.15). As Abel was matched against Cain and Christ against Satan, so Peter bears the standard of his Master against a sorcerer who prefigures Antichrist.

By parity of reasoning, there must be two philosophers to set against the two sorcerers whose lies are to be exposed. Annubion is a duplication of Appion, being nothing but the bearer of an Egyptian name that stands to the god Anubis as that of Appion stands to Apis. The reason for this doubling is that such malignant figures in the Old Testament were apt to come in pairs. Moses and Aaron witnessed the curtailment of their prerogatives by the prophets Eldad and Modad (Numbers 11.26ff.), while their miracles were partly imitated by the Egyptian necromancers Jannes and Jambres.[18] We might even say that Simon stands to Korah as his acolytes stand to Dathan and Abiram, all of whom were destroyed for putting in jeopardy the office of the priest (Numbers 16.1ff.).

In their guise as Aquila and Nicetes, then, the twins are Peter's followers, two renegades from Simon to be set against two remaining satellites. Their being a posterior formation would account for their lack of individual character, the absence of any strong individuation even in their ages and their true names. If there had been an earlier romance in which each twin had his part, it might seem more surprising that the names Faustus, Faustinus and Faustinianus are applied to different members of the group in the different versions.[19] If there is any merit in the conjecture that the story was transferred to the *Homilies* from an early form of the *Recognitions*, it would appear that even at that time the twins had few distinguishing features. It is notable, on the other hand, that they are most distinct in a passage which occurs in the *Recognitions* as a prelude to Clement's speech against astrology (*R.* 8.7), which is therefore likely to be an addition to the basic plot. Here each twin takes up in turn the argument against the old man who will prove to be their father, each of them being qualified to attack a different philosophic school.[20]

[17] Perry (1967). The most celebrated parallel would be the *Menaechmi* of Plautus.

[18] See 2 Timothy 3.8, and for allusions to the pair in pagan authors Numenius Frr. 9 and 10a Des Places. Jannes and Jambres are associated with Balaam (a mightier figure, comparable to Simon) in *Targum Yerushalmi* to Numbers 22.22.

[19] The father is called Faustinianus in the *Recognitions*, but it seems more natural to follow the *Homilies* in allotting to him the shortest name, and its derivatives to his sons.

[20] 'Nicetes' has been a hearer of the Epicureans, 'Aquila' of the Pyrrhonists. Rehm (*ZNTW*, 1938), 128–34 observes that the attack on the mythographers which is conducted by Nicetes in the *Recognitions* is the passage that matches Clement's discourse against Appion in the *Homilies*.

The name Faustus and its cognates, abandoned in evil circumstances only to be resumed on the day when happiness is restored, are clearly built upon a Latin root that implies good fortune. This does not entail that the first account of their adventures was in Latin: the nomenclature is in keeping with the Latin name of Clement, and, for those who understand it, portends the fortunate outcome of the plot.[21] If, then, even this part of the *Clementina* need not be referred to a classical archetype, we are free to ask what theological motives have inspired the composition of the whole.

MATERIALS FOR INQUIRY

In the following sections it is argued that the *Clementina* demand comparison with pagan novels when they deny that divine activity is capricious and neglect such typical elements as lies, dreams, pictures and erotic love. Only the extant novels can be cited here, and the question therefore arises whether these are representative of the books that an early Christian might have known. We cannot be sure that the audience of Xenophon of Ephesus would have found leisure for perusing Longus and Chariton, let alone Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus: is it therefore probable that a Christian author, who may have lived as early as the second century, would have been acquainted with such products of sophistic artifice?

To this it may be answered that there were Christians even in the second century who possessed some measure of learning, particularly if they stood a little to the side of orthodoxy.[22] Some passages of the *Clementina* allude to pagan writings that are otherwise unknown to us,[23] and in point of length and variety it is with the more laboured novels that they seem inclined to vie. The discovery of so many points of contrast will itself afford some evidence that the comparison is a fair one; and it may not be an accident that the island of Aradus, where the identity of Mattidia is disclosed, is also the scene of an episode in Chariton.[24] We must remember, in any case, that it is to Christian scribes that the extant novels owe their survival, and that Christian tradition was so eager to condone the two most artificial specimens of the genre that it turned the authors into bishops.[25] We may therefore proceed to the scrutiny of the works that we have to hand.

THE WORK OF PROVIDENCE AND THE PLAY OF FORTUNE

In pagan novels Fortune, whether maleficent or benign, is always a capricious sovereign, and the union of the two lovers, though inevitable, is impeded by delays that do not serve any obvious end. In the *Clementina* Providence assumes the role of Fortune, and its workings are at last seen to have been purposive throughout, in that

[21] The name Justa, given to the woman who reared the infant twins at *Recognitions* 7.32 and *Homilies* 2.19, would seem to be another that is significant to those who understand Latin.

[22] See e.g. the quotations of Homer by the Valentinians (Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 1.9.4) and in the *Exegesis on the Soul* (Nag Hammadi Codices 2.6).

[23] Especially the Orphic lore, which appears as Frr. 55–6 Kern (see n. 30). On Orphic literature and Christian heterodoxy see M. J. Edwards, 'Gnostic Eros and Orphic Themes', *ZPE* 88 (1991), 25–40.

[24] For the name Aradus see *Recognitions* 7.12; at *Homilies* 12.1 it appears as Antaradus. The imprisonment of Callirhoe in Aradus is described by Chariton at 7.4.13, and her deliverance by Chaereas occupies the narrative up to 8.5.

[25] See the *Suda*, under Achilles Tatius; for Hippolytus, Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 5.22. It need hardly be said that neither identification is secure.

they led a number of characters, by diverse ways, to a knowledge of the truth. That truth includes, among other things, the secret which is imparted in a number of the homilies, that Providence is the action of God's benign and omnipotent will.

By contrast, Fortune, bringing change for good and ill, is ever active in Achilles Tatius, but only, it seems, in order to prolong his narrative.[26] When Clitophon first proposes the seduction of Leucippe, he discovers that chance (*to automaton*) has favoured him by securing the complicity of her maid (2.4). Other circumstances of which he is able to take advantage are the appearance of a peacock (1.16) and the absence of the most watchful servant (2.31), both of which are construed as gifts of fortune. It is Tyche to whom Clitophon and Satyrus are prepared to resign themselves if Leucippe will not fall in with their design to elope, and Tyche again who, when Leucippe is dressed for immolation by her captors, enables a friend of Clitophon's to effect a cunning rescue (3.22). On another occasion, the power which conspires with the lovers is called an *agathos daimon* (3.20); yet Clitophon, lamenting the loss of another friend, exclaims that it is a *daimon* who has denied him the consummation of his happiness (3.23). When Leucippe is seized by madness he fears that the *daimon* has it in mind to multiply her afflictions (4.9), and when he reaches the midpoint of his history (5.2), he has already come to think of his vicissitudes as a training-ground, a gymnasium, of Tyche.

While this locution might appear to imply that there is a purpose in his toils, he is soon to speak of another event as a *paidia* or prank of the same divinity (whom he now upbraids as a *daimon*: 5.11), and, if Fortune seems to redress these wounds by subsequent gratuities or *dōreai* (5.26), the hero retains a belief that she is wantonly opposed to his desires (6.3). Even when reminded that her earlier deaths were illusory, he concludes that the third disappearance of Leucippe must betoken a real visitation by his fortune of the calamity that has twice been simulated by her whim (7.5).

The effect of Tyche upon the characters, therefore, is not to edify but to beguile them with misfortune; her service to the reader is to supply him with an interesting plot. To see her hand is not to explain the world, but to preclude an explanation, since she makes the lovers passengers rather than pilots in the course of their own affairs. Clitophon tells Leucippe that she cannot ascribe her adventures to herself, but to the *daimon* (8.4); as such remarks are nowhere contradicted, and as many of the malign or helpful circumstances seem as adventitious to the reader as to the characters, we must presume that the author wishes us to believe in the play of Fortune, at least while we read his book. Since Plato's time the word *tragikos* had been scornfully bestowed on any narrative of mortal tribulation which denies the guilt of man; and it is therefore quite in keeping with his frequent praise or vilification of fortune that Clitophon is apt to speak as though the scenes of his life had been enacted on the stage.[27]

Other novelists use the same device. At the end of Chariton's tale of Chareas and Callirhoe, the hero can excuse the machinations of Aphrodite as the necessary instruments of his fate. In *Daphnis and Chloe* Tyche is most often a word for unusual

[26] M. Hikichi, 'Eros and Tyche in Achilles Tatius', *JCS* 13 (1965), 116–26, is one of the few studies on this subject. Since certain points require emphasis for the purpose of this essay, I have collected all my evidence (including that in Achilles Tatius) directly from the texts.

[27] See Plato, *Rep.* 413b; Plotinus, *Enneads* 2.9.13.7; Numenius Fr. 21.6 Des Places. For studies on the opposition of Platonists to tragic fatalism see S. Halliwell, 'Plato and Aristotle on the Denial of Tragedy', *PCPS* 30 (1984), 49–71; M. J. Edwards, '*Aidōs* in Plotinus', *CQ* 39 (1989), 228–32. On the use of terms from the stage in the Greek novelists see J. W. H. Walden, 'Stage-terms in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *HSCP* 5 (1894), 1–43; S. Bartsch, *Decoding the Ancient Novel* (Princeton, 1989), pp. 109–43.

and invidious prosperity (4.18.3, 19.5, 21.2; cf. 3.26.3), though never for a prosperity achieved without desert; but it can also be personified as an impresario to leading characters, such as Daphnis and Philetas, who seem, once introduced, to have their destiny in their own hands. While Tyche is responsible for the exposure and discovery of Daphnis (1.2.3, 6.1, 8.1, 4.21.1), she is equally responsible for the ripening of an apple in its season (3.34.1): she is thus a force important to the novel, who works upon the world, but intermittently and with little complication or caprice.

Whether it be obsequious or tyrannical, harsh or temperate, Tyche in these writings gives the novelist a free hand with his characters: the reader is asked to acquiesce in laws that do not hold in the natural world. Heliodorus differs from the majority of Greek novelists in propounding a general theory of causation which explains the role of accident in his book. The key is the force of destiny, which must not be confused with chance. When Cnemon's father finds himself ensnared by filial intrigue, his own folly has connived at this *dénouement*, and he has no right to declaim, as he does, against the malignant agency of Fortune (1.13); equally false is the judgement of the Ethiopian sovereign that destiny has resolved upon the death of Charicleia (10.32–3); it is the stars, in their immutable rotation, who are the keepers of man's destiny, and only one proficient both in science and in virtue, like the old man Calasiris, is prepared for what awaits him. He, indeed, is allowed to receive their prophecy as a hypothetical warning, and forestall the mutual slaughter of his sons (7.8).

The notion that fate is conditional rather than positive, the syllogistic outcome of a necessary major and a contingent minor premiss, was embraced by the Middle Platonists, including Apuleius,[28] who nevertheless makes little use of it in his *Metamorphoses*. Here the acts of fortune are invariably pernicious, at least to those who put themselves at her mercy. One becomes her trophy, another falls to her lethal arrow (1.7, 1.16); harsh, unequal and blind in the bestowal of her gifts (5.9, 6.21, 7.2) she spoils man's goods and mars his calculations (4.12, 4.31). While every man has a certain fortune imparted to him with his Genius (8.20), Lucius believes that he is subject to one of peculiar animosity (8.28), which intervenes continually to ensure that he remains a prisoner of his asinine body. At one point he declares that even *divina providentia* has no power against her insatiable and pertinacious rancour (9.2; c. 7.17, 7.28). We might suspect (since the ass is hardly blameless, and many a dart thrown at his overweening curiosity) that Fortune is an invention to conceal his responsibility, or else that she personifies the author's desire to complicate his plot. In the final book, however, she proves to be real and therefore superable (11.2). Lucius masters her by his submission to the indomitable Isis; or rather, he exchanges a purblind fortune for a sighted one, by whom the strength and malice of the other are disarmed (11.15).

All these authors, then – or, if we care to make a distinction, their *dramatis personae* – give countenance to the view that man owes nothing to his own will except his ability to bear the acts of Fortune. Any Christian homily would condemn this error, any Christian novelist would avoid it. What better way to purify the novel than to incorporate such homilies? What better illustration of the homilies than the writing of the novel? The knitting of plot and speech is so contrived that the experience of the actors will confirm those very dogmas which their early experience seemed to have disproved.

The first of Simon's falsehoods to be called to a public reckoning in the *Homilies* is that man was created ignorant of the means of his own salvation (3.18 etc.). Sin,

[28] *De Platone* 12; J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (London, 1977), pp. 320–6.

as Simon holds, is an inevitable concomitant of existence in the realm of becoming or genesis, the king and author of which is a subordinate being ignorant of all eternal goods. This bondage, which is imposed on man by matter, is dissolved for the elect by a higher deity, but only on condition that the elect conceive themselves to be pure spirits, as Simon is. This thesis, which by affirming the radical ignorance of the senses would justify Simon's dealing in illusion, is denied, if not confuted, by a lengthy demonstration that the Scriptures make the author of the present world identical with the god of the elect.

After this it is Clement's turn to tax the Greeks with errors which, though diverse in formulation, have conduced to the same effect. Some postulate a multitude of gods, each of whom is begotten by the fornication of some previous couple; others subject the world to an immutable destiny, others speak of genesis as fate (4.12–16). Each of these opinions would render free will useless, since the due rewards for good and ill deeds would not have been appointed. If the gods themselves are enslaved by passion, and their dynasties evolve as the forced corollaries of that passion, we have no grounds for believing in a providential government of the world.

The digression which now intrudes is no digression. Clement, in recalling the discomfiture of Appion, apprises us (and Peter) of his own cunning and Appion's weakness, while advancing Peter's case against the pagans with a learning which no Jew of pure extraction would command. He paraphrases Orphic myths recounting the birth of Eros,[29] an event to which mind and will contribute nothing, any more than they contribute to the workings of that passion in gods and men. The Apostle proceeds to show that, since the history of every man since Adam is a chronicle of wilful provocations, he must always be a suitor to that mercy which is promised by God to those who have been baptised in a state of penance. If the call to unbelievers is 'Repent and be baptised', believers have the assurance that a man who loves the governor and creator of the universe will find that all things in it work together for his good (11.16).

Only then is Clement asked for his story, and it might seem that his juvenile bereavements are a proof of the ascendancy of Fortune. Peter's tears endear him to the reader, but providence barely waits to dry them, for the excursion of the next morning finds Mattidia among the statues, while her orphan twins and unbelieving husband are restored within a few days. The crude concatenation of surprises is diversified by irony when Clement's father inadvertently proves that most of his sufferings are illusory, and that thus he is not the slave of Fortune after all. Events have thus restored that faith in the apostolic teaching which the story of Clement's childhood would have destroyed had it been true.

DECEPTION AND UNDECEPTION

It was noted above that in the *Recognitions* one of the twins addresses his father by that title before he knows him; the astrologer Calasiris is addressed as 'father' by Cnemon (*Aethiopica* 3.1), though here the otiose compliment is not rendered more significant by any revolution of events. But, while a better destiny awaits him, the astrologer in the Christian romances lacks the art which Heliodorus grants to Calasiris. Even the reader has the advantage of him, having learned from the unimpeachable Mattidia that her flight from home was occasioned, not by her fear of being taken in adultery, but by the incestuous overtures of one who has now

[29] A critical text of these can be found in O. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta* (Berlin, 1922), pp. 132–7 (= Frr. 55 and 56).

traduced her with his own crime. These edifying novels do not practise those deceptions on the reader which are the stock-in-trade of pagan entertainments:[30] it seems to be a presumption that the Christian, though an expeditious liar (*R.* 10.65 etc.), is immune to the lies of pagans, and such protagonists therefore cannot be used to mislead the reader into false anticipation or erroneous surmise.

This policy is as obvious from the beginning as its logic would demand. The ancient novel retains the verisimilitude of drama, which forbids a speaking character to identify himself, without good reason, on first appearance; and when the narrator purports to tell his own story, like the Lucius of Apuleius and his predecessors, his name is apt to lie concealed behind the personal pronoun, in one case perhaps for ever.[31] Clement, however, forestalls surprise and extinguishes curiosity when he opens his account with a declaration of his name and place of birth.

Readers of pagan novels are inveigled, like the characters, into mistaken prophecies by the premature interpretation of dreams. Discovering that Leucippe has made all but the final motion in surrendering her virginity to Clitophon, her mother would have been foolish not to construe this as the assault which was portended in her dream of the previous night (Achilles Tatius 2.24). In that dream she saw her daughter's belly ripped asunder; now the hero contemplates the rupture of the hymen. On another occasion there appears to be infallible proof that Leucippe has been sacrificed, as though in a second, and genuine, fulfilment of the vision; none the less she escapes death, in a manner that could not have been foreseen (3.15–22). In Heliodorus an oracle of similar content, similarly misread at first, is verified by a murder, though it chances to be Thisbe's, not Charicleia's (1.18, 30–1); but the reader who has allowed Achilles Tatius to dupe him twice is never so undeceived as to know whether either of the scenes described is the one foreshadowed in the mother's dream.[32]

Although the greater number of dreams in novels are as plain as they are veridical, there are none in the *Clementina*. Mattidia's is invented to facilitate an escape which is enjoined upon her by conscience, and, while Clement fails to penetrate the ruse, he never imagines that he has witnessed the fulfilment of the omen. This forbearance seems to have been imposed upon the novel by the precepts of the Apostle, who in the *Recognitions* warns his adversary that the confidence which he places in mental images is too easily abused:

> I know that I myself, O Simon, have sometimes in thought extended my sense, as you say into regions... afar off... not less than if it had been seen with my eyes. When I was at Capernaum, occupied in the taking of fishes, and sat upon a rock, holding in my hand a hook attached to a line and fitted to deceive the fishes, I was so absorbed that I did not feel a fish adhering to it while my mind eagerly ran through my beloved Jerusalem, to which I had frequently gone up, waking, for the sake of offerings and prayers (2.62).

The result of weaving an arbitrary fancy is that the mind of Peter, meditating a laudable deception, falls a prey to its own deceit. For pagan novelists such imagination is a virtue. In Achilles Tatius the telling of a story is inspired by the contemplation of a picture; in Longus the story itself has been invented to explain a

[30] See e.g. Bartsch (1989); G. N. Sandy, *Heliodorus* (Boston, Mass., 1982), pp. 33–74.

[31] See J. J. Winkler, *Auctor & Actor* (Berkeley, 1988), pp. 135–79; A. Laird, 'Person, Persona and Representation in Apuleius' Metamorphoses', *Materiali e Discussioni* 25 (1990), 129–64. Laird maintains, perhaps with an excess of ingenuity, that there is no lacuna (or rather an artificial one) at [Lucian] *Onos* 55 (p. 337.4 Jacobitz), so that the name of the narrator remains unspoken.

[32] See Bartsch (1989), pp. 80–108. At *Homilies* 17.17 it is asserted that the wicked sometimes have veracious dreams.

pictured scene.[33] Peter himself, is proof against all sensory delusions. When Clement's father appears to more debilitated intellects to wear the face of Simon, it is Peter alone who sees his proper countenance, and at the same time divines the cause of error in those around him (*Recognitions* 10.53). Women, when objects of love or subjects of grief, are typically conceived as statuesque by Classical authors, and the conceit is applied to Psyche by Apuleius and by Achilles Tatius to Leucippe. When a woman is surrounded, like Mattidia, by statues of rare beauty and verisimilitude, the likeness might perplex the keenest judges; but here the judge is Peter, who is not the man to hesitate, even on a first discovery, in distinguishing the living from the dead.

Nor has Peter any more esteem for contingent prophecies, which state that if a certain event occurs another will follow. Heliodorus flatters Calasiris with this modest degree of perspicacity; Peter's God, however, imbues his prophet, not with casual premonitions, but with the perfect understanding of his will (*Homilies* 3.11). With the wisdom of his years and the disposition to impart it, the Apostle plays that character whose role in ancient novels is to discern the laws that lie behind the superficial play of incident. He maintains a benevolent vigil over Clement, though his discretion is not engaged, like that of Calasiris, in abetting the elopement of his protégé (*Aethiopica* 5.17–18); Clement learns of God from his discourses, just as Daphnis and Chloe are acquainted by Philetas with the nature and works of Love. Both Apostle and poet thus give features to the deity whose secret operations are the cause of the surrounding narrative; both are also figures drawn from history, though Peter has more substance than Philetas, whose Hellenistic namesake is but half-discernible under his new guise.[34]

Some novelists saw that reliance upon such guides, who may be accredited only by seniority, was likely to put an ingenuous protagonist at the mercy of a charlatan. The aged crone who allays the grief of Charite in Apuleius is a bawd and a nurse of brigands; while the poetaster and moralist Eumolpus, in Petronius' *Satyricon*, makes love, as he makes verses, with a candid impropriety that would justify his own strictures on the faults of modern poetry and the sins of modern Rome. In each of the *Clementina*, a pagan who has assumed the paternal tutelage of Clement finds that his youth is not the measure of his wisdom. In the *Recognitions* the vanquished party is an astrologer, like Calasiris; in the *Homilies* Appion professes, like Philetas, to be an adept in the mysteries of Love.

LOVE AND ITS ILLUSIONS

Catalogues of learning in the pagan novel, like that which is recited at the end of the second book of Achilles Tatius (2.37) are less likely to enforce a religious moral than to dignify an encomium of Love. Such a demonstration is attempted by the impudent magician who, in the *Homilies*, visits Clement to inflame what he understands to be a fit of melancholy induced by passion. Appion exhorts the youth to imitate the lascivious freedom of the Olympian deities, the eldest of whom, the master and first origin of all, is Love himself (5.10). It is in corroboration of this platitude that he adduces the birth of Phanes, a masculofeminine god known only to Orpheus, who emerged from the egg which Chaos had precipitated, separated himself from the

[33] Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe* 1.1; Achilles Tatius 1.1–2. On the role of the mimetic arts in Longus see F. Zeitlin, 'The Poetics of Eros: Nature, Art and Imitation in Longus', in D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin (eds.), *Before Sexuality* (Princeton, 1990), pp. 417–64.

[34] On the use of Hellenistic figures in Longus see E. L. Bowie, 'Theocritus' Seventh Idyll, Philetas and Longus', *CQ* 35 (1985), 67–91.

grosser elements of the matrix and took his place upon the supernal throne as an all-irradiating light (6.6). If the elements now proceed to dispose themselves without his intervention, that is merely a sign that the present version of the teaching is a late one; for early Orphism, unlike the Platonism of the Empire, had no use for idle deities, and Phanes was endowed with the wings of Eros and the phallus of a satyr.[35] Even in the *Homilies* he is what Love is also said to be – the eldest of the living and the illumination of every sentient mind.

Eros was accustomed to enter novels in a vision or an icon, which would offer little check to the penetration of his disguise. Philetas in *Daphnis and Chloe* (2.5–6) describes his epiphany as a mischievous baby, winged and equipped for archery, who declares that his infant form conceals the oldest of the gods. The picture which moves Clitophon to commence his endless monologue in Achilles Tatius represents a splendid bull submitting to the halter of 'a tiny child, with wings outspread, quiver dangling, torch in hand' (1.1 Winkler).[36] The editor of the *Clementine Homilies*, knowing that his readers would be prepared for a manifestation of this deity, did not bore them with the use of his common name.

Although the *Clementina* speak of marriage as a duty, they regard it as an expedient against uncontrollable passion (*Homilies* 5.25), to which the hero of an edifying novel cannot fall prey. The loves of the protagonists are domestic, their longing for reunion bespeaks the intensity of pious hearts. Marriage with the Christians was for ever, and the children a sacred charge. The miraculous restoration of a foundling, which brings in its train an acknowledgement of parentage, is the device by which such novelists as Longus and Heliodorus facilitate the union of their lovers, whom at the same time they raise from a humble station to one of superior dignity. Christians would rejoin that the abandonment of a child is always wrong, and that greater parents must be taxed with greater sin. Clement being destined for a metropolitan bishopric, his genealogy must be free of scandal: the recognitions are therefore never discoveries of parentage, but always of the parents, whose names at least have never been in doubt.

A pleasant setting is, as Achilles Tatius knew (1.2), the conventional seat for a colloquy on love. The aim of the erotic discourse of Socrates in the *Phaedrus*, which is the germ of this tradition, is to make the pupil's soul aware of its fallen state and eager to renew the stricken plumage of its wings. Platonic touches in Achilles Tatius are always trivial,[37] but the *Clementine Homilies* seize the spirit of the famous prologue when Appion and Clement, on retiring for their first debate to a garden, make the theme not love but virtue, not the power of daemons over the body, but the reconciliation of the autonomous soul with God (4.10).

Justin, a second-century theologian, gives a setting in a garden to his *Dialogue with Trypho*, and resembles Clement also in his account of his fruitless wanderings in the deserts of pagan thought.[38] The conversion which is narrated in *Dialogus* 2–9,

[35] See for the phallus Fr. 80 Kern. On the character of Phanes see W. K. C. Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion* (London, 1935), pp. 95–102. If the *Clementina* could be securely dated to the second century, they would afford the earliest attestation of the name, but the character is much older.

[36] See Reardon (1989), p. 177.

[37] Thus Clitophon at 2.36 appropriates the distinction between the Uranian and the Pandemic Aphrodite, but it is only in Apuleius, *Metamorpheses* 4.28, that this commonplace has been thought to foreshadow an allegory which challenges the profundity and beauty of the Platonic original.

[38] I have discussed this relation in my '*Locus Horridus* and *Locus Amoenus*', in L. M. Whitby *et al.* (eds.), *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol, 1987), pp. 267–76. The sea shore is more frequently a scene of lamentation than of deliverance in pagan writing: see e.g. *Iliad* 1.348f.; *Odyssey* 5.151–3; Theocritus, *Idyll* 9.17f.

however, takes place in the vicinity of the sea. Both Justin's *Dialogue* and the *Clementina* sustain the tendency of early Christian literature to choose the sea and the wilderness as places for conversion – a choice which is perhaps explained for all the others by the *Clementina* when the sea is made the font of Mattidia's baptism after a period of fasting. Such elevated dialogue in such terrain would have shocked the Greek philosophers, who recommend for this purpose a withdrawal into seclusion rather than solitude, where neither common nor natural things would invade the thoughts of educated men. The novel is therefore not the only genre on which the *Clementina* sought to improve by innovation.

MAGIC AND DESIRE

One character who is fit to play the villain, both in the novel and in a philosophical treatise, is the sorcerer. The Platonists and the authors of the Hermetica represent him as the enemy who enslaves the souls of men – even, if he can, the souls of philosophers[39] – to the most mechanical principles in nature and the passions least amenable to the counsel of the mind. In popular literature the role of witchcraft is to propagate illusions of the senses, and especially to constrain by charms and philtres the heart that remains unmoved by the charms of love. The unrequited passion which invokes Thessalian magic will be all the more vindictive when the witch herself is the lover:[40] in Apuleius, Lucius' friend acquaints him with the history of one Socrates, whom an indignant sorceress robbed by gradual stages of his heart, his blood and his life. The fornication of Simon therefore accredits him as a mage, no less than it discredits him as a vessel of Christian doctrine:

> But Simon is going about in company with Helena, and even till now, as you see, is stirring up the people. And he says that he has brought down this Helena from the highest heavens to the world; being queen, as the all-bearing being, and wisdom, for whose sake, says he, the Greeks and barbarians fought, having before their eyes an image of truth; for she, who really is the truth, was then the chiefest god (*Homilies* 2.25).

Thus Homer, Plato and even, it seems, Euripides, are laid under contribution. Helen of Troy, the lodestar of Greek passion, is but one of those illusions which the sorcerer makes a profession of inducing.[41] No wonder that one so evil has professed to recall the dead. This claim, which rather diminishes than adds to Simon's retinue, results in no sensation to be compared with the witch's raising of a ghost in Heliodorus (6.15); Simon both advances and denies it, and, since it is never verified, we cannot know which profession is more sincere. To whet the curiosity of the reader by such scenes of effective magic as the transformation of Apuleius' hero would be to compromise the object of the early Christian novel. It suffices that the heretic should impale himself on his argument as surely as the witch in Heliodorus spears her own body; for his pretensions clearly support the belief, which he affects to scorn, in the immortality of the human soul.[42]

[39] See e.g. Plotinus, *Enneads* 4.4.40; Porphyry, *Vita Plotini* 10; Zosimus Panopolitanus, *Treatise on the Omega* 7.

[40] For consultation of Thessalian witches see e.g. Propertius 1.1.19ff., and for a witch in love any telling of the story of Medea.

[41] A Simonian (or Pseudo-Simonian) text interpreting the treachery of Helen on the night of the sack of Troy was current in the fourth century A.D. See Epiphanius, *Panarion* 21.3.

[42] The argument for the immortality of the soul at *Homilies* 2.29 is followed by Simon's admission that he conjured, not a human soul, but a daemon (2.30–1). See further Rehm (*ZNTW*, 1938), 130.

CONCLUSION

The *Clementina* have therefore been compiled with no small art. So far as their common ancestor was a library of doctrine, it had only Christian sources; so far as it was a novel, it was probably a Christian invention, but devised to be consistent with those sources. The aim was to set forth arguments that would edify even Christians in a form that even pagans would admire. The *Clementina* acknowledge, without obeying them, the constraints of a pagan genre; their digressions in the narrative entail no deviation in the argument; repudiating fortune and its theatre of illusions, enjoining the pursuit of a love uncompromised by Eros, they can emulate or surpass their pagan models in their artificiality of plot.[43]

New College, Oxford M. J. EDWARDS

[43] I am grateful to the referees of *Classical Quarterly* for comments on an earlier version of this article.