

# Jewish Teachings for Gentiles in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*: A Jewish Reception of Ideas in Paul and Acts Shaped by a Jewish Milieu?

Karin Hedner Zetterholm

Lund University | karin.zetterholm@ctr.lu.se

*JJMJS* No. 6 (2019): 68–87

The fourth-century Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* are traditionally seen as representing a particular form of Jewishly inclined Christianity (“Jewish Christianity”) that promotes baptism and a limited law observance for all “Christians,” whether Jewish or gentile in origin. Considered a “Jewish Christian” text, it has also been presumed to be anti-Paul.<sup>1</sup> This paper suggests instead that the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* reflect the ideology of a Jesus-oriented subgroup that remained within or in close association with the broader Jewish community and who address their teachings exclusively to non-Jews.<sup>2</sup> Somewhat surprisingly considering its reputation as being anti-Pauline,<sup>3</sup> it preserves and transmits a Pauline–Acts position on non-Jews in including them in the people of God without requiring them to become Jews.<sup>4</sup> Like Paul and the

---

<sup>1</sup> See the survey in F. S. Jones, *Pseudoclementina Elchasaiticaque inter Judaeochristiana: Collected Studies* (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 81–113.

<sup>2</sup> Adherence to Jesus remained an option within Judaism for quite a long time, at least in some places; see D. Frankfurter, “Beyond ‘Jewish Christianity’: Continuing Religious Sub-Cultures of the Second and Third Centuries and Their Documents,” in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A. H. Becker and A. Y. Reed (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 131–143.

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that the statements commonly seen as anti-Pauline are few in number and never mention Paul by name (*Hom.* 17.14, 17–18; cf. *EpPet.* 2;) and may well be directed at Marcion or a Marcionite interpretation of Paul, as was already suggested long ago, see Jones, *Pseudoclementina*, 152–171. For a similar approach to the *Homilies*, see G. B. Bazzana, “Paul Among his Enemies? Exploring Potential Pauline Theological Traits in the Pseudo-Clementines,” in *The Early Reception of Paul the Second Temple Jew: Text, Narrative and Reception History*, ed. I. W. Oliver and G. Boccaccini (London: T&T Clark, 2018), 120–130.

<sup>4</sup> This was a matter of dispute within the early Jesus movement, as is evident from the insistence by some Jesus-believing Pharisees that these gentiles be circumcised and commanded to keep the law of Moses (Acts 15:5, cf. 15:1).

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.<sup>5</sup>

Focusing on the salvation of gentiles, the *Homilies* see God's law—previously the exclusive possession of the Jewish people—as having been revealed also to gentiles through the teachings of Jesus. Provided they put their trust in Jesus and observe the part of God's law that applies to non-Jews (Lev 17–18; cf. Acts 15:20, 29), Jesus-oriented gentiles can achieve the same status as Torah-observant Jews and be saved along with them. At a time when many Christians were promoting a separation from Judaism, the *Homilies* instead see gentile followers of Jesus as closely aligned with Jews and Judaism.<sup>6</sup> Interestingly, the author(s)/redactor(s) of the *Homilies* (henceforth the Homilist) does not use the term “Christian,” and it is quite possible, as Patricia Duncan has suggested, that he deliberately avoided the word because it was associated in his mind with the increasing separation of Jesus-followers from Jews and Judaism within other more “orthodox” Christian groups, from which he wished to distance himself.<sup>7</sup> Instead, he chooses the term *theosebeis* (godfearers) to refer to all those who adhere to the one God, Jews as well as Jesus-oriented gentiles. The terms *theosebeia* and *theosebēs* were used in the Hellenistic period by Jews who wished to highlight the universalistic claim of Judaism and it seems that Jews in the early

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Paul for whom teaching the Nations is central to what it means to be a Jew, M. D. Nanos, “Paul’s Non-Jews Do Not Become ‘Jews,’ But Do They Become Jewish?,” *Journal of the Jesus Movement in Its Jewish Setting* 1 (2014): 26–53, esp. 42, and P. Fredriksen, “The Question of Worship: Gods, Pagans, and the Redemption of Israel,” in *Paul Within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*, ed. M. D. Nanos and M. Zetterholm (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 175–201, esp. 196–199. For the Jewish traditions from the Second Temple period; see T. L. Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007), 499–505.

<sup>6</sup> See A. Y. Reed, “From Judaism and Hellenism to Christianity and Paganism,” in *Nouvelles intrigues pseudo-clémentines/Plots in the Pseudo-Clementine Romance: Actes du deuxième colloque international sur la littérature apocryphe chrétienne, Lausanne—Genève, 30 août–2 septembre 2006*, ed. F. Amsler, et al. (Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2008), 425–435.

<sup>7</sup> P. A. Duncan, *Novel Hermeneutics in the Greek Pseudo-Clementine Romance* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 18.

centuries CE preferred them over the more general terms *eusebeia* and *eusebēs*.<sup>8</sup> From the perspective of the Homilist, humanity is divided into two main groups: those who worship the one God (*theosebeis*) and those who worship many gods (*ethnē*). The entity of *theosebeis* consists of Jews (*iudaioi/hebraioi*)—whether Jesus-oriented or not—and Jesus-oriented baptized gentiles, two distinct groups who together make up the people of God.<sup>9</sup> This choice of terms, the preservation of a distinction between Jewish and non-Jewish adherents of *theosebeia*, along with the insistence that non-Jesus-oriented Jews have their own path to salvation, seem to point to a development of traditions from the first-century Jesus movement shaped by a Jewish rather than a gentile milieu.

The two main texts that together make up the bulk of the Pseudo-Clementine writings, the *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, are both composite works with a complex literary history that offer two different but similar versions of a novel about Clement of Rome and his travels with the apostle Peter.<sup>10</sup> Since they have the same basic structure and share a considerable amount of material, most scholars assume that they are reworkings of an earlier, no longer extant, source commonly referred to as the *Grundschrift*, usually dated to the third century. Material that the two versions share are considered to have been part of the *Grundschrift*. In their redacted forms the *Homilies* and *Recognitions* both date to the fourth century, with the *Homilies* considered to be the earlier of the two. Both were originally written in Greek and probably originated in Syria, likely in

---

<sup>8</sup> Jones, *Pseudoclementina*, 150–151. Jones notes that the use of *theosebēs* on gravestones and inscriptions instead of the usual word *eusebēs* could indicate Jewish ties, and J. M. Lieu, “The Race of the God-Fearers,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 46 (1995): 483–501, writes: “Whereas pagan inscriptions are apt to celebrate their honorand as ‘pious’ (εὐσεβής), the claim that he or she was θεοσεβής seems to have been monopolized by the Jews” (p. 493).

<sup>9</sup> The Greek *ta ethnē* (the nations) can be rendered either “gentile” or “pagan” in English, the first connoting ethnicity and the second cultic affiliation. A pagan gentile who joins the Jesus movement abandons worship of Greco-Roman gods and is accordingly no longer a pagan, but unless he or she also converts to Judaism, such an ex-pagan is still a gentile, i.e. a non-Jew; see P. Fredriksen, “Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul’s Gospel,” *New Testament Studies* 56 (2010): 232–252, esp. 242 n. 23.

<sup>10</sup> Attached to the *Homilies* are also three introductory writings: a letter pretending to be written by Peter to James (Epistula Petri), an account of the reception of that letter (Contestatio or Diamartyria), and a letter from Clement to James (Epistula Clementis).

Antioch, or possibly Edessa.<sup>11</sup> Numerous extant manuscripts of one of the *Homilies*' epitomes testifies to a wide circulation in antiquity.<sup>12</sup>

The *Homilies* offer a history of the early apostolic period with the Jewish apostle Peter and the gentile Clement of Rome as the main characters. Peter, presented as being in charge of the mission to the gentiles, travels from Caesarea to Antioch in the company of Clement, and along the way he addresses the inhabitants of the gentile cities on the Syrian coast, urging them to abandon idolatry and turn to the one God:

I [Peter] am going forth to the nations [*ethnē*] which say that there are many gods, to teach and to preach that God is one, who made heaven and earth, and all things that are in them, in order that they may love Him and be saved (*Hom.* 3.59.2).<sup>13</sup>

We should note that Peter's homilies about true worship of God are always addressed to non-Jews, and as we shall see, the laws he urges them to observe are those that according to the Hebrew Bible (Lev 17–18) are binding upon non-Jews. Thus, contrary to what has often been assumed in earlier scholarship, there is no reason to think that the laws he prescribes are intended for a uniform group of "Christians," Jewish as well as gentile.

---

<sup>11</sup> The *Homilies* have survived in the original Greek, but the *Recognitions* are extant only in a Latin translation from 406 CE. For the text, translations, sources, and ancient witnesses; see Jones, *Pseudoclementina*, 8–49; J. N. Bremmer, "Pseudo-Clementines: Texts, Dates, Places, Authors and Magic," in *The Pseudo-Clementines*, ed. J. N. Bremmer (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 1–23; G. Stanton, "Jewish Christian Elements in the Pseudo-Clementine Writings," in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*, ed. O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007), 305–324. For a history of research, see Jones, *Pseudoclementina*, 50–113 (originally published in *Second Century* 2 (1982): 1–33, 63–96).

<sup>12</sup> Stanton, "Jewish Christian Elements," 309. For the *Homilies*, there are two epitomes in Greek and a partial translation into Syriac in a manuscript from 411 CE. The *Recognitions* were translated into Latin, Syriac, Armenian, and Arabic; see also Jones, *Pseudoclementina*, 8–20.

<sup>13</sup> Elsewhere, the one God is explicitly identified as "the God of the Jews" (*Hom.* 16.7.1; 16.14.4). Citations are from B. Rehm's critical edition updated by G. Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen, vol. I: Homilien*, 3rd ed. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1992) and translations adapted from "The Clementine Homilies and the Apostolic Constitutions," in *Ante-Nicene Christian Library: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A. D.* 325 vol. 17, ed. A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1870) with modifications upon consultation with the original.

### Jewish Teachings for Gentiles

The way of life that the *Homilies*' Peter urges gentiles to adopt is referred to either as θεοσεβεία ("fear of God"),<sup>14</sup> or θρησκεία ("service" or "worship"),<sup>15</sup> whose main characteristics are said to be worship of the one God and observance of his law (13.4.2–4). More specific rules for gentiles who agree to abandon idol worship and adhere to *threskeia* are listed in *Hom.* 7.8.1–2:

And this is the θρησκεία he has appointed: To worship him only, and trust only in the Prophet of truth, and to be immersed [βαπτισθῆναι] for the remission of sins, and thus by this pure immersion to be born again [ἀναγεννηθῆναι] unto God by saving water; to abstain from the table of demons (that is, from food offered to idols [εἰδωλοθύτων],<sup>16</sup> from dead carcasses [νεκρῶν], from animals which have been suffocated [πνικτῶν] or caught by wild beasts [θηριαλώτων], and from blood [αἵματος]); not to live any longer impurely [μὴ ἀκαθάρτως βιοῦν]; to wash [λούεσθαι] after intercourse, that the women on their part should keep [the law of] menstruation; that all should be sober-minded, given to good works, refraining from wrongdoing, looking for eternal life from the all powerful God, and asking with prayer and continual supplication that they may win it.<sup>17</sup>

These rules are clearly based on the laws that Lev 17–18 prescribe for *gerim*, that is, non-Israelites living in the land of Israel and looks like an extended version of the laws of the Decree of the Apostles, explicitly addressed to gentiles (Acts 15:19–20).<sup>18</sup> However, in light of the claims made by Jürgen Wehnert and others,

---

<sup>14</sup> E.g. 2.1; 8.9; 12.5; 12.11; 11.33; 15.4–5, by Roberts and Donaldson translated as "worship of God."

<sup>15</sup> E.g. 9.8, 19–20; 11.15, 28, 33; 13.4; 15.11. Roberts and Donaldson translate it as "religion" but the word θρησκεία rather carries the meaning "worship" or "rituals;" see B. Nongbri, *Before Religion: A History of a Modern Concept* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 34–38.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. 1 Cor 10:21 where similar language is employed.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. 7.4.2–4; 8.19.1 and *Rec.* 4.36.4 and 6.10.5. *Rec.* 4.36.4 omits animals torn by wild beasts, washing after intercourse, and the law of menstruation but *Rec.* 6.10.5 prohibits coming near a menstruating woman.

<sup>18</sup> For details on the relation of the laws for gentiles in the *Homilies* to Acts and Leviticus, see H. M. Zellentin, "Judaean-Christian Legal Culture and the Qur'an: The Case of Ritual Slaughter and the Consumption of Animal Blood," in *Jewish-Christianity and the Origins of Islam*, ed. F. del Río Sánchez (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018), 117–159, esp. 142–146.

according to which Jews of the first century would have seen the laws of the Apostolic decree as a shorthand for the laws for *gerim* in Lev 17–18 and understood them to have included all of these,<sup>19</sup> the expansion is more limited than it appears at first sight. An understanding of the Apostolic Decree in light of Lev 17–18 means that the prohibitions against blood and strangled animals would have been understood to include carrion and animals torn by wild beasts, said to defile *gerim* no less than Israelites in Lev 17:15–16,<sup>20</sup> and *porneia* to include all forms of prohibited sexual relations specified in Lev 18, namely, incest, bestiality, adultery, male homosexual intercourse, and sexual intercourse with a menstruating woman.<sup>21</sup> Thus, the addition in the *Homilies* is restricted to

---

<sup>19</sup> Such an understanding would account for the choice and number of commandments outlined in the decree, four in total, which are listed in Acts 15:29 and 21:21 in the same order as the corresponding laws given to the Israelites and the *gerim* in Lev 17–18; see the overview in I. W. Oliver, *Torah Praxis after 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 365–398 and Zellentin, “Ritual Slaughter,” 127–132. Both Oliver and Zellentin build on J. Wehnert, *Die Reinheit des “christlichen Gottesvolkes” aus Juden und Heiden* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1997), 213–238. See also C. Werman, “The Concept of Holiness and the Requirements of Purity in Second Temple and Tannaitic Literature,” in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*, ed. M. J. H. M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 161–179, and the evidence from *Jubilees*. Werman shows that by the first century, the laws of Lev 17–18 were understood to apply not only to Israelites and *gerim* living in the land of Israel but to all humanity everywhere.

<sup>20</sup> See Wehnert, *Reinheit*, 221–232. Wehnert points to *m. Hull.* 1:2 and *t. Hull.* 1:7 where the Hebrew term חנק (“suffocate”) is used as a synonym for פסול and גבלה, i.e. animals not properly slaughtered. Philo’s discussion of strangled meat (*Spec.* 4.119–123) displays several connections to Lev. 17; see Oliver, *Torah Praxis*, 381–382. See also M. Bockmuehl, *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches: Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 165–167. Moreover, the writings of the church fathers, even those who dismiss the idea of purity confirm that the Decree was understood in light of Lev 17–18; see Zellentin, “Ritual Slaughter,” 132–140; P. J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1990), 177–186.

<sup>21</sup> B. Malina, “Does Porneia Mean Fornication?,” *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972): 10–17. A wide range of texts including the Dead Sea Scrolls, several Greek apocrypha, and the Targumim designate any forbidden sexual relation as *porneia*, or as *zenut*, its Hebrew cognate; see, Wehnert, *Reinheit*, 232–233 and Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 97–98. Likewise, Paul’s use of *porneia* in 1 Cor 5–6 and Gal 5:19–21 would also seem to presuppose the prohibitions in Lev 18, Oliver, *Torah Praxis*, 377, and Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 97–116.

extending to gentiles the commandment to wash after intercourse, prescribed in Lev 15:18 for Israelites but not for *gerim*.

The *Homilies* have a very negative view of pagans, who are seen as “impure [ἐμισάνθητε] in body and soul” (8.22.2), subject to the power of demons in this world and destined for destruction in the next.<sup>22</sup> The worship of many gods spurs evil and unrighteous behavior and the ensuing corruption and pollution seem to go so deep as to effect the nature of pagans. Hence, in order to adhere to *threskeia* they must be immersed “for the remission of sins” (7.8; 8.22; 9.23; 17.7) whereby they become “pure [καθαροί] in body and soul” and transformed from *ethnē* to *theosebeis*.<sup>23</sup> Only gentiles are baptized,<sup>24</sup> an initiation rite that purifies them from the pollutions of idolatry and the sinful nature intrinsic to all who worship many gods (7.8.1; 9.23.2; 13.4.3).<sup>25</sup> Baptism is perceived as a rebirth whereby pagans acquire a new origin/descent enabling them to observe God’s law: “Being born again [ἀναγεννηθεῖς] to God by water ... you change your first origin/descent/race [γένεσιν],<sup>26</sup> which is of lust, and thus

---

<sup>22</sup> On the pagans’ subjection to demons, see G. B. Bazzana, “Healing the World: Medical and Social Practice in the Pseudo-Clementine Novel,” in *Rediscovering the Apocryphal Continent: New Perspectives on Early Christian and Late Antique Apocryphal Texts and Traditions*, ed. P. Piovaneli and T. Burke (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 351–367, esp. 362–363.

<sup>23</sup> While the term godfearers in ancient texts (and scholarly literature) has a range of different meanings, the *Homilies* use it specifically to denote law-observant worshippers of the one God.

<sup>24</sup> E.g. people of Tyre (7.5), people of Sidon (7.8), people of Beyrouth (7.12), people of Tripolis (8.22; 9.19; 9.23; 11.25–27), Clement (11.35), and Clement’s mother (13.4–14.1–2).

<sup>25</sup> Baptism as a marker of initiation or conversion seems to have been the prevalent view during the early centuries C.E. Cf. W. Schmithals’s study “On Baptizing Children in Early Christianity,” in his *The Theology of the First Christians* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997) where he shows that in the first three centuries, infants born to Christian parents were generally not baptized because they were considered to be born Christian. Baptism was reserved for converts, and as noted by D. Weiss, this seems to imply that salvational status can be passed down genealogically by Christian parents to their children in a manner reminiscent of the rabbinic understanding of entry into God’s covenant through birth, D. H. Weiss, “Born into Covenantal Salvation? Baptism and Birth in Early Christianity and Classical Rabbinic Judaism,” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 24 (2017): 318–338.

<sup>26</sup> The Greek word *γένεσις* can mean “origin, race, descent,” “race, kind, or sort of animals,” and “family,” H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon with a Revised Supplement* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 343.

you are able to obtain salvation. But otherwise it is impossible” (11.26.1, cf. 11.24; *Rec.* 6.8–9, 4.32), and “[W]e can show you how, being born again [ἀναγεννηθείς], and changing your origin/descent/race [γένεσιν], and living according to the law, you will attain eternal salvation” (19.23.6, par. *Rec.* 3.67).<sup>27</sup>

Idolatry, race/descent, and observance of the law are all intertwined in the *Homilies* and accordingly, pagans must be purified from the corrupting effects of idolatry integral to their nature, enabling them to begin a new life with a new genealogy. Purified and transformed, ex-pagan gentile *theosebeis* acquire a status equal to that of Jews and, like Jews, baptized gentiles who adhere to God’s law are “heirs of eternal blessings” (*Hom.* 9.23), “sons of God,” and “heirs of the eternal kingdom” (*Hom.* 10.25; *Rec.* 5.35). That they do not become Jews is indicated by the fact that male converts are not circumcised and that gentile *theosebeis* are bound only by the commandments that Leviticus 17–18 and Acts 15:19–20 prescribe for non-Jews.<sup>28</sup> The claim that the *Homilies* replace circumcision with baptism and prescribe a limited law observance for all Christians expressed by some scholars,<sup>29</sup> rests on the assumption that the *Homilies* address a “Jewish Christian” community made up of a mix of Jesus-oriented Jews and gentiles (“Christians”), and fails to note that Peter’s public teachings about law observance always address gentiles. Thus, it appears that rather than imposing a common practice for all Jesus adherents, the decision to baptize gentiles while not circumcising the males actually *upholds* the distinction

---

<sup>27</sup> Rabbinic texts reflect a similar view of conversion as a rebirth whereby the convert severs all former family ties, making the rabbinic conversion ceremony and the *Homilies’* baptism similar both in appearance and significance. For the development of the rabbinic conversion procedure; see M. Lavee, “The ‘Tractate’ of Conversion—BT Yeb. 46–48 and the Evolution of Conversion Procedure,” *European Journal of Jewish Studies* 4 (2011): 169–213.

<sup>28</sup> Male circumcision as the main marker of conversion to Judaism is early and taken for granted in tannaitic texts; see S. J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 209–221). Accordingly, the fact that circumcision is omitted and only immersion prescribed seems to suggest that these gentiles do not, according to the *Grundschrift* and *Homilies*, become Jews.

<sup>29</sup> See e.g. E. Molland, *Opuscula Patristica* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1970), 33–34, who suggests that baptism in the *Homilies* has replaced circumcision for all Jesus adherents, including Jews. Jones, *Pseudoclementina*, 148, also maintains that the author of the *Grundschrift* thinks Jews must be baptized.



between Jesus-believing gentiles and Jews even as they together make up the people of God.<sup>30</sup>

Unlike gentiles, who when joining *threskeia* undergo an initiation rite whereby they are born anew and switch categories from *ethnē* to *theosebeis*, there is no indication that Jews who embrace Jesus change their identity or cease to live Jewishly.<sup>31</sup> As worshippers of the one God and adherents to his law all Jews—whether Jesus-oriented or not—are by definition *theosebeis*, and given the *Homilies* view that it is gentiles, not Jews, who need to change, the latter presumably remain committed to full Torah observance.<sup>32</sup> The great importance attributed to law observance (e.g. *Hom.* 8.5–6; 11.16) and the fact that Jesus is presented primarily as the teacher for gentiles would also seem to support this assumption.

The extent to which baptized gentiles are aligned with Jews is illustrated by the fact that they enjoy commensality with Jews and other baptized gentiles but are prohibited from eating with *ethnē* (pagans). As often noted, partaking of food is a social act that creates and cements a bond between those who share a meal, and a prohibition to eat with certain people is tantamount to saying that certain kinds of vital social relations with them are to be avoided.<sup>33</sup> Peter explains *threskeia* to Clement’s pagan mother as follows:

I wish you to know, o, woman, the course of life involved in our *θηρησεία*. We worship one God, who made the world which

---

<sup>30</sup> This is in continuity with Paul, of whom P. Fredriksen says: ‘Paul’s principled resistance to circumcising gentiles-in-Christ ... precisely *preserves* the distinction *kata sarka* between Jews and the various other ethnic groups within the *ekklēsia*,’ P. Fredriksen, ‘How Later Contexts Affect Pauline Content, or Retrospect is the Mother of Anachronism,’ in *Jews and Christians in the First and Second Centuries: How to Write Their History*, ed. P. J. Tomson and J. Schwartz (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 17–51, quote on p. 36.

<sup>31</sup> The term “identity” here denotes the fact that the God, family relationships, and customs of Jews remain the same, as opposed to baptized gentiles who abandon their gods and ancestral customs and are said to be born anew (11.24, 26; 19.23).

<sup>32</sup> Cf. the Apostolic Decree that makes no mention of Torah observance by Jews and yet full Torah observance by them seems to be taken for granted; see M. Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 123; Zellentin, “Ritual Slaughter,” 130.

<sup>33</sup> D. C. Kraemer, *Jewish Eating and Identity Through the Ages* (London: Routledge, 2009 [2007]), 28; D. M. Freidenreich, *Foreigners and Their Food: Constructing Otherness in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Law* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015 [2011]), 96–100.

you see and we keep his law, which has for its chief injunctions to worship him alone, and to hallow his name, and to honour our parents, and to be chaste, and to live piously. In addition to this, we do not live with all indiscriminately; nor do we take our food from the same table as pagans [ἐθνῶν], inasmuch as we cannot eat along with them, because they live impurely [ἀκαθάρτως]. But when we have persuaded them to have true thoughts, and to follow a right course of action, and have immersed [βαπτίσαντες] them with a thrice blessed invocation, then we associate with them. For not even if it were our father, or mother, or wife, or child, or brother, or any other one having a claim on our affection, can we venture to take our meals with him; for our ἠρησκεία compels us to make a distinction (13.4.3–4).<sup>34</sup>

The “we” here refers to *theosebeis*, that is, the larger group of believers in the one God consisting of Jews and baptized gentiles. Speaking from the perspective of gentile *theosebeis*, the *Homilies’* Peter is concerned to separate them from relatives who are still pagans and whose influence would constitute a constant threat to the new way of life of these gentile *theosebeis*. Commensality between Jews and baptized gentiles reflects the fact that the line dividing humanity has been redrawn so that it no 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. This new division was initiated by Paul and others within the early Jesus movement, who allowed unrestricted commensality between Jews and non-Jews within the movement, but it was apparently a contested issue in the first century, as seen from the Antioch incident (Gal 2:11–14; cf. Acts 15:1–21).<sup>35</sup> While Paul allowed gentile adherents to the Jesus movement to eat with pagans, although with some restrictions (1

---

<sup>34</sup> Paralleled in *Rec.* 7.29.2–5.

<sup>35</sup> The discussion seems to be part of an ongoing debate among Jews as to whether or not eating and drinking in the company of non-Jews was permitted (e.g. Jub. 22:16; Jdt. 12:17–19; Let. Aris. 181–186). For a survey of the Antioch incident, see M. Zetterholm, “The Antioch Incident Revisited,” *Journal for the Study of Paul and his Letters* 6 (2016): 249–259. A similar debate is attested in rabbinic literature, where some sources establish rules for eating with gentiles (e.g. *m. Abod. Zar.* 5:5), while others consider all partaking of food with gentiles to be idolatrous (e.g. *t. Abod. Zar.* 4:6); see the discussion in Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 230–236. Both texts indicate that at least some Jews ate with some gentiles but reflect different Jewish attitudes to this.

Cor 10:27–32), the *Homilies*' categorical prohibition against eating with pagans reflects a later time and a view according to which baptized gentiles and Jews make up a single community.<sup>36</sup> This position represents a major realigning of humanity whereby baptized gentiles become rather closely associated with Jews.<sup>37</sup> It is in light of this realignment that we should understand a passage that is sometimes cited as evidence that the *Homilies* redefine Jewishness to include law-observant gentile *theosebeis*:<sup>38</sup>

For he is a godfearer [θεοσεβής], of whom I speak, who is truly godfearing [θεοσεβής], not one who is such only in name, but who really practices the Law that has been given him. If anyone acts impiously [ἀσεβής], he is not pious [εὐσεβής]; in like manners, if he who is of another tribe observes the Law, he is a Jew; but he who does not observe it is a Greek. For the Jew trusts God and observes the Law. ... But he who does not observe the Law is manifestly a deserter through not trusting God; and thus as no Jew, but a sinner, he is on account of his sin brought into subjection to those sufferings which are ordained for the punishments of sinners (*Hom.* 11.16.2–4).

However, this is not a halakhic redefinition of who is a Jew, but rather illustrates the restructure of humanity that gives a law-observant gentile the same status as a (law-observant) Jew *in the eyes of God*. Given the emphasis on observance of the law in the immediate context, the point of the statement, “if he who is of another tribe observes the Law, he is a Jew” seems to be that a gentile who

---

<sup>36</sup> By aligning baptized gentiles with Jews, whether Jesus-oriented or not, the *Homilies* distinguish themselves from the attempts to separate Jesus-adherents from Jews, as reflected in the canons of the council at Elvira, which prohibit Christians from eating with Jews. For these canons, see Freidenreich, *Foreigners and Their Food*, 113–118.

<sup>37</sup> From the perspective of pagans, these gentile *theosebeis* may even have appeared to be Jews, as suggested by the *Homilies*' statements that Clement's pagan father Faustus did not want to see his sons after 'they had become Jews' (20.22.2), Appion's comment that Peter had seduced Clement to act and speak 'in the manner of the Jews' (4.7.2), and that he had become lacking in judgment since he began 'consorting with Jews' (4.24.1).

<sup>38</sup> See A. Y. Reed, “‘Jewish Christianity’ after the ‘Parting of the Ways’: Approaches to Historiography and Self-Definition in the Pseudo-Clementines,” in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A. H. Becker and A. Y. Reed (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 189–231, esp. 219–221; D. Forger, “Interpreting the Syrophoenician Woman to Construct Jewish-Christian Fault Lines: Chrysostom and the Ps-CI Homilist in Chrono-Local Perspective,” *Journal of the Jesus Movement in Its Jewish Setting* 3 (2016): 132–166, esp. 147–148.

observes God's law for non-Jews is *like* a Jew in God's estimation, not that he is a Jew. This interpretation is supported by the parallel in *Rec.* 5.34 that states explicitly that this is about who is a Jew or not in God's eyes: "For in God's estimation he is not a Jew who is called a Jew among men, nor is he a gentile that is called a gentile."<sup>39</sup> Thus, in God's eyes, a law-observant gentile is like a Jew, even though he is a gentile. Once a pagan has become a *theosebēs*, his or her situation is the same as that of a Jew. The nature of a baptized gentile is transformed so that he has the ability to live according to the commandments that God has prescribed for him, but in order to be saved he must also realize that potential and observe the commandments. Neither circumcision nor baptism is sufficient to attain salvation; both Jews and gentile *theosebeis* must also observe God's law (8.5, cf. 8.22). A Jew who does not observe the commandments is a "sinner" and has lost everything that is worthwhile about being a Jew, even though halakhically speaking he remains a Jew.

This is similar to 1 Cor 7:17 where Paul famously claims that "circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing; but obeying the commandments of God is everything." As Matthew Thiessen explains, Paul is saying that being Jewish (circumcision) or being gentile (uncircumcision) does not matter—only keeping the commandments that God requires of each group of people does. This does not mean, however, that Jews and gentiles are now the same, or that circumcision is a trivial ritual that can be ignored. It only means that people's origin does not matter; the important thing is that both groups keep the laws given to them.<sup>40</sup>

### **Jesus—the Teacher and Savior of Gentiles**

For the Homilist, the coming of Jesus marks the point in history when God will save the gentiles from the powers of evil by sending Jesus to teach them what the Jews already know through Moses: "In his mercy, God sent his Prophet, and the Prophet has given us the mission to tell you what you ought to think, and what to do" (10.4.3–4), "proclaiming the things which from the beginning were delivered in secret to the worthy, extending mercy even to the gentiles" (3.19.1; cf. 8.6; 7.4). As worshippers of idols, the pagans are subject to the powers of evil ever since the Fall of humankind brought about by the fall of the angels and their subsequent intermingling with human women (8.11–17).<sup>41</sup> At that time God

---

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *b. Meg.* 13a where it says: "anyone who renounces idolatry is called a Jew."

<sup>40</sup> M. Thiessen, *Paul and the Gentile Problem* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 8–10.

<sup>41</sup> Rejecting the idea that Adam sinned, the *Homilies* instead adopt the myth of the origin of evil in the Enoch literature. On the relationship between the *Homilies* and the Book of

made an agreement with the demons—souls of the giants who survived the Flood in the form of demons—according to which they would have power over those humans who worship them and/or fail to keep the law given to all humankind through Noah (8.18–20).<sup>42</sup> Accordingly, pagans suffer from diseases and afflictions imposed by demons, while (law-observant) Jews who worship the only God are spared (9.16). However, in becoming *theosebeis* through purification in baptism and observance of God’s law, these former pagans will recover *threskeia*—the original saving worship intended for all humanity (9.19.2)—and retrieve their soul and likeness to God, lost in the Fall:

Therefore, approach with confidence to God, you who at first were made to be rulers and lords over all things; you who have his image in your bodies, have in like manner the likeness of his judgment in your minds. Since, then, by acting like irrational animals, you have lost the soul of man from your soul, becoming like swine, you are the prey of demons. If, therefore, you receive the law of God, you become men. For it cannot be said of irrational animals, “you shall not kill, you shall not commit adultery, you shall not steal” and so forth. Therefore, do not refuse, when invited, to return to your first nobility, for it is possible, if you be conformed to God by good works. And being accounted to be sons by reason of your likeness to him, you shall be reinstated as lords of all (10.6.1–4).

In the worldview of the *Homilies*, it is commitment to God’s law and good works that save. Through observance of God’s law, gentiles will be restored

---

the Watchers and *Jubilees*, see E. Tigchelaar, “Manna-Eaters and Man-Eaters: Food of Giants and Men in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* 8,” in *The Pseudo-Clementines: Texts, Dates, Places, Authors and Magic*, ed. J. N. Bremmer (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 92–114, esp. 93–94, 97–102, and K. C. Bautch, “The Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*’ Use of Jewish Pseudepigrapha,” in *Rediscovering the Apocryphal Continent: New Perspectives on Early Christian and Late Antique Apocryphal Texts and Traditions*, ed. P. Piovaneli and T. Burke (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 338–350. Bautch notes that the similarities between Enochic traditions and the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* may help to reconstruct the development of a trajectory of one type of Second Temple Judaism; Bautch, “Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*,” 348.

<sup>42</sup> These laws include the prohibition against shedding blood, consuming carrion or meat torn by wild beasts, or limbs cut from a living animal, and strangled animals (8.19).

to their “first nobility,” that is to their pre-Fall Adamic state. Given his dependence on traditions from the Enoch literature, the Homilist may well have understood the revelation of God’s law to the gentiles through Jesus as the fulfillment of the vision of a time “in which righteous law will be revealed to all the sons of the whole earth” (1 En. 91:14), and “all the sons of men will become righteous, and all the people worship [God]” (1 En. 10:21), as predicted in the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Book of the Watchers.

The Jesus event is the divine intervention necessary to remedy the evil brought into the world by the Fall of the Watchers and for the divide between Jews and gentiles to be overcome so that gentile *theosebeis* in the eyes of God can obtain the same status as Jews. Although the gentiles do not become Jews and a distinction between them remains in daily life, that distinction is less important than it used to be. While it may still dictate the rules for some parts of daily life, the Jesus event has separated gentile *theosebeis* from *ethnē*/pagans and drawn them closer to Jews. Along with Jews they are now part of *threskeia*, the superordinate entity of righteousness made up of all those who believe in the one God, and as sons of God with the same status as Jews, they can hope to attain eternal life in the world to come.

It is only with the explicit assertion that Moses and Jesus are two parallel paths to salvation that the *Homilies* deviate slightly from Paul. While agreeing with Paul that the fact that all Jews have not accepted Jesus as their teacher is part of a plan of divine concealment, the *Homilies* are more confident that Jews do not need Jesus,<sup>43</sup> provided they observe the law given by Moses:

For on this account Jesus is concealed from the Hebrews, who have taken Moses as their teacher, and Moses is hidden from those who have believed Jesus. For, there being one teaching by both, God accepts him who has believed either of these. Neither, therefore, are the Hebrews condemned on account of their ignorance of Jesus, by reason of him who has concealed him, if, doing the things [commanded] by Moses, they do not hate him whom they do not know. Neither are those from among the gentiles condemned, who know not Moses on account of him who has concealed him, provided that these also, doing the things spoken by Jesus, do not hate him whom they do not know (8.6–7).<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> While Paul seems convinced that all Jews will in the end be saved, he does not know exactly how it will happen, leaving it to God and the eschatological future (cf. Rom 9–11).

<sup>44</sup> On this passage, see Reed, “Jewish Christianity,” 213–217.

According to this passage, Jews do not have to believe in Jesus and gentiles do not have to follow the law of Moses, provided they observe the commandments of their respective teachers and do not hate the other teacher (8.5). That Moses and Jesus provide two equivalent paths to salvation, a view that is accompanied by the claim that the teachings from Moses — identified as the oral tradition among non-Jesus-oriented Jews — and the teachings of Jesus constitute two equally valid hermeneutical keys to Scripture (*Hom.* 3.48–57; 16.14; cf. *EpPet.* 1.1; 1.3).<sup>45</sup>

### **Homilies within a Jewish Milieu?**

The *Homilies* have a much greater interest in non-Jesus-oriented Jews and Judaism than the *Recognitions* and betray familiarity with specifically rabbinic ideas, leading some scholars to posit contact with contemporary Jews.<sup>46</sup> In particular, scholars have noted the appreciation for the rabbinic notion of oral Torah and its influence both on the way that correct transmission of the teachings of the true prophet is perceived in the *Homilies* and the way it is considered as a necessary tool for the proper interpretation of Scripture.<sup>47</sup> As argued by Reed, the Homilist appeals to the faithful transmission of Moses' teachings among Jews (2.38; 3.47) and even recognizes rabbinic claims to authority in presenting prophetic truth as being transmitted through two parallel lines, one through the Pharisaic/rabbinic Jews in the “seat of Moses” and one

---

<sup>45</sup> See K. H. Zetterholm, “Israel and the Nations in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions* 1.27–72: Receptions of the Gospel of Matthew” in *Matthew within Judaism: Israel and the Nations in the First Gospel*, ed. D. M. Gurtner and A. Runesson (Atlanta: SBL, 2019), forthcoming. On Jewish oral teachings as a key to a correct understanding of the scriptures, see D. H. Carlson, *Jewish-Christian Interpretation of the Pentateuch in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013), 111–136, and on the teachings of Jesus as an exegetical criterion, Carlson, *Jewish-Christian Interpretation*, 88–105 and Duncan, *Novel Hermeneutics*, 90–92.

<sup>46</sup> A. I. Baumgarten, “Literary Evidence for Jewish Christianity in the Galilee,” in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*, ed. L. I. Levine (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992), 39–50, esp. 47; Reed, “From Judaism and Hellenism,” 432; Reed, “Jewish Christianity,” 222–223.

<sup>47</sup> See K. E. Shuve, “The Doctrine of the False Pericopes and Other Late Antique Approaches to the Problem of Scripture’s Unity,” in *Nouvelles intrigues pseudo-clémentines/Plots in the Pseudo-Clementine Romance: Actes du deuxième colloque international sur la littérature apocryphe chrétienne, Lausanne—Genève, 30 aout–2 septembre 2006*, ed. F. Amsler et al. (Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2008), 437–445, esp. 441–443; Carlson, *Jewish-Christian Interpretation*, 111–136.

through Peter's bishops on the "throne of Christ" (3.70; 3.18–19, cf. 3.60),<sup>48</sup> statements that are unparalleled in the *Recognitions* and which seem to reflect a wish to accommodate rabbinic Jews. Other factors pointing to affinity with non-Jesus-oriented contemporary Jews are the presentation of Jewish practices as a model to be emulated (4.13; 7.4; 9.16; 11.28),<sup>49</sup> the emphasis on the continuity between Moses' teachings for Jews and Peter's teachings for gentiles, the partnership between Jews and gentile *theosebeis* against paganism,<sup>50</sup> and the appeal to God's saving act of Israel through Moses as a model for the gentiles' salvation through Jesus (2.33).

These traits might indicate not only that the Homilist had contacts with rabbinic Jews but that he himself functioned in a context where non-Jesus-oriented Jews were present. Instead of automatically assuming that the *Homilies* represent a separate "Jewish Christian" group with influence from and close ties to rabbinic Jews, we might consider the possibility that a local Jewish community, possibly in Antioch, may have been able to accommodate the presence of Jesus-oriented Jews and gentiles even as late as the early fourth century. In the third and early fourth century, "Jewish" was not yet synonymous with "rabbinic," and a Jewish milieu would not have been limited to the rabbinic movement. Rabbinic influence did not yet dominate,<sup>51</sup> and synagogue art from

---

<sup>48</sup> A. Y. Reed, "'Jewish Christianity' as Counter-history? The Apostolic Past in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* and the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*," in *Antiquity in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Pasts in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. G. Gardner and K. L. Osterloh (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 172–216, esp. 190–194; A. Y. 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. R. S. Boustán et al. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 860–895, esp. 887–888.

<sup>49</sup> See C. Gianotto, "Les baptêmes dans les Pseudo-Clémentines," in *Nouvelles intrigues pseudo-clémentines/Plots in the Pseudo-Clementine Romance: Actes du deuxième colloque international sur la littérature apocryphe chrétienne, Lausanne—Genève, 30 aout–2 septembre 2006*, ed. F. Amsler et al. (Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2008), 223–234, esp. 229–230; A. Y. Reed, "'Jewish-Christian' Apocrypha and the History of Jewish/Christian Relations," in *Rediscovering the Apocryphal Continent: New Perspectives on Early Christian and Late Antique Apocryphal Texts and Traditions*, ed. P. Piovaneli and T. Burke (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 87–116, esp. 106.

<sup>50</sup> Reed, "From Judaism and Hellenism," 425–435.

<sup>51</sup> Although the rabbis were beginning to gain in influence during this period, the process was slow; see C. Hezser, *The Social Structure of the Rabbinic Movement* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997) and H. Lapin, "The Origins and Development of the Rabbinic Movement in the Land of Israel," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism. Volume IV: The Late Roman-*



fourth–sixth centuries indicates that a wide range of ideological inclinations were represented among community members.<sup>52</sup> The new dating of the Aphrodisias inscriptions to the fourth or fifth century makes them contemporaneous with the *Homilies*, and raises the possibility that the *theosebeis* mentioned there as being associated with the Jewish community included Jesus-believing *theosebeis* of a kind similar to those we encounter in the *Homilies*.<sup>53</sup> Although by the early fourth century, many gentile believers in Jesus had broken away from Jewish institutions and formed communities of their own, we need not assume that all had. The social network in Greco-Roman societies was based on various kinds of associations or craft guilds organized around ethnic identity, cult, trade, or neighborhood, where Jews and non-Jews would have intermingled. An occupation guild that based membership on a common profession would have been likely to include a mix of Jews, Jesus-oriented gentiles, and pagans who were involved in the same trade. As recently argued by Richard Last, an occupation-based association (or neighborhood association) that included Jews would not have been much different from the ethnic-based institution commonly known as a synagogue. All associations had patron gods and hence the God of Israel would have been worshipped not only in synagogues but also in guilds and neighborhood associations which included Jewish members.<sup>54</sup> In light of this, it does not seem unlikely at all to imagine gentile Jesus-adherents in a milieu where non-Jesus-oriented Jews were both present and perhaps influential. The tendency towards accommodation of non-Jesus-

---

*Rabbinic Period*, ed. S. T. Katz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 206–229, esp. 213–218.

<sup>52</sup> See R. Talgam, “Constructing Identity Through Art: Jewish Art as a Minority Culture in Byzantium,” in *Jews in Byzantium: Dialectics of Minority and Majority Cultures*, ed. R. Bonfil et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 399–454, who suggests that the synagogue in late antiquity was a communal cultural–religious establishment, which absorbed and combined traditions from various groups within Jewish society. On the limited influence of the rabbi in the synagogue during this period; see L. I. Levine, *Visual Judaism in Late Antiquity: Historical Contexts of Jewish Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 428–434.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Levine, *Visual Judaism*, 195 and n. 76; P. Fredriksen, *Paul: the Pagans’ Apostle* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 205, n. 46, who suggest that some of the *theosebeis* mentioned in the inscription may have been Christian.

<sup>54</sup> R. Last, “The Other Synagogues,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 47 (2016): 330–363. Last points out that ancient writers actually refer to Jewish craft guilds as “synagogues” (p. 334). See also A. Runesson, “Jewish and Christian Interaction from the First to the Fifth Centuries,” in *The Early Christian World*, ed. P. F. Esler (London: Routledge, 2017), 244–264.

oriented Jews, characteristic of the *Homilies* as opposed to the *Recognitions*, would make sense as part of an effort to convince fellow Jews that law-observant baptized gentiles have much in common with Jews and should maintain their relationship to the Jewish community, even as both rabbinic Jews and gentile Christians were trying to separate Jesus-followers from Jews.

A concern to convince non-Jesus-oriented Jews of the loyalty and admiration of gentile *theosebeis* and as being closely aligned with Jews could account for the description of Clement's defense of and attraction to Judaism in *Hom.* 4–6. The material in *Hom.* 4–6 is commonly understood to derive from an independent source, most often characterized as a Hellenistic Jewish apology,<sup>55</sup> and the Homilist's reworking of it differs radically from the version in *Rec.* 10.17–51. Here Clement describes his piety as being closely related to Judaism ("I betook myself to the holy God and law of the Jews," 4.22.2) and reveals that he was attracted to Judaism through an encounter with a Jewish merchant already during his youth in Rome (5.26–28). Although the text stops short of saying that Clement converted to Judaism, as is sometimes claimed, there is undeniably a tension with the rest of the work where Clement is introduced to the teachings of the True Prophet (referred to as *threskeia* rather than Judaism) through the apostle Peter (*Hom.* 1.15–3) and is baptized in *Hom.* 11.35. While these inconsistencies in the narrative probably indicate the origin of some of this material in another source, the way in which the Homilist included and reworked it may point to a concern to make gentile Jesus-adherents more acceptable to non-Jesus-oriented Jews with the claim that one of their early leaders had received a Jewish education and had both knowledge of Judaism and sympathy for Jews.<sup>56</sup> Clement's defense of Jews and Judaism (absent from *Rec.* 10.17–51) and simultaneous condemnation of Greek *paideia* as encouraging impiety, impurity, and irrational hatred of Jews (4.17.1–20.3), align him and

---

<sup>55</sup> W. Adler, "Apion's 'Encomium of Adultery': A Jewish Satire of Greek *Paideia* in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 64 (1993): 15–49, esp. 28–30. An alternative hypothesis is that it originated with the *Homilies*, but in view of its similarities with Philo and because some of the material is paralleled in *Rec.* 10; see Reed, "From Judaism and Hellenism," 427 n. 15.

<sup>56</sup> The same concern may be behind the reference to Justa, the adoptive mother of Clement's brothers as "a proselyte of the Jews" (13.7, cf. 2.19–20), unparalleled in the *Recognitions* and inconsistent with the *Grundschrift's* view that gentile *theosebeis* do not become Jews. This deviation from the position that gentile *theosebeis* remain non-Jews, otherwise faithfully preserved by the *Homilies*, could perhaps be explained by the same wish to invent a Jewish background for important gentile leaders.

other gentile *theosebeis* closely with Judaism while marking a certain distance to gentile Christianity.<sup>57</sup>

### Conclusion

The *Homilies* display a number of traits, which seem to point to a milieu where there was a presence of non-Jesus-oriented Jews. These include the choice of the term *theosebeis* rather than “Christian,” the claim of continuity between the teachings of Moses and those of Jesus, the concern to include and accommodate non-Jesus-oriented Jews, and the tendency to mark a distance to gentile Christianity. The claim that baptized gentiles are united with Jews could be understood as a wish to convince non-Jesus-oriented Jews that Jesus-oriented gentiles were their allies against pagan myths and culture. The idea that Moses and Jesus are two parallel paths to salvation appears also in the *Recognitions* (*Rec.* 4.5), which suggests that it derives from the third-century *Grundschrift*, and although it appears that the *Homilies* have reinforced and developed it further,<sup>58</sup> its presence in the *Grundschrift* nevertheless seems to suggest that its author was also concerned to include non-Jesus-oriented Jews among those who will be saved. Such a concern also appears in other texts from Syria and Palestine, such as the *Apocalypse of Peter* and the *Testament of the 12 Patriarchs*, the latter of which outlines a two-paths soteriology similar to the *Homilies*.<sup>59</sup> Moreover, texts such as *Recognitions* 1.27–72 (a distinct source within the *Recognitions*, dated to ca. 200 CE), the *Ascension of Isaiah* and 5 and 6 *Ezra* present adherence to Jesus as part of Judaism or at least as being in continuity

---

<sup>57</sup> Reed notes that by attacking Greek *paideia* as a whole, not making the distinction between Greek myth and philosophy, as was common among gentile Christians who condemned Greek piety but held philosophy in high regard, the Homilist would have dismissed many of gentile Christian contemporaries as merely “Greeks”; Reed, “From Judaism and Hellenism,” 429–435. She also sees *Hom.* 4–6 as a reworking that reflects the Homilist’s concern to portray Peter’s preaching about the true Prophet Jesus as closely aligned with Judaism.

<sup>58</sup> The *Recognitions* develop the *Grundschrift* in the opposite direction here, adding that Jews who believe in Moses ought also to believe in Jesus (*Rec.* 4–6, esp. 5.10–13). A. Reed has suggested that the *Homilies* and *Recognitions* have both reworked their source here, the Homilist enhancing and developing the “Jewishness” of the *Grundschrift*, while the author/redactor of the *Recognitions* downplayed it; Reed, “Jewish Christianity,” 221–224.

<sup>59</sup> On the *Testament of the 12 Patriarchs*; see J. Marcus, “The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Didascalia Apostolorum: A Common Jewish Christian Milieu?,” *The Journal of Theological Studies* 61 (2010): 596–626; J. Marcus, “Israel and the Church in the Exegetical Writings of Hippolytus,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130 (2011): 385–406.

with it.<sup>60</sup> Perhaps then, we can trace a development within one strand of tradition from the early Jesus movement (especially Paul and Acts) into the early fourth century, which focused solely on the conversion of pagans, while asserting that non-Jesus-oriented Jews could be saved by observing the teachings of Moses. During these centuries, those who belonged within this strand of tradition had to come to terms with the fact that all Jews had not accepted Jesus as their teacher and found a solution that Paul only hints at in eschatological terms. Jews will be saved apart from Jesus, provided they remain committed to the Torah. Such a strand of tradition would likely have evolved in a milieu that was dominated not by the concerns of gentile Christianity but rather by the presence of non-Jesus-oriented Jews.

---

<sup>60</sup> See Frankfurter, “Beyond Jewish Christianity,” 131–143 and the survey in Reed, “‘Jewish-Christian’ Apocrypha,” 87–116. On *Rec.* 1.27–72; see F. S. Jones, *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity: Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.27–71* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).