

Beyond Conflicts

Edited by
LUCA ARCARI

*Studien und Texte zu
Antike und Christentum*

103

Mohr Siebeck

Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
Studies and Texts in Antiquity and Christianity

Herausgeber/Editors

CHRISTOPH MARKSCHIES (Berlin) · MARTIN WALLRAFF (München)

CHRISTIAN WILDBERG (Princeton)

Beirat/Advisory Board

PETER BROWN (Princeton) · SUSANNA ELM (Berkeley)

JOHANNES HAHN (Münster) · EMANUELA PRINZIVALLI (Rom)

JÖRG RÜPKE (Erfurt)

103



Beyond Conflicts

Cultural and Religious Cohabitations
in Alexandria and Egypt between the 1st
and the 6th Century CE

edited by

Luca Arcari

Mohr Siebeck

LUCA ARCARI, born 1977; 2005 PhD in Ancient History; 2007–2012 Post-Doctoral Researcher at the University of Naples Federico II, the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, and the “Michele Pellegrino” Foundation (University of Turin); currently Assistant Professor of History of Ancient Christianity and History of Religions at the University of Naples Federico II.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-155171-0

ISBN 978-3-16-155144-4

ISSN 1436-3003 (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum)

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

© 2017 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. www.mohr.de

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Gomariningen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Acknowledgements

This volume is the result of the international conference “Beyond Conflicts: Cultural and Religious Cohabitations in Alexandria and in Egypt between the 1st and the 6th cent. CE,” held in Naples (Federico II University) from 17th to 19th September 2014. This conference was organised in the context of a research project on “The Construction of Space and Time in the Transmission of Collective Identities: Religious Cohabitations and/or Polarisations in the Ancient World (1st–6th cent. CE)” (FIRB – Future in Research 2012, Italian Ministry of Scientific Research and University: <http://www.firbcoabitazioni.it>; Project no.: RBFR12R82W), hosted by Federico II University of Naples, under my direction, in collaboration with both the University of Turin (Roberto Alciati) and the University of Catania (Arianna Rotondo). During the project’s three years, the Federico II University hosted seminars, led by both fellows and guests, plus a further two international conferences (“Signs of Cohabitations in Urban Spaces of the Roman Near East [1st–6th cent. CE],” January 22nd–23rd 2015, in cooperation with Raffaella Pierobon Benoit; “Second Temple Jewish *Paideia* in Its Ancient Near Eastern and Hellenistic Contexts,” Fifth Enoch Seminar Nangeroni Meeting, in cooperation with the Enoch Seminar, directed by Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason M. Zurawski, June 30th–July 4th 2015). The proceedings of both these conferences are to be published.

As the project’s coordinator, it was an honour for me to collect and collate the study’s findings and the discussions of the “Beyond Conflicts” participants. I would like to thank my colleagues for sharing their studies and dilemmas with both these participants and other researchers. I want to express my warm gratitude to the University of Naples Federico II, to the Director of the Department of Humanities, Professor Edoardo Massimilla, to the Vice-Rector, Professor Arturo De Vivo, and to the Rector, Professor Gaetano Manfredi for their invaluable support, as well as to their dedicated staff, whose constant effort and hospitality to our colleagues facilitated our work together. Special thanks are due to Tobias Nicklas and Ismo Dunderberg for their friendly suggestions regarding the publication of this book in the prestigious series “Studies and Texts of Ancient Christianity/Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum,” as well as to its Editors, Professors Christoph Marksches, Martin Wallraff and Christian Wildberg for their prompt acceptance. I am also especially grateful to Marianna Ferrara for her work as editorial assistant, and to Chiara Ghidini, Brian Picco and Assia Zizza for their rigorous revision of the English.

Luca Arcari

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	V
Abbreviations	XI

Introduction

Luca Arcari

Cultural and Religious Cohabitations in Alexandria and Egypt between the 1st and the 6th Cent. CE	1
---	---

Part One

Use, (Re-)Invention and (Re-)Definition of Discursive Practices

Tobias Nicklas

Jewish, Christian, Greek? The Apocalypse of Peter as a Witness of Early 2nd-Cent. Christianity in Alexandria	27
--	----

Philippe Matthey

The Once and Future King of Egypt: Egyptian “Messianism” and the Construction of the Alexander Romance	47
--	----

Antonio Sena

Demonology between Celsus and Origen: A Theoretical Model of Religious Cohabitation?	73
--	----

Daniele Tripaldi

“Basilides” and “the Egyptian Wisdom:” Some Remarks on a Peculiar Heresiological Notice (Ps.-Hipp. <i>Haer.</i> 7.20–27).....	87
---	----

Thomas J. Kraus

Demosthenes and (Late) Ancient Miniature Books from Egypt: Reflections on a Category, Physical Features, Purpose and Use.....	115
---	-----

Paola Buzi

Remains of Gnostic Anthologies and Pagan Wisdom Literature in the Coptic Tradition	131
--	-----

Part Two
Ideological Debates as Images of Cultural
and Religious Cohabitations

Bernard Pouderon

“Jewish,” “Christian” and “Gnostic” Groups in Alexandria during
 the 2nd Cent.: Between Approval and Expulsion 155

Adele Monaci Castagno

Messengers from Heaven: Divine Men and God’s Men in the Alexandrian
 Platonism (2nd–4th Cent.)..... 177

Mark J. Edwards

Late Antique Alexandria and the “Orient” 195

Ewa Wipszycka

How Insurmountable was the Chasm between Monophysites and
 Chalcedonians?..... 207

Philippe Blaudeau

Vel si non tibi communicamus, tamen amamus te. Remarques sur
 la description par Liberatus de Carthage des rapports entre Miaphysites
 et Chalcédoniens à Alexandrie (milieu V^e–milieu VI^e s.) 227

Part Three
Cults and Practices as Spaces for Encounters and Interactions

Sofia Torallas Tovar

Love and Hate? Again on Dionysos in the Eyes of the Alexandrian Jews.. 247

Francesco Massa

Devotees of Serapis and Christ? A Literary Representation of Religious
 Cohabitations in the 4th Cent. 263

Mariangela Monaca

Between Cyril and Isis: Some Remarks on the Iatromantic Cults
 in 5th-Cent. Alexandria..... 283

Part Four
“Open” and “Closed” Groups

Marie-Françoise Baslez

Open-air Festivals and Cultural Cohabitation in Late Hellenistic Alexandria	307
---	-----

Livia Capponi

The Common Roots of Egyptians and Jews: Life and Meaning of an Ancient Stereotype	323
---	-----

Hugo Lundhaug

The Nag Hammadi Codices in the Complex World of 4th- and 5th-Cent. Egypt	339
--	-----

Part Five
*The Construction of Authority in Philosophical
and Religious Schools*

Carmine Pisano

Moses “Prophet” of God in the Works of Philo, or How to Use <i>Otherness</i> to Construct <i>Selfness</i>	361
---	-----

Giulia Sfameni Gasparro

Alexandria in the Mirror of Origen’s <i>didaskaleion</i> : Between the Great Church, Heretics and Philosophers	377
--	-----

Marco Rizzi

Cultural and Religious Exchanges in Alexandria: The Transformation of Philosophy and Exegesis in the 3rd Cent. in the Mirror of Origen	399
--	-----

Index of Ancient Sources	415
--------------------------------	-----

Index of Modern Authors	439
-------------------------------	-----

Index of Main Topics	453
----------------------------	-----

List of Contributors	459
----------------------------	-----

Abbreviations*

ACO 2.5	Liberatus Carthaginensis. <i>Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum</i> . Edited by Eduard Schwartz. Acta Conciliorum Œcumenicorum 2.5. Berlin–Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1936.
ÄHG	Jan Assmann. <i>Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete</i> . Freiburg in der Schweiz–Göttingen: Universitätsverlag–Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.
BD	The “Book of the Dead.”
CC	<i>Clavis Coptica</i> (or <i>Clavis Patrum Copticorum</i>): http://www.cmcl.it/~cmcl/chiam_clavis.html .
CCL	<i>Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina</i> . Turnhout: Brepols, 1953ff.
C.Gloss.Biling.	<i>Glossaria Bilingua in Papyris et Membranis Reperta</i> . Edited by Johannes Kramer. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 30. Bonn: R. Habelt, 1983.
CIJ	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum: Jewish Inscriptions from the Third Century BC to the Seventh Century AD</i> . Edited by Jean Baptiste Frey. Vols. 1–2. Rome–Paris: Pontificio Istituto d’archeologia cristiana, 1936–1952; 2nd Edition. New York: Ktav, 1975.
CIL	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i> . Berlin: G. Raiser–W. de Gruyter, 1863ff.
CMCL	<i>Corpus dei manoscritti letterari copti</i> : http://www.cmcl.it .
CPJ	<i>Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum</i> . Edited by Victor Tcherikover, Avigdor Tcherikover, Alexander Fuks. Vols. 1–3. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957–1964.
CSEL	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i> . Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1866ff.
CT	<i>The Egyptian Coffin Texts</i> . Vols. 1–8. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935–2006.
Edfou	Maxence de Chalvet marquis de Rochemonteix, Émile Chassinat. <i>Le temple d’Edfou</i> . Vols. 1–10. Cairo: IFAO, 1897–1934.
Esna	Serge Sauneron. <i>Le temple d’Esna</i> . Vols. 1–6. Cairo: IFAO, 1959–1969.
FGH	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> . Edited by Felix Jacoby. Berlin; Leiden: Weidmann; E.J. Brill, 1923ff.
G ¹	The <i>Vita prima</i> of Pachomius (see Armand Veilleux. <i>Pachomian koinonia: The Lives, Rules, and Other Writings of Saint Pachomius and His Disciples</i> . Vol. 1. Cistercian Studies 45. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1980).
LSJ	Henry G. Liddell, Robert Scott. <i>A Greek–English Lexicon</i> . Rev. and Augmented by Henry S. Jones with the Assistance of Roderick McKenzie. With a Revised Supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

* Ancient works are abbreviated according to the *SBL Handbook of Style* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999). For those not listed here, the reader will find the first mention in extenso. The abbreviations listed here are a selection of the main collections and series cited in this volume. For other abbreviations, especially Greek, Latin, Demotic, Coptic editions, and papyri, ostraca and tablets, please refer to http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/texts/clist_papyri.html and <http://papyri.info/docs/checklist>.

- NASB *New American Standard Bible*: <http://www.biblestudytools.com/nas/>.
- NETS *New English Translation of the Septuagint*. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- NRSV *New Revised Standard Version*: <http://www.biblestudytools.com/nrs/>.
- OF *Poetae Epici Graeci Testimonia et Fragmenta. II. Orphicorum et Orphicis similium testimonia et fragmenta*. Edited by Alberto Bernabé. Vols. 1–2. München–Leipzig: Saur. Vol. 3. Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004–2007.
- P.Adler *The Adler Papyri: The Greek Texts*. London: Milford, 1939.
- P.Amh. *The Amherst Papyri being an Account of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of the Right Hon. Lord Amherst of Hackney, at Didlington Hall, Norfolk*. Vols. 1–2. London–Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1900–1901.
- P.Ant. *The Antinoopolis Papyri*. Vols. 1–3. Egypt Exploration Society, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 28, 37, 47. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1950–1967.
- Pap.Flor. *Papiri greco-egizi pubblicati dalla R. Accademia dei Lincei*. Vols. 1–3. Supplementi filologico–storici ai monumenti antichi. Milan–Rome: U. Hoepli–Reale Accademia dei Lincei, 1906–1915.
- PG *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca*. Edited by Jacques–Paul Migne. Vols. 1–161. Paris: Bibliothecae Cleri Universae, 1856–1866.
- PGM *Papyri Graecae Magicae*. Edited by Karl Preisendanz. Vols. 1–2. Berlin–Leipzig: Teubner, 1928–1931.
- P.Hamb. *Griechische Papyrusurkunden der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek*. Vols. 1–4. Berlin–Leipzig: Teubner; Hamburg–Bonn–Stuttgart–Leipzig: R. Habelt, 1911–1998.
- P.Lond. *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*. Vols. 1–7. London: British Museum, 1893–1974.
- P.Lond.Lit. *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum*. Edited by Herbert J.M. Milne. London: Trustees, 1927.
- P.Mon.Epiph. *The Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes, Part II*. Edited by Walter E. Crum, Hugh G. Evelyn–White. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition, 1926.
- P.Oxy. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vols. 1–80. London: The Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898–2014.
- P.PalauRib. *Papiri documentari greci del fondo Palau-Ribes*. Edited by Sergio Daris. *Estudis de papirologia i filologia bíblica* 4. Barcelona: Institut de teologia, 1995.
- P.Ryl. *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library*. Vols. 1–4. Manchester–London–New York: The University Press–Longmans, 1911–1952.
- PLRE *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. Edited by Arnold H. Martin Jones, John R. Martindale, John Morris. Vols. 1–3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971–1992.
- Pn *Ranke, Hermann. Die ägyptischen Personennamen*. Vols. 1–3. Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin, 1935–1977.
- PO *Patrologia Orientalis*. Vols. 1–53. Paris: Firmin–Didot; Leuven: Brepols, 1904–2015.
- PSI *Papiri greci e latini*. Vols. 1–16. Florence: Pubblicazioni della Società italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto, 1917–2013.
- PT *Die Altaegyptischen Pyramidentexte. Pyramidentexte nach den Papierabdrucken und Photographien des Berliner Museums*. Vols. 1–2. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1908–1910.

RIC	<i>Roman Imperial Coniage</i> . Vols. 1–10. London: Spink, 1923–1994.
RICIS	Bricault, Laurent. <i>Recueil des inscriptions concernant les cultes isiaques</i> . Mémoires de l'académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres 31. Paris: De Boccard, 2005.
SB	<i>Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten</i> . Vols. 1–28. Berlin–Leipzig: W. de Gruyter; Heidelberg: Im Selbstverlag des Verfassers; Straßburg: K.J. Trübner; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1913–2013.
SBo	Recension of the <i>Life of Pachomius</i> represented by the Bo, Av, S ⁴ , S ⁵ , S ⁶ , S ⁷ , etc. (Compiled and Translated by Armand Veilleux. <i>Pachomian Koinoinia. The Lives, Rules, and Other Writings of St. Pachomius and His Disciples</i> . Vol. 1. Cistercian Studies 45. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1980).
SEG	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> . Amsterdam: Lugduni Batavorum; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1923ff.
SHA	<i>Scriptores Historiae Augustae (Historia Augusta)</i> . Edited by David Magie. Vols. 1–3. Loeb Classical Library 139, 140, 263. London–New York: W. Heinemann–G.P. Putnam Sons: 1922–1932.
SIG	Dittenberger, Wilhelm. <i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> . 3rd Edition. Vols. 1–4. Leipzig: Hirzelium, 1915–1924.
TB	Talmud of Babylon.
TJ	Talmud of Jerusalem.
TLG	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i> : http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu .
TM	Trismegistos Database: http://www.trismegistos.org/index2.php .
Urk. 4	Sethe, Kurt. <i>Urkunden der 18. Dynastie. Historisch-biographische Urkunden</i> . Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906–1909.
Urk. 8	Sethe, Kurt. <i>Thebanische Tempelinschriften aus griechisch-römischer Zeit</i> . Edited by Otto Firkow. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957.
XS	Shenoute's <i>Canon 5</i> (see <i>Sinuthii Archimandritae: Vita et opera omnia</i> . Edited by Johannes Leipoldt. Vol. 3. <i>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</i> 73, <i>Scriptores Coptici</i> 5. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1913).
Wb	<i>Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache</i> . Vols. 1–6. Edited by Adolf Erman, Hermann Grapow. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957.

Introduction: Cultural and Religious Cohabitations in Alexandria and Egypt between the 1st and the 6th Cent. CE

Luca Arcari

1. Methodological issues

As the title of the project mentioned *supra* shows, this research focuses on the construction of space and time in the transmission of religious identities between the 1st and the 6th cent. CE, through the analysis of literary, archaeological and epigraphic data. As a result, this book aims to foster the cultural impact of a new heuristic model, whereby socio-religious identities in the ancient world are no longer analysed through the commonly utilised system of polarisation. The main aim of the book stems from the need to overcome the theological model of cultural polarisations. Such a model often fuelled misperceptions regarding collective identities in the ancient world. It imposed on the ancient world ideas and ideologies alien to antiquity and rather belonging to the contexts of European nationalisms.

One of the inputs for this research project, as well as for the book, has been the four-year project coordinated by N. Belayche and J.-D. Dubois between 2006 and 2009 (EPHE).¹ Reacting against the more traditional approach towards crisis and conflict, they analysed some specific cases of cohabitation between different cultural systems and religions within the Greek and the Roman worlds. This book, the first of a series, expands Belayche-Dubois' perspective, by applying it to broader case-studies and sources, through the well-known category of "Middle-Ground."² In so doing, this volume organically and

¹ See Belayche, Dubois 2011. See also Massa 2014.

² On this category, see White 2010. Studying the region around the Great Lakes (especially the area between Lake Erie and the Ohio river) between 1650 and 1815 (defined by French as *pays d'en haut*), White underlines that the concept of middle-ground emerges as both a place and a style of cultural interaction. For the application of the concept of "middle-ground" to a specific ancient cultural context, see Bonnet 2015. Framing "Greek" and "Phoenician" as monolithic categories that obscure the cultural pluralism of Phoenicia's urban areas and rural hinterlands, "Bonnet captures such intricacies by communicating the nature of Phoenicia's 'paysages religieux,' the landscapes or spaces in which Phoenicians created lived religious realities through their social and cultural practices, and her primary analytical frames are the negotiations of 'the Middle Ground,' the entanglements of *métissage*, and anthropological

extensively examines the specific middle-land of Alexandria and Egypt. Such a geo-cultural breadth inevitably calls for cooperation with experts in various fields, relating to different historical periods as well as various linguistic contexts. By doing so, we intend to overcome both chronological and academic barriers, allowing all sources to interact productively.

The pivotal idea of the book is the relevance of the spatial and chronological dimensions in the construction and transmission of collective identities. More generally, we aim to investigate the heterogeneous and contextual nature of social groups who coagulate themselves around the very commonly discussed, yet still useful notion of the “sacred.”³ Opposing the idea that advocates the existence of a “prototypical” identity, the book focuses on assimilation processes and/or osmoses, as well as on competition dynamics and/or phenomena, in a specific regional area and in a diachronic perspective.

1.1. Constructing collective “identities”

In a very well-documented essay, based entirely on the *fundamenta* of the recent sociological research concerning collective identities and/or groups, James C. Miller observes:

Forged within the multifaceted forces of social interaction, collectivities come in a bewildering variety of configurations. They may form for any number of reasons, they may be made up of people whose adherence to the group varies depending on a further host of factors, and they are shaped by the particulars of time and place. This many-layered, contextual nature of social groupings makes collective identity a difficult matter to study and define.⁴

Starting from similar methodological assumptions, this book portrays group-identity and processes of construction/formation of collective identities on the basis of three key components:

- a) collective identity as perception of similarities and differences;
- b) collective identity as it is perceived through time and space;
- c) collective identity as a social process.

views on culture articulated foremost by Marshall Sahlins and fellow travelers” (Andrade 2015). In the study of very complex phenomena of cultural and religious interaction, it is important to invoke, as Bonnet clearly does, other terms that have gained traction in classical studies, anthropology, various fields of history, and even the natural sciences, including, *bricolage*, “hybridity,” “modernity,” “new deal,” “subversive submission,” *simplicité*, and “more is different.” On the category of *métissage*, see the inputs developed, among the others, by Kandé 1999, Sahlins 1981 and Stoler 2002.

³ When I use terms like “religion” and/or “sacred,” here I allude to discourses as common-place rhetorics, authenticity narratives, social and/or individual practices or legitimating tales/myths which function in the creation, maintenance, and contestation of specific social formations. For the scholarly debate, see Anttonen 1996; for a cognitive approach to the “sacred,” see Anttonen 2000.

⁴ James Miller 2010a: 12. See also Miller 2010b.

Concerning a), the essays included in the volume seem to emphasise that collective identities are connected with perceptions of similarity and difference between groups of people. In Miller's words, collective identities entail

a sense of "we are us, they are not us, and we are not them." Without a sense of commonality, collective identity could not exist. At the same time, similarity cannot occur apart from difference; to say "we are alike" necessarily entails the idea that others are unlike us. This sense of similarity and differences arises as a result of social interaction. Through the give and take inherent in social engagement, similarities and differences become the stuff defining the "boundaries" between groups, those factors that enable those involved on both sides of the divide to distinguish who "we" are as opposed to "them."⁵

Concerning b), all the essays seem to underline that

describing communal identity as emerging out of social interaction does not mean that identity is spontaneous, as if it arises or exists only in the moment. A critical component of collective identity is the perception that it persists through time.⁶

Two factors contribute to this perception of continuity: communal narratives and the "routinisation" or institutionalisation of identity. Within the perceived history of a group, or within a history reinvented and perceived by the living group as an ongoing past, collective identity is grounded on a physical or imagined space. Therefore, identity emerges as the effect of what people have introduced and/or invented in the past. Specific identity markers – from particular language usages, ways of conceiving and seeing the world, to rituals or everyday practices – become routine.⁷

As Miller brilliantly states:

Such patterns of behaviour turn into "the way things are done." Once recognized as such, we can say they are "routinized" or "institutionalized" within a group.⁸

Concerning c), the essays in the book emphasise how difficult it is to conceive of collective identities as reified or substantial. Identities are thus cultural constructions, subject to constant negotiation or re-negotiation.

As people bring perceptions of group identity with them into social interaction, this "identity" must be produced and reproduced in each new situation. In the process, identity becomes redefined, if only slightly, for every fresh set of circumstances. Identities, therefore, are enacted or embodied perceptions of similarities and differences within a given social situation. In effect, group members must ask themselves at every turn, "What does it look like to be one of 'us' within this situation?". Answering that question is a complex task. It depends on which aspects of identity come into question in the specific situation, how negotiable these facets or identities are, the social positions of the various parties involved, the number and

⁵ James Miller 2010a: 12–13.

⁶ James Miller 2010a: 13–14.

⁷ On similar questions, see Esler 2003: 20.

⁸ James Miller 2010a: 14.

degree of differences between groups, and so on. What features of identity are called upon in a particular situation can determine how vigorously and in what manner that aspect of identity becomes enacted.⁹

1.2. Identifying religious groups in antiquity

As a starting point, contributors were asked to follow preliminary criteria aimed to identify specific communal contexts:

- expressions by which a specific membership is defined (ethnic paradigms of self-definition, “brothers,” “sons of ...,” followers and/or disciples of ..., etc.);
- ideological structurings by which a particular membership is defined (a shared system of behavior[s], shared variations in a behavior system as a source for the formation of particular in-group identities, worldviews, etc.);
- practices and behavioral norms by which a particular collective membership is defined (shared practices, ways of life by which a specific group distinguishes itself as regards a cultural macro-system, etc.).

Concepts such as “group,” “groupality,” “groupness,” are not taken for granted, but critically assessed. Sociologist Roger Brubaker, in his work on ethnicity, nationalism and race, usefully reconsiders the concept of “group,” starting from a critique to “groupism.” He questions the

tendency to treat ethnic groups, nations and races as substantial entities to which interests and agency can be attributed.¹⁰

Brubaker’s insights can be applied to the study of ancient religious groups, often characterised by a sort of automatism, as if, to quote Brubaker,

they were internally homogeneous, externally bounded groups, even unitary collective actors with common purposes.¹¹

While similar insights appear as a convenient *vade mecum* in the analysis of ancient texts and conflicts, their indiscriminate usage seems to generate more problems than they intend to solve. Among the issues raised by Brubaker, the tendency to treat groups as abstract entities and individual actors is the most prominent.¹² As for the collectivities discussed in the book, when people involved in cohabitations or conflicts stigmatise a particular group, they turn it into an “abstract entity,” in order to strengthen the impact of their ideological and rhetorical agenda.¹³ Following Brubaker, it is important to focus on the “relational, processual, dynamic, eventful and disaggregated” elements concerning the people discussed in the book, without analysing groups on the basis

⁹ James Miller 2010a: 15.

¹⁰ Brubaker 2002: 164. See also Lundhaug’s essay in this volume.

¹¹ Brubaker 2002: 164.

¹² Brubaker 2002: 165.

¹³ See Brubaker 2002: 166; see also Bourdieu 1991b: 220–221.

of our classifying categories, but rather on their being “contextually fluctuating conceptual variables.”¹⁴

Another methodological *caveat* concerns the more general concept of “identity,” a *basso continuo* for all the discussions concerning groups, groupality and/or groupness in the ancient world. As Emiliano R. Urciuoli has recently pointed out,¹⁵ it seems more fruitful to analyse the concept of “identity” by combining at least five different perspectives: identity as history (in the sense of story-telling), as asceticism (in the etymological sense of the word “askesis,” as a performance involving the dialectical process of reduction and amplification of the represented self), as camouflage (or mimetic negation of some stereotypes generally acknowledged as part of a specific perceived identity), as norm (as a process of re-negotiation of “dominant traits” assumed as norms in and for specific hegemonic contexts), and as success (in Bourdieu’s terms, the preservation of the “political capital” involved in every identity representation and/or self-definition).¹⁶ All these perspectives contribute to a more accurate definition of the “quantitative” dimension of identity, meant as a dialectic relationship between collectivities and individual¹⁷ actors who live, share and define themselves in a specific historical and cultural context. As Richard Jenkins has brilliantly summarised,

With respect to identification, the individually unique and the collectively shared can be understood as similar in important respects; the individual and the collective are routinely entangled with each other; individual and collective identifications only come into being within interaction; the processes by which each is produced and reproduced are analogous; the theorization of identification must therefore accommodate the individual and the collective in equal measure. The most significant contrast between individual and collective identification in this model may be that the former emphasizes difference and the latter similarity. This is only a matter of their respective *emphases*.¹⁸

2. Religious and cultural cohabitations in Egypt and Alexandria (1st–6th cent. CE)

Since the publication of Fraser’s masterpiece dedicated entirely to Ptolemaic Alexandria,¹⁹ and often following his methodological assumptions, scholarly debates on Alexandria and Egypt in antiquity have agreed on the coexistence,

¹⁴ Brubaker 2002: 167–168.

¹⁵ Urciuoli 2015.

¹⁶ See Bourdieu 1991a.

¹⁷ For a refreshing new approach to ancient religious individualities, see Rüpke 2013; Rüpke, Spickermann 2012.

¹⁸ Jenkins 1996: 38.

¹⁹ See Fraser 1972.

in this area, of different social and religious groups.²⁰ For many decades, a portion of scholars was more interested in conflicts. Such an approach found its justification in a series of historical events regarded as emblematic, first of all the *pogrom* under Caligola (38 CE), by which the broader modern perception of the cultural interactions in the area was often influenced. The presence of the “library” of Nag Hammadi, considered as an expression of a group that privileged its own communal life and apparently rejected any contact with the cultural and political centre of the region, has also confirmed the image of Egypt as a theatre of conflicts and tensions, culminating in the definitive, officially regulated, establishment of the “Great Church.”

In line with this, Guy G. Stroumsa has underlined the existence of the “scholarly myth” of the “multiculturalism” of Alexandria “the Great.” According to Stroumsa, this myth entails the double claim of both pacific coexistence of different religious and cultural groups, and significant exchanges and mutual relationships or influences. Stroumsa obviously acknowledges that Alexandria, since its (more or less artificial) creation *ex nihilo*, has been a melting-pot of various cultures and religions.²¹ In ancient Alexandria coexistence was far from peaceful, and some groups lived in constant tension, but one cannot fail to consider that culture²² was often viewed as a pole of attraction for people interested in reaching high social positions. Also, culture acted as a *passe-partout* in spreading particular claims of authority or specific (re-)inventions of tradition.²³ Stroumsa stresses an element that is crucial:

Now that we speak of the global village rather than of multicultural cities, we know that cohabitation of cultural or religious communities, even when mutually fruitful, never entailed true *convivencia*. Throughout history, men and women belonging to different cultural and religious groups have shown a great ability to hate one another intensely, while at the same time learning to communicate and exchange cultural patterns. This discrepancy, in a sense, seems to be at once a riddle and a motor of history. Multiculturalism, if it entails both smooth cultural exchanges and irenic social relations, may well be a myth. But it is one of those powerful myths by which intense, generous, and gifted individuals, throughout the centuries, have been able to dream of a higher reality.²⁴

This statement seems to imply that cohabitation represents a sort of living historical process determined by contextual political, social and cultural dynam-

²⁰ In the scholarly debate on the topic such a coexistence is a sort of “must:” e.g., see Bonnet, Payen 2014; Bowersock 1996; Bowman 1996: 203–233; Frankfurter 1998; 2000; Haas 1996; Watts 2006: 143–256.

²¹ See Stroumsa 2003.

²² Following Cultural Studies, I use “culture” here in its very broad sense, including patterns of consumption goods and leisure activities as determined by relations of production, which led them to focus on class relations and the organisation of production. See Bennett 2010.

²³ For the concept of “(re-)invention of tradition,” see Hobsbawm, Ranger 2012.

²⁴ Stroumsa 2003: 29.

ics, always “fabricated” under a specific hegemony.²⁵ It is no exaggeration to state that Ptolemaic rulers have created, in the leading centre of the reign and, *per riflesso*, in other parts of Egypt, a cultural whole existing among other systems of consolidation and administration, under which people who “produced” culture were “forced” to operate.²⁶ Such a system was mostly preserved under the Roman domination and, to a lesser extent, even in the very complex phase of “Episcopal” governments.²⁷ To summarise, in the case of ancient Alexandria

²⁵ According to Antonio Gramsci’s statements. See Gramsci 1971: 7–8; 9–10 and the recent assesment by Grelle 2017. For a recent application of Gramsci’s concept of hegemony to the Hellenistic period, see Portier-Young 2011: 3–45. It is important to underline that Egyptian papyri written in both Greek and demotic testify that the supposedly widespread “Hellenisation” of the Eastern Mediterranean – firstly prompted by Gustav Droysen to designate “Hellenistic period” – has undoubtedly been overestimated: on this topic, see Rotroff 1997 and Hall 2002 (especially 221–222). When we refer to Greek (more precisely to “Atheno-concentric”) *paideia*, we deals with both elites and groups of individuals who adopts (also countering) Greek hegemonic culture in order to define themselves in the same elitarian context or in cultural contexts more or less connected to the hegemonic social “platform.” In this regard, it is important also to recall that postcolonial studies and related fields of research pay great attention to the problem of hegemony as well as to its intrinsic ambivalence. The concept of cultural hybridity as introduced by Homi Bhabha (1994) is only understandable in the context of the ambivalence of hegemony and power. Whereas in the past ethnicity was a central category in the study of ancient and modern colonisations, post-colonial criticism emphasises the role of ethnicity as one category among others to define power relations. Inspired by the work of Antonio Gramsci, postcolonial authors started to shift the perspective towards cultural hegemony and subalternity.

²⁶ The affirmation of Coptic language in the history of late antique Egyptian Christianity emerges in the same context of Greek cultural hegemony. On this question, see the *status quaestionis* by Camplani 2015a.

²⁷ The reign of Septimius Severus (146–211 CE) seems to mark an important turning point in the history of late antique Egypt. The most relevant change consists in what modern scholars define “municipalisation” (see Capponi 2010: 191; Bagnall 2003: 56 and 78), i.e. the introduction of *boulai*, “the Greek equivalent of Roman municipal senates, both in Alexandria and in the capitals of the Egyptian districts. The process affected the administration of the cities, which were now governed by an assembly of liturgical councillors (that is, selected on the basis of their wealth), who were responsible for the collection of taxes” (Capponi 2010: 191). Diocletian (244–311 CE) completes this process of “municipalisation,” subdividing Egypt initially in two, later three, four or even more provinces, which partly reflect regional identities. After 381 CE, an Augustal Prefect is placed in overall charge of the Egyptian provinces. This more or less late and quite slow affirmation of municipality seems to explain the specificity of Ecclesiastical structures of government in late antique Egypt, as observed by Alberto Camplani: “In primo luogo merita almeno una breve considerazione la storia sociale e politica. Solo piuttosto tardi (III sec.) i centri urbani egiziani hanno acquisito lo statuto municipale, ciò che ha prodotto élites locali dotate di uno scarso senso dei principi dell’autonomia cittadina, a differenza di quanto avveniva, ad esempio, in Siria. Tale stato di cose si è riflesso anche nella struttura ecclesiastica lungo la Valle del Nilo, che ha lasciato agire, senza frapporte gravi ostacoli, la forza centripeta della megalopoli, portando alla formazione di un

and Egypt, domination and hegemony provide conditions and materials for the emergence of cultural and/or religious cohabitations.

2.1. *A regional approach in light of the integration between different sources*

That there were various ways of interaction between different groups in the Graeco-Roman Egypt cannot be doubted, as a number of regional studies have further reinforced.²⁸ Yet, the scale and nature of the interaction requires further research, in which an effective integration between various sources should play a central role. Exploring interactively the variety of documentary material is the main aim of this book. As Peter Parsons, among others, has recently re-affirmed, Egypt emerges as a great exception in the study of ancient history, for it provides scholars with the possibility of relying on a great number and variety of documents.²⁹ In socio-cultural terms, such a possibility corroborates the image of Egypt as a pervasive hegemonic system under which people, even when different languages and textual practices surface, produce culture in a more or less autonomous way.

2.1.1. *“Pervasive” cultural centres*

In spite of the great gap in sources and traditions, Alexandrian cultural institutions (the Bibliotheca/Museum, the Serapeum, as well as the gymnasium) are often represented as the most famous scholarly centres in antiquity. Beyond the celebrative intentions of the sources available to us, it is important to keep in mind the following elements:

- the strong influence of Aristotelian tradition (for example, the succeeding integration of both Aristotelian and Platonic assumptions) for the definition of *paideia* and its hegemonic programs in the history of both Alexandrian and Egyptian cultures of Hellenistic-Roman periods;³⁰

corpo episcopale apparentemente debole e omologabile alle direttrici della sede alessandrina. E tuttavia le élites cristiane locali, sebbene in ritardo, si sono formate e si sono evolute, lasciando tracce inequivocabili della loro presenza” (Camplani 2006: 400–401).

²⁸ Recent bibliography on such a regional approach emerges as a *mare magnum*. E.g., see Bagnall 2006; Frankfurter 1998, 2000; Riggs 2012: 317–489; other references and critical discussion in Gwynn 2010: esp. 32; 46–47. For the Jewish presence in Hellenistic-Roman Egypt, see the seminal works by John J. Collins 2000; Gruen 1998; 2002: 54–83; Momigliano 1990: 74–96. For the different forms of Egyptian Christianity, see Blaudeau 2006; Camplani 2013 and 2015b; Griggs 2000; Parsons 2007: 181–200; Pearson 2004; Simonetti 1997; Wipszycka 2015. For the Christian documents from Oxyrhynchus, see the recent work by Blumell, Wayment 2015.

²⁹ See the recent presentation by Parsons 2007.

³⁰ Concerning the Museum, Niehoff 2011: 18 underlines how it assumed the role of “the leading centre of Homeric scholarship in the Hellenistic world: developing Aristotelian models, it boasted of the largest library at the time as well as the famous Museum, which has rightly been identified as a type of university.” For the history of Alexandrian library, see the

- the development of a “typical” Alexandrian exegesis concerning ancient texts variously modelled on the principles of the leading cultural centres of Alexandria and the formation of textual communities influenced by such an exegetical activity;
- different levels of adhesion/opposition to such a cultural hegemony, and divergences between Alexandria and the *chora*, as well as between the leading centre of the reign and other cities in Egypt.

The hegemonic *paideia* highlighted the superiority of the Greek-speaking groups of the cities over the Egyptian-speaking peasants of the villages; it connected cultural products to elites outside Egypt, i.e. the educated groups of the Greek East and of the Latin West – whose cultural products were founded on Greek models. Hegemonic *paideia* assumed a pivotal role also in the counter-discourses and in the different forms of resistance to hegemonic culture. Articulating and promulgating counter-discourses implied competing re-uses and relocations of discursive elements ascribable to the same hegemonic *paideia*.

2.1.2. *Local reinventions of tradition*

Summarising Antonio Gramsci’s concept of hegemony, Timothy Mitchell underlines its dimension of

Non-violent form(s) of control exercised through the whole range of dominant cultural institutions and social practices, from schooling, museums, and political parties to religious practice, architectural forms, and the mass media.³¹

In the ancient world, hegemony was often a violent form of physical coercion exercised through enslavement, policing actions, murders, torture, etc.; but it also assumed the aspect of more subtle forms of control conveyed through cultural institutions, systems of patronage and social network as well as the structured practices of everyday life. This is the case with the Ptolemaic power in Egypt. The same control system was assumed, re-oriented but mostly preserved by the Romans. While Mitchell has highlighted mechanisms of hegemony, Daniel Miller has emphasised its “cosmological” dimension:³² hegemony often emerges as a normative and universal pattern entirely based on assumptions constructed (or invented) as traditional and, as a consequence, monolithic. Hegemony deliberately obliterates what is particular and contingent, assuming a specific “tradition” as the unique way in both perceiving the world and mapping the universe (and the place of men in it). “Tradition” separates inside from out-

seminal work by Canfora 1990. For more recent critical discussions on the topic see, among the others, MacLeod 2000 and Berti, Costa 2010. On the relationships between the Greek version(s) of the Bible and the Alexandrian Library, see Nina L. Collins 2000.

³¹ Mitchell 1990: 553.

³² Daniel Miller 1989: 64.66.

side, normal from aberrant; its logic legitimises claims about truth and authority. Pierre Bourdieu has named such an invisible logic *doxa*, “the sum total of the theses tacitly posited on the hither side of all inquiry.”³³

The many reinventions of “tradition” relocated and re-negotiated in the cultural context of Hellenistic-Roman Egypt are all perceived as non-arbitrary, as products of a self-evident and natural order, which goes unquestioned. The aspirations of agents live in the system of orientation created by hegemony under which they cohabit all together.³⁴ Experiences of forced or intensive cultural contact open up possibilities for mutual re-negotiations of different traditions, not only in naming and thinking what was previously unnamed and unthinkable, but also in re-thinking and re-defining what was rejected by the *élite* in order to react to hegemony with counter-discourses that articulate new parameters under the hegemonic forms of cultural activity. In a hegemonic context, marginal (or constructed as marginal) social actors are forced to dress counter-discourses often condemned by dominant elites with acceptable robes. In turn, this re-negotiation may be perceived as a “shift” from the “true tradition” by the other marginal (or constructed as marginal) actors, who share the same cultural space with the “new” deviants.

2.2. *The limits of the “traditional” taxonomies*

With the term “groups,” here meaning those collective entities traditionally defined according to ethnic paradigms (for example, Egyptians and Greeks) and cultural models (“pagans,” “Jews,” “Christians,” “Gnostics”). Upon a close examination of available sources, a use of such categories is not always justified, especially in the context of Alexandria and Egypt, where interactions cut across areas of actual social, cultural and religious cohabitations. As many recent scholars have observed, in a variety of cases sources show that our usual categories in classifying ancient “religious” groups, deriving from ancient Christian apologists (i.e. labels as “Jewish,” “Christian” and “Greek-Hellenistic,” or “pagan” if we still want to use this term), cannot fully and realistically represent the ancient world.³⁵ Following a very authoritative tradition of studies, a tendency towards a “taxonomic” analysis of Alexandrian sources is still well-attested in many publications and academic debates. Such a choice seems in part to find its justification in the *mare magnum* of the documentation coming out from the region.

All of the book’s essays, despite a certain terminological “fluctuation,” connected to the authors’ different “schools of thought,” aim at analysing cultural elements testifying to interactions between neighboring groups that share ac-

³³ Bourdieu 1977: 168.

³⁴ Further arguments in Bourdieu 1977: 166.

³⁵ For a critical discussion on this topic, see Nicklas 2012.

tual and symbolic spaces. Thanks to a methodological approach that considers religious groups as *loci* of cohabitation, rather than emphasising ideological and/or theological polarisations, cultural products, ideologies, and worldviews shared in public or private religious spaces assume their actual dimension of counter-discourses, implicitly or explicitly connected to a contextual hegemonic system.

In this framework, structures of power take on the appearance of something ideal, transcendent, and metaphysical, and counter-discourses emerge as competitive creations that share, and often re-use, the same hegemonic constructions in order to create a space for action.

3. Structure and contents of the book

First and foremost, this book aims to focus on distinct aspects concerning the implicit value of the documents analysed (*Use, [Re-]Invention and [Re-]Definition of Discursive Practices*): for example, uses of specific literary forms and/or specific terminology, reformulations of traditional *topoi*, reinventions of appellatives and *formulae* that also characterise contexts represented and/or considered as “other” in order to construct a viable representation of the self. The essays included also pay close attention to cases of re-negotiated identities, in which the “other” appears to be re-constructed in terms of conflict, with the aim of defining specific in-group identities (*Ideological Debates as Images of Cultural and Religious Cohabitations*). The book intends to analyse the construction of conflicts as instrument of both internal and external self-definitions, rather than mirror of real and/or well-documented social contrasts. As many scholars have observed, the traditional historiographical paradigm that has been producing literary and ideological profiles especially of Jewish and Christian ancient authors and groups, has carved through its endeavor a perspective by which the history of religious dynamics in antiquity is represented by a process of evolving debates and ideological conflicts on “orthodoxy” matters. The third part (*Cults and Practices as Spaces for Encounters and Interactions*) aims to attempt instead to identify and describe the multifarious religious practices for Alexandrian groups documented in sources.

As we have observed in the first part of this introduction, collective identity involves a perception of similarity and difference between one group of people and another. This sense of similarity and difference arises as a result of social interaction. Similarities and differences become the stuff defining the “boundaries” between groups, those factors that enable those involved on both sides of the divide to distinguish who “we” are as opposed to “them.” According to such a perspective, in the fourth part of the book (“*Open*” and “*Closed*” *Groups*) an intriguing topic in the analysis of ancient religious groups according to a socio-historical perspective is discussed.

The book's analysis of group dialectics and/or interactions in ancient Alexandria and Egypt also intends to redefine questions connected to the construction of authority in philosophical-religious schools (fifth part: *The Construction of Authority in Philosophical and Religious Schools*). By starting the already mentioned recent studies,³⁶ it is possible to provide focused corrections of some antiquity scholarship that tends to over-emphasise the collective aspect of ancient cultic practice. For the most part, according to differing methodologies of analysis, papers included in this section shed light upon the individualities of exceptional people, either ancient authors or "fictional" persons of some renown.

The first part of the book is opened by Tobias Nicklas' essay, "Jewish, Christian, Pagan? The *Apocalypse of Peter* as a Witness of Early 2nd-Cent. Christianity in Alexandria." Nicklas concludes that the *Apocalypse of Peter* seems to add an important piece to a puzzle lacking in many aspects: it served as evidence for a group of Christ followers who on one hand appear to have been isolated from important strands of the earliest Christianity, while on the other were interested in the figure of the apostle Peter. They developed the idea of a heavenly Christ who will return triumphant with his cross at the end of the days. They believed in a powerful God who as the world's creator has dominion to resurrect the dead and whose justice will be used to punish every sinner, but mostly those who do not worship him, in places of eternal torture, while his elect are assured a place in Christ's everlasting kingdom. While the *Apocalypse of Peter* does not make clear whether it sees "Judaism" already as an entity separate of "Christianity" or a group in opposition to the community of Christ-followers and though indebted in many ways to Jewish ideas, the label "Jewish-Christianity" (with its many associations regarding Torah practice and lower Christology) according to Nicklas' analysis appears problematic, especially if we have to be aware that this "Judaism" differs greatly from what we find in writings of communities like the Nazoraeans or Ebionites; it is a Judaism that is able to integrate many elements of the diasporic world of which it is part of.

In Philippe Matthey's essay, entitled "The Once and Future King of Egypt: Egyptian Messianism and the Construction of the *Alexander Romance*," it emerges how "typical" Egyptian elements, together with the Egyptian pseudo-prophetic texts, have often been interpreted as the result of native, "nationalist" reactions against foreign invasions, a form of Egyptian "propaganda." In this article, however, its author proposes to go beyond the potentially anachronistic categories of "nationalism" and "propaganda," and to demonstrate that the legend connecting Alexander to Nectanebo might not be the result of an explicit political and propagandist agenda, but might instead have organically emerged from the cross-cultural interactions of narratives and counter-narratives within the frame of a Late Egyptian historical theology de-

³⁶ See Rüpke 2013; Rüpke, Spickermann 2012.

manding piety of pharaohs and adherence to the precepts of divine law (*Ma'at* or *Hp*), a category very near to the one expressed in Jewish “Deuteronomist” books.

In his paper entitled “Demonology between Celsus and Origen: A Theoretical Model of Religious Cohabitation?,” Antonio Sena starts from the Alexandrian formation of Origen according to Eusebius, characterised by teaching classical subjects, biblical formation, deep contacts with “Gnostics” and “pagans.” In Sena’s analysis, this is the cultural network in which polemics about demonology appear to be rooted in *Contra Celsum*. Sena’s article aims at identifying various levels of the polemics in the 5th and 8th books of *Contra Celsum* and at identifying the diversity of values that Celsus’ ideas could have had in the 2nd cent., when the platonic philosopher wrote his *Alethes logos*, and in the middle of the 3rd cent., when Origen wrote his confutation of Celsus’ work.

Daniele Tripaldi (“Basilides and the ‘Egyptian Wisdom:’ Some Remarks on a Peculiar Heresiological Notice [Ps.-Hipp. *Haer.* 7.20–27]”) aims at shedding new light on a very neglected text, tracing his possible sources and comparing it with other images we have of Basilides, of his literary production, as well as of his teachings. The analysis deploys through four subsequent stages: first of all, as it needs to be done for any quotation, whether it be long or short, Tripaldi makes the attempt to understand Ps.-Hippolytus notice on Basilides within the redactional context in which it is embedded. Next he re-locates it in the overall frame of Basilides’ and his followers’ teachings as we know them from Clement of Alexandria. In a third step, Tripaldi takes “Hippolytus” at his word as he charges his “Basilides” with a full-blown *paideia* in Egyptian lore, searching for Egyptian and Graeco-Egyptian sources for possible parallels to the ancient text. Special attention is paid to an “Orphic” cosmogony recorded in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homiliae* and to a few passages from the 1st book of Diodorus of Sicily’s *Bibliotheca historica*, a Greek compendium on Egypt and Egyptian gods and traditions of the second half of the 1st cent. BCE. The cross-comparison carried out by Tripaldi is at first conducted on a strictly formal, structural and lexical basis. This structured analysis then leads him to his fourth point, re-assessing the relationship between this heresiological report and the notices on Naassenes, Perates and Sethians in the 5th book of *Refutatio*. Finally, by way of conclusion, Tripaldi explores the possibility that such a wide-ranging exegetical activity intended as an integral part, a basis and a plead for a “Christian” worldview in a multi-religious culture may in fact stem from the *Exegetika* on Parchor the Prophet attributed to Basilides’ son, Isidore, or from a literary enterprise of the like. As such, the profile emerges of an Alexandrian Christian intellectual milieu striving to combine theogony, cosmogony and *Heilsgeschichte*, Greek philosophical teachings and “barbarian wisdom,” Hebrew scriptures and older traditions of earlier groups of Jesus’ followers, in a degree of complexity reflecting the socio-cultural diversity of a realistic historical complex urban environment.

Thomas J. Kraus’ essay (“Demosthenes and [Late] Ancient Miniature Books from Egypt: Reflections on a Category, Physical Features, Purpose and Use”)

starts from the analysis of a private letter from the second half of the 5th cent. CE (P.Berol. 21849 = SB 12.11084 = C.Pap.Hengstl 91), where a certain Victor writes to a certain Theognostus to return a book he borrowed in Hermopolis. Victor adds the title and the name of the author of this book (the commentary on the orator Demosthenes by Alexander Claudius) and three more titles (Menander's "Art," the "Methods," and the "Eulogies"). The first book is attributed as τὸ βιβλίον, i.e., with a diminutive form; and this may lead to miniature books from (late) antiquity, their physical features, usages, contents, and, above all, purposes. Both sender and addressee are Christians. Furthermore, the whole text and the terms used for the two people in the papyrus letter suggest that Victor was a lawyer and an orator as well. On the basis of the fragments discussed, Kraus analyses how books looked like in late antique Egypt, as well as the reception and the transmission of one of the principal protagonists in the reinvention of a "Classic" *paideia* in such a regional area, i.e. Demosthenes.

Within the wider theme of cultural and religious cohabitations in Alexandria and in Egypt in the first six centuries CE, Paola Buzi ("Remains of Gnostic Anthologies and Pagan Wisdom Literature in the Coptic Tradition") focuses on the aspect of appropriation and re-use of traditional literary forms in specific (micro-)cultural contexts, and in particular on the re-definition and the re-location of gnomic literature, aiming to demonstrate that this cultural phenomenon was not limited to the schools, but had a strong influence also on the production of the Coptic literature, proving therefore a wide and vivid linguistic and literary interaction among various ethnic and cultural groups. As is well known, the *Menandri monostichoi* or *Menandri sententiae* are collections of one-verse sayings and moral precepts, ordered according to the first letter, that started to circulate, in Greek, from at least the 3rd cent. CE, under the name of Menander, although only a few of them may be directly referred to the authorship of the comedy writer. Their contents, in fact, draw material in almost equal proportion from both Greek philosophy, tragedy and comedy as well as the Old Testament. The second example that Buzi takes into consideration is represented by the very *Sexti sententiae*, a collection of 451 maxims traditionally attributed to the Pythagorean philosopher Quintus Sextus, formed mainly in the 2nd cent. CE in Greek. Whatever the reason maybe that the copyist of NHC XII decided to include the *Sexti sententiae* in the manuscript, it is clear that they were perceived as appropriate for that context (the Nag Hammadi version of the *Sexti sententiae* is, for the moment, the only extant Coptic witness). The third example that Buzi considers is represented by a fragmentary miscellaneous codex from the White Monastery of Shenoute (MONB.BE), dated to the 10th–11th cent. and containing *excerpta*, preserving a text defined as *Dicta philosophorum*. Buzi includes it in this analysis, despite the fact that it apparently exceeds the chronological limits of the book, because it is clear that it makes use of older textual material. Despite the undeniable classical origin of these types of gnomic collections, very likely they were not perceived any longer as "pagan," but rather as another

expression of the appreciated genre of the *apophthegmata*: edifying sayings and precepts, whose function was essentially that of providing an ethic and behavioural model to monastic, as well as non-monastic, communities.

The second part of the book is opened by Bernard Pouderon's essay ("‘Jewish,’ ‘Christian’ and ‘Gnostic’ Groups in Alexandria during the 2nd Cent.: Between Approval and Expulsion"). Pouderon initially points out that "Jewish," "Christian," and "Gnostic" groups (according to a highly debated terminology) in 2nd-cent. Alexandria have been so often studied that there seems very little to be discovered on similar questions. However, his analysis turns on the mutual relationships between these various groups, in order to know both the way they perceived each other and how they saw and defined themselves. Pouderon analyses various "monotheistic" (or perhaps also "ditheistic") groups in Alexandria, as well as the relationships between these communities. What emerged from Pouderon's study is that Early Christianity in Alexandria was at first Jewish-Christian, before it rejected its Jewish roots – rejection of the worship and the observance of the Law, but not of the Scriptures, appropriated by means of exegesis, either typological or allegorical, nor of this history, the Hebrews being looked as forefathers according to God. Pouderon stresses also that Early Christianity in Alexandria was at first varied and tolerant, so that the Gnostic trend was not rejected at once, and finally that Judaism, once distinguished from Christianity, was more harshly rejected than the philosophical theism, because it was judged less dangerous.

Adele Monaci Castagno's essay ("Messengers from Heaven: Divine Men and God's Men in the Alexandrian Platonism [2nd–4th Cent.]") observes that between the 2nd and the 4th cent., the divine man was a subject of great interest in the debate among the learned Christ's followers and between the various philosophical schools. In Celsus' *Alethes logos*, the person of Jesus was understood and challenged on the basis of the Graeco-Roman traditions concerning the divine men. Celsus criticised the incoherence of Jesus's followers, who worshipped him as a God and, on the contrary, refused any such cult of men like Pythagoras, Orpheus, and Asclepius (whom Celsus considered much more deserving of such worshipping). Moreover, in Monaci Castagno's analysis this debate must be placed within the framework of the intensive use of the *bios* of the philosopher, which growingly assumed religious contours in the competition and propaganda of philosophical schools, and as conveyance of a heroic ideal of perfection capable of fostering and strengthening consensus. Monaci Castagno stresses that there are many studies on this interlacement of discursive interests and practices that go throughout the different groups of the learned late ancient society. She deals with an aspect that has been on a lesser level: the importance of the divine men in the confrontation among the different groups that drove the most learned persons to rethink their presence in the world as a philosophical issue, that is, how these exceptional men could be understood on the basis of an anthropological and cosmological model that

– directly or indirectly through the Bible’s interpretation – was anchored to Plato’s *Dialogi*. Methodologically, Monaci Castagno focuses the attention (as Ludwig Wittgenstein and the sociologists that learned his methodological lesson) on that “family resemblances,” that “kinship” or circularity of solutions, which have constituted the common conceptual framework of texts that are only apparently different from each other.

Mark J. Edwards (“Late Antique Alexandria and the ‘Orient’”) considers three hypotheses of “Eastern” influence on the culture of Roman Egypt. The first posits native Egyptian roots for the Christian doctrine of the Trinity; the second traces the origins of Neoplatonic thought to India; the third sees Gnostic thought in Egypt as an offshoot of native theology. Edwards argues that of these three speculations, the third one is the only one that is tenable, because the others fail to meet the criterion of proximity (according to which some channel must be traceable between the putative source and the recipient of influence), the criterion of salience (according to which the supposed source of influence must resemble the recipient more closely than any rival candidate), and the criterion of indispensability (according to which we must be able to say that without the influence of this source the recipient would have undergone a different course of development).

Ewa Wipszycka (“How Insurmountable was the Chasm between Monophysites and Chalcedonians?”) starts underlying that, according to the *communis opinio* carried out by the scholarship on the history of Late-antique Christianity, there was an insurmountable chasm between Chalcedonians and Monophysites. In her analysis, however, literary sources seem to bear this opinion: the harsh polemics contained in them suggest that the two dogmatic camps were rigorously separated from each other. As for the documentary papyri found in Egypt, they cannot be used for discussing this issue, for they never refer to the existence of two camps. However, there are some literary texts that can shed light on the religious attitudes and behaviors of ordinary believers, not of polemicists. They seem to prove that the division between Chalcedonians and Monophysites was not so irreducible. They are mainly narratives concerning the larger sanctuaries, especially that of Abu Mena and that of the Saints Cyrus and John. According to Wipszycka, there are several pieces of information which prove that exponents of both dogmatic camps could collaborate with each other on some particular occasions: it is not by chance that we unexpectedly see them appear together during solemn ceremonies, in presence of the crowd.

Philippe Blaudeau (“*Vel si non tibi communicamus, tamen amamus te*. Remarques sur la description par Liberatus de Carthage des rapports entre Miaphysites et Chalcédoniens à Alexandrie [milieu V^e–milieu VI^e s.]”) deals with the Carthaginian Liberatus’ book, the *Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum*. This is a composition of 24 chapters dealing with Christological controversies in the East, since the preaching of Nestorius until the

promulgation of the first edict of Justinian against Three Chapters. Probably written around 566, this narrative gives a condensed ecclesiastical knowledge of great importance. This work contains an unusual wealth of information that comes from Alexandria. Moreover the booklet seems to consist of an updated response to the ecclesiastical history of Zachariah Rhetor. Thus, beyond the conflict between Miaphysites and Chalcedonians, in Blaudeau's analysis the *Breviarium* is a unique and exceptional witness to the greater complexity and the often unexpected richness of their relationship in Alexandria between Chalcedon (451) and the middle of the reign of Justinian (approx. 530/35).

The third part of the book is opened by Sofia Torallas Tovar's essay ("Love and Hate? Again on Dionysos in the Eyes of the Alexandrian Jews"). She explores the representation of Dionysos as well as references to the cult of this God in Hellenistic-Jewish texts mainly from Alexandria, including Septuagint and Philo the Alexandrian. Notwithstanding such a topic has been interpreted in different ways, Torallas tries to revise arguments and texts themselves placing them in their specific Alexandrian socio-historical and hegemonic contexts.

Francesco Massa ("Devotees of Serapis and Christ? A Literary Representation of Religious Cohabitations in the 4th Cent."), starting from the edict against Egyptian paganism issued by Valentinian I, Theodosius, and Arcadius, reminds us that the temple of Serapis, *unum et solum spectaculum novum in omni mundo*, was destroyed by the Christians in 392 CE, as well as a *martyrium* and a number of churches were erected in its place. Such destruction, according to Massa's analysis, marked the ultimate transformation of Alexandria's religious topography to a Christian city. Massa underlines that the events of 392 emerged as the result of a growing conflict between the religious communities of Alexandria that intensified during the second half of the 4th cent. CE. Nevertheless, according to Massa, at least from the end of the 2nd cent., Christians and pagans had been living together in the big and multicultural city of Egypt. By analysing literary as well as topographical sources, Massa concludes by illustrating the competition between Christians and the followers of Serapis in the context of the cohabitation of different Alexandrian groups.

Mariangela Monaca's essay ("Between Cyril and Isis: Notes on the Iatromantic Cults in 5th-Cent. Alexandria") starts from Cyril's proclamation in one of his "sermons" delivered during the transfer of the relics of Saints Cyrus and John from the Church of Saint Mark in Alexandria to the Church of the Evangelists in Menuthis (near Canopus), where there was a temple of the *Kyra* Isis, a place of an iatromantic cult whose vitality is attested by sources still in the 5th cent. Monaca points out that there are various suggestions offered by the narrative, which has come with some variations through an Italo-Greek manuscript, the Vaticanus G. 1607, containing texts of hagiographic character (the works of Sophronius, consisting of a *Praefatio*, a *Laus*, and *Miracula* of the Saints Cyrus and John, as well as two *Biographies* of Saints and the *Orationes* attributed to Cyril). Monaca underlines that Cyril – according to the

late history of Sophronius of Jerusalem (634 CE) – undertakes a persecuting work against the temple of Isis in Menuthis, a place of pilgrimage for pagans as well as for “baptised” Christians, eager to get healing through the practice of *incubatio*. According to Monaca, Cyril’s narrative provides a vibrant picture of a century and of a society in which a Christian majority, albeit internally divided, was opposed to the remains of a “pagan” religiosity, marginalised but at the same time strong and faithful in preserving the traditional cults.

Part four is opened by Marie-Françoise Baslez’s essay (“Open-air Festivals and Cultural Cohabitation in Late Hellenistic Alexandria”). The starting point of Baslez’s paper is the paradoxical testimony of the Jewish-Alexandrian literature, especially 2 and 3 *Maccabees*, as well as the book of *Judith*, all written in Alexandria or in the Alexandrian diaspora. They are stories of persecution against Jewish people ending with a Salvation Day (*soteria*) celebration intended as a Reconciliation Day as well. Baslez observes how in the 1st cent. CE also Philo and Josephus draw attention to another Salvation Day and to the Celebration Day of the Septuagint translation, where Jews and Greeks are mixed. According to Baslez, it seems possible to study Alexandrian festivals and festivities as spaces and opportunities for cultural and religious interactions. In such a context, persecution emerges as a consequence resulting not from an interethnic antagonism inside the civic system but from the lobbying inside the royal court. Baslez also questions if open-air festivities become space for encounters between Alexandrians and Jews. Textual comparative studies testify that the author (or the translator) of the Greek book of *Judith* knew the Great Procession of Alexandria, as well as that this typology of festivities (which corresponds to the Greek *eranos*) was assumed by Alexandrian Jews in celebrating their Salvation Day and Septuagint commemoration. Common open-air celebrations, associating Jews and Alexandrians, are really likely considering both social and military networks which grew up in the Alexandrian social life during the Late Hellenistic period.

Livia Capponi’s essay (“The Common Roots of Egyptians and Jews: Life and Meaning of an Ancient Stereotype”) deals with the idea and the discursive practices concerning a common origin for Jews and Egyptians. Capponi recalls that Hellenistic sources of Egyptian origin such as those from Manetho, Chaeremon, Lysimachus and Apion who identified the founder of the Jewish state with Moses/Osarseph, a philosopher and priest of the city of Heliopolis and explained the Exodus as the expulsion from Egypt of a group of lepers. Capponi underlines also that Strabo and other non-Egyptian sources agreed on the origin of Jewish people and of the Egyptian as being from the same stock, highlighting similarities of their customs. As Tacitus informs us, Emperor Tiberius expelled both the Egyptian and the Jewish people from Rome in 19 CE, and conflated the two religions into one *superstitio*. The literature of the so-called *Acta Alexandrinorum*, whether it was committed or mostly entertainment, gives voice to hostile attitudes towards the Jewish people, who are regarded as unworthy of the

Alexandrian citizenship and similar to the Egyptians; this again confirms the old conviction that Jewish people and the Egyptians had a common origin. Capponi stresses that the main enemy of this ancient commonplace is the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus, who in his work on the antiquity of the Jewish culture, conventionally called *Contra Apionem*, struggles to draw a boundary between his fellow countrymen and the Egyptians, against the common idea that the two groups were related. Earlier, the philosopher Philo of Alexandria, in his works *Legatio ad Gaium* and *In Flaccum*, tries to build a common cause for the Jewish people, Greeks and Romans against the Egyptians, who are regarded as an ancient civilisation with barbarous religious customs. Capponi's essay aims to investigate the reasons why first Philo and then Josephus wanted to separate the Egyptians from the Jewish history and tried to establish clearer boundaries between the two. The blurring of the ethnic boundaries and the question of the definitions of ethnic identity in this historical context is worth looking at as it may be linked to the vexed question of the origins of the presumed "Alexandrian anti-Judaism."

According to Hugo Lundhaug's essay ("The Nag Hammadi Codices in the Complex World of 4th- and 5th-Cent. Egypt"), in scholarship on the Nag Hammadi Codices one often encounters the claim that these codices were manufactured and read by people who were in opposition to, or even outright conflict with, institutional, ecclesiastical Christianity, and that the Pachomian monks, who were active in the area where the codices were discovered, would not have been likely to read this kind of literature. By going beyond traditional stereotypes and dichotomies, however, and taking textual fluidity and the complexities of real people fully into consideration, Lundhaug applies a fresh perspective and outlines a more complex picture of the place of the Nag Hammadi Codices in the world of early Egyptian monasticism. Lundhaug stresses that there is need of much further research explaining exactly how and why Egyptian monks read, copied, and edited the texts of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Even then, the only way to understand these codices in their proper context is by acknowledging a much higher degree of complexity than it is generally assumed, by dropping the all-too-convenient categories that have shown themselves to be unhelpful, and by comparing individual tractates to other sources contemporary with the Nag Hammadi Codices themselves. While doing so Lundhaug, paraphrasing the First Greek *S. Pachomii vita*, points out that "in a group or a community there are all kinds of people." Lundhaug's conclusions emphasise that there is no reason to dismiss the possibility that there were monks in the Pachomian monasteries who were capable of thinking for themselves and reading the Nag Hammadi Codices with a critical mind, finding inspiration in some of their contents while rejecting others.

Part five is opened by Carmine Pisano's essay ("Moses 'Prophet' of God in the Works of Philo, or How to Use the *Otherness* to Construct the *Selfness*"). Pisano observes that at the beginning of his *De vita Mosis*, written around the first half of the 1st cent. CE, Philo says that "according to some Moses is the

lawgiver of the Jews, for others the interpreter of the sacred laws” (*Mos.* 1.1; see also *Praem.* 55). Philo opposes the biblical lawgiver (*nomothetes*), a title with which Moses is generally known by the Greek and Roman authors, for the *hermeneus nomon hieron*, a syntagm that, in the Jewish-Hellenistic tradition, defines Moses in his function of a “prophet:” that is the official who, as the “mouth” (*stoma*) of God (*Her.* 266; *Mos.* 1.84), reveals to men the words that God “suggests to him interiorly” (*endothen hypechountos: Praem.* 55) in the forms of “inspired possession (*entheo katakoche*) and *mania*” (*Her.* 250; *Migr.* 84). Following in the footsteps of other modern scholars, Pisano notes that the prophetic figure of Moses incorporates elements of the biblical tradition, in which Moses speaks with God “mouth to mouth” (*Num.* 12.8) and God himself defines the prophet as “my own mouth” (*Isa.* 30.2; *Jer.* 15.19), as well as elements derived from the Platonic definition of the *mania* outlined in *Phaedrus* (244b–d; 248d–e; 256b), and in this sense presents itself as a symbolic place of cultural cohabitation. Pisano’s essay focuses on this process of cohabitation as well as on the Philonian use of the Platonic model that for Philo represents an effective means of interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures.

Starting from Origen’s intellectual and existential experience, Giulia Sfameni Gasparro (“Alexandria in the Mirror of Origen’s *didaskaleion*: between the Great Church, Heretics and Philosophers”) aims at identifying several salient elements in intellectual, ideological, religious, social, and economic contexts as well as in the political atmosphere of a metropolis characterised by many vital streams as Alexandria, between the last decades of the 2nd and the middle of the 3rd cent. CE. In this atmosphere – *mutatis mutandis* – Caesarea Maritima also seems to be involved, another metropolis with several social and cultural cores, i.e. Christianity, Judaism and Hellenism, all elements which live together and appear to be reciprocally connected. Through the analysis of main sources, especially of *Contra Celsum*, the historical situation experienced by Origen emerges through cultural and religious encounter and confrontation, as well as an irreducible conflict. If we assume Origen’s existential and intellectual biography as the mirror of a specific historical and geographical context, that of Alexandria, which in turn appears like a sort of counterpart – in spite of its historical-cultural specificity – for other metropolises in the Roman Empire, at the same time we can argue that in such a period as well as in such a context forms of cultural and religious contacts, confrontations and cohabitations were admissible as well as practicable. Nevertheless, there were strong motivations and occasions for disputations.

The book is completed by Marco Rizzi’s essay (“Cultural and Religious Exchanges in Alexandria: The Transformation of Philosophy and Exegesis in the 3rd Cent. in the Mirror of Origen”). Eusebius and Porphyry unanimously affirm that Origen had some contacts with Ammonius Sakkas, the shadowy teacher of Plotinus. They both testify that Sakkas was born Christian, even though they disagree in evaluating his attitude towards Christianity in his mature years when

his philosophical teaching shone brightly in Alexandria, attracting not only Origen and Plotinus, but also the future bishop Heraklas, and many others. In Rizzi's analysis, the treatment of these sources by modern scholars (roughly from the 18th cent. onwards) is indicative of the historiographical approach (and its changes) to the more general issue of cohabitation, conflict, and mutual influence between philosophical and religious cultures and practices in Alexandria during the 3rd cent. Rizzi observes that Origen's attitude stands on the watershed between tradition and innovation in the story of Alexandrian philosophy, stressing at the same time that we have no evidence of philosophers who pursued this program with the same radical approach as Origen did. In his case, eclecticism and disciplinary conflation find their specific space of application in the literary genre of allegorical commentary on the Bible, which so disturbed Porphyry, but seems to have been Origen's decisive gain at Ammonius' school in Alexandria.

Bibliography

- Andrade, Nathanael. "Review to Corinne Bonnet, *Les enfants de Cadmos*." *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2015.08.46: <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2015/2015-08-46.html>.
- Anttonen, Veikko. "Rethinking the Sacred. The Notions of 'Human Body' and 'Territory' in Conceptualizing Religion." Pages 36–64 in *The Sacred and Its Scholars: Comparative Methodologies for the Study of Primary Religious Data*. Edited by Thomas A. Idinopulos, Edward A. Yonan. Numen Book Series 73. Leiden–New York–Köln: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- Anttonen, Veikko. "Toward a Cognitive Theory of the Sacred: An Ethnographic Approach." *Folklore* 14 (2000): 41–48.
- Bagnall, Roger S. *Reading Papyri, Writing Ancient History*. 2nd Edition. London–New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Bagnall, Roger S. *Hellenistic and Roman Egypt. Sources and Approaches*. Variorum Collected Studies Series 864. Aldershot–Burlington: Ashgate, 2006.
- Belayche, Nicole, Jean-Daniel Dubois (Eds.). *L'oiseau et le poisson. Cohabitations religieuses dans les mondes grec et romain*. Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris–Sorbonne, 2011.
- Bennett, Tony. "'Culture Studies' and the Culture Complex." Pages 25–34 in *Handbook of Cultural Sociology*. Edited by John R. Hall, Laura Grindstaff, Ming-Cheng Lo. London–New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Berti, Monica, Virgilio Costa. *La Biblioteca di Alessandria: storia di un paradiso perduto*. Ricerche di filologia, letteratura e storia 10. Tivoli: TORED, 2010.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London–New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Blaudeau, Philippe. *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491). De l'histoire à la géo-ecclésiologie*. Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 327. Rome: École française de Rome–De Boccard, 2006.
- Blumell, Lincoln H., Thomas A. Wayment (Eds.). *Christian Oxyrhynchus. Texts, Documents and Sources*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2015.
- Bonnet, Corinne. *Les enfants de Cadmos: le paysage religieux de la Phénicie hellénistique*. De l'archéologie à l'histoire 63. Paris: De Boccard, 2015.
- Bonnet, Corinne, Pascal Payen. "Le nouvel espace hellénistique." Pages 187–208 in *Alexandrie la divine*. Edited by Charles Méla, Frédéric Möri. Vol. 1. Fondation Martin Bodmer. Neuchâtel: La Baconnière, 2014.

- Bourdieu, Pierre. "Genesis and Structure of the Religious Field." Translated by Jenny B. Burnside, Craig Calhoun, Leah Florence. *Comparative Social Research* 13 (1991): 1–44.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "Identity and Representation: Elements for a Critical Reflection on the Idea of Region." Pages 220–228 in *Language and Symbolic Power*. Edited by John B. Thompson. Translated by Gino Raymond, Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology 16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Bowersock, Glenn W. "Late Antique Alexandria." Pages 263–272 in *Alexandria and Alexandrianism. Papers Delivered at a Symposium Organized by The J. Paul Getty Museum and The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities and Held at the Museum, April 22–25, 1993*. Malibu: Getty Publications, 1996.
- Bowman, Alan K. *Egypt after the Pharaohs: 332 BC–AD 642, from Alexander to the Arab Conquest*. 2nd Paperback Printing. Berkeley–Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996.
- Brubaker, Rogers. "Ethnicity without Groups." *Archives of European Sociology* 43 (2002): 163–189.
- Camplani, Alberto. "Chiesa urbana e 'periferie' cristiane di Alessandria nella tarda antichità: premesse per una ricerca." *Annali di storia dell'esegesi* 23.2 (2006): 389–413.
- Camplani, Alberto. "Il cristianesimo in Egitto prima e dopo Costantino." Pages 863–882 in *Costantino I. Enciclopedia costantiniana sulla figura e l'immagine dell'imperatore del cosiddetto Editto di Milano 313–2013*. Vol. 1. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 2013.
- Camplani, Alberto. "Il copto e la chiesa copta. La lenta e inconclusa affermazione della lingua copta nello spazio pubblico della tarda antichità." Pages 129–153 in *L'Africa, l'Oriente mediterraneo e l'Europa. Tradizioni e culture a confronto*. Edited by Paolo Nicelli. Africana Ambrosiana 1. Milan–Rome: Veneranda Biblioteca Ambrosiana–Bulzoni, 2015.
- Camplani, Alberto. "The Religious Identity of Alexandria in Some Ecclesiastical Histories of Late Antique Egypt." Pages 85–119 in *L'historiographie tardo-antique et la transmission des savoirs*. Edited by Philippe Blaudeau, Peter Van Nuffelen. Millennium-Studien/Millennium Studies 55. Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.
- Canfora, Luciano. *The Vanished Library*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 7. Berkeley–Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990.
- Capponi, Livia. "The Roman Period." Pages 180–198 in *A Companion to Ancient Egypt*. Edited by Alan B. Lloyd. Vol. 1. Maiden–Oxford–Chichester: Blackwell, 2010.
- Collins, John J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem. Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. The Biblical Resource Series. 2nd Edition. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2000.
- Collins, Nina L. *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 82. Leiden–Boston–Köln: E.J. Brill, 2000.
- Esler, Philip F. *Conflict and Identity in Romans*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Frankfurter, David. *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Frankfurter, David. "The Consequences of Hellenism in Late Antique Egypt: Religious Worlds and Actors." *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 2 (2000): 162–194.
- Fraser, Peter M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Vols. 1–2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited and Translated by Quintin Hoare, Geoffrey N. Smith. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1971.
- Grelle, Bruce. *Antonio Gramsci and the Question of Religion. Ideology, Ethics, and Hegemony*. London–New York: Routledge, 2017.
- Griggs, Charles W. *Early Egyptian Christianity: From its Origins to 451 CE*. Brill's Scholar List 3. Leiden–Boston–Köln: E.J. Brill, 2000.

- Gruen, Erich S. *Heritage and Hellenism. The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 30. Berkeley–Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998.
- Gruen, Erich S. *Diaspora. Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*. Berkeley–Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002.
- Gwynn, David M. “Religious Diversity in Antiquity: A Bibliographic Essay.” Pages 15–133 in *Religious Diversity in Late Antiquity*. Edited by David M. Gwynn, Susanne Bangert. Late Antique Archaeology 6. Leiden–Boston: E.J. Brill, 2010.
- Haas, Christopher. *Alexandria in Late Antiquity. Topography and Social Conflict*. Baltimore–London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Hall, Jonathan M. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Classics: History. Chicago–London: The University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, Terence Ranger (Eds.). *The Invention of Tradition*. 20th Printing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Jenkins, Richard. *Social Identity*. London–New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Kandé, Sylvie (Ed.). *Enquête d’Ariel. Discours sur le métissage, identités métisses*. Paris: L’Harmattan, 1999.
- MacLeod, Roy (Ed.). *The Library of Alexandria: Centre of Learning in the Ancient World*. London–New York: I.B. Tauris, 2000.
- Massa, Francesco. *Tra la vigna e la croce. Dioniso nei discorsi letterari e figurativi cristiani (II–IV secolo)*. Postdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 47. Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 2014.
- Miller, Daniel. “The Limits of Dominance.” Pages 63–79 in *Domination and Resistance*. Edited by Daniel Miller, Michael Rowlands, Christopher Tilley. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- Miller, James C. “Communal Identity in *Philippians*.” *Annali di storia dell’esegesi* 27 (2010): 11–23.
- Miller, James C. “The Sociological Category of ‘Collective Identity’ and Its Implications for Understanding Second Peter.” Pages 149–156 in *Reading Second Peter with New Eyes*. Edited by Robert L. Webb, Dune F. Watson. Library for New Testament Studies 382. London: Continuum, 2010.
- Mitchell, Timothy. “Everyday Metaphors of Power.” *Theory and Society* 19 (1990): 545–577.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization*. 1st Paperback Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Nicklas, Tobias. *Jews and Christians? Second Century ‘Christian’ Perspectives on the ‘Parting of the Ways’*. Annual Deichmann Lectures. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Niehoff, Maren R. *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Parsons, Peter. *City of the Sharp-Nosed Fish. Greek Papyri Beneath the Egyptian Sand Reveal a Long-Lost World*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2007.
- Pearson, Birger P. *Gnosticism and Christianity in Roman and Coptic Egypt*. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. London–New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Portier-Young, Anthea E. *Apocalypse against Empire. Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids–Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 2011.
- Riggs, Christina (Ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Rotroff, Susan I. “The Greeks and the Other in the Age of Alexander.” Pages 221–236 in *Greeks and Barbarians: Essays on the Interactions Between Greeks and Non-Greeks in Antiquity and the Consequences for Eurocentrism*. Edited by John E. Coleman, Clark A. Walz. Department of Near Eastern Studies: Occasional Publications of the Department of Near Eastern Studies and the Program of Jewish Studies 4. Bethesda: Southgate Publishers, 1997.

- Rüpke, Jörg (Ed.). *The Individual in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Rüpke, Jörg, Wolfgang Spickermann (Eds.). *Reflections on Religious Individuality: Greco-Roman and Judaeo-Christian Texts and Practices*. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 62. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012.
- Sahlins, Marshall. *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities: Structure in the Early History of the Sandwich Islands Kingdom*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1981.
- Simonetti, Manlio. "Teologia e cristologia nell'Egitto cristiano." Pages 11–38 in *L'Egitto cristiano. Aspetti e problemi in età tardo-antica*. Edited by Alberto Camplani. Studia Ephemeridis "Augustinianum" 56. Rome: Augustinianum, 1997.
- Stoler, Ann L. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Stroumsa, Guy G. "Alexandria and the Myth of Multiculturalism." Pages 23–29 in Origeniana Octava. *Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition/Origene e la tradizione alessandrina. Papers of the 8th International Origen Congress, Pisa, 27–31 August 2001*. Edited by Lorenzo Perrone. Vol. 1. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 164. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.
- Urciuoli, Emiliano R. "Contro l'albero, per i flussi. Identità: cinque marcatori di lunghissima durata." In *Identità etniche, identità collettive, identità religiose. Problemi aperti in prospettiva diacronica*. Edited by Luca Arcari. *Reti medievali* 15.1 (2015): <http://www.rmojs.unina.it/index.php/rm/article/view/468>.
- Watts, Edward J. *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria*. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London: University of California Press, 2006.
- White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815*. Studies in North American Indian History. 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Wipszycka, Ewa. *The Alexandrian Church. People and Institutions*. The Journal of Juristic Papyrology Supplement 25. Warsaw: Warsaw University Press, 2015.

Part One
Use, (Re-)Invention And (Re-)Definition
of Discursive Practices

Jewish, Christian, Greek?

The *Apocalypse of Peter* as a Witness of Early 2nd-Cent. Christianity in Alexandria

Tobias Nicklas

For Jan N. Bremmer

When we search for the roots of Christianity in Alexandria we are in the dark,¹ and when we investigate the origins of the apocryphal *Apocalypse of Peter* we skate on thin ice. Nevertheless, in this paper I will not only ask both questions but will also try to show their relation. I will first take a look at some details in the text of the *Apocalypse of Peter*. Based on this text I will then seek to demonstrate the inadequacies of typical categories of ancient “religious” movements, such as “Jewish,” “Christian,” and “Greek-hellenistic” (or “pagan” if we still want to use this term). These categories are actually taken over from ancient Christian apologists and in many cases cannot fully represent the realities of life in ancient worlds.² I will conclude by adding a few arguments about the *Apocalypse of Peter*’s alleged origins.

1. The *Apocalypse of Peter* – Jewish, Christian, or other?

Because there is no complete and reliable witness for the original text of the *Apocalypse of Peter*,³ any scholarly discussion about the text’s origins is full of problems. While the text’s Ethiopic version is usually thought to preserve the overall plot in a fairly reliable manner, many details in this version⁴ are clearly corrupt. In addition to the Ethiopic translation there are a few ancient quotations of the *Apocalypse of Peter* – one of which, however, does not find a

¹ For an overview of the present state of research see Löhr 2013: 413–415; see also B. Pouderon’s balanced paper in this volume.

² For a broader discussion of this question see Nicklas 2014a and 2014b.

³ Even if the Ethiopic manuscripts provide a complete text, in many details this late version is not very reliable.

⁴ Regarding the Ethiopic transmission of the text cf. Buchholz 1988: 119–157; besides Buchholz’s edition of the Ethiopic (162–227), see mainly Marrassini 1994.

counterpart in any manuscript (see Clem. *Ecl.* 41.1–3)⁵ – and two fragmentary Greek witnesses coming from the same miniature codex (Ms. Bodl. G. th. f. 4 [P] + P. Vindob. G. 39756)⁶ that preserve parts of *Apoc. Pet.* 10 and 14 plus one long Greek fragment in the so-called Akhmim-Codex (6th–7th cent. CE).⁷ Although this final fragment offers a text that is closely related to the other witnesses of the *Apocalypse of Peter*, its differences are important enough compared to what we find, for example, in the Ethiopic versions to consider this text an apocryphal writing on its own. Perhaps it should even be read together with the passion and resurrection account of the *Gospel of Peter*, since both texts were copied by the same scribe.⁸

I.1. Although the text-critical problems of the *Apocalypse of Peter* should prompt us to be cautious, the question about its use of written sources can be solved without too many problems. As this paper will demonstrate, the text presupposes ideas from the Old Testament and early Jewish literature, but its only two quotations from the Old Testament – parts of *Ezek.* 37.1–4 in *Apoc. Pet.* 4.7–9 and parts of *Ps.* 23[24] in *Apoc. Pet.* 17.2–6 – are significant. According to Jacques van Ruiten, the quote from *Ezek.* 37 can be called a “summarising quotation”⁹ rather than a direct use of the Old Testament text;¹⁰ the text’s idea of bodily resurrection goes parallel to other early Jewish interpretations of *Ezek.* 37.¹¹ Even if *Apoc. Pet.* 17 does not quote all of *Ps.* 24 (23 LXX), according to van Ruiten “[t]he whole Psalm, in the version of the Septuagint, is presupposed, although only very few phrases are actually taken over.”¹² In other words, we are dealing with an author who is acquainted with interpretations of *Ezek.* 37 as a prophecy of future bodily resurrection and – even if not extensively – writes a Greek text that quotes at least one Scriptural passage in its LXX form.

Regarding Christian writings, only two texts have been broadly discussed as sources of the *Apocalypse of Peter*. While the text apparently makes quite extensive use of *Matthew* in its first and final chapters (Jesus’ eschatological speech in *Matt.* 24 is of special importance for the eschato-

⁵ For a discussion see Kraus, Nicklas 2004: 89–90.

⁶ For a detailed argument see Kraus 2003c.

⁷ For a full edition of the Greek manuscripts of the *Apocalypse of Peter* see Kraus, Nicklas 2004: 101–130.

⁸ For a discussion of this problem see Nicklas 2013: 339–349.

⁹ Cf. van Ruiten 2003: 173.

¹⁰ The original text of *Ezek.* 37 with its focus on the future of Israel probably does not presuppose the idea of a bodily resurrection of the individual. For more details see Schöpflin 2009.

¹¹ This, according to van Ruiten (2003: 163–168), does not mean that the text necessarily depends on 4QPseudo-Ezekiel, as R. Bauckham has suggested in Bauckham 1998b (reprinted from Bauckham 1992).

¹² Van Ruiten 2003: 173.

logy of the *Apocalypse of Peter*), the list of motifs that connect the *Apocalypse of Peter* and *2 Peter* do not necessarily mean that the *Apocalypse of Peter* used *2 Peter* as a source. The strong arguments of R. Bauckham and T.J. Kraus about both texts' interdependence do not necessarily mean that the *Apocalypse of Peter* is later than *2 Peter*.¹³ W. Grünstäudl's recent suggestion is quite convincing; he shows that *2 Peter* is not the source of the *Apocalypse of Peter*, but vice versa.¹⁴ Grünstäudl's most persuasive argument is simple: *2 Peter* is clearly dependent on the *Epistle of Jude*¹⁵ but the *Apocalypse of Peter* is not. If *Apocalypse of Peter* used *2 Peter* as a source, it is difficult to explain why the text is not dependent on any of the passages where *2 Peter* uses *Jude*. If, however, *2 Peter* used both the *Apocalypse of Peter* and the *Epistle of Jude* as its sources, the evidence can be explained very well.

In other words, the only Christian writing that the *Apocalypse of Peter* definitively used is *Matthew*, which was certainly "the" Christian writing with the broadest distribution in pre-Constantinian times. Interestingly, it seems that the *Apocalypse of Peter* did not use *Matthew* because of its "Jewish" features – e.g., its interest in a proper Jesus *halakha* as expressed in the Sermon on the Mount (*Matt.* 5–7). Although *Matt.* 5.29–30 may have provided a background for some descriptions of hellish punishments in the *Apocalypse of Peter*, as Istvan Czachesz has supposed,¹⁶ the sins mentioned in its description of hell do not have any clear counterparts in Jesus' discussions of proper justice (see *Matt.* 5.20). If *Matthew* is the only later New Testament writing used by the *Apocalypse of Peter*, this also implies that there is no awareness of a Pauline corpus and (quite probably) that no Johannine literature is present in this text.

1.2. This becomes even clearer when we take a closer look at the text's concept of bodily resurrection at the final judgment.¹⁷ According to the *Apocalypse of Peter*, the resurrection of the dead (contrary, e.g., to *1 Cor.* 15) does not have anything to do with the resurrection of the crucified Christ (who is not even mentioned). Additionally, at least according to the (certainly problematic) Ethiopic version of the text, the day of resurrection and final judgment is called "the day of God" – Jesus Christ only appears on the scene in chapter 6. The resurrection occurring on this special day is described in extremely corporeal terms. God commands Sheol to give back everything in it; even birds and wild animals have to give back the flesh they have eaten. According to R. Bauckham, the whole concept of "giving back the dead" finds its roots in the idea expressed in *1 En.* 61.5 that from God's

¹³ The main arguments regarding literary relationship (but arguing that *2 Peter* is the source of the *Apocalypse of Peter*) have been given by Bauckham 1998a, and Kraus 2001: 386–396.

¹⁴ For his full argument see Grünstäudl 2013: 97–144.

¹⁵ Regarding this literary relationship see, for example, Kraus 2001: 368–376.

¹⁶ Cf. Czachesz 2012: 13.

¹⁷ Regarding the following passage see also (in more detail) Nicklas 2012 and 2015.

perspective no one and nothing can be destroyed.¹⁸ The text's image of bodily resurrection, as we have seen, is explicitly connected to a reception of *Ezek.* 37, the well-known vision of the resurrection of the dry bones of Israel. The question about the possibility of bodily resurrection, finally, is answered with the motif that nothing is impossible for God, the creator of the world (*Apoc. Pet.* 4.5). The most probable background of this argument, which is also used by *1 Clem.* 27.1–3 and Just. *1 Apol.* 18.6 and 19.6,¹⁹ can be found in Old Testament passages as *Job* 42.2 and *Gen.* 18.14. The profile of the author (or perhaps the group) behind the *Apocalypse of Peter* becomes clearer: while no definite influences from Pauline Christianity can be observed,²⁰ the Scriptures of Israel are used (at least partly) in a LXX like version. Early Jewish ideas of bodily resurrection developed from *1 Enoch* and *Ezek.* 37 play a role – this last observation goes so far that without its current context it would be very difficult to decide whether the description of the resurrection of the dead according to *Apoc. Pet.* 4 is what we call “Jewish” or what we call “Christian.” But does this mean that our author comes from a Jewish Christian group – if we still want to use the term “Jewish Christian”²¹ – which demarcates itself more or less from the rest of the world? If we compare the text to what we have, for example, from the Ebionite movement, a very different profile is seen: while the Ebionites were very much concerned with a proper (and even very strong) observation of the Torah, which even included vegetarianism, the *Apocalypse of Peter* does not show clear traces of a typical Torah-bound *halakha* connected to questions of purity, fasting, questions of cult, etc.

1.3. This, however, is not yet the whole picture. The very “Jewish” idea of a bodily resurrection of the dead as expressed in *Apoc. Pet.* 4 is connected to the image of a destruction of the world in fire – *ekpyrosis* – in chapter 5, a motif which is rarely found in early Christian writings. As far as I see, the only New Testament parallel is in *2 Peter*.²² As is commonly known, the decisive

¹⁸ See Bauckham 1998c: 288.

¹⁹ As far as I can tell, Justin and *1 Clement* use the argument independently from the *Apocalypse of Peter*.

²⁰ It is of course, difficult (if not impossible) to prove that there is absolutely nothing in the *Apocalypse of Peter* which could be traced back to ideas also found in Pauline writings.

²¹ As is well-known, the use of the term “Jewish Christian” is highly problematic. I personally regard the cluster of questions developed by Luomanen (2012: 11–12) to develop profiles of different groups as very helpful. See also the definition of “Jewish Christians” offered by Jones 2012: 453–455.

²² For more information regarding the motif in *2 Peter* and in other early Christian literature (*2 Clem.* 16.3; *Sib. Or.* 2.194–213; 1: Just. *1 Apol.* 60.8–9 and *2 Apol.* 7.3; 2: Iren. *Haer.* 1.7.1, and Orig. *Cels.* 4.11–13), see Grünstäudl 2013b. Regarding a possible relation between Peter's martyrdom in fire and the idea of *ekpyrosis* expressed in the *Apocalypse of Peter*, see Nicklas 2015.

idea behind the motif *ekpyrosis* goes back to the myth of Phaeton, whose most well-known version is found in Ov. *Metam.* 2 (which is explicitly connected to Egypt!).²³ Graeco-Roman versions of the myth do not understand the *ekpyrosis* as a sign of the end of the world but as a terrible accident that leads to a new beginning. Based on ideas developed by Heraclitus, different philosophical schools – mainly the Stoa – borrowed ideas of a periodic destruction of the world through fire, and in Jewish and Christian circles this was connected to the idea of an absolute end of the world. If we regard 2 *Peter* as dependent on the *Apocalypse of Peter*, the *Apocalypse of Peter* is the oldest Christian writing describing the end of the world as an *ekpyrosis*, the (probably) oldest Jewish parallel being *Sib. Or.* 5.206–213, where the motif of *ekpyrosis* is limited to a future burning of Ethiopia.²⁴ While it is quite difficult to date *Sib. Or.* 5 exactly (its kernel may be traced back to the time before Hadrian), its clear emphasis on Egypt (5.60–114; 179–199; 458–463; 484–511; see also the relation of Sibyl and Isis 5.53)²⁵ plus the fact that it is quoted for the first time by Clement of Alexandria (*Protr.* 4.50 and *Paed.* 2.10.99) makes it highly probable that it was produced in Egypt – in which case, Alexandria is always a good choice.

1.4. Additionally, according to both the Ethiopic text of chapter 14 and P.Vindob.G. 39756 (also known as the “Rainer” fragment) Christ will give his called and chosen “a fine baptism in the salvation of what is called the Acherusian Lake, in the Elysian field, a part of justice with my holy ones.”²⁶ This, of course, comes as a surprise – at least if we simply work with the idea of very distinct categories like “Jew,” “Christian,” and “Graeco-Roman.” As Thomas J. Kraus has shown,²⁷ the use of both motifs was fairly widespread in “Christian” circles. According to E. Peterson, it is very possible that the author of the *Apocalypse of Peter* took over this motif from Jewish circles,²⁸ which can be seen by the use of comparable motifs in Josephus (*B.J.* 2.156) and Philo,²⁹ the idea of the *Acheron* as the river around viz. bordering the netherworld and the Elysion as the place for the God’s favorites who do not have to die (like Menelaos or Helena according to *Od.* 4.561–565) or (later) the place where the blessed ones live after their death is first and foremost a widespread idea in ancient Hellenistic and Roman worlds. Thomas Kraus discusses four ancient Christian writings where at least one of the two ideas is mentioned, namely the *Apocalypse of Peter*, *Sib. Or.* 2.330–338, the *Apocalypse of Paul*, and the Coptic *Resurrection*

²³ For a much more detailed overview and description see Usener 2013.

²⁴ See Usener 2013: 178.

²⁵ See Gauger 2002: 454–455.

²⁶ Translation according to Kraus, Nicklas 2004: 128.

²⁷ For the following arguments see Kraus 2003a.

²⁸ See Peterson 1959.

²⁹ See the examples given by Kraus 2003a.

of *Jesus Christ according to the Apostle Bartholomew*.³⁰ Perhaps the closest parallels to the *Apocalypse of Peter* are found in *Sib. Or.* 2.330–338, which connects the motifs of the destruction of the world by fire, intercessory prayer of the pious before God, and eternal life in the Elysion where the waters of the Acherousian lake empty. In the Coptic *Resurrection of Jesus Christ*³¹ the motif of Bartholomew's triple immersion in the Acherusian Lake (see 21.8) before he enters paradise probably goes back to the *Life of Adam and Eve* (37) and seems to be of minor import for the text's overall eschatology. Both *Sib. Or.* 2.330–338 and *Apoc. Paul* 22 seem to be dependent on the *Apocalypse of Peter* regarding this motif.³² As far as we can tell, therefore, the *Apocalypse of Peter* is the most ancient "Christian" writing taking over, combining, and integrating both motifs in its idea of salvation.

Paragraphs 1.3. and 1.4. help shape our image of the author. His eschatology is not only dependent on the interpretation and development of *Matthew* and some Old Testament sources. Concepts from Graeco-Roman religion and mythology are also natural parts of his worldview and form an integral part of both his conception of salvation and the end of the world. Although Acherousia and Elysion are concepts that might be considered "common knowledge," the integration of the *ekpyrosis* into a Jewish and/or Christian concept of the end of the world and its final judgment seems to be an original invention.

1.5. This situation becomes even more complicated when we consider the different ideas about angels in the *Apocalypse of Peter*, in which various angelic figures appear.

1.5.1. According to *Apoc. Pet.* 4.9–10, it is Uriel (according to the Ethiopic version: Urael) who is commanded by God to bring soul and spirit into the bodies of the dead.³³ Certainly not every detail of Uriel's role in the *Apocalypse of Peter* can be explained by the few parallel sources we have. Interestingly, however, *1 En.* 20.2 describes this angel as custodian of the Tartarus, while according to *Sib. Or.* 2.215–220 the archangels (among them Uriel, who is explicitly mentioned in 2.215) have to lead the human souls to God's throne for judgment (see also 2.228–237). As in chapter 4, Uriel's role is repeated in chapter 6, where he is an "angel of God" bringing the souls of the sinners who have died in the great flood and who pray to idols to God's judgment, where they are burned in eternal fire.

³⁰ Besides Kraus 2003a, see also his article Kraus 2003b.

³¹ This text likely dates from between the 5th and (less probably) 9th cent. CE and was probably composed in Coptic; see the remarks by Schenke 2012: 855.

³² For a more detailed argument see Kraus 2003b.

³³ Regarding this figure see Nicklas 2007: 471; regarding the backgrounds of the idea of archangels see Berner 2007.

The description of Uriel is not consistent, however, since in chapter 12 he appears again torturing sorcerers in hell.

1.5.2. Several times an angel named Ezrael appears, acting as God's angel of wrath (see, e.g., chapter 9). The name bears a Hebrew theophoric name which could be understood as "God is help."

1.5.3. According to chapter 8, children which have been killed by their parents are given to an angel called Temlakos in the Ethiopic version. This somewhat mysterious (and perhaps partly corrupt) passage is clearer in a quote from Clem. *Ecl.* 48–49. According to this quote, exposed children are given to a *Temelouchos* angel who, although usually connected to hell, acts in this context as a guardian angel (τημελοῦχος = "tutelary, guardian"),³⁴ educating and raising them. The original etymology of the name *Temelouchos*, according to J.-M. Rosenstiehl,³⁵ however, is *Temeliouchos* (= "in charge of the foundation"), an epithet of Poseidon. *Temelouchos* is also known from the *Apoc. Paul* 40 (which probably uses the *Apocalypse of Peter* as a source for this figure), the much later *Apocalypse of Mary* and (with many variations in its name, including the strange *Abdimelouchos*) in Coptic literature. Even though it is unclear why the *Apocalypse of Peter* refers to *Temelouchos* as a guardian angel, the text seems to have taken over a figure from pagan worlds and reinterpreted it as an angel responsible for a special task in the netherworld. Beyond this point, further conclusions can be drawn. According to Rosenstiehl,³⁶ many elements in *Apoc. Pet.* 8 can be understood as an adaptation of elements related to descriptions of hell in the deuterocanonical / apocryphal *Wisdom of Solomon*. I find his most convincing observations to be (1) the parallels between *Wis.* 5.21 and the motif that flashes of lightning come from the children's eyes and pierce the eyes of their parents, and (2) *Wis.* 5.1 and the idea that the children face their parents being tortured in hell. This background helps Rosenstiehl identify the role of the *Temelouchos*-angel in this context: the *Temelouchos* takes over the task promised in *Wis.* 4.10–11 to the just who died in young years but remain in God's hand (*Wis.* 3.1). *Apoc. Pet.* 8 is thus an interpretation of what happens to the just who did even not have a chance to live because their parents exposed or killed them.

1.5.4. The angel Tatirokos (= Tartarouchos or "keeper of the Tartaros"), finally, is attested in chapter 13 of the Ethiopic version.³⁷ According to the *Apoca-*

³⁴ For more references see Lampe 2003. For other etymologies see Rosenstiehl 1986: 48–49.

³⁵ See Rosenstiehl 1986, taken over also by Bremmer 2003: 9.

³⁶ For the following passage see Rosenstiehl 1986; regarding the relation of *Apoc. Pet.* 8 and *Wis.* 2–5, see esp. 50–51.

³⁷ Unfortunately, no parallels in the Greek witnesses are extant.