

ANTIQUA ET MEDIÆVALIA • JUDAICA ET ORIENTALIA



ANTIQUA ET MEDIÆVALIA • JUDAICA ET ORIENTALIA

This volume was not conceived as an exhaustive collective contribution to the topic, but it is rather a pretext and a starting point for new debates to come. It promotes interdisciplinary studies related to various research field-works such as the history of religions, cultural anthropology, epigraphy, archaeology, theology, philosophy, and ethnology. Even if no chronological or territorial restraint is to be framed, both the Ancient and Mediaeval periods are targeted, as well as the areas belonging to the Near Eastern and Graeco-Roman civilizations. The thematic field include theoretical and applied approaches on historical sources regarding the divine world hierarchy, perception of the nature of deities, angelic and demonic powers, uniqueness of the divinity, representations within the collective mentality of death and salvation ideas, curse and benediction funerary formulas, typology of the personal epithets and of the social relations indicated by the Jewish and pagan funerary epitaphs, divine messengers image in the Graeco-Roman literature, soteriology and eschatology within the oriental cults, Judaism and Christianity, the metaphors of divine justice, the hierarchy of the divine world in the works of the Church Fathers or the image of death and the perspective of afterlife.



Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” Iaşi

ANGELS, DEMONS AND REPRESENTATIONS OF AFTERLIFE
WITHIN THE JEWISH, PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN IMAGERY

IULIAN MOGA
(COORDINATOR)



ANGELS, DEMONS AND REPRESENTATIONS OF AFTERLIFE

WITHIN THE JEWISH, PAGAN
AND CHRISTIAN IMAGERY



IULIAN MOGA
(COORDINATOR)



ANTIQUA ET MEDIÆVALIA • JUDAICA ET ORIENTALIA



Colecție coordonată de Lucrețiu Mihailescu-Bîrliba și Adrian Muraru
Seria JUDAICA ET ORIENTALIA coordonată de Iulian Moga



Society of Assyriologists,
Biblicists and Caucasiologists (SABC)



The Centre of Jewish History
and Hebrew Studies „Dr. Alexandru Safran”

Referenți științifici:

Prof.univ.dr. Alexandr V. Podossinov, Academia Rusă de Științe,
Institutul de Istorie Universală

Prof.univ.dr. Eka Avaliani, Universitatea de Stat Iv. Javakhishvili din Tbilisi

Lect.univ.dr. Ligia Ruscu, Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai din Cluj-Napoca

Redactor: Alina PIFTOR

Coperta: Manuela OBOROCEANU

Tehnoredactor: ing. Luminița RĂDUCANU

ISBN 978-973-703-860-9

© Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2013

700109 – Iași, str. Pinului, nr. 1A, tel./fax: (0232) 314947

[http:// www.editura.uaic.ro](http://www.editura.uaic.ro) e-mail: editura@uaic.ro

IULIAN MOGA

(coordinator)

**Angels, Demons and Representations
of Afterlife within the Jewish,
Pagan and Christian Imagery**



Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza“ Iași

2013

Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naționale a României
Angels, demons and representations of afterlife within the jewish, pagan
and christian imagery / coord.: Iulian Moga. - Iași: Editura
Universității „Al. I. Cuza”, 2013
Bibliogr.
ISBN 978-973-703-860-9

I. Moga, Iulian (coord.)

28

29

Contents

Foreword.....	9
---------------	---

Imagologica, Soteriologica & Orientalia

Death and the Afterlife. A Comparative Perspective <i>Elena Ene D-VASILESCU</i>	15
“Good Luck in the Resurrection!”. Life after Death in Jewish Epigraphy <i>Tibor GRÜLL</i>	27
Microregional Manifestation of a Private Cult. The Mithraic Community of Apulum <i>Szabó CSABA</i>	43
Egyptian, Greek, Roman Harpocrates – A Protecting and Saviour God <i>Ştefana CRISTEA</i>	73
The Power of the Seven Vowels on a Magical Gem from Dinogetia (Moesia Inferior) <i>Sorin NEMETI</i>	87
The Romanian Zgripsoroaică ‘Female Griffin’ and Other Representatives of the Netherworld <i>Adrian PORUCIUC</i>	95
Seeing is Praying: Egyptian Spirituality in Images <i>Elena Ene D-VASILESCU</i>	103
Invoking Justice and Divine Wrath in this World and Afterwards in Roman Imperial Anatolia <i>Iulian MOGA, Alexandru DAJ</i>	112
Graeco-Egyptian Magical Gems Related to the Underworld <i>Ştefana CRISTEA</i>	131
Ancient Goddess and Birth Symbolism <i>Eka AVALIANI</i>	139
Some Aspects of Philostratean Religiosity: Spiritual Sacrifice and Love to God <i>Alexey V. BELOUSOV</i>	163
Poetic Imagery of Afterlife in Ancient Greece <i>Ştefania VOICU</i>	177

Angelica & Daemonica

Ancient Greek and Roman Ghost Stories. Some New Approaches <i>Levente NAGY</i>	225
La fenomenologia del demonico nelle Papyri Graecae Magicae e la voce dei primi Padri della Chiesa <i>Ennio SANZI</i>	245
Rhesos Anthropodaimon. Aspects of Thracian Heroisation <i>Michaela JORDANOVA</i>	268
The World of Angels: From Submission to Commandment, through a Biblical Perspective <i>Paul-Cezar HÁRLĂOANU</i>	279
Nekydaimones <i>György NÉMETH</i>	293
The Angels and the “Ethics” of Interval <i>Petru BEJAN</i>	301
The Soul of the Ascetic in the Fight against “the Evil Spirits”. Elements of Christian Ponerology for Avva Evagrius the Monk <i>Ioan TEȘU</i>	307
The Demons and Their Temptations. A Vision of the Romanian Philokalia <i>Liviu PETCU</i>	323
Anthropology and Angelology in the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom <i>Tikhon VASILYEV</i>	339
Representation of Angels in Byzantine Art: Interpretation of Corporeality <i>Maria GRINBERG</i>	373
Orthodox Angelology within the Greek Euchologion. A Theological and Philological Study <i>Ștefan Teofil GROSU</i>	385
Diabolus in Ecclesia. Considerations over the “Opening of the Holy Book” Divination Practice in the Context of the Romanian Orthodox Church <i>Mircea PĂDURARU</i>	422
Daimones in the Georgian Mythic-Ritual System <i>Nino ABAKELIA</i>	445

Thanatologica

Philosophical Thoughts and Meditations on Death and Immortality in the Works of Ancient and Contemporary Thinkers	
<i>Constantin MARIN</i>	461
Competing Social and Cultural Identities in Funeral Spaces of Iasi City during the Medieval and Modern Eras	
<i>Bogdan-Petru MALEON</i>	476
The Curse as Expression of Eschatological Fear in Medieval Moldavia	
<i>Petronela PODOVEI</i>	485
The Funeral Ceremony, Indicator of Mentalities and Attitudes to Death in Romanian Society	
<i>Gabriel ROMAN</i>	494
Death, Loss, and Trauma. The Challenges of Adjustment, Recovery, and Resilience	
<i>Maria Nicoleta TURLIUC</i>	517
On the Mortuary Rituals in Georgian Tradition	
<i>Nino ABAKELIA</i>	538
The Pagan “Heritage” of Romanian Cremationism	
<i>Marius ROTAR</i>	545
Plates.....	563

Some Aspects of Philostratean Religiosity: Spiritual Sacrifice and Love to God

Alexey V. BELOUSOV
Lomonosov State University of Moscow

Flavius Philostratus (AD 160-240) is one of the most prominent writers of the Severan epoch. As the whole epoch is generally characterized by the increase in the Oriental influences on Roman religious life, Philostratus' works demonstrate certain penetration of traditional Oriental genres into the Greek literature. For the most part, the extensive investigations dedicated to Philostratus' works researches only their possible literary sources and relative genres. The present study, however, focuses on Flavius Philostratus' writings as a manifestation of the most influential religious trends of their time. This approach should allow not only a better understanding of Philostratus' heritage, but also provide an answer to a number of important questions related to the history of the Greek literature of the Second Sophistic epoch. Therefore, the choice of Philostratus' works, which represents the focus of this research – *Vita Apollonii* and *Heroicus* – is conditioned by the fact that they are more related to the topic of religion than the others.

“Spiritual Sacrifice” and “Purity of Soul”, by Apollonius of Tyana

It becomes evident now that the great importance given to the image of Apollonius of Tyana created by Philostratus is defined by the fact that the author probably embodies the ideal of a spiritual leader of his own epoch in this character. From this angle, each episode of the *VA*, each statement made by Apollonius is significant for our research, regardless of the source study problems it raises, as the author included it into his “eulogistic biography”. The principal goal of my research, as I see it, is to single out some *new* aspects of the spiritual ideal that could be found in this image of the “god-like sage” and to study them in the general context of the religious life during the Severan epoch. This particular paper treats one of such aspects presented by the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*.

Apollonius' renunciation to bloody sacrifice could probably be regarded as a new feature of the image of a “god-like sage”. This trait is shown most explicitly in the *VA* episode describing Apollonius' sojourn at king Vardan's. The king invites Apollonius to participate in a sacrificial offering to the Sun, the offering being “a horse of the finest Nisaeen kind”, adorned “with metal discs as if for a procession”. Apollonius, however, declines this offer: “You may

sacrifice your own way, Majesty, but allow me to sacrifice in mine”. He took a handful of frankincense and said, “Sun, send me as far across the world as seems good to you and to me. Let me come to know good men, but let me not hear of bad ones, or they of me”. So saying, he dropped the frankincense into the flames, and observed how they divided, where they were smoky, how many tongues they flickered with, and he also touched the fire wherever it seemed auspicious and pure. He then said, “Now, Majesty, sacrifice according to your ancestral customs, because mine are as you see” (1, 31)¹.

Some other examples of renunciation to bloody sacrifices are known in the imperial epoch. The brightest of them are Lucian’s *Demonax* who said that “I never thought that the goddess (Athena – *A. B.*) needed my sacrifices”², and Plotinus who refused to go to a temple with Amelius as “they [the gods] should come to me, and not the other way around”³.

Apollonius’ renunciation to bloody sacrifice is usually explained by the possibility that the sage of Tyana may have been a follower of the Pythagorean doctrine, which suggests rigorous vegetarianism. However, it seems that a more profound explanation is possible.

We possess a fragment of Apollonius’ work *Περὶ θυσιῶν* extant in Porphyry’s rendering in his *De abstinence* (2, 34, 2) and in Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica* (IV, 12-13). Porphyry reads:

“We too will therefore sacrifice, but we shall do so as is proper, in that we make different sacrifices to different powers. To the supreme God, as a wise man said, we will sacrifice nothing perceptible either by burning or naming it, for there is nothing material that is not in itself impure to the immaterial Being. Therefore the speech uttered by voice is not appropriate for him, not even internal speech when it is defiled by workings of the soul: we worship him by pure silence and by pure

¹ Προσελθόντα δὲ καὶ ἀσπασάμενον προσεῖπέ τε ὁ βασιλεὺς φωνῇ Ἑλλάδι καὶ (δὴ) ἐκέλευσε θύειν μετ’ αὐτοῦ· λευκὸν δὲ ἄρα ἵππον τῶν σφόδρα Νισαίων καταθῆναι ἐμελλε τῷ Ἡλίῳ φαλάροις κοσμήσας, ὥσπερ ἐς πομπήν, ὁ δ’ ὑπολαβὼν “σὺ μὲν, ὦ βασιλεῦ, θύε,” ἔφη, “τὸν σαυτοῦ τρόπον, ἐμοὶ δὲ ξυγχώρησον θῆσαι τὸν ἐμαντοῦ” καὶ δραζάμενος τοῦ λιβανωτοῦ, “Ἥλιε,” ἔφη, “πέμπε με ἐφ’ ὅσον τῆς γῆς ἐμοὶ τε καὶ σοὶ δοκεῖ, καὶ γιγνώσκωμι ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς, φαῦλους δὲ μήτε ἐγὼ μάθοιμι μήτε ἐμέ φαῦλοι.” καὶ εἰπὼν ταῦτα τὸν λιβανωτὸν ἐς τὸ πῦρ ἤκεν, ἐπισκεψάμενος δὲ αὐτὸ ὅπη διανίσταται καὶ ὅπη θολοῦται καὶ ὁπόσαις κορυφαῖς ἄττει καὶ πού καὶ ἐραπτόμενος τοῦ πυρός, ὅπη εὐσημόν τε καὶ καθαρὸν φαίνεται “θύε,” ἔφη, “λουτόν, ὦ βασιλεῦ, κατὰ τὰ σαυτοῦ πάτρια, τὰ γὰρ πάτρια τάμα τοιαῦτα.” καὶ ἀνεχώρησε τῆς θυσίας, ὡς μὴ κοινωνοῖ τοῦ αἵματος. Translation by Chr.P. Jones.

² Luc., *Demon.*, 11.

³ Porph., *VP*, 10.

thoughts about him"⁴.

Eusebius renders the following:

That, then, is what he (Porphyry) says. Very similar and related to that is what the well-known Apollonius of Tyana, celebrated by many people, is said to write about the first and greatest god in his *On Sacrifices*: "One might best therefore, so I think, pay the fitting attention to the divine, and in consequence more than any human by comparison find him favorable and kindly, if he was not to sacrifice in any way to God (to Him whom we so name), who is one and superior to all, second to whom we must necessarily suppose the other gods, nor address any perceptible thing to him at all, for he needs nothing even from those who are superior to us, nor is there any plant or animal at all that the earth grows or that the air nourishes to which no pollution is attached. One should always use with Him the superior kind of discourse, I mean that which does not issue through the mouth, but ask for His blessing with the noblest element in us, and this is Mind, which needs no instrument. For these reasons one should in no way sacrifice to the great God who is above all"⁵.

Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν οὗτος, ἀδελφὰ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ συγγενῇ περὶ τοῦ πρώτου καὶ μεγάλου θεοῦ ἐν τῷ *Περὶ θυσιῶν* ὁ παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἁδόμενος αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος ὁ Τυανεὺς Ἀπολλώνιος τάδε γράφειν λέγεται·⁶ "Οὕτως τοίνυν μάλιστα ἂν τις, οἶμαι, τὴν προσήκουσαν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιοῖτο τοῦ θεοῦ τυγχάνοι τε αὐτόθεν ἰλεῶ τε καὶ εὐμενοῦς αὐτοῦ παρ' ὄντινα οὖν μόνος ἀνθρώπων, εἰ θεῶ μὲν, ὄν δὴ πρῶτον ἔφαμεν, ἐνὶ τε ὄντι καὶ κεχωρισμένῳ πάντων, μεθ' ὃν γινώριζεσθαι τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀναγκαῖον, μὴ θύοι τι τὴν ἀρχὴν μήτε ἀνάπτοι πῦρ μήτε καθόλου τι τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἐπονομάζοι (δεῖται γὰρ οὐδενὸς οὐδὲ παρὰ τῶν κρειττόνων ἥπερ ἡμεῖς· οὐδ' ἔστιν ὃ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀνίησι γῆ φυτὸν ἢ τρέφει ζῶον ἢ ἀήρ, ὃ μὴ πρόσσεστί γέ τι μίasma), μόνῳ δὲ χρώτο πρὸς αὐτὸν αἰεὶ τῷ κρείττονι λόγῳ, λέγω δὲ τῷ μὴ διὰ στόματος ἰόντι, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ καλλίστου τῶν ὄντων διὰ τοῦ καλλίστου τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν αἰτιοῖ τὰ ἀγαθὰ· νοῦς δὲ ἐστὶν οὗτος, ὄργανον μὴ δεόμενος. οὐκοῦν κατὰ ταῦτα οὐδαμῶς τῷ μεγάλῳ καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων θεῷ θυτέον."

⁴ Θύσωμεν τοίνυν καὶ ἡμεῖς· ἀλλὰ θύσωμεν, ὡς προσήκει, διαφόρους τὰς θυσίας ὡς ἂν διαφόροις δυνάμεσι προσάγοντες· θεῶ μὲν τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, ὡς τις ἀνὴρ σοφὸς ἔφη, μηδὲν τῶν αἰσθητῶν μήτε θυμιῶντες μήτ' ἐπονομάζοντες· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔστιν ἐνυλον, ὃ μὴ τῷ ἀλύφῳ εὐθύς ἐστὶν ἀκάθαρτον. διὸ οὐδὲ λόγος τοῦτο· ὁ κατὰ φωνὴν οἰκεῖος, οὐδ' ὁ ἐνδον, ὅταν πάθει ψυχῆς ἢ μεμολυσμένος, διὰ δὲ σιγῆς καθαρὰς καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτοῦ καθαρῶν ἐννοιῶν θρησκεύομεν αὐτόν. Translation by Chr.P. Jones.

⁵ Translation by Chr.P. Jones.

Therefore, it is obvious that Apollonius not only rejects bloody sacrifices, but he also denies the necessity of any material sacrifice to the “first” God and prefers the “spiritual” sacrifice.

The necessity of the “intellectual” sacrifice was first realized in early Imperial Rome⁷. If gods are in fact “pure souls”, “forces”, as they are presented by Porphyry, it is only logical that they would require purity of mind from their worshipers⁸. The purity of soul and mind is gradually becoming an essential part of the religious practice.

The ritual purity (i.e. abstention from contact with anything related to the death) was very important for classical Greek and Roman religious cults⁹. However, sometimes the “purity of mind” was also required, for example, by the famous Lindos decree¹⁰, while some sanctuaries practiced confession of sins¹¹.

Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to think that the moral purity was a universal and necessary condition for the rite to take place. It is important to remember that a “polytheist” did not try to follow the example of their gods as the Christians did. For the major part of the pagan cult, a “religious experience” was an experience of adaptation to gods’ activity in this world¹². So the moral purity was not a pre-condition for the “deification” in the Christian sense of the word, but a means of “communication” with a deity aimed at achieving something. In the case of philosophers, this “something” could as well be “the unity with the One”.

It is not surprising that, along with the idea of the “spiritual sacrifice”, in some episodes of his work Philostratus advocates the necessity of the moral purity for carrying out a rite or making a prophecy.

One episode of the *VA* first book referring to the early years of Apollonius, when he resided in the Aegae Asclepius sanctuary, is of particular interest in this regard. Once Apollonius saw “the altar covered with blood and the victims lying beside it (...) Two gold vessels had been dedicated, inset with marvellous stones of the finest Indian kind”. A certain rich Cilician, who wanted Asclepius to restore his damaged eye, made all these sacrifices. Apollonius finds out the

⁶ See also Petzke, 1970, 36; Norden, 1913, 344; Eusèbe de Césarée, *La préparation évangélique. Livres IV-V*, 1-17 (SC, 262, p. 143); Koskenniemi E., *Apollonios von Tyana...*, S. 3, Anm. 7; Philostratus, *Apollonius of Tyana. Letters of Apollonius*, 115.

⁷ Sen., *Ben.*, 1, 6, 3; Pers., 1, 69-75; Gal., *De usu partium.*, 111, 10. See Liebeschuetz, 2000, 1003.

⁸ See Ferguson, 1980, 1151-1189; Hanson, 1980, 910-973; Turcan, 1984, 209-226.

⁹ Burkert, 1985, 75-82.

¹⁰ *LSAG*, 139, vv. 4-5.

¹¹ Fowden, 2005, 527.

¹² Fowden, 2005, 528.

name of this man and says to the priest: “It seems to me best, your reverence, not to admit this man to the sanctuary. Somebody unclean has come, who met his affliction in inauspicious circumstances. Extravagant sacrifices offered when a man has not yet obtained anything from the god are not sacrifices, but excuses offered for shocking and wicked deeds”. Afterwards, Asclepius himself appears before the priest and says: “Let So-and-So keep his goods and go; he does not deserve even to have one eye”. After that it becomes known that this Cilician seduced the daughter of his wife (by her first husband), and when the wife discovered their affair she picked out her daughters’ two eyes and one eye of her husband’s (1, 10)¹³. Later on, in his conversation with the priest, Apollonius says: “The devout surely deserve good, your reverence, and the wicked the opposite. Hence, if the gods in their kindness find a man to be sincere and free from sin, they send him on his way crowned not with mere crowns of gold, but with every blessing. But if they see a man to be besmirched and corrupt, they leave him to receive his retribution, showing their anger with him only insofar as he dared to enter a holy place when not in a state of purity” (1, 11)¹⁴. It is noteworthy that the idea of “moral purity” is also present in the *Heroicus*. For example, Protesilaus cannot stand adulterers in his sanctuary, although he patronizes lovers in general (*Her.*, 16, 1).

It turns out that the real “communication” with a deity should happen without bloody sacrifices, while in the case of the “Highest” divinity one should abstain from any kind of material sacrifice at all, as this God accepts only “intellectual” sacrifices. To make such sacrifices one should possess the purity of mind and soul. Both these notions are relatively new to the antique piety. The search for virtue and the “spiritual life” in general were traditionally left for the philosophers. However, in the face of the rising Christianity, this division between morality and religion was most likely regarded as more and more inadequate by the partisans of the traditional religion. Therefore, religion and philosophy begin to merge, resulting in the Neoplatonism of Iamblichus and Proclus in the late antiquity. However, we can already see the traces of this convergence in the image of Apollonius created by Philostratus, particularly in the concept of the “bloodless sacrifice” and the “purity of soul”.

¹³ Translation by Chr.P. Jones.

¹⁴ “Πάντα” ἔφη ἄριστα, ὃ ἱερεῦ, καὶ ἀληθέστατα. ἐπεὶ τοίνυν πάντα γινώσκουσι, δοκεῖ μοι τὸν ἥκοντα ἐς θεοῦ καὶ χρηστὰ ἐαυτῷ ξυνειδόμενα τοιάνδε εὐχὴν εὐχεσθαι· ὃ θεοί, δοίητέ μοι τὰ ὀφειλόμενα· ὀφείλεται γάρ που, ὃ ἱερεῦ, τοῖς μὲν ὁσίοις τὰ ἀγαθὰ, τοῖς δὲ φαύλοις τὰναντία, καὶ οἱ θεοὶ οὖν εὖ ποιοῦντες, ὃν μὲν ἂν ὑγιαῖ τε καὶ ἄτρωτον κακίας εὕρωσι, πέμπουσι δῆπον στεφανώσαντες οὐ χρυσοῖς στεφάνοις, ἀλλ’ ἀγαθοῖς πᾶσιν, ὃν δ’ ἂν κατεστιγμένον ἴδωσι καὶ διεφθορότα, καταλείπουσι τῇ δίκῃ, τοσοῦτον αὐτοῖς ἐπιμνήσαντες, ὅσον ἐτόλμησαν καὶ ἱερὰ ἐσφοιτᾶν μὴ καθαροὶ ὄντες.”

Thus, Apollonius' renunciation of bloody sacrifice is undoubtedly connected to the concept of "spiritual sacrifice" and moral purity of soul. Therefore I believe that these ideas should be regarded not in the context of the Pythagorean doctrine, but in connection to the innovations introduced to the religious life in the Severan epoch.

"Love of God"

The suggestion that the concept of love for a deity was alien to the traditional Hellenic piety does not require additional proof. At the very least, the Classical epoch was not familiar with such a notion; and the phrase "it would be absurd if one says he's friends with Zeus" by Aristotle (*MM*, 1208 b 30), who created the "*summa*" of classical Greek mentality, confirms this conclusion once and for all¹⁵. Hellenic gods, even though they were rather immanent than transcendent to the world¹⁶, apparently did not want their mortal worshippers to love them, nor did they feel obliged to love them in return. That means that the love for a deity or the love of the deity for the mortals was not a constructive ontological condition (not even an aspect!) of the "salvation" within the frames of the traditional ancient Greek polytheistic system. Moreover, the very character of this "salvation" relates solely to this world in the majority of cases¹⁷.

In this context, the fact that until now no researcher has paid any significant deal of attention to one of the stories included in the *Heroicus* by Flavius Philostratus appears to be rather strange¹⁸. While telling a Phoenician about the heroes of the Trojan War, the Vinedresser brings up the following story:

¹⁵ Ἀποπον γὰρ ἂν εἴη εἴ τις φαίη φιλεῖν τὸν Δία. Cf. Arist., *ME*, 1239 a; *MN*, 1158 b 35, 1159 a 5. See Bremmer, 1994, 4. On the notion of the love of God in general see Schnackenburg, 2010, 1043-1045; Schmitt, 2002, 350-359.

¹⁶ For example, see Bremmer, 1994, 11-25.

¹⁷ See Burkert, 1987, 14-18. Cf. Bremmer, 1994, 6.

¹⁸ Commentaries on the dialogue by Beschoner, Aitken and Maclean, and even by Grossardt do not mention this subject at all (Beschoner, A., *Helden und Heroen, Homer und Caracalla: Übersetzung, Kommentar und Interpretationen zum Heroikos des Flavios Philostratos*, Levante, Bari, 1999; Philostratus, *Heroikos*, translated by J.K.B. Maclean and E.B. Aitken, *SBL* 1, Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, 2001 and Flavius Philostratus, *On Heroes*, translated by J.K.B. Maclean and E.B. Aitken, *SBL* 3, Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, 2003; Grossardt, P., *Einführung, Übersetzung und Kommentar zum Heroikos von Flavius Philostrat*, Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Band 33, Basel, 2006. Only Valeria Rossi (Filostrato, *Eroico*, a cura di Valeria Rossi, Marsilio, Venezia, 1997, 211) notes that "anzi si configura lessicalmente con termini molto pregnanti (*agapan*, *philein*, che rimandano a un legame affettivo molto stretto)". This remark, however, cannot be viewed as a serious study of the subject.

ἀκούω δ' ὁμῶς καὶ περὶ τοῦ Παλαμήδους ταῦτα· ἦν γεωργὸς ἐν Ἰλίῳ ταῦτόν ποτ' ἐμοὶ πράττων· οὗτος ἐπεπόνθει τι πρὸς τὸ τοῦ Παλαμήδους πάθος καὶ ἐθρήνει αὐτόν ἥκων ἐπὶ τὴν ἡίονα, πρὸς ἣ λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν βεβλήσθαι, καὶ ὅποσα νομίζουσιν ἐπὶ σημάτων ἄνθρωποι, ἐπέφερε τῇ κόνει τὰς τε ἡίδιους τῶν ἀμπέλων ἐξαιρῶν αὐτῷ κρατῆρα ἐτρύγα, καὶ ξυμπίνειν τῷ Παλαμήδει ἔφασκεν, ὅτε ἀναπαύοιτο τῶν ἔργων. ἦν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ κύων τέχῃ αἰκάλλων καὶ ὑποκαθήμενος τοὺς ἀνθρώπους· τοῦτον Ὀδυσσεὰ ἐκάλει καὶ ἐπαίετο ὑπὲρ τοῦ Παλαμήδους ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς οὗτος προσακούων κακὰ μυρία. δοκεῖ δὴ τῷ Παλαμήδει ἐπιφοιτήσai ποτε τῷ ἐραστῇ τουτῷ καὶ ἀγαθόν τι αὐτῷ δοῦναι, καὶ δῆτα ὁ μὲν πρὸς ἀμπέλῳ τινὶ ἦν γόνυ αὐτῆς ἰώμενος, ὁ δὲ ἐπιστάς αὐτῷ σὺ γινώσκεις με” ἔφη γεωργέ”; καὶ πῶς”, εἶπεν ὃν οὐπω εἶδον”; τί οὖν” ἔφη ἀγαπᾷς, ὃν μὴ γινώσκεις”; ξυνῆκεν ὁ γεωργός, ὅτι ὁ Παλαμήδης εἶη· καὶ τὸ εἶδος ἐς ἥρω ἔφερε μέγαν τε καὶ καλὸν καὶ ἀνδρεῖον οὐπω τριάκοντα ἔτη γεγονότα· καὶ περιβαλὼν αὐτόν μειδιῶν φιλῶ σε, ὦ Παλάμηδες”, εἶπεν ὅτι μοι δοκεῖς φρονιμώτατος ἀνθρώπων γεγονέναι καὶ δικαιοτάτος ἀθλητῆς τῶν κατὰ σοφίαν πραγμάτων, πεπονθέναι τε ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐλκεῖν διὰ τὰς Ὀδυσσεώς ἐπὶ σοὶ τέχνας, οὗ τάφος εἴ τις ἦν ἐνταῦθα, ἐξωρῶρυκετ' ἂν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ πάλαι, μισρὸς γὰρ καὶ κακίων τοῦ κυνός, ὃν ἐπ' αὐτῷ τρέφω.” φειδόμεθα λοιπὸν τοῦ Ὀδυσσεώς”, ὁ

I hear, nevertheless, stories about Palamedes. There was a farmer in Ilium, who did then what I do now. He had deep sympathy for Palamedes' suffering, and he used to sing a dirge for him when he visited the shore where it is said Palamedes was stoned by the Achaeans. And on the dust of Palamedes' grave he would place whatever people customarily bring to tombs. After selecting sweet grapes for him, he gathered them in a krater and said that he drank with Palamedes, when he rested from his labors. He also had a dog that fawned slyly, while lying in wait for people. This dog he called “Odysseus” and, in the name of Palamedes, this Odysseus was beaten, hearing in addition a thousand bad names. So it seemed good then to Palamedes to visit this admirer periodically and to give him something good. The farmer was, of course, at a certain grapevine, mending its joint, and Palamedes, standing by him, said, “Do you recognize me, farmer?”. He answered, “How would I recognize whom I have never seen?”. “Then do you love him whom you do not recognize?”, said the other. The farmer realized that it was Palamedes, and he reported that the hero's image was tall, beautiful, and brave, although he was not yet thirty years old. The farmer embraced him and said with a smile, “I love you, Palamedes, because you seem to me to be the most sensible of all and the more fair champion in deeds of skill. You have endured most pitiful ordeals at the Achaeans' hands because of

ἥρως ἔφη τούτων γὰρ ἐπραξάμην
αὐτὸν ἐγὼ δίκας ἐν Αἴδου· σὺ δέ,
ἐπειδὴ φιλεῖς πού τας ἀμπέλους, εἰπέ
μοι, τί μάλιστα περὶ αὐταῖς δέδοικας”,
τί δ’ ἄλλο γε” εἶπεν ἢ τας χαλάζας; ὅφ’
ὄν ἐκτυφλοῦνται τε καὶ ῥήγνυνται”.
ἰμάντα τοῖνον” εἶπεν ὁ Παλαμήδης
περιάπτωμεν μᾶ τῶν ἀμπέλων καὶ οὐ
βεβλήσονται αἱ λοιπαί.” (Her. 21)

ἐξαίρων Kayser: ἐξαίρων codd.
(om. **K**) || 7 ὑπὲρ] ὑπὸ **ΧΟ** | οὔτος om.
ΦΓ^aΓΡ^a || 8 δὴ] δὲ **ΚΟ** δήποτε **Γ** || 10
ἐμέ **V** || 11 μὴ] οὐ **HB** οὐ μὴ **Γ** || 12
ἔφερε] ἀνέφερε **AV**.

Full apparatus criticus see: de
Lannoy L., *Flavii Philostrati Heroicus*,
Teubner, Leipzig, 1977, 21-22.

Odysseus’ crafty designs against you.
If Odysseus’ s tomb had been here, I
would have dug it out long ago. He is
blood-stained and more evil than the
dog that I keep in his honor”. “Let us
spare Odysseus from now on”, the
hero said, “because for these deeds I
have exacted penalties from him in
Hades. But you, since you love the
grapevines, I suppose, tell me what
you are especially afraid could happen
to them”. “What else”, said the
farmer, “than that the hailstones will
blind and break them?”. “So then”,
said Palamedes, “let us fasten a
leather strap to one of them, and the
rest will not be hit”¹⁹.

I would like to point your attention, above all others, to the expressions
«ἀγαπᾶς, ὃν μὴ γιγνώσκεις», «φιλῶ σε, ὃ Παλάμηδες», as well as to the fact
that the farmer is called ἐραστῆς of Palamedes. As it is widely known, the Greek
language has four words to express the notion of love: στέργω, ἐράω, φιλέω and
ἀγαπάω with their derivates. While being synonyms in general, each word has
its own semantic shades²⁰.

The verb στέργω and its derivates were commonly used to express the
feeling of love between family members, friends, comrades and so on²¹.
Nevertheless, it could also be used in the religious context to express the love of
deities for places or people²². Ἐράω and its derivates usually stood for passionate
love or aspiration: sexual passion, craving for power and glory and so on²³.

The verb φιλέω, at least in the classical epoch, was used to express the
“natural” feeling of solidarity and fraternal or friendly support, or simply to
describe the friendship between family members, companions in arms, table
companions and so on. It is possible that one of the meanings of this verb, “to
kiss”, derive from the tradition of greeting friends and relatives with a kiss²⁴.

¹⁹ Translation by J. Berenson and E.B. Aitken.

²⁰ Söding, 1992, 287-288 (this is the best paper on the subject).

²¹ Söding, 1992, 287-288.

²² For example, see: Aesch., *Eum.*, 911; Aristoph., *Ran.*, 229.

²³ See Söding, 1992, 288-289.

²⁴ Söding, 1992, 290.

Starting from the classical period, this word was being used in the religious context to describe the friendly benevolence of gods towards kings, prophets, poets, cities or localities and so on. Of course, one could not call a commoner (or even himself) φιλόθεος without sufficient grounds, the word could be used only to describe those who were blessed with god's benevolence²⁵.

Ἀγαπάω and its derivatives (particularly ἀγάπη and ἀγάπησις)²⁶ originally meant "to be constant with smth."²⁷, "to aspire to smth.", "to value smth.", "to prefer smth.". From the 4th century on the use of this word in its original meaning seems to have been reduced, while the number of cases in which the verb is used to describe a feeling towards people increases. The word is more and more frequently used to describe love and respect towards a guest, an ally, a friend or a patron²⁸. In the same period, the word acquires the meaning of deity's love of a certain person (a king) or a city in religious contexts²⁹. It is interesting that in the 5th-4th centuries, the verb φιλέω was used more frequently by the Greek writers than the verb ἀγαπάω. In this epoch, the latter has a more distinct semantic emphasis of evaluation, interest, disposition and preference³⁰. Nevertheless, I would not be as categorical as Thomas Söding in asserting the almost absolute synonymy of these two verbs. If they were in fact absolute synonyms in the classical epoch, such a subtle stylist as Plato would not have "played" with their meanings in his *Lysis*: Ὁ δὲ μὴ του δεόμενος οὐδὲ τι ἀγαπῶν ἄν... Ὁ δὲ μὴ ἀγαπῶν, οὐδ' ἂν φιλοῖ (*Lys.*, 215 b). This phrase makes us think that these words are more likely to stand for co-dependent notions belonging to one sphere rather than to represent absolute synonyms. Later,

²⁵ Söding, 1992, 291-292. On φιλέω and φιλία in general see: Kienzl, P., *Die Theorie der Liebe und Freundschaft bei Platon*, Diss., Wien, 1941; Steinberger, J., *Begriff und Wesen der Freundschaft bei Aristoteles und Cicero*, Erlangen, 1955; Klein, E., *Studien zum Problem der "römischen" und "griechischen" Fremdschaft*, Diss., München, 1957; Steinmetz, F.-A., *Die Fremdschaftslehre des Panaitius. Nach einer Analyse von Ciceros "Laelius de amicitia"*, Palingenesia 3, Wiesbaden, 1967; Fraisse, J.-C., *La notion d'amitié dans la philosophie antique*, Vrin, Paris, 1974. On φιλανθρωπία in classical literature of the later epoch see Kabiersch, J., *Untersuchungen zum Begriff der Philanthropia bei dem Kaiser Julian*, Klass.-Philolog. Studien 21, Würzburg, 1960. On φιλόθεος see Peterson, 1923, 161-202.

²⁶ Söding, 1992, 296 sqq. See also Tromp de Ruiter, S., *Gebruik en betekenis van ΑΓΑΠΑΝ in de griekse literatuur*, Groningen-Den Haag, 1930; Peterson, 1932, 378-382; Tarelli, 1950, 64-67; Ceresa-Gastaldo, 1951, 269-306; Ceresa-Gastaldo, 1953, 1-10, 347-356; Ceresa-Gastaldo, 1954, 408-409; Wischmeyer, 1978, 212-238; Schwarz, 1992, 19-29.

²⁷ For example, see Plat., *Pol.*, 330 b; Thuc., IV, 36, 4. Cf. Suda, s.v. ἀγαπᾶν τὸ ἀρκεῖσθαι τινι καὶ μὴδὲν πλέον ἐπιζητεῖν.

²⁸ See Söding, 1992, 296.

²⁹ For example, see Demosth., *Or.*, 16, 9; Ps.-Demosth., *Erot.*, § 9, 30; *OGIS*, 90, 4.

³⁰ See Söding, 1992, 298.

starting with the 3rd century, the verb φιλέω loses ground and gives way to the verb ἀγαπάω, which most likely becomes the universal word for describing “love for a person” (usually a non-related person, but not in all instances) in the Hellenic *koine*. In the language of the *Septuagint*, the verb ἀγαπάω is used to define the “love of God” and “God’s love for people” for the first time³¹. The pagan neighbours of the Jews also gladly used the verb in the religious context. For example, the inscriptions of the Temple of Mandulis in Kalabshah hand down a formula that was most likely of ceremonial character: ἐνθα σε ἔγνων, Μανδοῦλι, / ἥλιον τὸν παντεπόπτην δεσπότην, ἀπάντων βασιλέα, / Αἰδὼνα παντοκράτορα· ὃ τῶν εὐτυχεστάτων λαῶν τῶν κατοικούντων, / ἦν ὁ ἥλιος Μανδοῦλις ἀγαπᾷ, τὴν ἱερὰν Τάλμιν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ὑπὸ / τὰ σκά[πτρα τῆς εὐε]θείρας μυριωνύμου Ἰσιδος³² (*Temple de Kalabchah*, 241, 4/a). And finally, in the New Testament the verb ἀγαπάω occurs 320 times. The Synoptists cite the love of God, the love of one’s neighbour (Mt., 22, 35-40; Mk., 12, 28-34; Lk., 10, 25-28) and one’s enemy (Mt., 5, 43-48; 10, 25-28) as the main commandment³³.

The love for a deity appears in the texts of pagan writers only in the 1st century AD. I will not address the 47th epistle of Seneca³⁴ as this research deals mainly with Greek literature. The first and almost the only example of this

³¹ The verb ἀγαπάω occurs in LXX 277 times (ἀγάπησις 12 times), στέργω 1 time (Sir., 27, 17), στοργή 4 times, ἐρᾶσθαι 3 times, and φιλεῖν 33 times. See Söding, 1992, 299 sqq. On the acquisition of the meaning ‘love of God’ by the verb ἀγαπάω see also Chantraine, 1999 (s.v. ἀγαπάω). I think the joint usage of the verbs ἀγαπάω and στέργω in a Roman era inscription from Amargos, unnoticed by Söding (*IG*, XII, 7407, v. 15: ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν πάνυ ἐπ’ ἀξιώματος / στέργεσθαι τε καὶ ἀγαπᾶσθαι αὐτήν), as well as that of the nouns ἀγάπη and στοργή in an inscription from Euboea dating back to the same epoch (*IG*, XII, 9856, v. 4-5: Τροφίμη χαῖρε / πολλῆς στοργῆς καὶ ἀγάπης ἀνδρὶ σωφροσύνῃς / περὶ τὸ ζῆν ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀείμνηστον / ἀφεῖς ἀρετὴν τοῖς σοῖς / κηδομένοις) is also worth mentioning.

³² It is interesting that Isis herself in *POxy.*, 1380 (109) is called ἀγάπη θεῶν. On this subject see Roberts, C.H., *ΑΓΑΠΗ in the Invocation of Isis*, in *JEA*, 39, 1953, 114; Witt, 1969, 209 sqq.; Griffith, 1978, 147-151; Manteuffel, 1928, 161-167; West, S., *An Alleged Pagan Use of Αγάπη in POxy 1380*, in *JTS*, 18, 1967, 142-143; West, 1969, 228-229.

³³ See also in Paul’s epistles on love of (1 Cor., 2, 9; 8, 3; Rom., 8, 28), and love of Christ (1 Cor., 16, 22 – φιλεῖν).

³⁴ Seneca, *Epist.*, 47, 18: “*Dicet aliquis nunc me vocare ad pilleum servos et dominos de fastigio suo deicere, quod dixi, ‘colant potius dominum quam timeant’. Ita inquit ‘prorsus? colant tamquam clientes, tamquam salutatores?’ Hoc qui dixerit obliviscetur id dominis parum non esse quod deo sat est. Qui colitur, et amatur: non potest amor cum timore misceri*”.

notion's use prior to Philostratus is the "Olympic" oration by Dion of Prusa (an author much respected by Philostratus)³⁵:

*"For precisely as infant children when torn away from father or mother are filled with terrible longing and desire, and stretch out their hands to their absent parents often in their dreams, so also do men to the gods, rightly loving them for their beneficence and kinship, and being eager in every possible way to be with them and to hold converse with them. Consequently many of the barbarians, because they lack artistic means and find difficulty in employing them, name mountains gods, and unhewn trees, too, and unshapen stones, things which are by no means whatever more appropriate in shape than is the human form"*³⁶.

Now we should go back to the text of Philostratus. The evolution of the Hellenic religious mentality is pretty obvious, at least that of the intellectuals of the Imperial epoch: it came to the notion of the love of God. And if Dio in the 1st century talks about some vague "gods" (θεοί) or a "deity" (δαίμόνιον), Philostratus' farmer "loves" and actual hero, Palamedes.

It is logical to ask the following question here: why did the Hellenic religious mentality that managed without the "love of God" for so long, suddenly feel the need for it in the Roman epoch? I think one might suppose that it is a fruit of the natural development of all the aspects of the ancient (in this case Greek) society, economic, social, political and, of course, religious.

The notion of "πίστις" appears in the Hellenistic epoch. One should interpret this word not as "faith", but as "loyalty" to certain divinities, which by itself indicates the revolution in the polis polytheistic mentality. And even though the polis itself did not pass away before it turned into the Christian town, the inhabitants of the cities grew more and more apolitical and dove deeper into the ever-expanding sphere of the "private life". A person became less and less attached to the collective "we" of a polis, and started associating himself with the "we" of a family or a religious group.

³⁵ Even though in the *Lives of the Sophists* Philostratus puts him in the ὑπὲρ τῶν φιλοσοφησάντων ἐν δόξῃ τοῦ σοφιστεῦσαι category.

³⁶ Ἀτεχνῶς γὰρ ὥσπερ νήπιοι παῖδες πατὴρ ἢ μητὴρ ἀπεσπασμένοι δεινὸν ἕμερον ἔχοντες καὶ πόθον ὀρέγουσι χεῖρας οὐ παροῦσι πολλάκις ὀνειρώττοντες, οὕτω καὶ θεοῖς ἄνθρωποι ἀγαπῶντες δικαίως διὰ τε εὐεργεσίαν καὶ συγγένειαν, προθυμούμενοι πάντα τρόπον συνεῖναι τε καὶ ὁμιλεῖν· ὥστε καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων πενία τε καὶ ἀπορία τέχνης ὅρη θεοῦ ἐπινομάζουσι καὶ δένδρα ἀργὰ καὶ ἀσήμους λίθους, οὐδαμῇ [οὐδαμῶς] οἰκειότερα τῆς μορφῆς (Dio Chrys., 12, 61). Translation by J.W. Cohoon. Cf. Dio Chrys., 12, 32: ἐπινοοῦντες οὐκ ἐδύναντο μὴ θαυμάζειν καὶ ἀγαπᾶν τὸ δαίμόνιον.

Due to the dramatic increase in the interest towards the mystery cults as well as to the existing tradition of deification of monarchs, who were perceived as “parents” by their subjects, the Roman Imperial epoch saw the birth of the belief that a personal meeting with a deity and a certain kind of “salvation” is accessible to everyone. And of course the spreading Christianity with its active missionary position and the “Good News” of the universal salvation also contributed greatly to this evolution. All these phenomena (and I have listed only the most obvious ones) could not fail to have a destructive effect on the traditional Hellenic religious mentality, which in its turn resulted in the activization of hero cults on the break of the 2nd century AD. Samson Eitrem provides us with extensive data on this subject in his famous article³⁷.

I believe that it is no accident that it was the *heroes* that became the most worshiped in this epoch, as a hero could be truly *loved* by a worshiper. A hero is essentially a *human* being (or a half-deity), while a traditional Hellenic deity has only human looks and passions, nothing else, at least as described by Homer. One could feel love towards a half-human half-divine hero, as he was capable of loving the worshiper in return, as did Palamedes in the above-cited story. A hero differs from an ordinary mortal only as he is freed from his human body and is close to the deities. And, according to Philostratus, he was granted not only traditional heroic *ἐναγίσματα*, but also divine *θεστίαι*.

To sum up, I would like to stress the following aspects: the notion of the “love of god” appears in the Hellenic religious mentality on the turn of the Hellenistic epoch. By the 3rd century AD, the missionary activity of the Christians and the widespread popularity of the mystery cults (which, just like the myths about the resurrecting heroes, reproduce the archetypical Mediterranean myth of a dying and resurrecting divinity in their “sacred stories”), some of which came from the East but assumed a Hellenic appearance, as well as the complicated political situation on the eastern borders of the Empire made Philostratus put forward the *amor herois* as a means to defend the “pure” Hellenism from the barbaric incursion of the Sasanids and the syncretic religious cults (the Christianity being not the least important of them).

Bibliography

- Beschorner, A. (1999), *Helden und Heroen, Homer und Caracalla: Übersetzung, Kommentar und Interpretationen zum Heroikos des Flavios Philostratos*, Levante, Bari.
- Bremmer, J.N. (1994), *Greek Religion, Greece & Rome. New Surveys in the Classics*, № 24, Oxford.
- Burkert, W. (1987), *Ancient Mystery Cults*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

³⁷ See Eitrem, 1929, 1-56.

- Burkert, W. (1985), *Greek Religion*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Ceresa-Gastaldo, A. (1954), *Ancora sull'uso profano di ΑΓΑΠΗ*, in *RFIC*, 32, p. 408-409.
- Ceresa-Gastaldo, A. (1951), *Ἀγάπη nei documenti anteriori al Nuovo Testamento*, in *Aegyptus*, 31, p. 269-306.
- Ceresa-Gastaldo, A. (1953), *Ἀγάπη nei documenti estranei all'influsso biblico*, in *RFIC*, 31, 1-10, p. 347-356.
- Chantraine, P. (1999), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, Paris.
- Eitrem, S. (1929), *Zu Philostrats Heroikos*, in *Symbolae Osloenses*, 8, p. 1-56.
- Eusèbe de Césarée (1979), *La préparation évangélique. Livres IV-V*, 1-17, Introduction et annotation par Odile Zink, révisé par Éd. Des Places, Paris (SC, 262).
- Ferguson, E. (1980), *Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and Its Environment*, in *ANRW*, II, 23.2, p. 1151-1189.
- Filostrato, *Eroico*, edited by Valeria Rossi, Marsilio, Venice, 1997.
- Flavius Philostratus (2003), *On Heroes*, translated by J.K.B. Maclean and E.B. Aitken, *SBL* 3, Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta.
- Fowden, G. (2005), *Late Polytheism. The World-View*, in *CAH*, XII, p. 521-537.
- Fraisse, J.-C. (1974), *La notion d'amitié dans la philosophie antique*, Vrin, Paris.
- Griffith, J.G. (1978), *Isis and the "Love of the Gods"*, in *JTS*, 29, p. 147-151.
- Grossardt, P. (2006), *Einführung, Übersetzung und Kommentar zum Heroikos von Flavius Philostrat*, Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Band 33, Basel.
- Hanson, R.P.C. (1980), *The Christian Attitude to Pagan Religions up to the Time of Constantine the Great*, in *ANRW*, II, 23.2, p. 910-973.
- Kabiersch, J. (1960), *Untersuchungen zum Begriff der Philanthropia bei dem Kaiser Julian*, Klass.-Philolog. Studien 21, Würzburg.
- Kienzl, P. (1941), *Die Theorie der Liebe und Freundschaft bei Platon*, Diss., Wien.
- Klein, E. (1957), *Studien zum Problem der "römischen" und "griechischen" Fremdschaft*, Diss., München.
- Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. (2000), *Religion*, in *CAH*, XI, p. 984-1008.
- Manteuffel, G. (1928), *Quelques notes sur le Pap. Oxy 1380*, in *Revue de Philologie*, 54, p. 161-167.
- Norden, Ed. (1913), *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*, Leipzig-Berlin.
- Peterson, E. (1923), *Der Gottesfreund*, in *ZGK*, 42, p. 161-202.
- Peterson, E. (1932), *Ἀγάπη*, in *BZ*, 20, p. 378-382.
- Petzke, G. (1970), *Die Traditionen über Apollonius von Tyana und das Neue Testament*, E.J. Brill, Leiden.
- Philostratus, *Apollonius of Tyana. Letters of Apollonius. Ancient Testimonia. Eusebius's Reply to Hierocles* (2006), edited and translated by Ch.P. Jones, Harvard.
- Philostratus, *Heroikos* (2001), translated by J.K.B. Maclean and E.B. Aitken, *SBL* 1, Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta.
- Roberts, C.H. (1953), *ΑΓΑΠΗ in the Invocation of Isis*, in *JEA*, 39.
- Schmitt, H.-Chr., Morgen, M. et alii. (2002), *Liebe Gottes u. Liebe zu Gott*, in *Religion in Geschichte u. Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie u. Religionswissenschaft*, 4te Aufl., Bd. 5, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.
- Schnackenburg, R. (2010), *Liebe Gottes*, in *LTK*, p. 1043-1045.

- Schwarz, J. (1992), Ἀγάπη, in *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, herausgegeben von H. Belz und G. Schneider, Bd. I, 2te Aufl., Stuttgart, Berlin-Köln.
- Söding, Th. (1992), *Das Wortfeld der Liebe im paganen und biblischen Griechisch. Philologischen Beobachtungen an der Wurzel ἀγαπ-*, in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 68, 4, p. 284-330.
- Steinberger, J. (1955), *Begriff und Wesen der Freundschaft bei Aristoteles und Cicero*, Erlangen.
- Steinmetz, F.-A. (1967), *Die Fremdschaftslehre des Panaitius. Nach einer Analyse von Ciceros "Laelius de amicitia"*, Palingenesia 3, Wiesbaden.
- Tarelli, C.C. (1950), Ἀγάπη, in *JTS*, 1, p. 64-67.
- Tromp de Ruiter, S. (1930), *Gebruik en beteekenis van ΑΓΑΠΙΑ in de grieksche litteratuur*, Groningen-Den Haag.
- Turcan, R. (1984), *Les motivations de l'intolerance chrétienne et la fin du mithraïsme au III^e siècle ap. J.-C.*, in *Proceedings of the VIIth Congress of the International Federation of Societies for Classical Studies*, Budapest, p. 209-226.
- West, S. (1969), *A Further note on Ἀγάπη in POxy 1380*, in *JTS*, 20, p. 228-229.
- West, S. (1967), *An Alleged Pagan Use of Ἀγάπη in POxy 1380*, in *JTS*, 18, p. 142-143.
- Wischmeyer, O. (1978), *Vorkommen und Bedeutung von Agape in der außerchristlichen Antike*, in *ZNW*, 69, p. 212-238.
- Witt, R.E. (1969), *The Use of Ἀγάπη in POxy 1380*, in *JTS*, 19, 209 sqq.