Although Egypt was renowned for its wisdom in antiquity, there were of course foolish Egyptians too - at least from a Christian point of view. Good examples must have been Appion and Annoubion, since they were so ‘foolish’ to follow Simon Magus in the *Pseudo-Clementines*. The ‘foolish duo’ first appears in the *Pseudo-Clementines*, when the protagonist of the novel, Clement, arrived in Tyre together with his companions Aquila and Nicetas. It was their task to investigate what Simon Magus was saying in order to prepare Peter for a confrontation with him. However, their arrival was in vain, since ‘in the morning, a friend of Bernice came and said that Simon had set sail for Sidon. From his pupils he had left behind him Appion Pleistonikes, a man of Alexandria, a grammarian by profession (whom I knew as being a friend of my father), Annoubion the Diospolitan, an astrologer, and Athenodorus the Athenian, who was a dedicated follower of the doctrine of Epicurus’ (H[omilies]) 4.6.3

Both Appion and Annoubion are also known from other sources, and recent papyri have enriched our knowledge of them. In my contribution I will look at their pre-Clementine careers and briefly compare these with the representations of Anoubion and Apion in the *Pseudo-Clementines*. These are of course imaginative interpretations by an author who was well informed about them,
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1 See the contribution of A. Hilhorst to this volume.
3 The translations of the *Recognitions* and *Homilies* are adapted from those of the *Ante-Nicene Christian library*, vols 3 and 17 (Edinburgh, 1868 and 1870, respectively).
but who did not strive for conscientious, historical portraits. I will start with their ‘partner in crime’ Athenodorus, who is the most obscure of this infamous triad.

1. Athenodorus

In the Homilies Athenodorus is regularly mentioned in company with Simon Magus, Appion or Annoubion, but he does not have a life of his own. Nowhere do we receive any information about his ideas and he remains a mere puppet on the Pseudo-Clementine stage. Dirk Obbink persuasively notes that ‘Athenodorus of Athens is otherwise unknown; perhaps his name was chosen for its geographical associations, adding Athens to Alexandria and Diospolis, and implying that Simon drew followers from a broad spectrum of centres of learning’. However, as Appion and Annoubion were chosen for their backgrounds in historical Egyptian intellectuals, one may wonder whether Athenodorus was not in fact modeled on the philosopher Athenodorus from Cilician Tarsus, the teacher of Augustus. Although we do not have sufficient information about him to explain that choice, we should not forget that the Pseudo-Clementines are fiction and do not necessarily aim at providing precise historical knowledge. In any case, labeling him as an Epicurean was surely meant to make Athenodorus immediately suspect in the eyes of the Christian (and Jewish!) reading public.

2. Annoubion

Our first ‘foolish’ Egyptian is introduced as ‘an astrologer’ and an inhabitant of Diospolis, but later he is characterised as ‘the best of the astrologers’ and ‘inseparable’ from Simon Magus (H 14.11). That is the sum total of what we are told about Annoubion. He is no longer an important figure in the Pseudo-Clementines, and his presence in the Recognitions (10.52, 56, 58-9, 62-3) is clearly due to the influence of the Homilies. Yet his

8 C. Schmidt, Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen (Leipzig, 1929) 70f.
role must have been much more prominent in the elusive *Grundschrift* of the *Pseudo-Clementines*. Inspired by Heintze, Schmidt has pointed out that the *Grundschrift* contained a disputation on the *genesis*, the moment of birth that determined man’s life according to astrology. This debate must have taken place at Laodicea and was abbreviated by the *Recognitions* (8.2.2). In the *Homilies* we read in the last book that Peter says: ‘God arranges our affairs in a most satisfactory manner; for we have with us Annoubion the astrologer. When we arrive at Antioch, he will discuss the *genesis*, giving us his genuine opinions as a friend’ (H 20.21). Yet, as in earlier passages (H 14.12, 20.11), the debate never materialises and the reader of the *Homilies* is left unsatisfied in this respect. Apparently, in the *Grundschrift* Annoubion was the opponent of Clemens in a debate about astrology, just as Athenodorus must have been the opponent in a debate about providence.

Sufficient material has survived to see that Annoubion was modelled on a well known Egyptian astrologer, Anoubion, who used to be located in the time of Nero. The Pseudo-Clementine spelling of his name with its doubling of the *n*, Anoubion/Annoubion, will have been invented by the author of the *Grundschrift*, as he also wrote Appion instead of Apion (§ 3) and Mattidia (H 13 etc.) instead of Matidia, the name of the daughter of Trajan’s sister, whose own daughter Matidia was the sister-in-law of Hadrian.

Unfortunately, we do not have much information about the historical Anoubion. He has a common Egyptian-Greek name, which is formed from the root of Anubis, the jackal-headed
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9 W. Heintze, *Der Klemensroman und seine griechischen Quellen* (Leipzig, 1914) 49.
14 In later times, Anubis is also associated with astrology, cf. W. Gundel, *Neue astrologische Texte des Hermes Trismegistos* (Munich, 1936) 307.
Egyptian divinity,\textsuperscript{15} who has also given us the names Anoubarion, Anoubas, Anoubiaina and Anoubias.\textsuperscript{16} The name of the god was already used for theophoric names in the Middle Kingdom and remained productive well into Coptic times.\textsuperscript{17} I see therefore no reason to consider Anoubion a pseudonym, as has recently been suggested by Dirk Obbink.\textsuperscript{18} Annoubion’s origin from Diospolis fits the Egyptian background of his name, but Schmidt states that we do not know which of the three cities with the name Diospolis is meant.\textsuperscript{19} However, we may firmly locate Annoubion in the old capital of Egypt, which the Greeks called Thebes,\textsuperscript{20} since the city was well known for its temples and esoteric wisdom, and the autobiography of Thessalos, the magician, mentions Thebes as a place for necromancy.\textsuperscript{21}

The only reason for Anoubion’s traditional chronology is his occurrence in the \textit{Pseudo-Clementines}, and it cannot be excluded that he lived somewhat earlier, like Apion, or somewhat later. In any case, Obbink notes that it is unlikely that he is to be dated after the second century.\textsuperscript{22} This argument can be strengthened by an observation of Hermann Usener (1834-1905) in 1900 that traces of Anoubion can be found most likely in Pseudo-Manetho’s \textit{Apotelesmatika},\textsuperscript{23} which has a firm \textit{terminus post quem} of AD 80, as the author provides his own horoscope.\textsuperscript{24}
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Gradually the content of the work of the historical Anoubion has become clearer. In 1887 it was noted that Anoubion was known to Firmicus Maternus in his *Mathesis* (III.11), and in 1900 Wilhelm Kroll (1869-1939) argued that in his Book VI Firmicus had used material of Anoubion, on the basis of correspondences between Firmicus and a prose paraphrase of material ‘from Anoubion’. In 1914 Werner Heintze (1889-1914?), one of the many scholarly victims of the First World War, compared four astrological schemata in the *Recognitions* with the meagre fragments of Anoubion published by A. Olivieri in the *Catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum* (= *CCAG*: II, 202-3, 208). 1921 saw the publication of an elegiac distich of Anoubion in the work of the early Byzantine astrologer Rhetorios (*CCAG* VIII 4, 208), and in 1952, on the basis of these publications, Stefan Weinstock (1901-71) could connect the astrological elegiacs of *P. Schubart* 15 and Firmicus VI.31.78-85, pointing to Anoubion as their author. In 1991 Simonetta Feraboli identified a further number of passages in which Anoubion and Firmicus VI coincided. Finally, the publication in 1999 by Obbink of *POxy*. LXVI.4503-4505 from Anoubion’s book III has definitively demonstrated that Firmicus II.4.1-6 and VI.29-31 are an almost word-for-word translation of Anoubion. In fact, Obbink has now also noted that the predictions in *Recognitions* 10.9 are authentically Anoubionic, both in the content of the horoscopes and their form: he has included them as fragments and has attempted a Greek version in elegiacs in his forthcoming Teubner edition of Anoubion.

It should be clear by now that the author of the *Grundschrift*, when looking for an astrologer as opponent of Clement, had chosen an Egyptian astrologer whose work, a didactic

see R. Garnett, ‘On the Date of the $\pi_327^{1/6}/\beta_601^{1/6}/\epsilon$ of Manetho’, *J. of Philol*. 23 (1875) 238-40; Neugebauer and Van Hoesen, *Greek Horoscopes*, 92.
27 Heintze, *Der Klemensroman*, 109f.
29 Weinstock, ‘A New Anubio Fragment’.
poem in elegiacs of at least four books, must have been widely circulating in Late Antiquity. It is not immediately clear, though, why the author of the Grundschrift dedicated so much attention to astrology. Two possibilities come to mind. First, astrology was so pervasive in Greco-Roman society that it played a big role in many ancient novels. This was especially the case in the original Greek version of the Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri, which recent research has now established as an important model for the Grundschrift. Consequently, the author of the latter may well have thought it necessary to still pay attention to astrology but to approach it now from a Christian point of view. Second, the Grundschrift was probably written in Edessa. Here the heterodox Christian philosopher Bardaisan had been much influenced by current astrological thinking, even though he partially rejected these thoughts as constraining human liberty too much. The Grundschrift, which must have been written shortly after Bardaisan’s death in AD 222, was perhaps engaged in a polemic against the views of Bardaisan’s followers, who continued for many centuries to propagate the master’s ideas. Unfortunately, the loss of the Grundschrift does not allow any certainty in this respect.

3. Appion

The second ‘foolish’ Egyptian in the Pseudo-Clementines is Appion, whose name is clearly based on the Egyptian sacred bull at Memphis. Its cult has given us such Greek names as Apia/os, Ap(p)ianos, Apias and, of course, Apion, but theophoric names with the element
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33 For the content of the work see now Obbink, ‘Anoubion, Elegiacs’, 58f.
35 M. Vielberg, Klemens in den Pseudoklementinischen Rekognitionen (Berlin, 2000) 139-44.
39 Drijvers, Bardaisan, 227f.
‘Apis’ can be found throughout Egyptian history, from the Old Kingdom onwards. The spelling Appion is attested in both inscriptions (SB I 4549 [AD 226]; I. Creta IV.460 [AD 539]) and in about 10 mainly second-century papyri. In literature we find the spelling in some manuscripts of Pliny, *NH*. 30.18 (r) and 35.88 (VRF); in variant readings of Tatian 27 and 38 (P); in a variant reading of the critic Achilles Tatius, *Intr. Arat.*, p. 30 Maass (B); in the treatise traditionally known as Pseudo-Justinus, *Cohortatio ad Graecos* (9.2); in the preface of Hesychius; in *Etymologicum Genuinum* s.v. Πιζζέζεο, ιονςέζεο, ιονςέζεο ιονςέζεο and in one of its manuscripts s.v. ιονςέζεο ιονςέζεο ιονςέζεο (Laurentianus S. Marco 304); in *Etymologicum Gudianum* s.v. ιονςέζεο and in two of the manuscripts s.v. ιονςέζεο (= p. 540, 30-33 Sturz: Borterius gr. I 70 and Paris. suppl. gr. 172); in *Etymologicum Magnum* and *Symeonis* s.v. ιονςέζεο; in the Greek translation of Eutropius (6.11); in Photius (112-3, 90b), who clearly refers to the *Homilies*; in the scholia on Homer (*Il*. 5.403); in the Suda (s.v. ιονςέζεο) and in Synkellos (120 Mosshammer, where it is wrongly corrected to Apion).

To explain the spelling Appion, Riedweg suggests an influence from the Latin Appius. Yet that name was much more popular in the Greek world than in Palestine, where it occurs only once on an ostrakon (*O. Masada* 788), and in Egypt. Here the name is virtually limited to Appius Prostates, chairman of the town council of Panopolis (ca. AD 298) and Appius Sabinus, a Roman prefect of Egypt (ca. AD 250). Moreover, the spelling Appion for Apion is clearly a later development that is not yet visible in the contemporaries of Apion himself and of which the explanation is unclear. Consequently, the spelling Appion need not be connected with developments in Greek onomastics or in Greek spelling. Given the other names in the *Pseudo-Clementines* with a doubling of a consonant (Anoubion/Annoubion and Matidia/Mattidia: § 2), the doubling of the p seems to have been part of the stylistic repertory of the author of the
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44 The variants are not mentioned in the most recent edition by M. Whittaker, *Tatian, Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments* (Oxford, 1982).
46 S. Neitzel, in *Dionysius Thrax; Tyrannion Amisenus; Diocles Alexandrinus; Apion*, ed. K. Linke, W. Haas and S. Neitzel (Berlin, 1977) corrects Appion into Apion in these cases (= Apion, frr. 27, 50 and 86) and does not mention the spelling Appion in Apion, frr. 79 and 132.
47 Riedweg, *Ps.-Justin*, II.287.
48 F.Th. Gignac, *Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, 2 vols (Milano,
Apion was born in Upper Egypt in the later second half of the first century BC. Traditionally, his place of birth is located in the oasis of El Khargeh (ancient Hibis), but more recently there seems to have developed a preference for the Dakhleh oasis. Apion studied in Alexandria under Didymus Chalkenteros and later succeeded Theon as head of the Alexandrian school. His enormous industry gained him his nickname "Mnxyow." During the reigns of Claudius and Caligula he worked in Rome, and in AD 39 he acted as the leader of the Alexandrian delegation to Rome after the Greek pogrom that had cost the lives of so many Jews. He died about the middle of the first century AD.

It is of course impossible to discuss here the historical Apion in any depth, but it may be interesting to compare his occurrence and role in the *Pseudo-Clementines* in order to see in what ways Apion was remembered in the times after his death. As we have seen in our introduction, Apion was introduced together with Annoubion and Athenodorus as "Ãppuvna tòn Pleistonûkhon, ndra "Alejandr¡a, grammatìkòn t¯n Ìpipist®mhn (H 4.6). He is also called Pleistonikes in two other passages (H 20.11; R 10.52). The qualification must have immediately identified Appion’s model for the educated readership of the *Pseudo-Clementines*, as Pliny the Elder, who followed his lectures, already mentions it, and Pleistonikes was clearly a standing epithet of Apion. Jacobson has argued that in this case Pleistonikes does not have its usual meaning ‘victor in many contests’ but means ‘quarrelsome’. Yet the inscription "Apûvn Pleiston[ûkhw] ³kousa trûw on one of the two colossi of Memnon hardly favours this...
opinion. The oldest datable inscription on the colossi is from AD 20 and the next from AD 65, and the death of Apion (above) falls between these dates. As Van der Horst observes, ‘it would be most remarkable if there were to have been two Apions with a nickname that began with Pleiston-’. Surely, a vain person like Apion would not have propagated a negative nickname, and it is hardly in favour of Jacobson’s argument that his pupil Pliny also mentions the nickname.

Apion’s Alexandrian origin is also confirmed by other sources. In his Contra Apionem, Josephus informs us that Apion congratulated Alexandria for having such a great man like himself as citizen. And in a discussion of the games played by Penelope’s suitors, Athenaeus mentions the opinion of ‘Apion the Alexandrian’. Given his Egyptian origin, Apion must have acquired Alexandrian citizenship by special grant. Such grants were liberally awarded to dramatic and athletic victors from the Greek world, but it was extremely rare that a native Egyptian acquired Alexandrian citizenship: only one other case is known. This points to a very special occasion or service to the city, and it seems most likely to connect Apion’s franchise with his leadership of the Alexandrian embassy to Rome in AD 39.

The third qualification, ‘grammarian’, is also well attested in both Greek and Latin literature and was already part of his reputation during his lifetime. It is not exactly clear how Apion himself interpreted the qualification or how we should do so. The term γραμματικὴ ἡγεμονία means ‘grammarian/scholar’ but also ‘cultured person’. Apion was both, but his main fame derived

57 A. and E. Bernand, Les inscriptions grecques et latines du Colosse de Memnon (Cairo, 1960) 165.
58 For the colossus and its inscriptions see now G.W. Bowersock, Studies on the Eastern Roman Empire (Goldbach, 1994) 253-64.
59 Van der Horst, Japhet, 209; similarly, L. Holford-Strevens, Aulus Gellius. An Antonine Scholar and His Achievement (Oxford, 2003) 69: the objections against the identification are ‘hypersceptical’.
60 For Apion’s vanity see Pliny, NH Praef. 25, which relates that Tiberius called him cymbalum mundi; Gellius 5.14.1; note also that Syncellus 120 (= 282) Mosshammer calls Apion ‘the most pedantic of the grammarians’.
62 Athenaeus 1.16F, quoted by Eustathius on Od. 17.401.
63 D. Delia, Alexandrian Citizenship during the Roman Principate (Atlanta, 1991) 56.
64 Seneca, Ep. 88.40; Pliny, NH Praef. 25, 30.18; Josephus, C. Ap. 2.2, 12, 15; Tatian, Or. 38; Athenaeus 7. 294F; Clement of Alexandria, Str. 1.22; Eusebius, HE. 3.9.4, PE. 10.10.16, 10.11.14, 10.12.2; Cosmas Indicopleustes 12.4; Suda, s.v. Apión, Pasês.
from his historical and philological work, in which he was clearly not unsuccessful: Gellius (5.14.1) mentions his *libri non incelebres*. Apion’s Homeric scholarship was his main claim to fame, and his creativity and fertility with Homeric etymologies fitted the taste of his time. Yet this side of his activities is not explicitly mentioned in the *Pseudo-Clementines*, although we may perhaps see a reference to it in a passage in which he praises and explains Homer:

‘There was once a time when nothing existed but chaos and a confused mixture of orderless elements, which were as yet simply heaped together. This nature also testifies, and great men have been of opinion that it was so. Of these great men I shall bring forward to you as witness him who excelled them all in wisdom, Homer, where he says, with a reference to the original confused mass: “But may you all become water and earth” (*Il.* VII.99), implying that from these all things had their origin, and that all things return to their first state, which is chaos, when the watery and earthy substances are separated’ (H 6.3).

It would be interesting to know to what extent this passage illustrates the Homeric teaching of the historical Apion, but there is too little left of his works for a proper evaluation.

The recent entry on Apion in *Der neue Pauly* states that it is ‘sehr wahrscheinlich’ that he also worked on other authors. Unfortunately, it provides only one example and has missed the most recent one. In itself it is not so surprising that Apion’s other work has escaped attention. As can be easily seen from recent studies of Apion, interest in this author is highly compartmentalised. Students of Judaism have focused on his anti-Semitic side, whereas Hellenists concentrated on his Homeric scholarship. As marginalia are regularly omitted in standard editions of ancient authors, one often has to go back to the original publications of the papyri in order to gain a better view of Apion’s scholarship. The following is only a sampling, but it represents more than can be found anywhere else. So far, it is clear that, in addition to
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Homer, Apion has also worked on the following lyric poets:

1. Alcaeus:
   a) *POxy*. XXI.2295, fr. 4 col. i (= Alcaeus F 141 Voigt: as Barner suggests,\textsuperscript{69} the papyrus possibly mentions Apion, although this is not mentioned by Voigt)
   b) *POxy*. XXI.2295, fr. 4 col. ii (= Alcaeus F 143 Voigt: the papyrus possibly mentions Apion, although this is not mentioned by Voigt)
   c) *POxy*. XXI.2295, fr. 28.3, 17 (= Alcaeus F 167 Voigt)\textsuperscript{70}
   d) *POxy*. XXI.2295, fr. 40 col. ii.10 (?) (= Alcaeus F 179 Voigt)\textsuperscript{71}
   e) d) *POxy*. XXI.2295, fr. 54 (= Alcaeus F 190 Lobel-Page)\textsuperscript{72}


2. Simonides
   a) *POxy*. XXII.2327, fr. 2a col. i (= Simonides F 21 West\textsuperscript{2}).
   b) *POxy*. XXII.2327, fr. 19 col. ii (= Simonides F 46 West\textsuperscript{2}).
   c) *POxy*. XXII.2327, fr. 21 col. i (= Simonides F 21 West\textsuperscript{2}).
   d) *POxy*. XXII.2327, fr. 27 col. i (= Simonides F 11, 22 West\textsuperscript{2}).\textsuperscript{73}
   e) *POxy*. XXII.2327, fr. 31 col. i (= Simonides F 31 West\textsuperscript{2}).
   f) *POxy*. LIX.3965, fr. 2 (= Simonides F 11, 32 West\textsuperscript{2}).
   g) *POxy*. LIX.3965, fr. 18 (= Simonides F 64 West\textsuperscript{2}).

3. Other poets?\textsuperscript{74}

Apion is also mentioned in *POxy*. XXI.2295, fr. 54 and 55 (= Alcaeus 190-1 Lobel-Page), which are ‘very doubtfully assigned’ to Alcaeus by Edgar Lobel (*ad loc.*). This means that we cannot be certain which author Apion commented upon: it might have been even Homer.

\textsuperscript{69} See now the re-edition of the papyrus in G. Bastianini et al., *Commentaria et lexica graeca in papyris reperta* I (Leipzig, 2004) 127.
\textsuperscript{70} Bastianini, *Commentaria*, 130, 134 (A. Porro *ad loc.*).
\textsuperscript{71} Bastianini, *Commentaria*, 132, 135 (A. Porro *ad loc.*).
\textsuperscript{72} Bastianini, *Commentaria*, 133.
The same abbreviation $i\theta$ that means $\sqrt[3]{\frac{3}{4}}/\sqrt[3]{5}$ in the scholia on Alcaeus and Simonides, i.e. Apion and Nicanor, we also read in the scholia on POxy. XXXII.2617, fr. 12 (= Stesichorus S30 Davies) and fr. 22 (Stesichorus S34 Davies). However, lack of context prevents us from knowing which critics are meant here.

Whereas Apion’s philological activity was typical of the ancient grammarian, the Pseudo-Clementines mention at least two more aspects of Appion, in addition to those that we already have discussed, that can be paralleled from other sources: his anti-Semitism and his interest in magic. Let us start with the first aspect. Before Clement visits Appion in Tyre, he first relates his previous experiences with him:

‘And while I was confined to bed Appion came to Rome, and being my father’s friend, he stayed with me. Hearing that I was in bed, he came to me, as being not unacquainted with medicine, and inquired the cause of my being in bed. But I, being well aware that the man exceedingly hated the Jews, as also that he had written many books against them, and that he had formed a friendship with this Simon, not through desire of learning, but because he knew that he was a Samaritan and a hater of the Jews, and that he had come forth against the Jews, therefore he had formed an alliance with him, that he might learn something from him against the Jews’ (H 5.2).

It is interesting to see that this episode is located in Rome, as Apion’s Roman stay is also known from other sources. Moreover, Clement directs the attention of his audience to Appion’s anti-Semitic writings. Unfortunately, there is little left from Apion’s best known anti-Semitic work, the Aigyptiaka in 5 books, which is known mainly from Pliny, Gellius and Josephus’ polemics in his Contra Apionem. However, the passage in the Homilies suggests more than one title. In the English revision of Emil Schürer’s history of the Jewish people, Martin Goodman flatly rejects the notice: ‘this is of course not to be taken seriously’. Admittedly, it is certainly possible that the author exaggerated the amount of Apion’s anti-Semitic writings, but recent skepticism in this regard may have gone too far. In his Stromata (1.21.3), Clement of Alexandria mentions both
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74 I am most grateful to Peter Parsons for advice on these cases.
75 Cribiore, Gymnastics of the Mind, 185-219.
76 Pliny, NH 30.18; Suda s.v. Apiôn.
77 Note also H 5.27.
78 For the fragments see Apion FGrH 616 F 1-21, cf. P. Schäfer, Judeophobia (Cambridge Mass., 1997) passim.
Apion’s *Aigyptiaka* and a ‘book Against the Jews (*Kata Ioudaiôn*)’. He is quoted by his somewhat younger contemporary Julianus Africanus, who in turn is quoted by pseudo-Justin (*Ad Graecos* 9). Felix Jacoby (*ad FGrH* 616 F 2) tried to harmonize the titles by suggesting that *Kata Ioudaiôn* was the fourth book of the *Aigyptiaka*. However, Goodman argues that ‘the very fact that he (Josephus) is silent about it suggests that such a work never existed, and it is clear that these Church writers had no direct knowledge of it’. The latter seems perfectly true, as Clement of Alexandria regularly presents second-hand knowledge in his *Stromata*. Yet, Clement’s erudition and Alexandrian origin, the complete loss of Apion’s writings and the notice of the evidently well informed *Pseudo-Clementines* should make us wary of rejecting the notice out of hand.81

The episode of our Clement’s illness has another interesting aspect as well. When Appion asked Clement the reason of his illness, the latter answered that he was lovesick. Appion then told Clement that he had been in the same situation, but

‘happened to meet an Egyptian who was exceedingly well versed in magic, and having become his friend, I disclosed to him my love. He not only assisted me in all that I wished, but, honoring me more bountifully, he even did not hesitate to teach me an incantation by means of which I obtained her. And as soon as I had obtained her, by means of that secret instruction, being persuaded by the liberality of my teacher, I was cured of love’ (H 5.3).

The passage is a nice illustration of that strange human habit of losing interest in something or someone at the moment that one has finally got possession of it. It was probably inspired by the well known episode of the Seleucid queen Stratonice and her stepson, the prince Antiochus, whose lovesickness was diagnosed by the famous physician Eresistratus.82 The passage also illustrates the ubiquity of love magic in antiquity and the use of erotic charms, several of which
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81 For a different view see Jones, ‘The Figure of Apion’, Appendix.
have been found in Egypt. Erotic charms could range from quite simple ones, such as: ‘Horion, son of Sarapous, make and force Nike, daughter of Apollonous, to fall in love with Paitous, whom Tmesios bore’, to quite elaborate ones. The historical Apion may well have dabbled in love magic too, since Pliny (NH 24. 167) says that according to someone celeber arte grammatica paulo ante, clearly Apion, the touch of the plant called anacampseros, ‘love’s return’, caused either the return of love or its rejection with hatred.

Finally, the passage is one more example of the enormous importance of Egypt as the country of magic par excellence in antiquity. This importance is demonstrated more than once in evidence in the Pseudo-Clementines. Already at the beginning of the Homilies (1.5 = R 1.5) Clement decides to go to Egypt to solve the problem of the immortality of the soul:

‘I shall go into Egypt, and I shall become friendly with the hierophants and prophets of the shrines. And I shall seek and find a magician, and persuade him with large sums of money to effect the calling up of a soul, which is called necromancy, as if I were going to inquiere concerning some business’.  

Simon Magus also stayed in Egypt to practise magic (H 2.24), and his miracles were compared to those of the Egyptian magicians with whom Moses had to compete (R 3.56).
According to Recognitions (1.30.2-3), the Egyptians were even genealogically connected with the inventor of magic. One of Noah’s grandsons is said to have been the inventor of magic, the altar for demons, and animal sacrifice. Later we learn that the inventor really was Noah’s son Ham, who taught the art to his son Mestraim (R 4.27; H 8.3: Mestrem), the ancestor of the Egyptians, Babylonians and Persians. In the Old Testament Mesraim, ‘Egypt’, is the second son of Ham (Gen 10:6). Anyone who looks at the critical apparatus of the Göttingen Septuagint edition of Genesis ad loc., will be surprised how varied the spelling of the name actually is: we find Mesrem, Misraeim, Mesrai, Mesrain, Mestrem, Metraim, and Messaraeim – amongst many others. It may look strange to us that the Pseudo-Clementines spell the name in two different ways, but we find the same in, for example, Jubilees, where Ham’s son is called both Mestrem (7.13) and Mesrem (9.1). Different scribes had perhaps different recollections of the name, depending on the individual manuscript of their text. In any case, the difference in spelling may imply that the author of the Grundschrift knew some Hebrew. This is perhaps not so surprising in the light of his possible Jewish connections (below).

According to Recognitions (4.27), his contemporaries called Mestraim Zoroaster, but the Homilies (H 8.4) are slightly more detailed:

‘Of that family there was born in due time somebody who took up with magical practices, called Nebrod, who chose, giant-like, to devise things in opposition to God. Him the Greeks have called Zoroaster … He, after the deluge, being ambitious of sovereignty, and being a great magician, by magical arts compelled the world-guiding star of the wicked one who now rules’ (H 8.4). The devil did not accept this competition and destroyed him. ‘Therefore the magician Nebrod … for this circumstance had his name changed to Zoroaster, on account of the living (σαζιγ) stream of the star (οστιος) being poured upon him’ (H 8.5).

The passage is an interesting combination of later Jewish speculations on Nimrod and the attempts of the Greeks to make sense of the name of Zarathustra, which is still not satisfactorily explained, to whom they ascribed the origin of mageia.89

89 For the close association of Nimrod with Zoroaster see P.W. van der Horst, Essays on the Jewish
The connection of Appion with magic is also reflected in our knowledge about the historical Apion. Above we already saw Apion’s interest in love magic and Pliny (NH 30.18) also relates that as a young man he had Apion heard saying that the cynocephalia, ‘dog’s head’, was called in Egyptian osiritis. The plant was divine and afforded protection against all magic potions. Whoever uprooted it in one piece would die immediately! Apion even practised necromancy, as he had called up the soul of Homer to ask about his homeland and his parents. Unfortunately, he did not dare to reveal the answer to these pressing questions. It is no wonder, then, that he was reputed to have written a book On the Magus, in which he explained the expression ‘The half-obol of Pases’. Pases was an effeminate magician, a kind of modern illusionist, who could make expensive dinners and their serving staff appear and disappear, just as Simon Magus could let household equipment appear without seemingly anyone bringing it in (H 2.32). Evidently, Pases paid with a half-obol, which he subsequently could bring back into his possession. Apion, then, was apparently interested in a wide range of magic beliefs and practices.

4. Conclusion

With these observations on Apion’s interest in magic we have come to the end of the discussion of our two ‘foolish’ Egyptians. It is clear that the author of the Grundschrift was well informed about both Anoubion and Apion. Where and how did he obtain his knowledge about these two ‘foolish’ Egyptians? The case of Anoubion is perhaps the easiest one to answer. It is clear that Egyptian astrology was known in Edessa, as Bardaisan was familiar with ‘books of the Egyptians in which all the different things that may befall people are described’. The poem of

---


Dickie, Magic and Magicians, 214-6.


Philippus (Bardaisan), Book of the Laws of Countries, 38-40, cf. Fowden, Egyptian Hermes, 203-4;
Anoubion, then, may well have circulated in Edessa.

The case of Apion is more difficult. Older source-critical studies suggested that the section concerning Apion derives from a Jewish ‘Disputationsbuch’. In addition, Schmidt has reasonably argued that the figure of Appion could hardly have been imagined before Josephus’ *Contra Apionem* (ca. AD 93), whereas the existence of comparable apologetic treatises is improbable after the Jewish uprising under Trajan and the revolt of Bar Kokhba. The lost source, then, should date from the intervening years. The use of Jewish material is certainly possible, as Stanley Jones has also identified a Jewish-Christian source in the *Grundschrift* that has survived in the *Recognitions*. Yet the existence of (Alexandrian) Jewish apologetic at the time of Josephus’ *Contra Apionem* has become less certain, and current ideas about Jewish apologetics are clearly in need of a thorough revision. Moreover, the derivation of all material about Apion from just one book presupposes that the author of the *Grundschrift* had no other knowledge about Apion available to him. Such a presupposition cannot be substantiated, and we should perhaps be reticent in our attempts at reconstructing the *Grundschrift*’s sources, as previous attempts have not been particularly successful. In any case, the continuation of our investigations into the complex sources of the *Pseudo-Clementines* would lead us too far away from the ‘foolish’ Egyptians and hardly be a token of wisdom!
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