

Overview of Previous Scholarship

1.1. INTRODUCTION

Most of our knowledge about “Jewish Christianity” in antiquity is dependent on patristic heresiological sources. But in addition to these, the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* and the *Recognitions* (hereafter *Hom.* and *Rec.*) occupy a special place. For they are widely recognized as a few of the most important primary sources for gaining something of a firsthand knowledge of Jewish Christianity. The vast majority of scholarly attention given to the Pseudo-Clementines, however, has focused on its source criticism, but to date little attention has been given to pentateuchal exegesis within this literature, as the following survey will illustrate.

We are very fortunate to have available a thorough history of research on the Pseudo-Clementines, provided by F. Stanley Jones.¹ Here I will highlight only those works of scholarship that have immediate bearing on the present study. My overview will begin with some of the scholarship dedicated to source-critical issues. Second, I will move from there to survey scholarly work on biblical exegesis in the Pseudo-Clementines in general. Third, I will discuss the *status quaestionis* in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* regarding the more specific area of pentateuchal exegesis—the special focus of this study. Now, when it comes to source criticism, a great deal of scholarly effort has been directed toward the (now lost) “base text” on which *Hom.* and *Rec.* are believed to depend. Scholarship designates this base text as the *Grundschrift*. To this we now turn.

1. F. Stanley Jones, “The Pseudo-Clementines: A History of Research,” *Second Century* 2 (1982): 1–33; 63–96. Also helpful is Frédéric Manns, “Les Pseudo-Clémentines (Homélie et Reconnaissances): Etat de la Question,” *LASBF* 53 (2003): 157–84. For an overview of some more recent developments, see Frédéric Amsler, “État de la Recherche récente sur le Roman pseudo-clémentin,” in *Nouvelles intrigues pseudo-clémentines*, ed. Frédéric Amsler et al. (Lausanne: Editions du Zebre, 2008), 25–45; Pierre Geoltrain, “Le Roman pseudo-clémentin depuis les recherches d’Oscar Cullmann,” in *Le Judéo-christianisme dans tous ses états*, ed. Simon C. Mimouni and F. Stanley Jones (Paris: Cerf, 2001), 31–38.

1.2. THE GRUNDSCHRIFT

Insofar as *Hom.* and *Rec.* are similar in structure and share many parallels, it was the study of the complex literary relationship between them that eventually led scholars to postulate a *Grundschrift*. Scholarly efforts have necessarily had a speculative character and have led to uneven results. Adolf Hilgenfeld reconstructed a Jewish-Christian source document from *Rec.* 1.27–72 and the “table of contents” preserved in *Rec.* 3.75.² Also, attached to *Hom.* are two prefatory documents, the *Epistle of Peter to James* and the *Contestatio*. These were thought to be the introductory writings of the *Grundschrift*—which Hilgenfeld designated as the Κηρύγματα Πέτρου (“Preachings of Peter”). The Κηρύγματα were so called because of the various passages in *Rec.* which state that Peter had sent to James books recording his “preachings.”³ Hilgenfeld also believed the Jewish Christianity of the Κηρύγματα source was originally associated with the Essenes, and later adapted by Ebionites. Then, once the Κηρύγματα source was in the hands of the Homilist, it was given an “anti-Marcionite” shape.

Hilgenfeld believed that the Κηρύγματα source was subsequently combined with another source, called the Περίοδοι Πέτρου (“Circuits of Peter”). This source is attested to in Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.15, where he reports that the Περίοδοι Πέτρου were written by Clement and used (or rather abused) by the Ebionites.⁴ According to Hilgenfeld, *Hom.* are secondary to and represent a reworking of *Rec.*, both of which drew on the *Grundschrift* (which itself was to be identified with the Κηρύγματα Πέτρου).⁵

Karl Reinhold Köstlin differed from Hilgenfeld regarding the growth of the Pseudo-Clementines. He believed the material in *Rec.* 1–7 assumed only the Περίοδοι Πέτρου and that *Hom.* were also based on this source.⁶ He was the first to point out the similarity between parts of *Rec.* 1 and the Ἀναβαθμοὶ

2. See also *Rec.* 1.21.7–9, 74.3–5; *Rec.* 3.32.4–7, 52.5, 74.4–75.11.

3. This term is also taken from its occurrence in *ep. Petr.*, 1.2 and *Cont.* 1.1.

4. See *Pan.* 30.15.1–2: Χρῶνται δὲ καὶ ἄλλαις τισὶ Βίβλοις, δῆθεν ταῖς Περιόδοις καλουμέναις Πέτρου ταῖς διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφείσαις, νοθεύσαντες μὲν τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς, ὀλίγα δὲ ἀληθινὰ ἔασαντες, κτλ.

5. Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Die clementinischen Rekognitionen und Homilien* (Leipzig: Chr. E. Kollmann, 1848), cited in Jones, “Pseudo-Clementines,” 9n41. Hilgenfeld developed a view similar to Dodwell’s before him; see H. Dodwell, *Dissertationes in Irenaeum* (Oxford, 1689), 439–46, cited in Jones, “Pseudo-Clementines,” 8n36.

Ἰακώβου (“Ascents of James”) attested in Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.16.6–9. Similarly, Gerhard Uhlhorn argued against Hilgenfeld’s view that *Rec.* are primary. But since he regarded some parts of *Rec.* to have “primitive” features, he was also compelled to assume a *Grundschrift* behind both *Hom.* and *Rec.*⁷ It was also Uhlhorn’s estimation that the *Grundschrift* was composed of disputations between Peter and Simon, while lacking the personage of Clement.⁸

Later, Johannes Lehmann took a middle road between Hilgenfeld and Uhlhorn and proposed a synthesis that, according to Jones, “advanced research by preparing the way for a new approach where the exclusive priority of either [*Rec.* or *Hom.*] would no longer be discussed.”⁹ Consequently, the focus then shifted toward refining scholars’ understanding of the sources and character of the *Grundschrift* itself.

It was Richard Adelbert Lipsius who introduced a new stage in Pseudo-Clementine research. For Lipsius went beyond Hilgenfeld, asserting that the Κηρύγματα Πέτρου source was dependent on an older, Ebionite Πράξεις Πέτρου (“Acts of Peter,” attested to in Eusebius, *HE* 3.3.2), which depicted discussions between Peter and Simon Magus.¹⁰ It was also Lipsius who for the first time differentiated the *Grundschrift* itself from the Κηρύγματα Πέτρου. Shortly thereafter, at the beginning of the twentieth century, Hans Waitz attempted to substantiate Lipsius’s thesis.¹¹ Waitz employed a comparative methodology, analyzing patristic witness as literary proof for the actual existence of the *Grundschrift*, understood here as “the Clement-narrative.” He concluded that the *Grundschrift* originated in Rome around 220 or 230 ce, and that both *Hom.* and *Rec.* derived independently from it.¹²

6. Karl Reinhold Köstlin, review of Adolf Hilgenfeld, “Die clementinischen Rekognitionen und Homilien, nach ihrem Ursprung und Inhalt dargestellt,” in *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* (1849), cols. 577–78, 585, 608, 615, cited in F. Stanley Jones, *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity: Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 127-71* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 5n13.

7. Gerhard Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien und Rekognitionen des Clemens Romanus* (Göttingen: Dieterische Buchhandlung, 1854), 351, cited in Jones, “Pseudo-Clementines,” 9n42.

8. Another important contribution was his argument for locating the *Grundschrift* in Syria; earlier scholarship placed it in Rome. See Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien*, 343–64, 381–429, cited in Jones, “Pseudo-Clementines,” 9n44.

9. Jones, “Pseudo-Clementines,” 10.

10. See Richard Adelbert Lipsius, *Die Quellen der römischen Petrus-Sage* (Kiel: Schwesche Buchandlung, 1872), 13–46., cited in Jones, “Pseudo-Clementines,” 15n97.

11. Hans Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien und Rekognitionen* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1904), 2–15, 16–48, cited in Jones, “Pseudo-Clementines,” 11n57.

12. See Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, 74–75, 366, cited in Jones, “Pseudo-Clementines,” 11n61.

Carl Schmidt subsequently built on Waitz's efforts and proceeded to do comparative work on the *Grundschrift* and the *Didascalia apostolorum*.¹³ He concluded by dating the *Grundschrift* between 220 and 230 and locating it in the Transjordan; the author of the *Grundschrift* was thought to be a Syrian Catholic Christian of Jewish heritage.¹⁴ In Jones's estimation, Schmidt's presentation proved to be "the most extensive characterization of [the *Grundschrift*], and most subsequent scholars have done little more than accept Schmidt's view with minor variations."¹⁵ One important exception to the reception of Schmidt's work (as Jones notes) is his suggestion that *Rec.* were actually dependent on both *Hom.* and the *Grundschrift*. On this point, Schmidt's proposal has "remained highly controversial in Pseudo-Clementine research." The precise literary relationship between *Hom.*, *Rec.*, the *Grundschrift*, and the other underlying sources of all three remains a matter of ongoing scholarly debate.¹⁶ Indeed, as Jan N. Bremmer has recently summarized the situation, "Virtually everything is unclear about the work that is commonly known as the *Pseudo-Clementines*. Debates have raged now for over a century, and scholars have not yet reached a full consensus regarding the nature of the work, its sources of inspiration, the time and place of its composition, or the author himself and his milieu."¹⁷

In sum, as evidenced by this brief survey, twentieth-century scholarship on this literature sought to delineate alleged sources behind the *Grundschrift* and to determine its provenance, yielding mixed results.¹⁸ Let us turn now from source-critical questions to consider what other scholarly work has been done in the area of biblical exegesis in the Pseudo-Clementines.

13. Carl Schmidt, *Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1929), 278, 313, cited in Jones, "Pseudo-Clementines," 12n66.

14. Schmidt, *Studien*, 286–88, cited in Jones, "Pseudo-Clementines," 13n67.

15. Jones, "Pseudo-Clementines," 14. See also Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, 340; Bernhard Rehm, "Zur Entstehung der pseudoclementinischen Schriften," *ZNW* 37 (1938): 77–184; Hans Joachim Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1949), 38–41; Georg Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (Berlin: Akademie, 1981), 256, 259, 267, 291.

16. Jones, "Pseudo-Clementines," 14, especially nn82, 83. See also Manns, "Les Pseudo-Clémentines," 164–65.

17. Jan N. Bremmer, "Pseudo-Clementines: Texts, Dates, Places, Authors and Magic," in *The Pseudo-Clementines*, ed. Jan N. Bremmer (Leuven: Peeters 2010), 1.

18. See Jones, "Pseudo-Clementines," 14–33.

1.3. FROM “SOURCE-CRITICAL” TO “EXEGETICAL” CONSIDERATIONS

Although the literary-historical classification of the *Grundschrift* and/or the Κηρύγματa Πέτρου has long been disputed, the ubiquity of actual “Jewish-Christian” elements in the Pseudo-Clementine literature has not. As Jones puts it: “While most of modern research into the [Pseudo-Clementine literature] has focused on the question of the sources behind our present recensions, the older literature that was produced before the source critical phase undertook extensive discussions of the doctrine, date, and origin of [*Hom.* and *Rec.*].”¹⁹

About a hundred years ago, work like this was done by Juda Bergmann.²⁰ Bergmann’s study sought to examine the Clementine literature “au point de vue de leurs éléments juifs et de noter les vestiges des idées juives qui s’y trouvent à l’état sporadique” (“in terms of their Jewish elements and to note the remains of Jewish ideas which they occasionally contain”).²¹ But while some scholars have accounted for the Jewish-Christian theological/doctrinal elements in the Pseudo-Clementine corpus, the *exegetical* elements remain largely untouched. In the estimation of G. B. Bazzana, “It is an established fact that many inquiries into the pseudo-Clementine literary history have yielded results unstable, if not self-contradictory. New analyses require new criteria that focus less on theological doctrines than on stylistic and lexical observations on pseudo-Clementine materials.”²²

Moving somewhat further in the direction of exegetical analysis, some scholars have dealt with the scriptural quotations in the Pseudo-Clementines. Uhlhorn, for example, collected the quotations from the Old Testament.²³ Subsequently, Waitz collected quotations from both the Old and the New Testament.²⁴ But once again, it appears that the primary concern of these studies has been source critical. These collections, as valuable as they are for their philological notes and implications for source criticism, do little to further our knowledge about the *actual exegesis* of those biblical texts. Other similar studies have been conducted specifically on the scriptural quotations and sayings of

19. *Ibid.*, 69.

20. Juda Bergmann, “Les éléments juifs dans les pseudo-clémentines,” *REJ* 46 (1903): 89–98.

21. *Ibid.*, 89 (translation mine).

22. G. B. Bazzana, “Eve, Cain, and the Giants: The Female Prophetic Principle and its Succession in the Pseudo-Clementine Novel,” in *Nouvelles intrigues pseudo-clémentines*, ed. Frédéric Amsler et al. (Lausanne: Editions du Zebre, 2008), 314.

23. Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien*, 126–31.

24. Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, 259–70, for Old Testament quotations; New Testament quotations are found on 271–361.

Jesus in the Gospels.²⁵ The pentateuchal material, however, has received little attention. A thorough analysis of Jewish-Christian biblical exegesis in general, and of the Pentateuch in particular, remains to be done. C. Bigg wrote “The interest that attaches to the *Recognitions* is mainly literary. A close examination of its structure may throw light on difficulties that surround the other far more interesting book [i.e., the *Homilies*]; whereas the interest of the *Homilies* is mainly *doctrinal* and *historical*.”²⁶ It should be added that the interest of the *Homilies* is also exegetical. For the *Homilies* are imbued with a number of intriguing exegetical issues. Yet it remains the case that scholarship has largely overlooked the exegetical material contained in this rich corpus. This circumstance remains largely the same in the present situation, as can be seen from the *status quaestionis*. To this we now turn.

1.4. SURVEY OF MORE RECENT SCHOLARSHIP

As I bring my survey of previous scholarship on the Pseudo-Clementines to an end, it is fitting to call attention to some of the more recent works and their relationship to the present study. Jean Daniélou’s important work on the theology of Jewish Christianity is a valuable contribution, especially for the history of Christian doctrine. One chapter of Daniélou’s book is in fact dedicated to Jewish-Christian exegesis.²⁷ The goal of that chapter, Daniélou says, is “to try to discover *whether, in interpreting the Old Testament, Jewish Christianity made use of the methods of the Judaism of its day*.”²⁸ For his analysis of Jewish-Christian (theological) exegesis, Daniélou examines Targumim, midrashim, and various comments on the book of Genesis. Yet the Pseudo-Clementine literature plays only a very small role in Daniélou’s volume, with little concern for pentateuchal exegesis outside Genesis.

In a similar vein, H. J. Schoeps brought together an impressive body of material and gave to scholars a clearer picture of Jewish Christianity (which for him essentially means Ebionitism).²⁹ Schoeps combed through a great deal of the Pseudo-Clementine literature. Of interest to Schoeps were the (Ebionite)

25. See especially Leslie Kline, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* (Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1975).

26. The “Clementine Homilies,” in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica: Essays in Biblical and Patristic Criticism* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1890), 2:157–93 (italics mine).

27. Jean Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), 81–115.

28. *Ibid.*, 87 (italics original).

29. Hans Joachim Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1949).

doctrinal/theological characteristics found there. Schoeps's work represents a comprehensive, creative synthesis of material that is indispensable for the field. It goes without saying that the present work owes much to his efforts. Even so, his project was simply not directed toward examining the Pseudo-Clementines with a view to pentateuchal exegesis.

Georg Strecker's *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen* gives a detailed analysis of the various elements contained within the Pseudo-Clementines that give them their Jewish-Christian character. His work systematically addresses such Jewish-Christian features as the "True Prophet," the "False Pericopes of Scripture," anti-Pauline tendencies, and others. Particularly useful for the present study is Strecker's catalog of scriptural citations.³⁰ Even so, Strecker's analyses of the scriptural quotations are (once again) mainly concerned with text-critical and source-critical issues. Only occasionally are exegetical comments offered.³¹

Kelley Coblenz Bautch has explored some of the "esoteric traditions" – aspects of the True Prophet's teaching and an oral tradition affiliated with Moses – that inform the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies. The focus of her study is simply not exegetical in focus, and her treatment of pentateuchal exegesis is limited.³²

J. Neville Birdsall has done "a little original research, namely in looking at a sampling of instances which bear on the scriptural citations in the Clementines."³³ Birdsall focuses solely on Gospel citations. So, as far as the present study is concerned, it is in his discussion of the True Prophet that more profitable lines of thought are to be found. In particular, Birdsall addresses an issue concerning (what Strecker calls) the "incarnation" of the True Prophet. The issue here concerns the method whereby the "spirit" changes before ceasing at the final stage, that is, Jesus as the True Prophet.³⁴ Birdsall suggests a

30. Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum*, 117–36.

31. E.g., in Georg Strecker's estimation (*ibid.*, 249), "Gen 49.10 hat im Weissagungsbeweis der Alten Kirche eine bedeutende Stellung innegehabt." Strecker cites Tertullian, *Marc.* (4.11 CSEL 47); Eusebius, *Ecloge propheticae* 1.8; and *Constitutiones apostolicae* 6.11.10.

32. Kelley Coblenz Bautch, "Obscured by the Scriptures, Revealed by the Prophets: God in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies," in *Histories of the Hidden God: Concealment and Revelation in Western Gnostic, Esoteric, and Mystical Traditions*, Gnostica, ed. April D. DeConick and Grant Adamson (Durham: Acumen, 2013), 120–36. It was only in the final moments of the present book's publication that Prof. Bautch's essay came into my hands. It should be noted that she and I have examined facets of the subject of oral tradition in the *Hom.* independently of one another. Prof. Bautch's essay and my book did not have the opportunity to be informed by one other.

33. J. Neville Birdsall, "Problems of the Clementine Literature," in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. James D. G. Dunn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 347–61.

resolution to the matter by postulating either (1) a link between the idea of the “incarnation” and the concept of the *Logos empsykos* as found in Philo’s discussion of Moses, or (2) a similar phenomenon reported by Jerome whereby the spirit, having sought Jesus in all the prophets, now finds rest in him.³⁵

Annette Yoshiko Reed attempts to move beyond the multiplication of hypothetical sources posited by previous research. She focuses on the internal literary features of the text itself rather than emphasizing its hypothetical relationship to the (nonextant) texts mentioned by Epiphanius, Hegesippus, and others. Her study is “socio-critical” in nature and represents an attempt “to elucidate the self-understanding of their [i.e., *Hom.* and *Rec.*] final authors/redactors.”³⁶ Reed analyzes three short passages from *Hom.* and *Rec.* in an attempt to offer a corrective to the standard “parting of the ways” model so often employed within contemporary scholarship.³⁷ Reed emphasizes the “final form” of the Pseudo-Clementine literature and what it offers for our understanding of Judaism and Christianity in the fourth century.³⁸ Her project, and that of the other scholars who contributed to the same volume, represents an attempt to direct scholarly attention away from “approaching Judaism and Christianity as monolithic entities that partook in a single act of separation,” and toward an attempt “to illuminate the broad range of regional and cultural variation in the encounters between different biblically-based religious groups . . . who so strain the dichotomous definitions of modern scholarship.”³⁹

In recent days, scholarly attention given to the Pseudo-Clementines has also been directed toward addressing questions concerning the relationship between Judaism and Hellenism. A collection of recently published articles in *The Pseudo-Clementines*, edited by Jan N. Bremmer, exemplifies a number of scholars’ interest in this material for some of its more distinctively “Hellenistic” features. Thus G. H. van Kooten has written about the notion of “philanthropy” (φιλανθρωπία) in the Pseudo-Clementines; C. Jedan has investigated some

34. *Ibid.*, 352.

35. Jerome, *Commentariorum in Isaiam* 4.11.2.

36. Annette Yoshiko Reed, “Jewish Christianity’ after the ‘Parting of the Ways,’” in *The Ways That Never Parted*, ed. Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed (Minneapolis: Fortress Press 2005), 189–231.

37. The selections Reed analyzes include *Rec.* 1.21–71 (for its description of salvation history); *Hom.* 8.5–7 and *Rec.* 4.5 (for its treatment of Moses and Jesus as teachers of truth); *Hom.* 8–11 / *Rec.* 4–6 (for its treatment of demons, Jews, the salvation of Gentiles, as well as other Jewish Christian features).

38. See Hans Joachim Schoeps’s comment (*Jewish Christianity*, 122), “I see no point in renewing the debate concerning the complicated literary situation presented by the Clementine novel, into which the *Kerygmata Petrou* has been incorporated.”

39. Reed, “Jewish Christianity,” 1.

of the Epicurean and Stoic philosophical sources used in the corpus; and L. R. Lanzillotta has looked at Orphic cosmogonies in the Pseudo-Clementines (with a view to source-critical interests).⁴⁰ But of the seven studies included in Bremmer's book, only one deals with biblical exegesis in any direct way. E. J. C. Tigchelaar offers an analysis of *Hom.* 8.10–20 and the Enochic traditions therein (i.e., the Enochic “Watcher” myth based on certain elaborations of Gen. 6:1–4), arguing that “the so-called embellishments to the Watcher story, are, in fact, the most essential parts of the discourse of the author, and that the traditional Watcher story mainly serves as a stepping-stone to propound the author's distinctive application of the story.”⁴¹ But Tigchelaar concentrates on how the Homilist reworks the Enochic Watcher myth and gives only minimal attention to questions of biblical exegesis.

In sum, the preceding survey reveals something of a gap in the scholarly literature regarding biblical exegesis in the Pseudo-Clementines. Indeed, that such a gap exists is made clear from the most recent history of research to date—that of Frédéric Amsler.⁴² Amsler's survey highlights previous histories of scholarship on the corpus, the state of the edition of texts, treatments of the source-critical problems, and a number of “synchronic studies.” It ends with an overview of scholarly treatments of “le monde pseudo-clémentin” (“the Pseudo-Clementine world”), including studies on such topics as “Jewish-Christianity,” “anti-Paulinism” (with philosophy and astrology), and “women and family.” Absent are any studies dedicated to a fuller investigation of biblical exegesis in the Pseudo-Clementines. It is hoped that the present study will meet this need by shedding light on the area of exegesis in the *Homilies*. My specific goal is to identify the Homilist's exegetical theory in his approach to the Pentateuch.

Finally, a brief word is in order regarding methodology. Annette Yoshiko Reed's work on the Pseudo-Clementines is one expression of the penchant others share for sociohistorical and rhetorical matters.⁴³ I wish to briefly highlight the basic methodology these scholars and others have employed in

40. G. H. van Kooten, “Pagan, Jewish and Christian Philanthropy in Antiquity: A Pseudo-Clementine Keyword in Context,” in Bremmer, *Pseudo-Clementines*, 36–58; C. Jedan, “Fautus: Epicurean and Stoic? On the Philosophical Sources of the *Pseudo-Clementines*,” in Bremmer, *Pseudo-Clementines*, 142–56; L. R. Lanzillotta, “Orphic Cosmogonies in the Pseudo-Clementines? Textual Relationship, Character and Sources of *Homilies* 6.3–13 and *Recognitions* 10.17–19.30,” in Bremmer, *Pseudo-Clementines*, 115–41.

41. E. J. C. Tigchelaar, “Manna-Eaters and Man-Eaters: Food of Giants and Men in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* 8,” in Bremmer, *Pseudo-Clementines*, 94–95.

42. Amsler, “État de la Recherche récente.”

43. Noteworthy in this regard is Nicole Kelley, *Knowledge and Religious Authority in the Pseudo-Clementines: Situating the Recognitions in Fourth Century Syria* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

their works. For as N. Kelley suggests, “Future scholarship might profitably continue this trend toward redaction, narrative, and rhetorical analysis of the Pseudo-Clementines.”⁴⁴ Or, as Reed observes, “Rather than studying [*Hom.* and *Rec.*] for their own sake, scholars have focused their efforts on reconstructing the early sources that may lie *behind* their (also non-extant) source [i.e., the *Grundschrift*].”⁴⁵ Consequently, Reed takes a different route, focusing primarily on “the late antique authors/redactors of this literature, exploring the efforts at self-definition found within [*Hom.* and *Rec.*] in their extant, redacted forms.”⁴⁶ To this extent, she shares the approach employed by Jones in his 1995 monograph, in which Jones (says Reed) “attempts to move beyond the multiplication of hypothetical sources (and conflicting scholarly hypotheses about them) in previous research on the Pseudo-Clementines by focusing upon the internal literary features of the text itself.”⁴⁷ This is echoed by K. M. Vaccarella, who writes, “Out of frustration with source criticism as well as an interest in the literary motivations behind the *Recognitions* and the *Homilies* themselves, there has been a growing trend in recent scholarship to investigate the texts using other approaches that relegate the issue of sources to minimal importance. Such scholars argue that there is intrinsic value in the investigation of the surviving texts.”⁴⁸ Graham Stanton made a similar observation: “Scholars have all too often paid scant attention to the forms of the text for which we have firm textual evidence. They have started back to front, so to speak, and isolated earlier sources with breathtaking confidence as a prelude to reconstruction of their redaction by later editors. The influence of redaction critical studies of the Gospels on some recent studies of the *Pseudo-Clementines* is all too apparent.”⁴⁹

Likewise, while my own reading of the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* is bound to no *single* literary method or theory in particular, I do find traditional “formalism” helpful. In my estimation, George W. E. Nickelsburg has spoken aptly on this. In the introduction to his commentary on *1 Enoch*, he writes the following:

44. *Ibid.*, 25.

45. Reed, “Jewish Christianity,” 201.

46. *Ibid.*, 203.

47. *Ibid.*, 203n52.

48. Kevin Vaccarella, “Shaping Christian Identity: The False Scripture Argument in Early Christian Literature” (PhD diss., Florida State University, 2007), 127.

49. Graham Stanton, “Jewish Christian Elements in the Pseudo-Clementine Writings,” in *Jewish Believers in Jesus*, ed. Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), 307.

The surface structure of a text provides clues for the text's interpretation, and to take seriously the shape, pattern, and order of a text is to honor the text as it presents itself. Because they are not likely to be accidental, they provide entry to an author's mind and purpose. . . . When such order presents itself, it invites the careful reader to make sense of it. This approach from the textual data themselves bears more fruit, I believe, than reading a text through our own axiomatic, theological, literary, and philosophical categories. Thus my way into the text has been inductively literary. . . . I have also sought to make sense of the text as a whole.⁵⁰

I wish to affirm these remarks. Here I adopt something of an “inductively literary” approach, which seeks to address these texts as they appear in their “final forms,” paying special attention to the texts' rhetorical “patterns.” Proceeding in this fashion, it is the goal of the present study to accurately describe the theory of exegesis of the Pentateuch as it emerges from the texts of the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*.⁵¹ I begin my study with an investigation into a fundamental principle underlying the Homilist's theory of exegesis—the rejection of allegorism.

50. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: a Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 1–2.

51. Relevant parallels in the *Recognitions* will also be treated.