

“BE HOLY”: THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF PURITY IN THE PEDAGOGUE OF CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

G.D.S. Smit
(University of Pretoria)

Abstract

Purity was one of the most fundamental social values in ancient Mediterranean society. In ancient literature, we frequently read about someone or something being pure or impure. However, the available research on purity and pollution in the writings of the Church Fathers are at best extremely sketchy. Even well known scholars on the topic of honour and shame in Mediterranean society seldom refer to purity as a social value in their quest to try to understand the socio-cultural ideas of the ancient near East. This fact emphasises the need for further research on the topic of honour and shame, especially in the writings of the Church Fathers. In this article, it is argued that purity and pollution indeed are important social values in the Pedagogue of Clement of Alexandria.

1. Introduction

According to deSilva¹ (2000) purity is one of the most fundamental social values in Biblical writings. Unfortunately, modern socio-cultural research sometimes overlooks this value mentioned in classical and Biblical literature. In Biblical texts, we frequently read that someone or something was regarded as pure or impure. Impure people and objects were to be avoided. By avoiding pollution, someone was accepted as being pure in cult or in daily life.

Jesus had a different approach to purity than the Jewish religious leaders of His time. This often led to conflict between Jesus and the Jews. In Mark 7:2-5 we read that the Pharisees and some of the teachers of the law of Moses saw some of Jesus' disciples eating bread without washing their hands first. Because they did not wash their hands before eating, they regarded the disciples as "unclean". Furthermore, by not washing their hands, Jesus' disciples "*don't...live according to the tradition of the elders*" (New International Version). In another instance², Jesus criticizes the Pharisees for cleaning the outside, whilst inside they are full of greed and self-indulgence.

There are many such instances in the Bible concerning purity and impurity. Nevertheless, the topic of purity and pollution does not really figure in anthropological research³.

2. Purity and pollution in early Christianity

Honour and shame were part of every relationship within the ancient communities. In ancient Mediterranean society there were endless debates on the topic of purity (Neyrey 2004:online). There were many ways to lose or to gain honour by ways of handling pure or impure objects, or to be seen in the company of pure or polluted individuals. This focus on purity naturally had its meaning to society, which should not be overlooked. Firstly, everyone needed a basic knowledge of purity and consequently of hygiene, in order to avoid contamination of food, objects or people with bacteria as well as to avoid the spread of diseases. Secondly, purity was a social concept society had to reckon with in their public daily life. For Neyrey (2004:online) the literal approach to purity in some texts, must be understood as a “*descriptive and historical*” approach to purity, and the second approach to purity must be understood in an “*anthropological and social*” context. One must read much more in Biblical customs regarding purity than just by ways of being descriptive and historical to the ways of the Jews many years ago, argues Neyrey (2004:online). In ancient Israel the Mosaic laws on purity were primarily regarded as safe holds that separated Jews from gentiles. Nevertheless, antiquity had a prominent social approach towards purity not always understood by modern readers.

Although a large number of converts to Christianity were originally from a Jewish background, in the New Testament ethnical differences between Jew and non-Jew became irrelevant (deSilva 2000:280). The Jewish laws concerning purity and pollution were often described by Christianity as a barrier to the unity of the early Christian community. Therefore Christianity gradually abandoned these Jewish laws and customs. Nonetheless, the concept of purity and pollution never ceased to exist in early Christianity. However, the content of purity as a social value differed in a broad way from those of the Jews. House (1983:143-153) argues that there were two different approaches to purity in the New Testament church. The first is the approach of Peter and the second of Paul. Peter primarily focused on the acceptability of Christianity within the Jewish community of Palestine. Therefore, Peter argued that the Christians should try to assimilate the Jewish concept of purity into Christianity. Paul on the other hand argued that the Christian community no longer needed any part in Jewish customs⁴ and should therefore separate themselves from the Jews, as well as their way of thinking about purity in terms of rituals. He rather calls for a social approach to purity.

It seems that the approach of Paul steadily gained momentum in the late first century through to the time of Clement of Alexandria.

3. Clement's perspective on Christian purity

As was mentioned earlier, purity certainly was a key concept in ancient Mediterranean society. Regardless of the fact that a majority of scholars on the topic of honour and shame do not give the social value of purity the place it deserves, it seems that we should consider it an integral part of the honour and shame debate. As I also mentioned elsewhere⁵, the view of the Church Fathers in connection with honour and shame is a topic seldom addressed in modern research on honour and shame.

Our focus now shifts to the *Pedagogue* of Clement in order to see how he thought on the topic of purity within the early Christian community.

3.1. The *Pedagogue* on pure and defiling foods

In *Pedagogue* (*Ped.*) 2, I, 53 Clement gives an overview on how the life of the individual being led by the *Pedagogue*⁶ should look like. According to Clement the person wanting to live in accordance with God's will, should not focus primarily on the behaviour of other people⁷, but should rather focus on the words and the exemplary life of the *Pedagogue*. The reason is that the *Pedagogue* has the ability to clean His subjects from spiritual and bodily defilement (...τὸ ὄμμα τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκκαθαίρειν, ἀγνίζειν δὲ καὶ τὴν σάρκα αὐτῆς... - *Ped.* 2, I, 54). With these words about the *Pedagogue*'s ability to clean the "bodily defilement", Clement primarily focuses on some people's urge to *eat for a living* instead of *eating so they may live* (*Ped.* 2, I, 54-55).

According to Clement, there are some people in their society who discriminate against the Christians for not participating in the public banquets (*Ped.* 2, I, 55). To these people Clement breaks the news on the use of certain foods. One should consume food to build up one's strength, and not for pleasure, explains Clement (*Ped.* 2, I, 58). Because of the gentiles' custom to consume all kinds of expensive foods at their banquets, Clement urges the Christians not to participate in these feasts (*Ped.* 2, I, 60-63). For, the people whose bellies are their gods, as well as they who discriminate in reference to food (*Ped.* 2, I, 63), will not be trained up to immortality by the *Pedagogue* (*Ped.* 2, I, 62). According to Clement, it is a shame if someone is this much obsessed with food (*Ped.* 2, I, 63-66).

People behaving like these gentiles should be positively identified as unclean, and the Christians must consequently avoid these people at any cost, for all transgressors will be punished for their transgressions (*Ped.* 2, I, 83).

Furthermore, it is clear that Clement does not share in the typical Jewish view that one should avoid certain foods in order to be considered pure. He clearly states that in the eyes of the Pedagogue, these things do not really matter (*Ped.* 2, I, 55). For, it is not the things going into the mouth, but rather the things coming out of it, that makes someone unclean (*Ped.* 2, I, 30-31). With this argument, Clement unarguably confirms Paul's social viewpoint on purity. However, the Pedagogue warns the Christian not to indulge so much in the pleasures of this life, to become obsessed with it. In such an instance, it must be considered unclean/polluted, and one must avoid it at any cost (*Ped.* 2, I, 63-66).

In another instance, Clement argues about the gentiles' custom to prepare certain objects for certain feasts. They prepare specific sauces to mix with their food, and they prepare certain gifts for specific idols (*Ped.* 2, I, 86). Their feasts are thus not only occasions for filling their bellies, but occasions of adultery against God as well (*Ped.* 2, I, 89). Such feasts are not feasts of love (*agape*), because these people invite the rich and influential people to their banquets. They indulge in earthly pleasures and not for once do they think about the poor and needy (*Ped.* 2, I, 90). In this regard Clement quotes the words of Jesus in Luke 14:8-10⁸. Clement states that one must always be satisfied with the things given to you. Clement concludes that it is not the type of food one consumes, nor the objects in which they are prepared, but rather the intentions of the individual that can make him/her unclean (*Ped.* 2, I, 98-99).

In the ancient Mediterranean society, a person's mouth was commonly associated with honour and shame (Pilch & Malina 1993:25-26). Food (the things going into the mouth) was considered to be relevant to the behaviour (the words coming out of the mouth) of humans. The mouth is an important part of the human body in Jewish and Christian religion⁹. Clement does not focus on the mouth as an object of purity or pollution, but rather uses food as a metaphor to point to the honourable deeds of the Christian community, despite the fact that they were despised by the gentiles for not sharing in their view of honour and shame.

In line with his view on the consumption of food in terms of purity,

Clement writes about the use of liqueur (*Ped.* 2, II). Clement quotes the words of Paul to Timothy¹⁰ concerning the use of a little wine because of the stomach (*Ped.* 2, II, 96). According to Clement, Paul deliberately uses the words οἶνον ὀλίγον (*a little wine*). For, according to Clement, the thirsty must drink water, not wine (*Ped.* 2, II, 98). Only the consumption of a little wine is pure behaviour (*Ped.* 2, I, 3). Clement argues that too much wine has the inherent ability to shame the user, therefore wine should be avoided: it makes men impure (*Ped.* 2, II, 99).

3.2. The *Pedagogue* on pure and defiling behaviour

Holiness was one of the most fundamental values in Old Testament society. However, according to deSilva (2000:294), the Christian church never rejected the call to holiness: it still was an important theme in Christian teaching. According to Neyrey (2004:online) *holy* means to be active in avoiding impurity for the sake of Christ. To be holy is to be pure. To be pure is honourable. *To be holy*, one needed to acknowledge boundaries. To be in the company of polluted people, was accepted as impure behaviour in Jewish religion. The Jewish religion thus concentrated on their members' ritual purity. The Jewish people therefore avoided outsiders.

For Christianity on the other hand, the total avoidance of outsiders were regarded as a direct violation of their apostolic mission ordained by Christ¹¹, although the presence of differences between Christian and gentile was a known barrier inflicting on the unity of the Christian group. The Christian religion had to work out a way to reconcile Jewish-Christian ethics and those of the Christian gentiles. In order to have that kind of unity amongst Christians, they had to concentrate not on ritual purity, but rather on ethical purity. In Christianity holiness consequently not necessarily meant to be in a state of ignorance towards outsiders.

It seems that Clement agrees with the assumption that holiness does not entail total avoidance of the outsider, as was the case with the Jewish community. In book two and three of the *Pedagogue*, Clement argues that there are indeed many reasons to assume that Christians need to have contact with individuals outside the Christian group. Although avoidance of the gentiles seems almost impossible, the Christians are nevertheless taught to keep their distance from shameless people. For this reason, Clement writes about the Christian's behaviour in the broader community. He specifically gives teaching about the handling of property (*Ped.* 2, III), the behaviour of the Christian in the presence of outsiders (*Ped.* 2, V-VI; 2,

IX), on honourable clothing and its relation to purity (*Ped.* 2, VIII - 2, XIII), and a Christian perspective on nudity in relation to purity (*Ped.* 3, V; 3, IX). The practicality of book two and three of Clement's *Pedagogue* is one of the outstanding characteristics of the *Pedagogue*.

3.2.1 The *Pedagogue* on money in relation to purity

In *Pedagogue* 2, III Clement focuses on the Christian's avoidance of all kinds of earthly temptations: "*And so the use of cups made of silver and gold, and those inlaid with precious stones, is out of place, being only a deception of the vision. For if you pour any warm liquid into them, the vessels become hot, to touch them is painful. On the other hand, if you pour in what is cold the material changes its quality, injuring the mixture and the rich potion is destroyed*" (*Ped.* 2, III, 79-80). At the public banquets the gentiles usually had their golden and silverware displayed to the visitors, in order to show off their monetary worth. These rich people considered themselves honourable citizens because of their richness. Here in *Pedagogue* 2, III, 79-80 Clement comments on these assumptions of the rich people stating that they are not as honourable as expected. What they display is a deception of the vision, for purity comes from within, not the outside (*Ped.* 2, III, 81). Clement assumes that to possess more than what man needs is a shame, and subsequently this kind of temptation should always be avoided (*Ped.* 2, III, 81). With this statement Clement argues in terms of honour and shame. He says, "*The elaborate vanity... is to be banished from our well-ordered constitution*" (*Ped.* 2, III, 82).

Clement describes the abuse of money by the rich people in such a way as to suggest that the honour of the so-called honourable people is jeopardized by their way of feasting. Clement argues that a Christian should always respect each other, regardless of how much certain people own or lack (*Ped.* 2, III, 87). They should be content with what they themselves have as well, because honour shouldn't be measured in terms of monetary value, but rather in terms of mutual love and respect (*Ped.* 2, III, 87). Clement calls the Christians rather to abstain from public feasts, than to participate in such public shaming in the name of honour. Therefore, they should rather give what they can to the poor and follow the *Pedagogue* (*Ped.* 2, III, 87).

This view on property does not mean that Clement advocates a socialistic approach to property. Instead, he calls the Church not to evaluate honour in terms of money or the amount of property they own or lack, but the

Pedagogue rather calls them to focus on *giving* instead of *getting*.

The problem Clement has with the rich people is that they are usually not so willing to share what they have with the poor. Malina (1993:95) explains why: in the ancient Mediterranean world, people knew not the concept of unlimited supplies modern Westerners are used to today. In Mediterranean society, people were used to limited goods. This meant that if you needed something, you had to know or befriend someone who could give it to you. These patrons chose their clients carefully. A client had to be able to give their patron something in return.

Parallel to ancient Mediterranean society's concept of a client-patron relationship between men, Clement argues that to be honourable means to be independent. On the other hand, Clement disagrees with this value system of ancient society, because he argues that honourable people should not be this dependent upon money. Money can be taken away by God or lost by ignorance. Honour is thus only relevant if it cannot be taken away. The Christians therefore had to look up to their Patron, i.e. the Pedagogue. He is the only One able to give them the unchallenged honour of eternal life (*Ped.* 2, III, 87). No one will find that in silver, gold or jewellery. To strengthen this argument, Clement elaborates by asking a number of philosophic-rhetoric questions: "*For tell me, does the table-knife not cut unless it be studded with silver, and have its handle made of ivory? On the other hand, must we forge Indian steel in order to divide meat, as when we do with a weapon for the fight? What if the basin was made of earthenware? Will it not receive the dirt of the hands anyway? Or the footpan the dirt of the foot? Will the table, unless it is made of ivory feet, be unable to bear a halfpenny loaf? Will the lamp not dispense light because it is the work of the potter, not of the goldsmith?*" (*Ped.* 2, III, 94-95). Clement concludes, the Lord ate from common plates, and His disciples sat on the grass. He washed His disciples' feet from a common basin. He did not bring a golden one with Him from heaven! (*Ped.* 2, III, 1-3).

Thus, according to Clement, honour should not be measured in terms of monetary value, like costly vessels and fine linen, nor by the washing of hands or the avoidance of certain people. These things are common to greedy people. Purity should rather be measured in terms of one's ability to be free from greed, to be friendly to outsiders, and by one's willingness in giving of alms.

3.2.2 The *Pedagogue* on clothing in relation to purity

According to Pattison (2000:311) the ancient writings frequently mention antiquity's assumption that the shameless go to Hades naked. In ancient culture, sin was related to sex, sex was related to nudity, and nudity was related to impurity (Pattison 2000:312). In most instances clothing had to do with honour and nudity with shame.

Clothing had a certain social value in ancient Mediterranean society. Clothing constitutes a person's worthiness or his lack of it. Clothing is a symbol of security (Pilch & Malina 1993:20). The loss of clothing is considered a loss of honour and status (Pilch & Malina 1993:21). To be naked is shameful. To be clothed, was considered "complete" (Pilch & Malina 1993:23). To be without one's clothes was incomplete, therefore not holy and consequently impure. Thus, to be nude in public was symbolically understood to be dishonourable. Clothing was thus a symbol of purity and holiness.

In the *Pedagogue* of Clement we do not see exactly a similar pattern concerning clothing in relation to purity. According to Clement, clothing, although a symbol of purity, has the possibility to manifest shame as well. This happens when people are so caught up in the type of clothes they wear, that they seem to forget that clothes are only a means of covering one's shame (*Ped.* 2, XI, 83).

Clothing is thus described by Clement as a possible antithesis to purity. Clement argues that in the kingdom of God, there is no place for different types of clothing and their connection to honour. For this reason, even if we are seemingly honourable, we need to keep humble (*Ped.* 3, VI, 74), because even people in purple robes are under God's judgment (*Ped.* 3, VI, 75).

It is clear that Clement wants his readers to discover for themselves the new kind of honour the *Pedagogue* has brought upon them. He urges the Christians to contemplate on the honour of the *Pedagogue*, by showing that although they are humiliated by some people in their community because they do not own all the things the rich people do, they should keep in mind that the world and its customs are honourable to outsiders only (*Ped.* 2, XI, 80-86). If a person has clothes to wear and shoes to cover the feet, it is enough to call him honourable, because he is not naked (*Ped.* 2, XII, 1-9). The type of clothes someone is wearing should anyway not be a yardstick

for honour, because rich people usually misbehave themselves, especially when they drink wine, adding to their shame. Clement, by his portrayal of the seemingly honourable people clearly disagrees with society's concept of honour. He does not share in their unhealthy interest in clothes, jewellery and public honour.

In connection with nudity and its possible relation to impurity in the ancient Mediterranean world, Wilson (2002:online) remarks that although public nudity was viewed as a shame in some circles, the Greek-Roman world had no problem with sexuality nor with nudity. For them it was part of their natural social life. Wilson (2002:online) comments on the Greek-Roman perception of nudity as follows: "*To be naked in public was to be at ease, confident in who you were and your status. It was a power gesture. It was a physical enactment of the conventional Stoic disinterest in and intellectual control over things physical and sensual*". To the ancient Greeks nudity personified intellectual superiority and the Romans saw it as a natural phenomenon. Therefore, they generally had no problem with being nude in public.

Clement, on the other hand, believes that the Greek-Roman view on sexuality was conditioning humanity to be at ease with promiscuity (*Ped.* 1, IX, 80-83). According to Clement, even mentioning sexuality was a shame. In ancient Mediterranean society, a group regarded someone breaking the rules of the group as an outsider whom they had to avoid in order to stay pure. In the *Pedagogue*, Clement argues that the Christian should abide by the rules of Christ (the *Pedagogue*) in order to be considered part of the Christian group. Consequently, the *Pedagogue* forbids them to have communion with shameful people who accepts sexuality as honourable (*Ped.* 1, IX, 83).

With regard to nudity, Clement shares in the general Jewish-Mediterranean view that it is a symbol of impurity. In *Pedagogue* 3, V, 58-59 Clement comments on some women who are willing to take off their clothes in front of other men for money. This really happened in Roman times according to Wilson¹², especially in the Roman baths. Clement argues that these women bring shame upon themselves as well as upon their families (*Ped.* 3, V, 67-68). Furthermore, he argues that all the things that glorify a woman dishonoured her when people see her nude (*Ped.* 1, IX, 80).

Public nudity is not only a symbol of shame according to Clement, but is certainly impure as well. By doing this these people pollute themselves

with the works of darkness. For Clement, virginity should not only be understood in terms of honourable deeds, but he argues that virginity should be cherished literally (*Ped.* 1, IX, 83-84). To emphasize his comments on virginity, he names God “*the God of virginity*” (*Ped.* 1, IX, 84). In *Pedagogue* 1, IX, 83-84 Clement mentions the harlot who anointed the feet of Jesus. He comments on her deed saying that Jesus shamed her by telling her not to sin anymore. Clement argues that Jesus called her to applaud sexual abstinence in future (*Ped.* 1, IX, 85). He literally called her back to virginity, according to Clement. The question is how this harlot could be called back to virginity? For this, Clement has an innovative answer: *Bringing one to his senses* (φρένωσις) is *censure* (*Ped.* 1, IX, 85). Censure is pure. Thus the Pedagogue reinstates the virginity of everyone coming to their senses¹³. This is honourable. In this regard, Wilson (2002:online) must be agreed upon. Wilson argues that in connection with the social context of nudity, Clement is following the Stoic’s view on purity and not that of the New Testament. For Clement, there is no place for nudity in society, not even in private.

4. The social context of purity in the *Pedagogue*

For Clement, holiness means to be in a good relationship with God (*Ped.* 1, II, 13). To be holy, means to be different (deSilva 2000:295). Clement argues that Christ was different from the other leaders of His time. He became the Christians’ Pedagogue, and consequently a Christian should act different to that of a gentile (*Ped.* 2, VII, 89). This is what Christ means by *following Him*, argues Clement.

Clement also comments on the Jewish laws on purity and pollution. He argues that it is not living up to the laws of Moses that one must be considered pure, rather to follow the example of the Pedagogue guarantees purity (*Ped.* 1, II, 13). To be impure not only impedes an individual’s relationship towards the group, but towards God as well. Therefore he calls the Christians to holiness.

It is clear that the early Church never abandoned the ancient Mediterranean codes regarding purity. Nevertheless, Clement considers purity not as much in connection with avoiding objects and ritual purity. He rather considers something pure when coming from a pure heart, i.e. coming from within (*Ped.* 3, I). Consequently, inner purity should be visible in the acts of Christians towards the rest of the group, but especially in public life (*Ped.* 3, IV).

5. Conclusion

Purity was an important social concept in the ancient Mediterranean world. Although Clement does not differ that much in his view on purity and pollution to that of the writers of the New Testament, it's still important to take note of his view on the topic.

In this article, it was argued that purity and pollution indeed are important social values in the *Pedagogue* of Clement of Alexandria. To be holy literally means to be different from the gentiles. With regard to purity, Clement calls the Christians to be different in their way of life, especially regarding their view on money, clothing and sexuality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- DeSilva, D.A. 2000
Honor, Patronage, Kinship and Purity. Unlocking New Testament Culture. Illinois: Intersity Press.
- House, C. 1983
“Defilement by Association: Some Insights from the usage of Koinos/Koinoō in Acts 10 and 11”. *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 21, 143-153.
- Malina, B.J. 1993
Windows on the world of Jesus. Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox.
- Malina, B.J., Joubert, S. & van der Watt, J. 1995
Vensters wat die Woord laat oopgaan. Halfway House: Orion.
- Melhuus, M. 1988
“A shame to honour: a shame to suffer”. *Working paper no. 3, 19.* University of Oslo: Sosialantropologisk institutt.
- Moxnes, H. 1988
The economy of the Kingdom. Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Moxnes, H. 2004
Honor and Shame. The Social sciences and New Testament interpretation. Available online at: <http://www.hendrickson.com/pdf/chapters/1565632397-ch01.pdf>. Accessed: 16 February 2007.
- Neyrey, J.H. 2004
Clean/Unclean, Pure/Polluted, and Holy/Profane: The Idea and System of Purity. Available online at: <http://www.nd.edu/~jneyrey1/purity.html>. Accessed: 14 February 2004.
- Pattison, S. 2000

- Shame. Theory, Therapy and Theology.* London: CUP.
- Peristiany, J.G. 1966
Honour and Shame: The Values of the Mediterranean. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- Pilch, J.J. & Malina, B.J. 1993
Biblical social values and their meaning. Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Wilson, M.P. 2002
Shame, Bodiliness and Salvation. Available online at: <http://oxford-institute.org/workinggroups2002.html>. Accessed: 10 October 2006.

NOTES

- ¹ In his book, David deSilva looks at the topic of honour and shame in the Biblical context. He expresses the view that all research on honour and shame in Mediterranean society comes down to four major themes, i.e. *Honor, Patronage, Kinship and Purity*.
- ² Matt. 23:25-26
- ³ See for example the works of Malina *et al* (1995); Melhuus (1988); Moxnes (1988); Moxnes (2004) and Peristiany (1966). None of these scholars note purity as an important social value in Mediterranean society.
- ⁴ See for example Paul's arguments in 1 Cor. 8 concerning the food sacrificed to idols.
- ⁵ In my D.Litt. thesis "*n Analise van die sosiale waardes in die leefwêreld van Klemens van Aleksandrië soos vergestalt in sy Paidagogos*", it is argued that honour and shame were important social values in the writings of the Church Fathers, and that patristic studies should be considered reliable commentaries on the social questions of early Christianity.
- ⁶ In the παιδαγωγός, Clement depicts Christ as the Christian's Pedagogue. In the Greco-Roman world a pedagogue usually was a slave who had to oversee the education of the children of his master. He was supposed to be a strict teacher and it was expected of him to be unsympathetic towards the failures of his learners. In this regard Clement of Alexandria describes Christ: He is the Pedagogue of the Christians. They are the Children of God and should consider the honour of their Father in their obedience toward the Pedagogue.
- ⁷ This approach of Clement differs from that of the leaders of his time. In the Mediterranean community, it was considered honourable to look at other people, especially to identify their weaknesses. That way one has the means to exploit other persons' weaknesses to your advantage.
- ⁸ In Luke 14:8-10 Jesus tells the story of the man taking the honourable front seat at the banquet, just to be asked to move up for someone more deserving of the seat ("When someone invites you to a wedding feast, do not take

the place of honor, for a person more distinguished than you may have been invited. If so, the host who invited both of you will come and say to you, 'Give this man your seat.' Then, humiliated, you will have to take the least important place. But when you are invited, take the lowest place, so that when your host comes, he will say to you, 'Friend, move up to a better place.' Then you will be honored in the presence of all your fellow guests.")
9 Jesus explicitly states that one's words (the things coming out of the mouth) must be pure (See for example Matt. 12:34).

10 1 Tim. 5:23 – "*Stop drinking only water, and use a little wine because of your stomach and your frequent illnesses.*"

11 See Matt. 28:19.

12 See in this regard Wilson's comments on public nudity in Roman times (Wilson 2002:online).

13 By *coming to their senses*, Clement means: not to sin in sexuality any longer.