Credible, Incredible

Edited by
TOBIAS NICKLAS and
JANET E. SPITTLER

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament
321

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament

321

Credible, Incredible

The Miraculous in the Ancient Mediterranean

Edited by
Tobias Nicklas and Janet E. Spittler

Mohr Siebeck

Tobias Nicklas, born 1967; since 2007 Professor for Exegesis and Hermeneutics of the New Testament at the University of Regensburg.

Janet E. Spittler, born 1976; 2007 MA, PhD; since 2007 Assistant Professor of Religion at Texas Christian University.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-152517-9
ISBN 978-3-16-152516-2
ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

The book was printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Großbuchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

For Lucy

Preface

The history of scholarship on miracles in the literature of the ancient Mediterranean has largely been occupied, perhaps preoccupied, with the identification of antecedents to early Christian miracle stories in the broader worlds of Greek literature or ancient Judaism. Parallels to the miracles performed by or associated with Jesus and his disciples have been sought and found; lines of influence and literary dependence have been argued for and, at times, offered as explanation for the presence of some of the more particularly fantastic episodes in early Christian texts. As a scholar of the New Testament and early Christian literature, I would admit that my own interest in the wide world of reports of miraculous or amazing occurrences in the ancient Mediterranean is driven by a desire to better understand early Christianity. That said, I am firmly convinced that the best way to increase our understanding of early Christian accounts of the miraculous is to increase our understanding of that "wide world" of the miraculous – not only to the extent that it seems connected to early Christianity, but also on its own terms. Moreover, even a passing familiarity with canonical or non-canonical sources reveals that there is no single "early Christian" perspective on miracles, and so we might also increase our understanding of the "wide world" of the miraculous not just surrounding early Christianity, but also *within* it.

What was considered "miraculous" or "amazing" in the first centuries CE? Which authors reported miraculous occurrences, and in what genres of texts? Which reports were considered credible, and by what criteria was credibility they judged? Which were, in the true sense of the word, incredible? How, if at all, did ancient authors indicate believability or unbelievability? This volume, like the conference for which most of the essays were originally written, is an effort to answer these and related questions, an effort to fill in the broader landscape of "miraculous" so as to better understand early Christianity's place (or, perhaps better, the various early Christianities' places) within it.

At the end of the 19th century, Richard Reitzenstein, the son of a pastor and student of Theodor Mommsen, recognized that certain miraculous accounts in the apocryphal acts seemed to be taken over directly from pagan sources. As Jan Bremmer writes in the first essay of this volume, Reitzenstein "gradually realised how much early Christian literature was obliged to Hellenistic Kleinliteratur," concluding that "he could not discuss this

influence without tracing the development of the Hellenistische Wundererzählung." In his book (titled *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*), Reitzenstein surveyed a broad swath of Greek literature, reaching many conclusions that hardly persuade contemporary scholars; nevertheless, Reitzenstein's work – particularly in the non-Christian sources he identifies for comparison – has exerted an enduring influence. Bremmer's essay, which reevaluates Reitzenstein's work, asking "what is still valuable in this book," is therefore a fitting place for the present collection to begin. At the risk of anticipating Bremmer's conclusions, I would point out that both the shortcomings and virtues of Reitzenstein's work are addressed in the essays comprised in this volume.

On the one hand, Reitzenstein completely ignored Jewish sources. Many scholars have since plumbed Jewish texts, particularly rabbinic sources, for stories of miracles similar to those found in the Gospels; Honi the Circle-Drawer and Chanina ben Dosa are often discussed as comparable charsimatic wonder-workers. In his essay, Günter Stemberger underscores that these examples are in fact at the margins of rabbinic interests; miracles play little role in halachic discussions. Nevertheless, in terms of "believability," several themes arise in rabbinic sources: the miracles reported in the Hebrew Bible are not to be questioned, they occurred exactly as described; the rabbis seem to have been highly skeptical, however, of any reports of comparable miraculous occurrences in their own day. But at the same time, many everyday occurrences – including God's enduring care for his people – are recognized as in a sense "miraculous."

On the other hand, Reitzenstein was quite right in the emphasis placed on the works of Lucian of Samosata. As the reader will see in the essays of Heinz-Günther Nesselrath and Christopher Mount, the miraculous looms large in the writings of Lucian, and Lucian looms large among ancient authors interested in the topic. In his essay, Nesselrath offers an overview of Lucian's presentation of miracles and amazing occurences, focusing on the various attitudes vis-à-vis the miraculous found in these works. In one instance Lucian presents himself as a naive believer; elsewhere reports of miraculous events are met either with sarcastic skepticism or unquestioning belief, though these initial reactions sometimes change in the course of the texts. Most memorable, perhaps, are the clever conceits that allow Lucian to relate the most fantastic tales with obvious relish while maintaining his own skeptical stance (as in *Philopseudeis*, *The Ship* and, most famously, *True History*, which Nesselrath treats in detail).

After Stemberger's and Nesselrath's essays, which provide surveys of the presentation and attitude toward the miraculous one Jewish corpus and one pagan author, respectively, we turn to canonical Christian sources. Hans Klein offers an overview and discussion of the presentation of miracles in the

synoptic Gospels, emphasizing the centrality of the miraculous as well as the various functions miracles serve in each text.

Each of the next four essays involves the comparison of Christian and non-Christian sources with respect to the presentation of miracles or wonder-workers and the belief or skepticism with which such reports were met. Christopher Mount's contribution returns to Lucian. In his *Alexander the False Prophet* we find a scathing (and quite funny) critique of belief, not in amazing and miraculous tales, but in a man and his prophetic and healing powers. In his essay, Mount compares the cult of Alexander of Abonoteichus as mocked by Lucian with early Christianity as defended from similar critiques by Paul, revealing the advantages and disadvantages – from two distinct ancient perspectives – of belief and disbelief. Both Clare Rothschild's and Trevor Thompson's contributions compare belief in Jesus with belief in the seemingly miraculous powers and/or divine status of other individuals in the first centuries CE. Rothschild indicates, through an analysis of Galen's *On Prognosis*, the overlap not just of the categories "magic" and "miracle," but also "medicine," highlighting the extent to which Gospel accounts of Jesus' miraculous healings (specifically in the Gospel of Mark) in fact mirror ancient descriptions of the activities of medical doctors. This overlap is seen both in the attribution of divine activity to doctors, who might, as Galen does, reject it, as well as in the denial of divine activity in healings that others consider miraculous (as Celsus accepted Jesus' healings, but denied there was anything divine about them). Perhaps most significantly for this volume, Rothschild underscores the importance of "belief" in ancient discussions of both medical doctors and miraculous healers. Thompson, in turn, compares belief in Jesus with belief in Antinoos, the deceased and deified lover of the emperor Hadrian, providing a much-needed comprehensive presentation of the evidence of Antinoos cult as well as an analysis of Origen's rather surprising discussion of the reasons for belief in either Antinoos or Jesus. Starting, like Stemberger, with the acknowledgement that research on miracles in rabbinic literature has largely been driven by those attempting to understand early Christianity, Jan Dochhorn focuses on the so-called "Jewish wonder-workers." In his essay he asks what value, if any, these figures have in understanding the historical Jesus, evaluating in detail one rabbinic report concerning Chanina ben Dosa.

As opposed to looking at Jewish sources for antecedents of the miracles associated with Jesus, Peter Busch, in his contribution, investigates the ways in which early Christians projected the miraculous back onto figures from the Hebrew Bible. Investigating the depiction of magic and the miraculous in the Testament of Solomon, Busch draws interesting conclusions concerning the miraculous power attributed to Solomon's seal. Meinolf Vielberg considers the depiction of miracles in the Pseudo-Clementine literature, particularly

important texts for our attempts to understand how early Christians understood miracles. Here, a character questions Peter quite plainly as to how one might differentiate the miracles performed by those acting with divine commission from those performed by magicians (such as Simon Magus), given that the miracles themselves seem to be quite similar. The response given by Peter, analyzed by Vielberg alongside the actual depiction of one paradigmatic miracle found later in the text, represents key themes in early Christian thinking about miracles, in many ways still present in contemporary Christian thought.

In his discussion of the Physiologus, Tobias Nicklas underscores an important aspect of the "miraculous" in the ancient world, that is, that, whereas contemporary understandings of the "miraculous" often involve the breaking of natural laws or phenomenon "contrary to nature," in the ancient Mediterranean, nature was a primary source of the "miraculous." Indeed, the Physiologus includes multiple reports of amazing animals, plants and minerals. Interestingly, the author directly connects these reports with Christian miracles (e.g. resurrection). Nicklas raises key questions: how "believable" were the Physiologus' reports of miraculous animals, plants and minerals, and to what extent was "belief" in the Christian miracles founded on the "believability" of these reports?

With an essay contributed by Joseph Verheyden, we return to the comparison of the miracles of Jesus with those of other figures. In an investigation of the discussion of miracles in book one of the Contra Celsum, Verheyden examines both Origen's and Celsus' views on the miracles performed by (or associated with) Jesus, underscoring their common assumptions with respect to the miraculous as well as both the more and less successful arguments presented by each author. As Verheyden writes, "a discussion on miracles and miracle workers is the kind of debate that ultimately cannot be won so much by convincing the other as by convincing oneself that one has routed the opponent."

The next two essays in the volume in part reflect on the role that the presence or absence of miracles might play in arguments concerning the composition and interpretation of a text. In her contribution, Candida Moss surveys the representation of miraculous events in the early Christian martyrdom stories. As Moss points out, these texts – despite other similarities – do *not* contain the fantastic tales found in the apocryphal acts of the apostles; in fact, the presence or absence of stylized miracles has been used to date martyrdom accounts as early or late. Moss, however, identifies the miraculous elements that *do* occur within the early accounts and, in this essay, examines their narrative function. In his essay, Gilbert Van Belle revisits his previous work on the signs source in the Gospel of John, reevaluating his own conclusions on the existence of a miracle critique in the fourth Gospel. Van

Belle's contribution illustrates the ways in which the presentation of miracles might come into play in biblical interpretation: is there a critique of miracles in John, and, if so, how does this critique affect a redaction-critical interpretation of the text?

Our final essay, contributed by Laura Feldt, offers a new perspective on biblical miracles, using fantasy theory as an interpretive lens through which to view the miraculous activities of Elijah and Elisha. Feldt's essay both introduces the reader to fantasy theory and takes it on a test drive, demonstrating its value for understanding, in particular, narratives in which events alternate between credible and incredible.

The essays collected here touch on a wide range of topics relevant to our understanding of ancient understandings of the miraculous. I hope, however, that this volume underscores how much material and how many sources still await scholaraly discussion. I do not believe that contemporary scholarship will ever provide firm answers and definitive arguments in response to our questions concerning miracles in the ancient world. Like all of the most fascinating areas for historical research, ancient attitudes toward miracles and amazing occurrences seem simultaneously very familiar and very foreign. I do, however, believe that our understanding is increased when we read as widely and deeply in the ancient sources as possible – and, of course, the breadth and depth of our explorations is increased when scholars of adjacent fields are brought together. This volume is an effort in that direction.

The majority of the essays in this collection were written for a conference ("Glaubwürdig oder Unglaubwürdig? Erzählung und Rezeption wunderbarer Ereignisse in der antiken Welt/Credible or Incredible? Report and Reception of Miraculous Ocurrences in the Ancient World") held at the University of Regensburg in June 2011. That conference was made possible by grants from several organizations as well as the tireless efforts of Regensburg's faculty, staff, and students. I would like to thank in particular the Vielberth Foundation and the University of Regensburg for their generous support. The Alexander von Humboldt Foundation provided the fellowship that allowed an American scholar to spend a very valuable, very enjoyable year doing research in Regensburg. The chairs of New Testament, Ancient Church History and Liturgical Sciences worked together to make this conference happen; we are grateful to each of them. The inimitable Frau Annemarie Dengg managed all the details, ensuring that the conference went off without a hitch.

I would like to thank Michael Sommer and Christian Bemmerl, students in Regensburg, as well as Ryan Mitchell, a student at Texas Christian University, for their help in preparing the indices.

I thank also the publication and editorial team at Mohr Siebeck, particularly Susanne Mang, who oversaw the formatting, as well as the series editor Jörg Frey, who accepted this volume for publication in WUNT II.

Finally, I wish to thank my new little daughter, Lucy Stone Spittler-Driver, who was born in the midst of this project and was kind enough to sleep peacefully in my lap during a significant portion of the editing and formatting.

Fort Worth, September 2013
Janet Elizabeth Spittler

Table of Contents

Richard Reitzenstein's *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*

JAN N. BREMMER

Richard Reitzenstein's book *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen* is a strange book,[1] just as, in several ways, Reitzenstein was a strange scholar.[2] In his introduction he tells us that when studying the so-called Gnostic hymns of the apocryphal *Acts of Thomas* he noted that these, together with the connected miracle stories, had been taken over, hardly changed, from pagan sources. In order to understand this procedure, he felt forced to continue his philological investigations, during which he gradually realised how much early Christian literature was obliged to Hellenistic *Kleinliteratur*. Moreover, when looking at an episode of the Acts of the Apostles, Reitzenstein concluded that he could not discuss this influence without tracing the development of the *Hellenistische Wundererzählung* and at least to suggest by this procedure what should be the method and goal of such a work.

To that end, Reitzenstein started from the ancient terminology ('antike Bezeichnung') and concept of miracle literature ('Wunderliteratur') as exemplified in the *Lovers of Lies*, a dialogue by the second-century satirist Lucian. In this treatise, he saw two tendencies at work. On the one hand, there was the religious-psychological enigma of the fascination of serious philosophers for

[1] R. REITZENSTEIN, Hellenistische Wundererzählungen (Leipzig, 1906) 1.

[2] For Reitzenstein, see E. FRAENKEL et al. (eds.), Festschrift Richard Reitzenstein zum 2. April 1931 dargebracht (Leipzig and Berlin, 1931) 160–168 (bibliography); M. POHLENZ, "Richard Reitzenstein," Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Geschäftliche Mitteilungen 1930/31 (Berlin, 1931) 66–76 (very interesting, usually overlooked); W. FAUTH, "Richard Reitzenstein, Professor der Klassischen Philologie 1914–1928," in: C.J. CLASSEN (ed.), Die Klassische Altertumswissenschaft an der Georg-August-Universität Göttingen (Göttingen, 1989) 178–196; G. AUDRING, Gelehrtenalltag. Der Briefwechsel zwischen Eduard Meyer und Georg Wissowa (1890–1927) (Hildesheim, 2000) 10–13 (on young Reitzenstein); S. MARCHAND, "From Liberalism to Neoromanticism: Albrecht Dieterich, Richard Reitzenstein, and the religious turn in fin-de-siècle German Classical Studies," in: I. GILDENHARD and M. RUEHL (eds.), Out of Arcadia. Classics and Politics in Germany in the Age of Burckhardt, Nietzsche and Wilamowitz (London, 2003) 129–160 at 151–158.

such stories as well as their *krankhafte Sucht* to invent these for a religious purpose and to authenticate them.[3] On the other, there was the aesthetic pleasure in relating such stories. Lucian tried to find a middle way between the craft of the historian, who should relate facts and truth, and that of the poet, who also had to please his audience, but should not neglect to incorporate some facts also.

However, before he entered into a discussion of these two tendencies, Reitzenstein first looked at the religious side of the treatise and took his point of departure in a miracle story told by one of the characters of the dialogue: Ion. This Platonist related that when he was fourteen years old someone came and told his father that around midday Midas, their sturdy and industrious vineyard worker, had been bitten in his big toe by a snake, which had subsequently disappeared again, whereas Midas cried and nearly died from pain. As they were being told what had happened, they saw this very Midas being brought by his fellow slaves on a stretcher, virtually on the brink of expiring and already suffering from gangrene. Fortunately, one of his father's friends said 'keep courage', for I will immediately send for a Babylonian from the so-called Chaldaeans, who will cure the man. And to be short: the Baylonian came, raised Midas and with some kind of incantation (*epoidê*) he expelled the poison from his body, where he also attached a stone to his foot which he had broken off a grave stele of a dead young woman. And that, Ion continued, was perhaps nothing out of the ordinary. However, Midas himself lifted up his stretcher on which he had been brought and quickly went back to his piece of land. Such was the power of the charm and that stone from the grave stele.

Ion continued his story by adding that the Babylonian even performed another, more striking miracle. Early in the morning, he went to the very field where Midas was bitten and, having proclaimed a number of ritually prescribed names, he purified the place with sulphur and a torch whilst circumambulating it three times. He called out all creeping animals: snakes but also toads and frogs. However, as he noted, an old snake was missing, perhaps because it was deaf or had difficulty in moving. So he sent the youngest of the snakes to fetch it and when they were all there, the Babylonian burned them with his breath. The last passage very much looks like Lucian's own invention and supports the idea of Ludwig Radermacher that the anecdote was taken over from a different source,[4] which I will mention shortly.

[3] For the element of authentication of miracles in aretalogical literature, see especially K. BERGER, "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament," in: ANRW II.25.2 (Berlin, 1984) 1031–1432 at 1294–95; W. AMELING, "Evangelium Johannis 19, 35: Ein aretalogisches Motiv," ZPE 60 (1985) 25–34.

[4] L. RADERMACHER, Griechische Quellen zur Faustsage = Ak. Wiss. Wien, Philos.-hist. Kl. 206.4 (Vienna and Leipzig, 1927), 7f.

Reitzenstein does not really enlighten us about the meaning of the acts of the Babylonian magician and suffices with adducing as parallel a story from Jerome's *Life of Hilarion* (39 Bastiaensen) when the saint stayed in Dalmatian Epidauros, modern Dubrovnik: 'An enormous serpent, of the sort which the natives call "boas" because they are so large that they are used to swallow oxen (Latin: *boves*), was ravaging the whole province far and wide, and was devouring not only flocks and herds, but also husbandmen and shepherds who were drawn in by the force of its breathing. Hilarion ordered a pyre to be prepared for it, then sent up a prayer to Christ, called forth the reptile, bade it climb the pile of wood, and then applied the fire. And so before all the people he burnt the savage beast to ashes. But now Hilarion began anxiously to ask what he was to do, whither to betake himself. Once more he prepared for flight, and in thought ranged through solitary lands, grieving that his miracles could speak of him though his tongue was silent'.

The reason why Reitzenstein adduces these stories is to illustrate the fact that believable witnesses authenticate the stories.[5] In the case of Lucian, this is Ion, a philosopher, and in the case of Hilarion it is the whole population: *cuncta spectante plebe*. In the case of Ion, though, the story is perhaps somewhat undercut by the fact that Ion was quite young when the related event took place, that the name Midas for a worker in a vineyard suspiciously reminds one of the story of king Midas being trapped drunk,[6] and that there seems to be a certain overdetermination of the miracle. The Babylonian not only expelled the poison, but he also tied a stone to the foot of the wine worker and, finally, he demonstrated the quality of his power by letting Midas carry away the very same stretcher on which he had been brought.

The story about Midas, as we have it, points to the time of Lucian himself, given that he also mentions a Babylonian magician in his *Nekuomanteia* (7) and even turns Homer into a Babylonian (*VH* 2.20) because real wisdom supposedly came from the East, witness also the invention of the so-called Chaldaean oracles in this period.[7] Yet this does not necessarily mean that Lucian himself had invented the story. Reitzenstein suggests that, originally, the story

[5] REITZENSTEIN, Hellenistische Wundererzählungen, 19, 81 n. 2; O. WEINREICH, Senecas Apocolocyntosis. Die Satire auf Tod, Himmel- und Höllenfahrt des Kaisers Claudius (Berlin, 1923) 20.

[6] For texts and representations, see M.C. MILLER, "Midas," in: LIMC VIII.1 (1997) 846–851.

[7] A. BAUMSTARK, "Chaldaioi," RE 3 (1899) 2045–2062; H. SENG and M. TARDIEU (eds.), Die Chaldaeischen Orakel: Kontext – Interpretation – Rezeption (Heidelberg, 2010). For a good survey of the fame of the Chaldaeans in this period, see I. TANASEANU-DÖBLER, "Weise oder Scharlatane? Chaldaeerbilder der griechisch-römischen Kaiserzeit und die Chaldaeischen Orakel," IBIDEM, 21–42; M. ERLER, "Chaldäer im Platonismus," in: E. CANCIK-KIRSCHBAUM et al. (eds.), Babylon. Wissenskultur in Orient und Okzident (Berlin, 2011) 225–37.

was told about an Indian fakir, but there is no evidence whatsoever to support this suggestion, and Greek snake charmers or handlers are well attested in antiquity.[8] On the other hand, Radermacher has persuasively identified a book with stories of magicians from different countries as one of the sources of the *Lovers of Lies*, which probably had appeared not that long before Lucian wrote.[9]

The incantation used by the Babylonian probably consisted of Greek hexameters, as the term *epaoidê* regularly refers to poetic charms.[10] The amulet tied to the foot reminds us of the little stones that the Thessalian female magician uses in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* (2.5),[11] but the most interesting part of the story, from a New Testament point of view, is the detail that Midas took up his stretcher and walked away. As so many excellent classical scholars, Reitzenstein was a *Pfarrerssohn*, and it is therefore not surprising that he noted the resemblance with the story that is attested in all the synoptic gospels, about the lame man to whom Jesus says, 'stand up, take your bed and go to your home', even though the term for bed differs in the various versions.[12]

In the most recent study of Lucian's *Lovers of Lies*, Martin Ebner also draws attention to the parallel. He notes the obvious differences: the lame man of the gospels enters through the roof, but leaves through the door, and the point of the gospels focuses on the forgiveness of sins. Ebner thinks that the man left through the door in order to deceive the bad spirits that caused the illness, but there is no evidence to support the suggestion, which looks very much influenced by modern stories about the deception of ghosts. In the end he thinks that the parallel can be explained best by *Gattungszwang*.[13] This seems unnecessary. Lucian's treatise on Peregrinus shows that his knowledge of Christianity was not bad for a pagan intellectual, certainly not less in quali-

---

[8] L. ROBERT, Opera Minora Selecta 2 (Amsterdam, 1969) 915–938; M. FRENSCHKOWSKI, "Religion auf dem Markt," in: M. HUTTER et al. (eds.), Hairesis. Festschrift für Karl Hoheisel = Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Erg. 34 (Münster, 2002) 140–158.

[9] RADERMACHER, Griechische Quellen zur Faustsage, 8–14.

[10] C. FARAONE, "Aristophanes Amphiaraus Frag. 29 (Kassel-Austin): Oracular Response or Erotic Incantation?," CQ 42 (1992) 320-27 and "A Socratic Leaf-Charm for Headache (Charmides 155b-157c), Orphic Gold Leaves and the Ancient Greek Tradition of Leaf Amulets," in: J. DIJKSTRA et al. (eds.), Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity. Studies in the History of Religions in Honour of Jan N. Bremmer (Leiden, 2010) 145–166 at 147f.

[11] See the commentary of D. MAL-MAEDER (Groningen, 2001) ad loc.

[12] Matthew 9.1–8; Mark 2.1–12; Luke 5.17–26, cf. REITZENSTEIN, Hellenistische Wundererzählungen, 3, n. 2.

[13] M. EBNER, "Neutestamentliche Wunder- und Erscheinungsgeschichten auf dem Prüfstand skeptischer Kritik," in: idem et al., Lukian, die Lügenfreunde oder: der Ungläubige (Darmstadt, 2001) 167–182 at 168.

ty than that of many a modern non-Christian intellectual.[14] After Glen Bowersock's persuasive demonstration that several passages from the Greek novels react to Christian rites or themes,[15] Peter von Möllendorff has persuasively argued that in his *True Histories* Lucian uses the *Apocalypse of John* in his picture of the City of the Blessed and the *Apocalypse of Peter* in his passage on the Isle of the Damned; after all, Lucian mentioned Christians also in his *Alexander of Abounoteichos* (25, 38).[16] There is thus no reason not to think of a direct derivation from one of the Gospels, the more so as the taking up of the bed and walking away is much better integrated in the story of a lame man than in the one bitten by a snake. We need not think of course that Lucian worked his way through the whole New Testament, which did not yet exist in one codex,[17] but there is no reason why he should not have read one of the Gospels.[18]

In a similar process of authenticating unlikely stories, Lucian lets the Pythagorean Arignotus – Pythagoreans and Platonists are both the aim of his satire – tell a story about a ghost whom he managed to confront in Corinth and who turned out to be a badly buried corpse (31). The philosopher was clearly well versed in Egyptian wisdom, as he stressed that he possessed many Egyptian books and, moreover, had been a pupil of the Egyptian 'holy man' Pankrates (34), whose proper Egyptian name Pachrates has turned up in the magi-

[14] In fact, Lucian's knowledge of Christianity was better than is often suspected, see my "Peregrinus' Christian Career," in: A. HILHORST et al. (eds.), Flores Florentino. Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez (Leiden, 2007) 729–747; O. KARAVAS, "Luciano, los Cristianos y Jesucristo," in: F. MESTRE and P. GÓMEZ (eds.), Lucian of Samosata. Greek Writer and Roman Citizen (Barcelona, 2010) 115–120; P. PILHOFER, Neues aus der Welt der frühen Christen (Stuttgart, 2011) 53–61.

[15] G. BOWERSOCK, Fiction as History: Nero to Julian (Berkeley, LA, London, 1994).

[16] P. VON MÖLLENDORFF, Auf der Suche nach der verlogenen Wahrheit. Lukians Wahre Geschichten (Tübingen, 2000) 318–321 (Apocalypse of John), 427–430 (ApPt) and "Christliche Apokalypsen und ihr mimetisches Potential in der paganen Bildungskultur. Ein Beitrag zu Lukians Wahren Geschichten," in: S. ALKIER and R.B. HAYS (eds.), Die Bibel im Dialog der Schriften (Tübingen and Basel, 2005) 179–194.

[17] See my "From Holy Books to Holy Bible: an Itinerary from Ancient Greece to Modern Islam via Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity," in: M. POPOVIĆ (ed.), Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism (Leiden, 2010) 327–360.

[18] J.J. WETTSTEIN, H KAINH DIAΘHKH. Novum Testamentum Graecum editionis receptae cum lectionibus variantibus codicum MSS., editionum aliarum, versionum et Patrum necnon commentario pleniore ex scriptoribus veteribus Hebraeis, Graecis et Latinis historiam et vim verborum, etc., 2 vols (Amsterdam, 1751-1752, repr. Graz, 1962) 1.358 already noted the parallel; see also WEINREICH, Antike Heilungswunder, 173f. For the learned Wettstein, see P. VAN DER HORST, 'Johann Jakob Wettstein nach 300 Jahren: Erbe und Auftrag,' Theologische Zeitschrift 49 (1993) 267–81.

cal papyri (*PGM* 4.2446).[19] In Egyptian his name means 'the child', that is a divine epithet of the sun-god Re, but in Lucian this has been slightly changed so that his name reflects the many miracles he performed.[20] His training in magic by Isis in subterranean chambers for 23 years is a fine illustration of the prominence of Egyptian wisdom at that period, and his origin in Memphis fits the high reputation of that city in that respect in the earlier centuries AD.[21] Strangely, Reitzenstein overlooked an important element of ancient aretalogy in this anecdote, as Arignotus tells that the morning after he had defeated the ghost he approached the owner of the house Eubatides, *euangelizomenos*, 'telling him the good tiding', an expression that we also encounter in Lucian's *Icaromenippus* (34), where the protagonist even goes to the Stoic philosophers 'to tell the good news', *euangelioumenos*, that he himself had heard. The expression also occurs in Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* (1.3), *pro tam bono nuntio*, so that we may suppose that the expression originated in some late Hellenistic aretalogical writing.[22]

A much more impressive story, though, is told by Eukrates, who explicitly mentions that he has witnesses for his story (22). At the middle of the day he went into the forest. It is important to note the time, which was the traditional moment of the appearance of gods, ghosts and demons in antiquity, just as in modern times ghosts tend to appear at midnight. The motif must already predate Homer, as in the *Odyssey* (4.400) Proteus appears to Menelaus when the sun is at its zenith, and the motif can be easily followed into later antiquity.[23] For example, in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* Philetas encounters Eros 'about noon' (2.4),[24] in Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* it is 'shortly before noon' that Apollonius demonstrates that he can unshackle himself (7.38),[25] and it is also 'about noon' that a man enters Apollonius' prison, announces his release and orders the sage to follow him, with no exlplanation from the narrator about this man, who looks like a messenger from the gods rather than the worldly authorities (7.40). In the later fourth-century *Vision of Dorotheus*,

[19] For Lucian's stay in Egypt, which may have contributed to this vignette, see A. MARTIN, "Lucien et l'Égypte," in: MESTRE and GÓMEZ, Lucian of Samosata, 191–201.

[20] P. KINGSLEY, "Poimandres: The Etymology of the Name and the Origins of the Hermetica," JWCI 56 (1993) 1–24 at 13.

[21] See my "Pseudo-Clementines: Texts, Dates, Places, Authors and Magic," in: J.N. BREMMER (ed.), The Pseudo-Clementines (Leuven, 2010) 1–23 at 18f.

[22] H.D. BETZ, Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament. Religionsgeschichtliche und paränetische Parallelen (Berlin, 1961) 158.

[23] I summarize and update here a paragraph from my Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible and the Ancient Near East (Leiden, 2008) 226f.

[24] K. NICKAU, "Zur Epiphanie des Eros im Hirtenroman des Longos," Hermes 130 (2002) 176–191.

[25] For the passage and its connection with the Bacchae see also J.-J. FLINTERMAN, "Apollonius' Ascension," in: K. DEMOEN and D. PRAET (eds.), Theios Sophistes: Essays on Flavius Philostratus' Vita Apollonii (Leiden, 2009) 225–248 at 231ff.

which was published about three decades ago, the protagonist receives his vision when he 'was sitting alone in the palace in the midst of the day' (4).[26] In short, Lucian clearly adapts here a traditional motif that was even used by Luke in his description of the conversion of the apostle Paul, which took place 'about noon' (*Acts* 22.6) or 'at midday' (26.13).

After an earthquake and thunder, traditional motifs from Dionysiac epiphany,[27] Eukrates met Hekate, and the memory of this meeting, although lying already five years behind him, still makes the hair on his arm stand on end. This biological reaction has recently drawn the attention of Walter Burkert, who points out that the physiological reaction can also be part of epiphany descriptions.[28] Hekate is enormous in size as are her accompanying dogs, which are even taller than Indian elephants. She stamps on the ground, and this causes a rift as deep as the Tartarus, traditionally the deepest region of the underworld.[29] After a while she disappears into the rift, and Eukrates manages to hold on to a tree and to look into the underworld, where he sees the Pyriphlegethon, the Acherousian Lake, Cerberus and the dead. It may surprise that Eukrates does not see the Styx and Charon, but only notices the Pyriphlegethon. However, the latter river is more prominent in later hellscapes, as fire and the damning element became more important in the course of Late Antiquity;[30] also the Acherousian Lake seems to have become more important in underworld descriptions: it occurs, for example, in the *Apocalypse of Peter*, which Lucian probably knew. On the other hand, both the Pyriphlegethon and Acherousian Lake are also mentioned by Plato in his *Phaedo* (113bc), which is the more likely source here.[31]

---

[26] I quote from the text and translation by A.H.M. KESSELS and P.W. VAN DER HORST, "The Vision of Dorotheus (Pap. Bodmer 29)," VigChr 41 (1987) 313–359; note also the list with errata of the editio princeps supplied by E. LIVREA, Kressona baskaniês. Quindici studi di poesia ellenistica (Messina and Florence, 1993) 147–148; see most recently, J. VERHEYDEN, "When Heaven Turns into Hell: The Vision of Dorotheus and the Strange World of Human Imagination," in: W. AMELING (ed.), Topographie des Jenseits. Studien zur Geschichte des Todes in Kaiserzeit und Spätantike (Stuttgart, 2011) 123–141.

[27] R. SEAFORD, "Thunder, Lightning and Earthquake in the Bacchae and the Acts of the Apostles," in: A.B. LLOYD (ed.), What is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity (London, 1997) 139–151.

[28] W. BURKERT, "Horror Stories. Zur Begegnung von Biologie, Philologie und Religion," in: A. BIERL and W. BRAUNGART (eds.), Gewalt und Opfer. Im Dialog mit Walter Burkert (Berlin and New York, 2010) 45–70 at 50–53.

[29] J.N. BREMMER, The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife (London and New York, 2002) 4, 91.

[30] J. LIGHTFOOT, The Sibylline Oracles (Oxford, 2007) 514.

[31] BREMMER, "The Apocalypse of Peter: Greek or Jewish?," in: J.N. BREMMER and I. CZACHESZ (eds.), The Apocalypse of Peter (Leuven, 2003) 1–14 at 11; J. KNAUSS, "Die oberirdischen Vorbilder für die Flüsse der homerischen Unterwelt. Acheron, Pyriphlege-

Among the dead Eukrates sees Socrates, but not Plato, and his father, who still wore the clothes in which he had been buried. The sight is an interesting illustration of the human experience, which is also attested for antiquity,[32] that we remember the dead as we saw them last. As witness of all this, Eukrates appeals to Pyrrhias who also had participated in looking for him, and the latter assures that he had heard the barking of the dogs and seen glimpses of the fire of Hekate's torch from the rift. Interestingly, Lucian's speaker Tychiades notes that Pyrrhias overdid his testimony by adding these details.

Eukrates is subsequently trumped by the next speaker, Kleodemos (25), who is able to relate a real visit to Hades, not just looking into it. He too has his witness in one of the speakers present, Antigonos. Kleodemos relates that when he was seriously ill Antigonos had ordered to close all doors. Suddenly, a very handsome young man dressed in white, stood at his bed, while he was awake. He took him through a rift – the Greek has the same word *chasma* as in the story of Eukrates – to Hades, where he immediately recognised the great sinners Tantalos, Tityos and Sisyphos, who are mentioned as early as Homer. In a subtle reference to the latter he even uses the term *idôn*, which refers to Odysseus' repeated *eidon*, 'I saw',[33] even though the expression had also entered aretalogical literature, witness the fact that the already mentioned Ion stresses that he saw with his own eyes – *ego goun kai eidon* – a demon being expelled by a Syrian with a black and ruddy skin color (16); in fact, in the prologue of his *True Histories* (1.4) Lucian explicitly stresses that he will now tell stories which he had *not* seen. When he came to the infernal court, where not only the judge Aiakos, but also the ferryman Charon was, as well as the Moirai and Erinyes, the young man presented him to Pluto, who called out the names of those who should have died already. But he declined him as his thread was not yet fully spun and told the guide: 'fetch me the blacksmith Demylos'. Kleodemos happily ran upwards and told everybody that Demylos would die. He was one of the neighbors, who was already ill, and soon Kleodemos heard the laments of those mourning him.[34]

The anecdote is clearly invented by somebody with literary knowledge. This is not only demonstrated by the references to Homer and current eschatological mythology, but it is also typical of one strand of the ancient *katabasis* literature that the story is told in the first person singular. We see this already in Homer's *Nekuia*, but the most famous example must have been Orpheus,

---

thon, Kokytos und Styx," in: E. OLSHAUSEN and V. SAUER (eds), Die Landschaft und die Religion (Stuttgart, 2009) 119–140.

[32] J.N. BREMMER, The Early Greek Concept of the Soul (Princeton, 1983) 83f.

[33] BETZ, Lukian von Samosata, 117 n. 4.

[34] The same anecdote, once again about a smith, is also told by Gregory the Great, Dial. 4.36. For a modern Indian parallel see S. PASRICHA and I. STEVENSON, "Near-death experiences in India: A preliminary report," J. of Nervous and Mental Disease 174 (1986) 165–170 at 167.

whose epic about his *katabasis* to retrieve his wife Eurydice was also told in the first person singular, as was realized by Norden in his famous commentary on *Aeneid* VI.[35] We have of course no idea who invented this anecdote, but we may at least notice that the name Demylos/-as predominantly occurs in Attica and neighbouring Euboea.[36] If Radermacher is right with his claim of a book by Heraclides Ponticus as an important source for Lucian,[37] Heraclides may well have picked up the name during his stay in Athens.

Reitzenstein noted of course that we find a very similar story in a fragment of Plutarch's dialogue *On the Soul*, which is quoted by Eusebius (*Praep. Ev*. 11.36) after his treatment of the myth of Er and related by one of the acquaintances of the revived person. A certain Antyllus told Plutarch and his company that he had died but been released again, since those who had fetched him had been reproached 'by the master' (*kurios*: a curiously vague term) for having returned with the wrong one: it should have been the shoemaker Nicandas. The story evidently got round and finally reached Nicandas himself, who started to feel very uneasy about the whole situation. Rightly so, since he suddenly passed away, whereas Antyllus recovered.[38]

However, we are not there yet, as Reitzenstein also noted that in his *The Care to Be Taken for the Dead* (12.15),[39] which probably dates to 421 AD, Augustine tells the following story: Curma, a poor *curialis* ('member of a city council') and *simpliciter rusticanus* ('a simple rustic'), who lived not far from Augustine's city of Hippo, fell into a deep coma. After a number of days, he awoke and immediately asked for somebody to go to the house of Curma the smith. On arrival they found out that his namesake had died at the very moment that our Curma had woken up from his coma. When they returned, Curma told bystanders that in the place he had been in he had heard the order not to bring Curma the *curialis* but Curma the smith.

After this exciting start, Curma relates that in a kind of hell – 'those places of the dead' (*loca illa mortuorum*), he says rather vaguely – he saw people treated

---

[35] See most recently, BREMMER, "The Golden Bough: Orphic, Eleusinian and Hellenistic-Jewish Sources of Virgil's Underworld in Aeneid VI," Kernos 22 (2009) 183–208 at 195.

[36] M. OSBORNE and S. BYRNE, A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names III (Oxford, 1994) 114 (Attica); P.M. FRASER and E. MATTHEWS, A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names I (Oxford, 1987) 129 (Euboia).

[37] RADERMACHER, Griechische Quellen zur Faustsage, 13.

[38] Rather curiously, U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, Kleine Schriften IV (Berlin, 1962) 419–420, believes in the reality of Antyllus' experience, but E.R. DODDS, The Ancient Concept of Progress (Oxford, 1973) 174 note 2 is more realistic.

[39] De cura pro mortuis gerenda (CSEL 41, 619–660). There are helpful Dutch, English and German translations: J. DEN BOEFT and H. VAN REISEN (eds.), Aurelius Augustinus: Wat kunnen wij voor de doden doen? (Budel, 2010); The Fathers of the Church 27 (New York, 1955) 347–384; Aurelius Augustinus, Die Sorge für die Toten, tr. G. SCHLACHTER (Würzburg, 1975), with a good introduction and notes by R. Arbesmann.

according to their merits, even some he had known before his coma. It is curious that at the same time he also saw people who had not yet died. Amongst them were some of the clergy of his own parish, a priest who told him to get baptised, and Augustine himself. After these sightings in an unspecified place, he was told that 'he was admitted into Paradise'. Later, when he was dismissed from Paradise, he was told: 'Go, get baptised if you want to be in this place of the blessed' (*in isto loco beatorum*). When he responded that he already had been baptised, somebody who remains anonymous answered 'Go, get truly baptised'. And that is what Curma did at Easter, without telling his experience to Augustine during the christening.

A few years later Augustine heard Curma's story from a mutual friend. At first he was not quite sure what to make of it, and he interpreted the experience not as an authentic meeting but as a kind of dream. Curma could not have met the real dead but their images, since Augustine believed that the deceased remained at a place of undisturbed peace where they had no contact with the living whatsoever.[40] Nevertheless, he took Curma's story very seriously and had Curma relate the whole thing to him while in the company of respectable citizens, who assured him that they remembered him telling them exactly the same. Both the obvious emphasis Augustine puts on the low social status of Curma and the confirmation of Curma's story by his fellow citizens indicate that he wanted the reader to believe this strange experience.[41]

With these examples Reitzenstein aimed to demonstrate that Lucian's *Lovers of Lies* belongs more or less to the same literary genre as the latter's *True Stories* which, in his words, in the variety of literary parodies also reflects *Volksvorstellungen* of the Isles of the Blessed and touches upon fairy tales. Incidentally, both ideas are highly questionable. Ideas about the hereafter were hardly limited to the 'common people', and the genre of modern fairy tales did not yet exist in antiquity. That Lucian in his *True Stories* refers to the *Odyssey*, Herodotus, Ktesias and Iamboulos is understandable as the raconteur Odysseus is his great example with his stories about one-eyed, raw meat-eating people, many-headed beings and *metamorphoseis* of his comrades. The passage, as Reitzenstein notes, is closely paralleled by a passage from Juvenal 15 (13–16) where the same sub-

[40] For Augustine's ideas about the hereafter see H. EGER, Die Eschatologie Augustins (Greifswald, 1933); M. DULAEY, Le rêve dans la vie et la pensée de saint Augustin (Paris, 1973) 205–210; C. CAROZZI, Le voyage de l'âme dans l'au-delà d'après la littérature latine (Ve-XIIIe siècle) (Rome, 1994) 14–34.

[41] I slightly revise here the treatment of this anecdote in my The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife (London and New York, 2002) 95f. For a subtle narratological and discourse-linguistic analysis of the episode, see now P. ROSE, Augustine on the Relations between the Living and the Deceased: a Discourse-Linguistic Commentary on De cura pro mortuis gerenda (Diss. Amsterdam, 2011) 253–297, although her comparison (p. 262 note 217) of the Curma episode with the Gabienus scene in Pliny, NH 7.178 seems to me less persuasive, cf. BREMMER, The Rise and Fall, 77.

jects are considered to be typical of a *mendax aretalogus*, a 'lying aretalogus'. That is, when a poet tells only wonders he becomes a liar, as he also has to tell some truth.

It is the term *aretalogus* that Reitzenstein subsequently tries to elucidate. He draws attention to a hitherto neglected scholion on Juvenal (15.16), which explains *arithologi* as persons that, in the opinion of some, speak about *miras res, id est deorum virtutes*.[42] The scholiast himself, however, suggests that *arithologi* bring things into the public space, *in vulgus*, that are not said, *ea quae dicta non sunt*. In other words, he mistakenly confused *aretalogos* with *arrêtologos*, as Reitzenstein failed to notice, the reason being that he had unnecessary emended *dicta* into *ficta*; moreover, Reitzenstein also failed to notice that in Eusebius we do indeed find the word *arrêtologia* (*PE* 3.13.24). In fact, Reitzenstein completely wrongly concluded that the older explanation understood *aretalogus* as the teller of miraculous tales, whereas the scholiast opted for the explanation in an honorific sense: the *aretalogus* is the prophet that proclaims the great deeds, especially miracles we may add, of the gods.

Reitzenstein proceeds with tracing the origin of the term. He claims that it was already current in New Comedy, as Terence in his *Adelphoe* (535), says regarding a god: *virtutes narro*. This certainly suggests that the idea of the great deeds of a god was present, but it does not prove the existence of a technical term, and Reitzenstein could not produce an older example than the Greek translation of Jesus Sirach 36.19: 'Fill Zion with the celebration of your wondrous deeds (*aretalogias*) and your people with your glory (*doxês*)' (tr. NRSV). As the *Septuagint* most likely was translated in Alexandria there is, *pace* Reitzenstein, nothing wrong with the older idea of *eine hellenistische Neubildung, etwa ägyptischen Ursprungs* (9). Yet one of the few Egyptian examples of the term *aretalogia* has now to be removed from the dossier. Reitzenstein still adduced Strabo's report of the Sarapeion in Kanobos where even the most famous men practised incubation or let others do it for them, what Reitzenstein wrongly translates with 'für sich oder andere' (10). In fact, some (not Radt's 'many') authors wrote down the healings and others the wondrous effects of the sayings there (*aretas tôn entautha logiôn*), as Radt in his new edition of Strabo has emended the older reading *aretalogiôn* (17.1.17).

Although the report about Kanobos might give the impression that aretalogies were limited to healing divinities, Reitzenstein argues that visions of, for example, the fourth-century alchemist Zosimos might also be termed aretalogies, as they served to teach others, which is of course not quite the same as spreading the *aretai* of specific gods. That is why, according to him, even the Christian treatise *Hermas* might be called an aretalogy.

Reitzenstein, first, though, turns to the 'worldly' aretalogy. He lists the passages where we have non-religious examples and concludes that these developed

[42] P. WESSNER, Scholia in Juvenalem vetustiora (Leipzig, 1931) 227, 286.

from the religious genre. In Egypt, on the other hand, 'wordly' and religious aretalogy are very hard to separate, and it was the pleasure in the miraculous that kept these writings alive. They are, in his view, *Volksbücher* (15), a view that he does not substantiate. At the same time, the *Wundererzählung*, which aims at a religious goal, penetrated high literature and attempted to acquire a more ornate form. However, during his wandering from the Orient to Greece and Rome the aretalogist increased the 'wordly' side of his miracle tales. As an argument for this interpretation Reitzenstein quotes one of the prodigies of Caligula's forthcoming murder in Suetonius: *parabatur et in noctem spectaculum, quo argumenta inferorum per Aegyptios et Aethiopas explicarentur* (*Calig*. 57), which he interprets as a performance of Osiris' wanderings through the underworld (17). However, the passage is clearly explained wrongly, as it only states that Egyptians and Aethiopians performed scenes of the underworld – surely because they were black not because they were showing native mythology.

Less mistaken is his interpretation of Euhemeros' authentication of his highly influential work, *Hiera Anagraphê*, 'Holy Record', which was written in Alexandria around 300 BC. The fact that it claims to be written by a god on a stele, which subsequently had been hidden for a long time is, according to Reitzenstein, the *typische Form der ägyptischen Offenbarungserzählung* (17). And indeed, such fictititous stelae are often attested for Egypt,[43] but is a strategy that was already employed by Akousilaos in 500 BC and by the author of the Gilgamesh epic even much earlier.[44] This also refutes Reitzenstein's idea that the novel of Antonius Diogenes, which also knows the motif of the buried book, should be connected with the Egyptian form, even though it features the Egyptian magician, Paapis (18). As Bowersock has persuasively argued, Diogenes came from Aphrodisias,[45] and we need not immediately suppose Egyptian influence therefore.

In addition to Egyptian material Reitzenstein quotes two epigrams of Callimachus (*Ep*. 10 and 13) regarding the hereafter, which in his view show that Lucian could have used also many religious *katabaseis* from the third century

[43] E. PETERSON, Eis Theos (Göttingen, 1926) 217–218; R. MERKELBACH, Roman und Mysterium in der Antike (Munich, 1962) 113, 171, 335 and "Fragment eines satirischen Romans: Aufforderung zur Beichte," ZPE 11 (1973) 81–100 at 88 n. 24; A. HENRICHS, "The Sophists and Hellenistic Religion: *Prodicus* as the Spiritual Father of the Isis Aretalogies," HSCP 38 (1984) 139–158 at 156f.

[44] A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, vol. I (Paris, 1950[3]) 319–324 and Études de religion grecque et hellénistique (Paris, 1972) 272–274; W. SPEYER, Bücherfunde in der Glaubens-werbung der Antike (Göttingen, 1970); P. PIOVANELLI, "The Miraculous Discovery of the Hidden Manuscript, or the Paratextual Function of the Prologue to the Apocalypse of Paul," in: J.N. BREMMER and I. CZACHESZ (eds.), The Visio Pauli and the Gnostic Apocalypse of Paul (Leuven, 2007) 23–49.

[45] BOWERSOCK, History as Fiction, 37–41; S. TILG, Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel (Oxford, 2010) 126f.

BC. Unfortunately, these epigrams do not show anything of the kind, as we can only conclude from them a thorough scepticism regarding the tales about the hereafter. Their reference may well be Homer or Plato and there is no indication that they are directed against contemporary descriptions of the underworld, let alone *eine ganze Fülle ähnlicher Schriftsteller* (20), although an Orphic *katabasis* was almost certainly known in Alexandria.[46]

In a somewhat complicated manner, Reitzenstein proceeds with a discussion of various satiric poems, such as Horace's *Satire* 1.8, which he also connects to the 'worldly' aretalogy, supported in this by the connection that Philodemus (*On Poetry* 5, p. 24 Jens.) makes between authors of mimes and those of aretalogies. It must be said, though, that the connection with the religious aretalogy in this discussion somewhat disappears behind the horizon. Really without much evidence, Reitzenstein argues for the existence of a *skoptische Satire von phantastischer Erfindung* that contained ascensions to heaven, descents into the underworld and necromancies (26). As an example he adduces Horace's *Satire* 1.8 where the god Priapus puts to flight witches by farting. It says something of his Egyptian obsession that he even wants to derive this 'heroic deed' from Egypt, for which there is, actually, not a shred of evidence.

Similarly, he adduces as second example Juvenal's fifteenth *Satire*, in which the poet relates a case of Egyptian cannibalism. The choice of the poem is not fortuitous. We noted earlier that Reitzenstein focused on this poem as it contained the term *aretalogus*, but now Juvenal also stresses that Odysseus told his story *nullo sub teste* (26), whereas he can tell *miranda quidem*, something miraculous, that is located in time, *nuper*, 'recently', when Iuncus was consul (AD 127), but also in space: south of Coptos in the Upper Thebaid. Reitzenstein even suggests that Juvenal hints at his own presence in Egypt, but that is probably a misunderstanding of the Latin *quantum ipse notavi* (Courtney on Juv. 15.45), 'so far as my personal observation goes'. In any case, we must note that his story of cannibalism is gruesome, but does not have one-eyed people or monsters like the Scylla and the Charybdis. It is a rather subdued miraculous tale.

Finally, Reitzenstein ends the first part with some observations on a possible influence of Stoic satires, to which he ascribes an influence on the erotic frivolity of Seneca in his *Apocolocyntosis* (29-30), to Petronius (30-31) and Lucius of Patrae (34), at the same time trying to connect these authors with aretalogies. At this point the reader, at least this reader, starts to feel a little bit desperate as the concept of aretalogy seems to become connected with all kinds of genres and

[46] For Orphic influence in Alexandria, see my considerations in: BREMMER, "The Apocalypse of Peter: Greek or Jewish?" and "The Golden Bough." For the important question of the origin of the Apocalypse of Peter in this connection, see the persuasive observations of T. NICKLAS, "‚Insider' und ‚Outsider': Überlegungen zum historischen Kontext der Darstellung ‚jenseitiger Orte' in der Offenbarung des Petrus," in: AMELING, Topographie des Jenseits, 35–48.

works and to lose any specificity. This does not immediately improve when we hear that the oldest aretalogy outside Egypt is the biblical book of Jonah (35), which he compares to Lucian's *True Histories*. In other words, from a genre that relates miracles we now seem to have to see the aretalogy as a novelistic genre about prophets or missionaries, even when miracles are not the most obvious characteristics of these stories.

Yet Reitzenstein first turns to the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles as the *einzige voll erhaltene Proben volkstümlicher religiöser Aretalogie* (35). He strongly resists the idea that these Acts could be best explained as novels, which does not seem to have been a bad idea, as they add miracle to miracle until the death of the Apostle ends the composition. The fact that these Acts are religious hardly seems to refute the closeness to the pagan novel.[47] Not surprisingly, Reitzenstein sees Egyptian *Wundertäter und Propheten* as contemporaries, even predecessors of the apostles, as they also wandered from city to city whilst performing miracles, although he, once again, provides no evidence for this claimed phenomenon.[48] And, so Reitzenstein continues, as their doctrines became Hellenised, Greek philosophers increasingly imitated them. The prophet thus became a philosopher, the philosopher a prophet.

Reitzenstein sees a typical prophet aretalogy in the biography of Apollonius of Tyana, which gradually developed, according to him, from earlier sources and treatises into a travel aretalogy. As with Lucian, Reitzenstein here too is sensitive to Christian influence and notes the, according to him, *einzige Stelle ... die man mit einer gewissen Wahrscheinlichkeit auf das Christentum beziehen könnte* (48). He refers to the passage in which Apollonius tells Damis that he will appear to him after his court case at the edge of the sea, a marginal place we may note. Damis is rather startled by this forecast of Apollonius and asks him: 'Alive?' and Apollonius answers 'To my way of thinking, alive, but to yours, risen from the dead (*anabebiôkota*: 7.41). When he is later discussing the preliminaries of Apollonius' trial with his comrade Demetrius and both are rather despondent, Apollonius appears to them. When they doubt whether he is alive or a ghost, Apollonius stretches out his hand to Demetrius and says: 'Take hold of me, and if I elude you I am a ghost (*eidôlon*) coming from Persephone ... but if I remain when grasped, persuade Damis too that I am alive and have not lost my body' (8.12.1). Reitzenstein is prepared to accept Christian influence here, although a direct derivation from a gospel (Luke 24.39; John 20.20, 27) clearly goes too far for him.

[47] For this proximity of the two genres, see my "The Novel and the Apocryphal Acts: Place, Time and Readership," in: H. HOFMANN and M. ZIMMERMAN (eds.), Groningen Colloquia on the Novel IX (Groningen, 1998) 157–180.

[48] REITZENSTEIN'S reference (36 note 2) to Chapter VII of his own Poimandres (Leipzig, 1904) does not help.

References to an apparent death and resurrection already start to proliferate in pagan novels from the Neronian time onwards, and Glen Bowersock has therefore persuasively concluded that the genre was probably influenced by the Christian gospel narratives.[49] It is indeed noteworthy that in the second century pagan magicians also started being credited with the power to resurrect, as in Lucian's *Lovers of Lies* (13), which of course mentions the resurrection of people already long dead.[50] It is therefore striking that Reitzenstein fails to point out the resurrection by Apollonius of Tyana of a recently deceased girl.[51] The passage deserves some more attention than Bowersock gives it. The actual death is highly dramatised, as the girl died just before her wedding, traditionally the highlight of a girl's life in ancient Greece. She was of course of the highest standing, as she belonged to a consular family. Her fiancé followed the bier, and Rome mourned with him. Although such public funerals are not uncommon in Rome,[52] Philostratus has clearly transformed a Greek custom, in which the deceased children of the highest families were mourned by the whole city,[53] into a Roman one. Apollonius does not make a fuss, asks her name, touches her, says something secretly and wakes her up from her apparent death. And like the apostles in the apocryphal Acts, he refuses to receive money for his intervention. The story of this resurrection, however downplayed by Philostratus, who keeps the option of a remaining spark of life open, can hardly be separated from the stories in Mark 5 (35–43) or the apocryphal *Acts of Peter*, as the authors of the novel clearly read one another, being pagan or Christian.

It is this kind of literature that according to Reitzenstein (55) was the inspiration for the Christian Apocryphal Acts. Strangely enough, he did not follow up this observation but immediately proceeded with the early Christian monastic literature, the *Life of Antony*, the *Historia Monachorum* and the *Historia Lausiaca*. One must say that the expositions of Reitzenstein on the *Life of Antony* are now completely out of date because of the new edition of the text by Bartelink and the many investigations about the nature of his work, which seems to have established that Athanasius redacted with minimal rewriting the work of a fol-

[49] BOWERSOCK, Fiction as History, 117–119; R. Kany, "Der lukanische Bericht von Tod und Auferstehung Jesu aus der Sicht eines hellenistischen Romanlesers," NovT 28 (1986) 75–90.

[50] Polemo, De physiognomia, pp.160–164; Lucian, Alexander of Abounoteichos, 24.

[51] Philostratus, Life of Apollonius, 4.45, cf. BOWERSOCK, Fiction as History, 109f. Note also the often overlooked mention of Apollonius' resurrections in Historia Augusta, Vita Aureliani 24.3.8.

[52] G. WESCH-KLEIN, Funus publicum: eine Studie zur öffentlichen Beisetzung und Gewährung von Ehrengräbern in Rom und den Westprovinzen (Stuttgart, 1993).

[53] See the examples in C.P. JONES, "Interrupted Funerals," Proc. Am. Philos. Ass. 143 (1999) 588–600 and A. CHANIOTIS, "Rituals Between Norms and Emotions: Rituals as Shared Experience and Memory," in: E. STAVRIANOPOULOU (ed.). Rituals and Communication in the Graeco-Roman World (Liège, 2006) 211–238.