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ABSTRACT

The figure of the sorcerer Pancrates in Lucian’s tale of The Sorcerer’s Apprentice at Philopseudes 33-36 alludes to the traditions relating to Hadrian’s poet Pancrates Epicus and to those relating to his supposed magical guru Pachrates. These traditions are argued to have had a common origin, and new arguments are advanced for this position. Lucian further exploits the significance of Pancrates’ name (“All-powerful”) in relation to that of a well-established character-type within his stock-in-trade, Exaretus (“Well-powerful”), who is accordingly cast in the role of his apprentice. Pancrates’ focal spell, the animation of the pestle for domestic service, reflects the themes and concerns of contemporary magical practice as documented in the papyri. Admiratory Cynic imagery, of a sort found elsewhere in the Philopseudes, may be latent both in the figure of Pancrates and in his pestle.

The famous tale of The Sorcerer’s Apprentice, now known principally from the works of Goethe and Disney,1 originates among the “lying” stories related in Lucian’s dialogue Philopseudes or ‘Liar of Lies.’ 2 Here Tychides gives his friend

---

* I acknowledge with gratitude the significant contributions made to the development of this paper by: the staff of the department of Classics, Near and Far Eastern and Religious Studies at UNISA; the staff of the Classics Department in the University of Natal at Pietermaritzburg, where an incunabular version was delivered in 2001; and the anonymous AClassic references.

1 Johann Wolfgang Goethe wrote his ballad Der Zauberkathadin in 1779. The subsequent verse-narrative by A.C.W. Stirling (1767-1840), Its harling van Pankrates (the text of which may be found at Leopold 1969/1, 275-77), retained more faithfully to the Lucianic text, from which it retrieved the character names. Goethe’s ballad further inspired Paul Dukas’ symphonic scherzo, L’apprenti sorciére (1897), now best known for its part in Walt Disney’s 1940 film Fantasia, wherein the role of the apprentice is taken by Mickey Mouse. More recently, the theme is reflected in Tahir Shah’s Indian travelogue, Sorcerer’s Apprentice (Shah 1998).

2 For general discussions of this episode, see the standard commentaries on the text ad loc. Müller 1932 and Schwartz 1951 are substantial; Altin 1993 and Elsner et al. 2001
Philoctes an account of the gathering of philosophers he has just witnessed at the house of the rich Eucrates (the Platonist Ion, the Peripatetic Cleomedes, the Stoic Diogenarchus and the Pythagorean Arigotos; the Hippocratic Antigonus also attends). Tychiadés' frustration has mounted as the credulous symposiasts have attempted to convince him of the efficacy of magic and the reality of supernatural intervention in human life by telling him fantastic stories, supposedly of their own experience. The Sorcerer's Apparition is the last complete tale to be delivered, and comes from the mouth of Eucrates, none other than the erstwhile apprentice himself. Eucrates not only presides as host but is personally responsible for four of the ten main tales recounted. He is, accordingly, probably to be considered the 'Lover of lies' of the work's title.1

33. 'But I'll tell you another story, one in which I was a participant, not one I heard from someone else. When you hear this, Tychiadés, perhaps even you will be persuaded of the truth of the narrative. I was in Egypt at the time. I was still a young man, and had been sent there by my father for my education. I was eager to sail up to Coptus and from there to go to the statue of Mennon to hear the marvelous sound it makes before the rising sun. The common experience is to hear some meaningless voice from it, but Mennon actually gave me a prophecy, opening his mouth to utter seven words. If it were not irrelevant, I would have told you the words.

34. 'We happened to be accompanied on the voyage up the Nile by a man of Memphis, one of the sacred scribes. His wisdom was marvelous and he had had the full Egyptian training. It was said that he had lived underground for twenty-three years in a crypt whilst being trained in magic by Isis.'2

You're speaking of Pancrates,' said Arigotos. 'He was my teacher: a holy man, always shaven, thoughtful, speaking his Greek with a heavy

have less to say. Note also the discussions in the two German dissertations devoted to magic and superstition in Lucian, Herzig 1940:27-28 and Koefler 1949:134-37.

1 It is more likely that the work's title is singular, i.e. Φασίσκος το ἔρως, 'Lover of lies', as opposed to Φασίσκοι το ἔρως, 'Lovers of lies'. The MS unanimously offer the singular form, and indeed no one thought to question this until Hartmann 1877 and then Rothstein 1888. If the singular title does not refer directly to Eucrates, it may alternatively refer more abstractly to the credulous character-type sinned more generally in the dialogue. Either way, we should not be swayed unduly by the occurrence of the (accusative) plural form Φασίσκες το ἔρως, 'lovers of lies', in §2 of the dialogue.

2 The achievement of a one-to-one encounter with a deity (ῥήτουργία) for revelation was often a goal of magical activity. Cf. PGAM IV.778-829, 930-1114; VII.505-28 and (Callisthenes) Alexander Romanus 6 (Nectanebo). See PGAM vol. 3 i.e. Ῥήτουργία B and Ῥήτουργία.
accent, long and thin, snub-nosed, with protruding lips and rather skinny legs."

"Yes, that's Pancreates!" He said. "At first I didn't know who he was, but when I saw him performing all sorts of miracles every time we put to, most notably riding on crocodiles and swimming with the animals, while they fawned upon him and wagged their tails, I realised that he was a holy man, and by being nice to him I became a friend and comrade by gradual and imperceptible stages. As a result, he shared all his secrets with me.

Eventually he persuaded me to leave all my servants behind in Memphis, and to accompany him, the two of us on our own. For, he explained, we would not want for attendants. This is how we lived thenceforth.

"Whenever we came to an inn, he would take the wooden bar from the door or the broom or even the pestle, dress it in a cloak, utter some incantation over it and make it walk. It would seem human to everyone else. It would go off and pump water, buy provisions and prepare them, and in all respects be a perfect servant and attendant for us. Then, when he no longer required its services, he would speak another incantation over it and make the broom a broom again or the pestle a pestle again.

"I was eager to acquire this power, but I had no way of learning this from him, for he was jealous of it, although openly generous with everything else. But then one day I secretly eavesdropped on the incantation – it consisted of three syllables – by lurking in the dark. He then went off to the market after giving the pestle its instructions.

"Yes, that's Pancreates!" said Dinomachus, "do you know how to do that, to make a man out of a pestle?"

"Yes indeed," he said, "well – half of it. For I still cannot return it to its former state, once it has become a water-carrier. But if I perform
the spell now our house will be deluged as water is continuously drawn into it.’
(Lucian, *Philopatres* 33-36)\(^1\)

This paper seeks to develop an understanding of some of the games played by Lucian in this episode and to do so by locating both the figure of the sorcerer Pancrates and his focal magical feat, his animation of the pestle, in their ancient historical and literary contexts. The first three parts are accordingly devoted to the contextualisation of Pancrates and that of his pestle. The fourth part builds upon these to ask whether some Cynic imagery may also be latent in the representations of both Pancrates and his pestle.

**Pancrates: the historical context**

Two broad issues must be addressed if we are to understand the archaeology of the figure of Pancrates. First: Does the figure make reference to any historical individual, or to the legend of any historical individual? And secondly: What is the significance of the figure both in the context of Graeco-Roman literature in general, and in that of the *Philopatres* itself and of Lucian’s wider oeuvre?

Cases have also been made that the figure of Pancrates reflects one of a series of more-or-less historical figures, the candidates being (H)ermouphis, Apion Grammaticus, Pancrates Epicus and Pachrates.

The least compelling candidate is Harnouphis or Armouphis. While the literary sources for him might have led us to doubt his existence, an inscription from Aquileia testifies to the historicity of the man: ‘Harnouphis, sacred scribe (*ἱερογράμματος*) of Egypt and Terentius Priscus [sc. make this dedication] to the Goddess Manifest [i.e. Isis]’\(^2\). His finest hour came in 172 AD when he supposedly produced a rain miracle for the benefit of Marcus Aurelius’ thirsty army as they faced the Quadri, by calling up a series of demons, including Hermes-Aerios.\(^3\) So, like Pancrates, Harnouphis was a native Egyptian and a *ἱερογράμματος* (cf. *Philopatres* 24, *ἱερόν γραμματέων*), and he could

\(^1\) The translation is based on Macleod’s *OCT* edition (Macleod 1972-87, vol. 2). None of Nesselrath’s suggested revisions to Macleod’s *Philopatres* text (1984:583, 589, 607) bear upon these chapters.

\(^2\) Inscription published at Gau 1948:19-20.

\(^3\) Dio Cass. 72.8.4 and Suda s.v. *Ἔρημος*, the latter noting that others attributed the miracle rather to Julian the Chaldæan, father of Julian the Theurge.
summon up assistant demons of some sort. Furthermore, his form coincided with that of Lucian’s literary career.9

The second candidate, the sorcerer Apion Grammaticus of Alexandria, another native Egyptian, was known to the Rome of Tiberius and Caligula.9 Pliny treats of Apion repeatedly and sometimes explicitly as a liar, a theme of special resonance for the Philogonous in general. A particular example of his supposed lying (savati) is found in his claim to have called up the ghost of Homer and in his subsequent refusal to divulge what the ghost had told him.9 This refusal could perhaps be compared with Pancrates’ refusal to divulge his animation spell. Like Pancrates too Apion sailed up the Nile to visit Memnon, who sighed to him three times. Apion himself inscribed the statue accordingly, with a legend that can still be read today, and perhaps started the trend amongst Greek and Roman tourists for so doing.11 Memnon’s response to Apion may put us in mind of the exceptional personal response Eucrates claims to have received from him. Among Apion’s works was an Agrippa in which he recorded the wonders of Egypt. He professed autops of all these wonders, which included the miraculous control of wild animals (most notably in the tale of Androcles and the lion), a capacity similarly claimed for Pancrates.12 Apion also wrote a book On the mage or perhaps On Homer as a mage, in which he told of the powers of a mage called Pases, who, amongst other things, had the ability to conjure up dinners out of thin air.13 Pases’ interest in domestic-service magic is perhaps not too far removed from the water-fetching of the Apprentice.14

9 Guy 1948 has full sources for and discussion of this figure and his ‘rain miracle’. Cf. also Dickie 2001:206. Schwartz 1951:16 and on §§12 and 34 contemplates but ultimately rejects Hamnopious as a model for Pancrates. However, he speculates that the official recognition accorded to magic following his miracle may have inspired the Philogonous in a more general way. Incidentally, if Hamnopious were to be taken seriously as a model for Pancrates, then 172 Αω, the point of his particular fame, would presumably become a terminus post quem for the composition of the Philogonous, as Schwartz realized.

10 Apion is FGrH 616.

11 Plin. NH 30.18.

12 Bertrand & Bertrand 1968b no. 71, with p. 165.

13 Aat. Geil. 5.14 (FGrH 616 T5 and 16a).

14 Vesta i.e. Bärnicht. He had also manufactured a half-ohol coin that he could call back to himself whenever he wished after spending it.

15 See the excellent review of the evidence for Apion at Dickie 2001:212-16, with interesting observations on the phenomenon of native-Egyptian interpreters of the culture of Egypt for Greek visitors, and an awareness of the significance of Apion for Pancrates (but not Eucrates’ role as apprentice is here foisted onto Tychiades).
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Although these cases may seem superficially attractive, the projection of these two men in the literary sources (including in Apion’s case his own), upon which the bulk of the case for the comparison must rest, are themselves subject to the same normative, conceptual pressures as is the representation of Lucian’s Pancrates itself. Thus, most of the ostensible correspondences between the historical portraits of the men and the literary portrait of Pancrates may well be explicable simply with reference to the fact that in both cases the portraits salute the same, essentially literary, stereotype.

If there is a possibility, therefore, of establishing a more tangible bridge between Pancrates and a historical individual, it will have to depend upon an even higher and more specialised degree of coincidence in representation, or upon a closer coincidence in name. On the latter basis, two more intriguing potential historical models for Lucian’s sorcerer may be considered: The first is Pancrates ‘Epicus’, the native-Egyptian writer of Greek epic who flourished under Hadrian. Athenaeus provides us with the following testimony:

Since I mentioned Alexandria, I am aware that they have in that beautiful city a garland they call the Antinous, which is made from the similarly named lotus. This grows in the marshes in the season of summer. It comes in two colours, one of which resembles the rose. It is a garland woven from this one that is properly given the name Antinous. The other one is called Latina, and has a blue colour. Pancrates, a poet from the native population (Τοὺς ἑπεξεργάζοντας Ποιητήδες), whom we actually knew, showed me the rose-like lotus as a wonderful thing to the emperor Hadrian (Ἀκαμαῖος τῷ ἀποκράτητος) when he was visiting Alexandria. He said that one should call it Antinous since it had sprung up from the ground when the blood of the Moorish lion had soaked into it, the lion that Hadrian had slain in a hunt in that part of Libya adjacent to Alexandria. This was a huge beast and it had long been ranging over the whole of Libya, robbing many parts of its uninhabitable. Hadrian was delighted with this new inventive idea and granted him lifetime dining rights in the Museum … In his poem Pancrates says, not without polish:

… Wooly thyme, white lily and purple hyacinth and petals of blue celandine and the rose opened by the spring zephyrs, for the flower named after Antinous grew not yet.

(Athenaeus 677d-f, including Pancrates F3 Hetzsch)

In all, three fragments of Pancrates’ hexameter mini-epic on the lion hunt of Hadrian and Antinous survive, one of which is substantial, narrating Hadrian casting his spear at the lion but deliberately wounding it only, so as to allow
Antinous to take a strike.\(^{15}\) The hunt took place in early September, 130 AD. In the next month, October, began the trip up the Nile on which Antinous was to die.\(^{16}\) Bowie contends that the poem could not, for taste, have been composed after the death of Antinous, and thus that it was written, quickly, immediately after the hunt.\(^{17}\) I, however, so far from perceiving a threat of poor taste here, consider that such a poem, with its evident promotion of a memorial flower (and note Hadrian’s own keenness to memorialise Antinous, discussed below), would have functioned well as a tribute to the dead youth.\(^{18}\) And it may well be significant that lotus garlands were particularly associated with the deified drowned, as Antinous was to become.\(^{19}\) So far there is little here, admittedly, beyond the coincidence of name to suggest that this poet has any role in the archaeology of Lactantius’ tale.\(^{20}\)

The second candidate is Pachrates, an Egyptian ‘prophet of Heliopolis’ mentioned in association with Hadrian in the Greek Magical Papyri. He is cited as the source for a burnt offering to be used in the course of a multi-purpose spell:

Burnt offering, Pachrates the prophet of Heliopolis (Προφήτης Ἡλείων) demonstrated it (εἰς διάκονον), when demonstrating the power of his divine magic to the emperor Hadrian (Ἁριωνὸς ἑαυτῷ). For it fetched a person within an hour; it sent someone to their sickbed within two hours; it killed within seven hours; and it sent dreams upon the emperor himself as he personally made trial of Pachrates’ magic. He was so impressed by the prophet that he commanded that he should be given double rations.

\(^{15}\) For these see Heischn 1963:51-54, no. xv (Pachrates). The edēs prinax of the substantial lion-hunt fragment (with translation and commentary) is to be found at Hunt 1911:37-77, no. 1085 (‘Pachrates, Hadrian and Antinous’). In addition to the three lion-hunt fragments, Heischn also reproduces for Pachrates a dubious ascribed elegiac couplet. Note also Plut. Mor. 1137ε, excluded from Heischn. For discussion see Bowie 1999:81-83; cf. also Herzog 1942:7-88; Schwartz 1951 on §34; Jones 1986:49-50; Albini 1993:104 n. 64; Anderson 1994:1438.

\(^{16}\) For the chronology of Hadrian’s great 121-125 journey, with sources and analysis, see Weber 1907:88-198 and 277-79.


\(^{18}\) As did von Fritz 1949:a.615.

\(^{19}\) Follet 1968:66.

\(^{20}\) Although Dessau 1924-30:680 speculated that he may have made himself the hero of a magical adventure and so acquired the name of a magician for himself, cf. also Caser 1937:333-34.
PGM IV, the largest of the formularies among the Greek Magical Papyri, was written in the fourth century AD, although it is thought to reflect a second-century AD original. Preissendanz suggests that the name Pancrates should be understood in Egyptian terms as meaning ‘The Child’, i.e. ‘Horus’.21

Now, the traditions relating to these two men, Pancrates Epicus and Pachrates, both Egyptians, both with the emperor Hadrian’s ear and both rewarded by the emperor with dining privileges, may well have had a common origin. While this may have been suspected before, a more specific indication that it was so has been overlooked.22 This indication is found in the verbal similarities between Athenaeus’ note on Pancrates Epicus and that of PGM IV on Pachrates (Παυκράτης/Παχράκης: παιδής + gen. / προφήτης + gen.; ἐπισκέπτεσθαι/ἐπεθέπται: Ἀδραύνας + αὐτοκράτωρ / Ἀδραύνας ἔσχατος).23 Do ‘Pancrates’ and ‘Pachrates’ represent different degrees of hellenisation of a native Egyptian name?24 Such considerations could also explain his transition in the tradition from poet of the natives to prophet of Heliopolis. If we may identify Pancrates Epicus and Pachrates, then we can deduce that the tradition came to represent Pancrates as a magical guru to Hadrian. Now, if the figure that was held to have celebrated Atenius after his death and the figure that was ultimately held to have demonstrated magic to Hadrian were one and the same, we may permit ourselves a further speculation. It is likely to have been the fantasies spun around this figure that lay behind the tradition that Hadrian actually had Atenius offer up his own life so that he could exploit his willing ghost for necromantic divination:

In Egypt too he [Hadrian] rebuilt the city named for Atenius [Antinoopolis]. Atenius was from the city of Bithynia in Bithynia, also known as Claudionopolis. He had been his catamite, and died in

21 Preissendanz & Henrichs 1973: 74; ad loc. 1942 (p. 74-75).
23 Weber 1907:281 n. 1 comes closest to making this point.
24 Or does the name ‘Pachrates’ of the papyrus represent an attempt, somewhere in the developing tradition, to re-Egyptianise the name Pancrates, with a view to imbuing it with the magical authority associated with that culture? Technically the name-forms differ only in the degree of nasalisation and aspiration of the velar. For broader questions of Hellenisation in Lucian’s day, see Swain 1996 and Whitmarsh 2001. It is not of concern that Athenaeus makes no reference here to the magical associations Pancrates acquired in the wider tradition: he is interested in the historical figure and his tangible writings.
Egypt, either after falling into the Nile, as Hadrian writes, or after being sacrificed, as the truth is. Hadrian was generally very middle-some, as I said, and used divinations and sorceries of all kinds. And so he gave honour to Antinous in this way, either because of his desire for him or because he had gone to his death voluntarily (for he needed a willing soul for his project). He founded a city in the place of his death and named it after him. And he dedicated statues of him over almost the entirety of the known world, or, rather, sacred images of him.

(Dio Cassius 69.11)

Dio specifies that, according to one view, Hadrian wanted necromantic divination. The principal medium of necromantic divination throughout antiquity was precisely the dream, and Pachrates, the papyrus tells us, sent dreams upon the emperor. The evident hostility towards Hadrian of the tradition reported by Dio and Dio’s slight tentativeness in asserting its truth are immaterial to the case advanced here, which depends only upon the existence of the tradition, not its truth. Even so, the notion that Antinous had left behind a magically exploitable ghost long continued to thrive. The most graphic and famous of the voodoo dolls from the Graeco-Roman world is the third- or fourth-century AD Louvre doll, thought to have been found in Antinoopolis itself. The clay doll consists of a reasonably well-fashioned female figure pierced by thirteen needles. It was accompanied, in its pot, by a lead curse tablet of erotic attraction made by one Sarapanmon against a woman Prolemais. The curse is addressed to the ghost (μαθαίνων) of Antinous for its enactment. This doll-and-curse-tablet assemblage have been produced in accordance with a recipe closely similar to another one in the PGH IV formulary.

If Lucian’s Pancrates partially reflects Hadrian’s guru, a possible corollary is that his pupil Eucrates should in part reflect Hadrian himself. An indication that this could be so may be found in Eucrates’ own visit to Memnon. The colossus was a firm favourite with the emperor, and the inscriptions upon it record that it saluted him a number of times.

It is likely, at any rate, that the traditions about Pancrates Epicus and those about Pachrates were spun around the same historical figure and are, in short, best seen as different faces of the same tradition. Given this, it is

---

21 See Ogden 2001: passim, especially 75-92, 153-54 and 211-14.
also likely that Lucian’s readers will have called this figure to mind when meeting an Egyptian sorcerer of the same name in the *Sorcerer’s Apprentice*.

Pancrates: the literary context

It is immediately apparent that the physical description of the *Philosophus* Pancrates accords closely with the typical conceptualization of the Egyptian priest in Graeco-Latin literature. He is ‘always shaven, thoughtful, speaking his Greek with a heavy accent, long and thin, snub-nosed, with protruding lips (πρόσωπον) and rather skinny legs (ἐπίκετον τὰ σκέλη)’. As for the shaven head, we may compare the general description of Herodorus, Apuleius’ description of Zatilas, the Egyptian priest hired in Thessaly to reanimate the corpse of Thélphōrion for necromancy, and the Pa-Callisthenic *Alexander Romano*’s description of the Pharaoh Nectanebo after he has disguised himself as a priest.21 There is some correspondence also with some other Lucianic Egyptians. Lucian describes an Egyptian boy in *Vulp.* He likewise has protruberant lips (πρόσωπον), speaks Greek with a thick Egyptian accent, and is too thin of leg (πεττός ἀγαθόν τὸν σκέλος). Lycurgus tells us that he has a plait of hair coiled behind which, he contends, is indicative of slavery. While this may initially seem to indicate that the boy is far from bald, Lucian almost certainly has in mind here the boys’ hairstyle commonly seen in Egyptian frescoes and reliefs wherein an S-shaped lock of hair is kept on an otherwise completely shaven head. This is known amongst Egyptologists as ‘the side-lock of youth’. The boy is also said to dress in white linen and be dark-skinned. In *Lapiths* we meet Satyrion, an ugly shaven-headed Egyptian dwarf clown, who abuses the Cynic Alcippedas; we shall have more to say of him later. In *Sacrifices* Lucian refers briefly to shaven Egyptian prophets, associating them with mysteries and Orpheus. Perigrinus the bogus Cynic went to Egypt, Lucian tells us, to train in asceticism under Agathobulus, where, besides daubing his face with mud, masturbating in public and being beaten on the bottom with fennel, he shaved half his head. No doubt this, too, should be construed as a reference to the side-lock.22

Pancrates also exhibits strong Pythagorean affinities. It is significant that Arigpatos, the resident Pythagorean of the *Philosophus*, should claim him as a

21 Hist. 2.34, Apul. Met. 2.28; and [Callisthenes]. *Alexander Romano* 3. As Schwartz 1951 on §34 notes, Pancrates’ only particularities are his physical type and his accent.

22 Lucian, *Narc.* 2 (on which see Caster 1937:334 and Anderson 1976a:28); *Comit.* 18-19 (cf. *De mort. cad. *27, where a performing Alexandrian dwarf recites erotic dirges); *Sacr.* 14 (quoting the Orphic tag *Prodana [Öfisios*], that your doom?); *Pente.* 17. Berz 1961:131 n. 3 collects numerous Lucianic passages bearing upon the cultic shaving of the head. For the side-lock of youth see, e.g., Shaw & Nicholson 1995:270, with illustration.
Descent into underground chambers for the purpose of obtaining wisdom, as Pancrates had done, had its own well-established history in a Pythagorean context. Pythagoras and many of his disciples had, tradition told, retreated into crypts to acquire wisdom from either ghosts or ethnonic deities or both, at many points around the world.50 More particularly, Pythagoras himself is said to have descended into a number of inner sanctuaries (śāmāna) in Egypt to inspect the learned books of Isis and Horus.32 And it is of especial interest that Iamblichus records that Pythagoras had himself spent twenty-five years of his life in Egyptian śāmānas learning astronomy and geometry and being initiated into all the rites of the gods. It at once becomes clear that Pancrates was ostentatiously outstripping his own ultimate master in holding out for twenty-three.33 But despite this there remains an irrefutable paradox in Pancrates projection as both Egyptian priest and Pythagorean, for just as the signal physical characteristic of an Egyptian priest was the shaven head sported by Pancrates, so the signal physical characteristic of the Pythagorean was his long, unkempt hair, and the Philosopher's Arignotus, for all that he is Pancrates pupil, conforms perfectly to this stereotype (29).4 We shall see that Pancrates' Pythagorean-ness may be undercut in further ways too.


52 See especially Lucian, Gall. 18, and also Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.66 (also telling the name of Tulas) and Diog. Laert. 8.2-3; cf. Schwartz 1951 on §34 and Betz 1961:108. For other references to Pythagoras' education in Egypt (and Babylon), see Lucian, I.v. 2; see also Hdt. 2.81 and 123, Aris. fr. 13 Wehrli, Iorc. Botte 28, Hecat. Abd. 4th century, 2b, TEGH 264 F5 at Diod. Sic. 156, Strabo G638, Plin. NH 30.13, Porph. I.P.6-7, Hippol. Haer. 1.2, cf. Phillip 1966:189.91.

53 Iambi. I.P. 18-19; cf. also 151, 154 and 158; note too Lucian, I.v. 2; see also Hecat. 1940:27; Schwartz 1951 on §34; Alhain 1993:104 n. 64.

These considerations apart, we depend wholly upon Pancretes’ name for clues as to the significance of the figure, and it is a name that seizes the attention in its own right, quite apart from any possible historical reference. At first it looks like an all-too-appropriate speaking name for a sorcerer, signifying as it does “All-powerful.” Indeed, it may be thought to be so unimaginatively appropriate as to constitute an indication on Lucian’s part that the primary narrator, Eucrates, is lying, and pinning on his sorcerer-character the first name that pops into his head. But we are also struck by the proximity of the name to that of Eucrates himself, the “All-powerful.” It should at once be made clear that the name ‘Eucrates’, together with the broad character-type associated with it, is a well-established part of Lucian’s stock-in-trade. This character-type is essentially that of a rich man with a penchant for dinner parties and philosophers, just as we see in the Philopseudes.

1. In Hermotimus Peripatetic and Stoic philosophers are invited to a dinner at the house of Eucrates for a birthday dinner for his (only?) daughter, and they argue late into the night. This Eucrates is described as ‘the great man’ and the term used, ὁ πάρυος, aligns closely with the τοῖς πάρυοι applied to the Eucrates of the Philopseudes (5). Amongst the philosophers, the Hermotimus Peripatetic Euthydemus seems to correspond with the Philopseudes Peripatetic Cleomedes.

2. In the Dream the poor cobbler Mieyllus tells his pet cock, a reincarnation of Pythagoras, how the day before the rich Eucrates (ὁ πλούσιος) had invited him to his daughter’s birthday dinner, complete with musicians and clowns. Among fellow guests was a tedious bearded philosopher, Thermopolis. This Eucrates superficially resembles both the Philopseudes Eucrates and the Hermotimus one, the latter particularly in the fact of throwing a birthday dinner for his daughter (there is also a son). However, on the night after the dinner Mieyllus dreams that Eucrates lies dying in

---

30 The name Pancretes could serve, unsurprisingly, given its significance, as the epithet of a number of gods, Zeus most commonly. But in Attica it was particularly associated with a Hades-like chthonic god associated with Heracles, the famous visitor of the underworld, and worshipped in a sanctuary beside the Ilissos. His sanctuary was constructed to embrace a crevice in the rocks, which doubtless led to the underworld. The cult figure itself seems to have taken the form of a giant head rising out of the ground. See Miailidis 1953 and 1954; Vikela 1994; Voutiras 1999:80-81. But it is hard to see a clear allusion to this Pancretes in Lucian’s figure, except, perhaps, for the underground connection.

31 Lucian, Herm. 11-12.

32 Schwartz 1951 on §6.
a state of childlessness and makes him his sole heir, whereupon he
throws himself into the lifestyle of a rich man.38
3. In the Dialogues of the Dead Pluto and Hermes plot the premature death
of the fortune-hunting flatterers of a rich (pio πλουτός), childless,
ninety-year old Eucrates, together with the rejuvenation of the man
himself.39 The Philopanetes Eucrates is said to be 60 years old (5). We
are told that the flatterers fuss over the Dialogues Eucrates particularly
when he is ill, in which respect he aligns with the Philopanetes Eucrates,
who has rheumatism in his feet (6). The Dialogues Eucrates presides
over huntsmen, no less than 50,000 of them in fact; the Philopanetes
Eucrates lets his sons go out hunting with their friends (22).
4. In Lapidus the rich host is not Eucrates but Aristaeus. However, he
invites a range of philosophers, including a Peripatetic Cleomedes and a
Platonist Ion, characters shared with the Philopanetes, together with Stoics
and an Epicurean, to the wedding of his daughter to the son of the rich
Eaertus, the latter's name closely resembling 'Eucrates'.40

As we can see, the issue of the succession to the rich man's estate looms
prominently in the other appearances of the Eucrates-character type, although
this seems to be absent from the Philopanetes at the explicit level at any rate (this
Eucrates has the security of two sons, 22 and 27). None of these dialogues can
be dated absolutely or even relatively within Lucian's career. There is no way
of knowing at what point in this group the Philopanetes Eucrates came into
being, but we have no strong reason for believing that he was the first. It is
therefore safer (if only in terms of statistical probability) to assume the
existence of this name and its character type prior to the composition of the
Philopanetes, and therefore to consider it to be a determining factor in the
selection of the related name Pancrates. Indeed very few of Lucian's dialogues
can be dated or sequenced,41 and in consequence it is usual in the criticism of

38 Lucian, Surn. 7.12.
39 Lucian, DMort. no. 5.
40 Lucian, Conin. 5; cf. Schwartz 1965:87.
41 See Jones 1986:167-69 for such meagre chronological indications as can be
gleaned from the various parts of Lucian's oeuvre; Hermotimus and Dream are
included, both for the vaguest of indications, but cannot be related to each other.
Anderson 1976:178 has a shorter list of the firmer dating criteria bearing upon just
five of Lucian's works, none of which are concerned here. Sensible accounts of the
related questions of the dating of Lucian's career and the chronology of his works
can also be found at Baldwin 1973:7-20; Hall 1981:1-63; MacDonald 1967. The once
popular project of arranging the entirety of Lucian's works in their supposed
chronological order and spinning an intellectual biography out of them is now
discredited. This way went the studies of Gallavotti 1932; Striko 1947; Schwartz
Lucian’s oeuvre and its constituent parts to consider everything as effectively a synchronic (or even ‘achronic’). The result of this is that Lucian’s motifs are often effectively treated as existing prior to their manifestation in any one of his individual pieces.

So how are we to construe the relationship between the two names? Are we to think of Pancrates as an alter ego projected by the narrating Eukrates? From a more authorial perspective, these two names might be thought to encapsulate the relationship between the two men: an appropriately all-powerful master-sorcerer and his partially but not entirely successful pupil, the all-powerful apprentice.

The pestle

Let us now attempt to contextualise Pancrates’ animated pestle. We may at first think the group of objects he is said to animate to work as servants – door-bars, brooms and pestles – a somewhat random selection of objects, but we may probably assume that for Lucian all three objects alike basically consisted of sticks of wood around four feet in length. This is self-evident in the case of the broom. The door-bar would significantly exceed in length the width of the door it was to secure. The pestle (ἐπτώβοα), specifically said to have been made of wood (36), is likely to have been conceived of as a long one for grinding material in a large floor-based mortar from a standing position. It is noteworthy that in the Lucanian Domnae we find a pestle (ἐπτώβοα) used as a staff. All these objects could then be thought to provide suitable basic maquettes for the magical construction of a more-or-less adult-sized humanoid servant. One reason Lucian may have chosen to make a special feature of the pestle, from among all comparable varieties of stick, may have been the fact that it could be particularly associated with a sorcerer, as a tool with which he might prepare his potions.

While the pestle may have some ancestors of a very general kind in indigenous Egyptian culture and in archaic and Classical Greek literature, it is most powerfully understood in the context of the magical practices, techniques and indeed concerns documented in the Greek Magical Papyri. It has become a commonplace amongst Egyptologists that the pestle reflects shabtis, the figures carved from wood to serve the dead in the afterlife, although no real argument

---

1965; Konus 1986. The details of the life of Lucian as laid out by these various scholars are listed and reviewed at Macleod 1994:1379-82.

42 This is the approach properly taken by the worthy Caster 1937 and the masterly Bompain 1958, on which see Reardon 1971:160 n.9; see also Anderson 1976b:177.

43 Lucian, Domus 48; cf. Schwartz 1951 on §35.
has been developed to support the assumption.44 Within Greek culture there are indeed some good literary precedents for the animation of objects to fulfill the role of domestic servants. In the Iliad Hephaestus is served by the animated golden maids he has endowed with understanding, speech, strength and skills,45 and he is found manufacturing twenty tripods with gold wheels, which will roll themselves automatically into divine dinners and serve the gods.46 Attic Old Comedy, with its strong interest in the utopian, was particularly taken with the notion of little robots. In the Comici poet Crates’ Animalia, two interlocutors imagine a Golden Age in which animated tableware will serve up food and drink on command and water will be delivered automatically into bath tubs.47 The automatic delivery of water is of particular interest for the Sorcerer’s Apprentice, and this is found also in a fragment of Eupolis’ Golden Race: “There is no [sc. cheese?] left. That mphales-cheese is off to fetch water, clothed in red” (F399 K-A). Here it is also of note that the animated object fetching the water is not one designed for that purpose, as with Eucrates’ pestle.

However, the contextuality of the pestle against the later literary and documentary evidence for magic and thinking about magic is ultimately more informative, as becomes clear once we consider what is actually supposed to happen to the pestle. Does it remain a pestle as it does its work, or is it transformed into human shape? As often, Lucian’s fast-paced narrative rides

44 The notion originated with Perrie 1935-4-5 (section 14). The now canonical expression of it is to be found in the appendix at Schneider 1977:1.349-54, who contends that ‘shabut’ in origin means ‘one carved from a stick’ (Egyptologists are warned that these pages include a number of misstatements about Lucian). Both authors guess that the three-syllable animation spell was some version of the word ‘shabut’, e.g. ša-wab-t or ’u-sheb-t’. More recently, see Ritter 2001:334.

45 I do not find the contention that the pestle salutes Jewish culture by reflecting the staff of Moses, which transforms into a snake at Exodus 7:8-12, remotely persuasive. For this notion, see Rademacher 1922; Heracl 1940:29; Ebner at Ebner et al. 2001:55.


47 Hom. Il. 18.373-77: Apollodoros of Tyana witnessed the Indian Brahmins being served by similar ones, these said to be made of bronze: Philostr. V-4 3.27 and 6.11; cf. Müller 1932:101-02. For a golden-age-style notion of abundant automatic food in an Egyptianising context, but without reference to animated vessels, see Hdb. 3.18. At Apul. Met. 5.3 Psyche is served chez Cupid from trays without waiters; however, it may be that these are supposedly controlled by intelligent gasts of wind rather than animated in their own right.

48 Crates, Anim. Frt. 16-17 K-A. Müller 1932:102-04 actually assigns both of these fragments rather to Eupolis’ Golden Race, alongside that play’s mphales-cheese. For discussions of these three fragments, further to K-A, see the various contributions in Harvey & Wilkins 2000, especially 347-48, 453-55, 490-91.
over uncertainties and discrepancies. Transformation is suggested by the fact that Eucrates’ pestle is made to perform a task other than that for which, as a tool, it is constructed. Also, we are invited to suppose that it becomes human in shape by its seeming need to acquire shoulders to wear a cloak, feet to walk and hands to carry and fill amphorae. By way of introduction, we are told that Panzerates’ own animated sticks of wood could, amongst other domestic tasks, even buy provisions. This seems to imply that they had faces and voices. That they had at any rate become something other than wood is implied by Eucrates’ statement that Panzerates eventually ‘returned the servants to wood.’ On the other hand, the fact that Eucrates is, without apparent difficulty, able to chop his pestle in half with an axe seems to suggest that it was in some way retaining its basic form as a stick of wood all along. These contradictory indications seem to crystallize in the ambivalent introductory phrase, ‘It would seem human to everyone else’ (τὰς ἄλλας ἄνθρωποι ἀνθρώπων ἔσχατα δοκίμασα). Does this mean ‘It actually became human in form, although we alone knew that this was not its true form’, or does it mean, ‘It actually remained a stick of wood in form, but gave the magical impression to other people of being human?’

This ambivalence alerts us to the probability that two rather different spell-types have been overlaid. These are, first, spells for the animation (but not transformation) of tools to carry out the task for which they were originally designed and, secondly, spells for the conjuring-up of an all-purpose human-formed servant. The animation of actual tools is relatively rare in ancient magical sources, documentary or literary. But one noteworthy example of this phenomenon is Simon Magus’ animation of a sickle in the Pseudo-Clementine: ‘I saw a sickle someone had put down, and I ordered it to go and reap, and it reaped ten times as much as the other reapers...’ (Reconstruction 2.9). Unlike Eucrates’ pestle, Simon’s sickle confines itself to the task for which it was designed. The Pseudo-Clementine also make brief mention of Simon’s ability to animate dishes at banquets, to carry the food directly to the guests.

The manufacture of anthropoid servants for defined magical purposes can be seen notably in erotic-attraction spells. Lucian himself gives us an example elsewhere in the Philopseudes, where his Hyperboran mage fashions an eros-doll

43 Lucian, Philopseudes, 35. 44 Paie Schwartz 1951 on §35, it is not really true that ancient literature about magic knew nothing of this sort. C.E. Davies 1957:102 for the distinction made here. 45 [Clement] Homilies 2.32. Simon’s animation of dishes is associated with his ability to produce images at banquets; this in turn puts us in mind of Democritus’ ‘Table Tricks’, a series of recipes for practical jokes, in a fourth-century AD magical papyrus, PGH VII.168-86. 46 Lucian, Philopseudes, 14; this sort of spell is regarded as the principal inspiration behind the pestle-animation by Schwartz 1951 on §35.
from clay and sends it flying off to fetch a desired woman (14). Amongst the Greek Magical Papyri, PGM XII.14-95, for instance, comparably offers a recipe for the attraction of a woman by means of the manufacture of a (wax) eros-doll. But of greater relevance to the Appuntios tale are the recipes for the manufacture of all-purpose human-formed servants. These are best exemplified by a fourth- or fifth-century AD spell calling itself the Old Servant Woman of Apollonius of Tyana, PGM XIa.1-40. 'The old woman' conjured up is in the first instance a servant of the general domestic variety ('I need your services for daily life'), as are Pancrates' various sticks of wood, although it also emerges that she will be able to accomplish anything you wish, like a genie. Among the wide, indeed almost infinite, range of abilities attributed to 'The demon-assistant of Phoebus' in a recipe of similar date (PGM I.42-195),12 many are of a domestic nature, and it is noteworthy that this τηρωδός is given the abilities, just like the pestle of the Ἀποπνίτιος, both to fetch water (δόξα φρέω) and to buy provisions.13

Eucrates' inability to bring his pestle's service to an end is central to the Appuntios tale,14 but nonetheless puzzling. For although a mysterious voc magia is needed to animate it,15 and another one, we may suppose, unknown of course to Eucrates, was needed to de-animate it, he is at first able to control the pestle, once animated, with a plain language command. It is therefore curious that it will not obey his second plain-language command, to stop. Even if Eucrates could not de-animate the pestle, he ought to have been able to make it sit quietly in the corner. It seems that Lucian's fast-paced narrative has in this respect rolled up a specific task-ending utterance into one with a service-ending spell (an

---

12 For this text see the commentaries of Hopfner 1921-24:2. no. 135; Prisendanz & Heineich 1973-74 and O'Neil in Betz 1992 ad loc. For the relevance of this text to the Servent's Appuntios, see Reitzenstein 1906:5 n. 3; Hopfner 1921-24:2.67-68; Müller 1932:101; Herzig 1949:28; Koefer 1949:136; Schwartz 1951 on §35; Elsner at Elsner et al. 2001:54.

13 PGM I.101.

14 Cf., broadly, the difficulty experienced by Lucius in bringing an end to the spell that has transformed him into an ios at Ome 13 and Apollonius’ Μοισειοθάνη 3.24. Lucian himself is probably the author either of the Ome we have, or of the longer original Greek text of which our Ome is an abridgement, the Μεταμορφώσεως λόγος δύο μορφών, which Ptolemy, Bibliotheca cod. 129 (at 2.103-04 Henry) ascribes to the hand of one Lucius of Patras.

15 We may assume that the three-syllable spell to animate the pestle, which Eucrates refuses to divulge, was a voc magia of the sort that populate the Greek Magical Papyri and the later curse tablets in prolific numbers. Schwartz 1951 on §33 considers it significant that he begs off revealing the words uttered to him directly by Memnon in a very similar way, and that we are expected to think that those words can never have been uttered at all. See also Koefer 1949:43.
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The Old Serving Woman offers another useful comparison. A second special spell is required to bring an end to her extended period of service as opposed to one of her particular jobs. The spell-author’s anxiety focuses not upon the possibility of the activated Serving Woman getting out of hand, but upon the rashness of her potential abandonment. The warning that once deactivated she may never be reactivated is also broadly suggestive for Lucian’s tale, which ends with an irreversible denial to Eucrates of the magic he seeks, as embodied in the figure of Pancrates, now gone forever.

Perhaps a closer comparison for a spell to curtail the activities of a magical device that has got out of hand is provided by a recipe from a skull-divination series in PGM IV, some of which are attributed to the Thessalian king Pithys. The underlying principle behind this series of recipes is that one performs certain magical rites upon a skull and is subsequently visited in one’s sleep by its respective ghost, which will provide one with divination. The purpose of the recipe in question is to restrain skulls that are ἀνιστάλλωντος, which probably means skulls that prophesy falsely or incoherently. Now, one might have thought that if one had found a given skull to be unreliable, then one could simply have stopped using it. But the need for such a spell as this implies that, once activated, the ghosts of such skulls could cause misery by continuing to interrupt one’s sleep unhindered with useless or misleading information. The symbolism of the technology prescribed for the silencing of such skulls is self-explanatory. The mouth of the skull is to be sealed with dirt from the temple-doors of Osiris or a grave-mound. Iron (superior to ghosts) from a leg fetter (particularly ‘binding’, therefore) is then to be made into a ring which is to be engraved with a headless lion wearing the crown of Isis on its neck and trampling a skeleton, with its right foot crushing the skull.37

The briskly narrated story of the pestle’s animation and subsequent misbehaviour, which initially seems rather remote from the world of the Greek magical papyri, can after all be accommodated within it fairly easily. Even if it does not correspond precisely with the terms of any one preserved recipe, it reflects and plays with the themes and concerns found in the papyri in a knowing fashion.

A Cynic voice?

34 Schwartz 1951 on §36 seems to have related concerns. For the term, see Koepler 1949:137.
37 PGM IV.2125–39. For formulas to make a τιμέριος stop, see, more generally, Hofmner 1922–25:1.247, §898; Reitzenstein 1906:5; Schwartz 1951 on §36. For skull necromancy see Ogden 2001:202–16, especially 211–14.
Both Panocrates and his pestle may, further, have functioned as admonitory Cynic symbols for Lucian. It has been recognised, notably by Caster, that Lucian attacks the Philostratus lovers of lies from a standpoint that is in part Epicurean. There are two main reasons for thinking this. First, the one supposedly ‘positive’ anti-lies story in the collection, that told by Tychiades himself, makes a hero of Democritus (32), whom Lucian sees as a precursor of Epicurus in his Alexander (17). And, secondly, Epicureans are explicitly attacked by the lie-loving Ion (Philostratus 24), just as they are by the hated Alexander in the Alexandre (47). However, Lucian’s stand-point may well be more broadly based. In fact three of the major philosophical schools go unrepresented amongst the liars: Epicureans, Cynics and Sceptics. Given the considerable thematic overlap of much of the Philostratus material with that of Lucian’s ‘Menippean’ works, a Cynic strand in particular is entirely to be expected here.

Cases can be made for the presence of admonitory Cynic symbols in at least two of the other stories in the Philostratus collection. First, in the story of Eucretes and Demainete (27-28), the ghost of Demainete disappears at the bark of a Maltese lap-dog (σκύλος Μελατρών) beneath a couch. This creature puts us in mind of Diogenes, who actually referred to himself as a ‘Maltese dog’ (ὁ σκύλος Μελατρών), as Diogenes Laertius tells us, the Cynics more generally regularly referring to themselves as dogs (Cynic’ literally meaning ‘doggish’). And, secondly, the story of the Pythagorean Arignotus’ exorcism of a haunted house is set in Corinth (29-31). When we are told that the house in question is

18 Caster 1937:95-96, 318 (especially), 330-31, 334; see too Tackaberry 1930:47.
19 Alexander’s attack on Epicureanism here provokes programmatic and extravagant praise of Epicurus from the author. His εὐσεβὴς λαλοῦσα are extolled as freeing people from terrors, apparitions and portents, which is certainly suggestive for the position adopted by Tychiades in the Philostratus. However, note Brannham 1989:197-200, especially 199. This (the Alexander’s) narrator’s emphatically Epicurean loyalties and his adulation of the philosopher as the sole guide to truth set him apart from other Lucianic voices.
20 Schwartz 1951 on 56 notes that the three philosophical schools not represented at the meeting, and therefore not denuded, are the Epicureans, the Cynics and the Sceptics, and accordingly concludes that Tychiades represents an amalgamation of the three. Cf. also Müller 1932:19 and Allini 1993:93-94 n. 12.
21 I.e. Menippus, Cataphiles, Diogēnēs Meletos, Callistus, Iatrophē Tragopous, Iatrophē Conjunctus, Deorum Consilium, Somnium, Consilium, Vīrērum Aquīs, Pisiciter, Fugitive, Iīs Aerochus, Satureia, Timon. The Cynic voice is often a conveniently strategic one for the satirist to adopt, but individual Cynics could also fall foul of Lucian, as most notably in the case of Peregrinus (Peregrinus). See Tackaberry 1930:38-45 and Caster 1937:63-84.
22 Diog. Laert. 6.55. I discuss this case in detail in Ogden 2004.
beside the 'Cherry Grove (Gymnasion)’ (τὸ Κράνιον, 30), we cannot help but think of the movement’s most famous figure, Diogenes of Sinope, who lived here in his jil/shoe, and indeed this was the site of his famous encounter with Alexander.33 In both these cases, the subtle Cynic imagery sounds a gentle warning note, from the liar’s own mouth, against the veracity of the story told.

And so to Pancrates. We have seen that Pancrates is in some clear ways projected as a Pythagorean, although this projection is somewhat undercut by his shaved Egyptian head. It may also be underlaid, in a more indirect way, by some Cynic imagery. The name Pancrates may, its other resonances apart, actually have belonged to a Cynic philosopher, real or imaginary. The chief evidence for this is the appearance of just such a figure in the highly Lucianic context of Alciphron’s Letters. Here, in a brief tale, Pancrates the Dog (Παγκρατός ὁ κύις, i.e. Cynic), burns in upon the dinner party, shoves the guests to one side, urinates on the floor and prepares to have sex openly with a courtesan in a typically Cynic display of contempt for good manners.34

This figure of Pancrates aligns closely with that of the Cynic Alcidamas in Lucian’s Lapiths. He thrusts himself into the dinner uninvited (12). He is described as ‘the noisiest of all the dogs’ (προκριματιστὸν καλὸν ἀπίστως) and as a ‘Maltese lapdog’ (Μελτητῆς κατακλύσιον, 19). He repeatedly exposes himself in public (διαγέμματος, 14; παραγέμματος, 16), urinates on the floor (35) and eventually attempts to have sex with the flute-girl then and there (46). Most interestingly, he gets into a fight with the ugly shaven-headed Egyptian dwarf clown, Sanyton, whom we mentioned at the beginning of this article. Lucian twice emphatically applies to this fight a term derived from παντρίωσις (παγκρατικὸς, ἐπάγραφότατος), which is evocative of the name ‘Pancrates’. Now the clown Sanyton (Σαντυτόν... γελοτουργός) constitutes a compelling further bridge to the Alciphron text, because also present there is one Sanyton (Σαντυτόν), who is described in passing as one of a group of ‘mime-actors of clowning’ (μύτη γελοιοτρόπος). We are told nothing more about him, but the exotic name is similarly compatible with Egyptian ethnicity.

That there is some sort of relationship between these two texts is indisputable, but what is it? Von Fritz contended that the subsequent Alciphron text was written directly out of the Lapiths episode: the figure of Alciphron’s Pancrates is a tribute to Lucian’s Alcidamas, and the name he bears salutes the fact that Alcidamas fights pancratium.35 This solution, however, seems to demand of Alciphron’s readers a peculiarly intimate verbal familiarity with the Lapiths. It is easier to hypothesise a third text, now lost, to which both the Lapiths and the

33 Diog. Laert. 6.38 and 77.
34 Alciph. Ep. 3.19 Benner-Fobes. For Alciphron’s frequent reworking of Lucianic material, see Benner & Fobes 1949:6-18.
35 Von Fritz 1949b.
Aleiphron letter refer. This will have resembled the two extant texts in their points of correspondence, and its Cynic ‘hero’ will have been called ‘Pancrates’.

Aleiphron will have taken the name over directly, and it will thus be the Lapiths that is, rather more lucidly, making allusion to the ur-Pancrates through its references to Aidaimas’ pancration.

These considerations raise the possibility that in choosing the name ‘Pancrates’ for his sorcerer in the Philopoemen Lucian was also alluding to this Cynic story-type. And this possibility is strongly enhanced by the sorcerer’s Egyptian style and ethnicity, which seems to salute the presence of the Egyptian clown in the story-type.65

We can say little more of the text in which this ur-Pancrates featured, but the possibility that it was itself another Lucianic piece should be borne in mind: we have observed Lucian’s tendency to rework his own material in the case of the Eucrates-figure, and Aleiphron’s devotion to the reworking of Lucian has already been acknowledged. But we can perhaps say something of the remoter archaeology of this ur-Pancrates. He seems to owe something to the historical figure – or at any rate to the anecdotes attaching to the historical figure – of the late-classical Cynic Crates of Thebes.66 ‘Pancrates’ is of course a compound form of the name ‘Crates’, and as such allows itself to be read as ‘All-Crates’, perhaps even as ‘Total Crates’.67 Two prominent elements of the traditions about Crates can be seen to be reflected in Aleiphron’s Pancrates and Lucian’s Aidaimas. First, Crates’ nickname was ‘The Door-Opener’, Ὀφρευδοκέτης, this supposedly because of his habit of thrusting himself into every house and lecturing those within.68 Secondly, Crates was notorious above all for having sex with Hipparchia (or Hipparchia) in public, in his ‘dog-marriage’ (ἰερογαμία).69

---

64 An alternative supposition is available, but it is more difficult. According to this, the Philopoemen text should be taken as the starting-point. The Lapiths will then disarticulate the figure of the Egyptian Pancrates into the elements of the Egyptian clown and (obscurely) the abstract notion of pancration. Subsequently, Aleiphron, cleverly detecting this disarticulation, will have recycled it, and in the process restored the name ‘Pancrates’ to greater prominence.

65 The principal source for whom is Diog. Laer. 6.85-93. I confine my references largely to this text, but the points made can be multiply illustrated from the copious further sources collected at Giannantoni 1983-85:2.766-57, 3V, H (Crates Thebanus) and 2.759-61, 3V, I (Hipparchia Maronea). Cf. also Stenel 1922:1625-31.

66 Furthermore, Crates had both a son and a brother named Pasiletes: Diog. Laer. 6.88: The first element of this name, which means ‘famous to all’ or ‘famous in all’ is, like Pas, drawn from the adjective πάνι.

67 Diog. Laer. 6.86.

68 See Diog. Laer. 6.96-97 and, amongst other sources, especially Apul. Fop. 14, with Huntsk 2001 ad loc.
And so to the pestle. We have already mentioned the pestle used as a staff in the Lucianic Domnuc. More particularly, Demonax has seen a Cynic philosopher using a pestle (ὀρταπος) for his staff, and jokes: ‘Do not lie (Μὴ αὐτόβου), for you happen to be a disciple of Hyperides (Ὕπεριδες).’ We perhaps do not need to point the existence of a long-lost Cynic philosopher called Hyperides: the pun on ὀρταπος, i.e. ‘Pestle-stone’, may itself explain the quip sufficiently. But the association between the rejection of lies and the pestle here is suggestive. If we may contextualise the Ἀποστειοτα διάλεγμα against this joke, which in any case appears to have been a traditional one, then the choice of a pestle in the tale may serve as a further subtle appeal from Lucian for a Cynic attitude on the reader’s part.

Let us conclude. The starting-point for Lucian’s construction of the sorcerer figure is likely to have been the coincidence in names between the central figures of two (to a greater or lesser extent) established traditions. One was that of the basically historical but already heavily fictionalised figure of Pancrates-Pachrates, who had come to be seen as Hadrian’s Egyptian magical guru. The other was that of a fictional Cynic figure whose origin may have lain in the traditions of the historical Cynic Crates. This allowed Lucian to employ an Egyptian sorcerer-figure broadly evocative, in the first instance, of the Egyptian guru, but at the same time to sound an admonitory Cynic note of caution. The presence of an Egyptian motif in the Cynic-Pancrates tradition smoothed the association between the two figures. The name ‘Pancrates’ was valuable to Lucian also in that it enabled him to construct and encapsulate a sorcerer-apprentice relationship for his established stock-in-trade figure named ‘Crate’, the ‘All-Powerful’ thereby appropriately instructing the ‘Well-Powerful.’ Lucian will then have filled out the details of this relationship with the stereotypical motifs found in an established story-type of master-sorcerer and apprentice in an Egyptian setting.

---

1 Lucian, Domnuc 48.
2 It is not therefore a critical point that Lucian’s authorship of the Domnuc should not be universally accepted.
3 Pestle-imagery is put to moral use by Lucian elsewhere too. At Hemotimus’ text 79 Lycinus uses a series of images or proverbs to describe the fruitlessness of Hemotimus’ approach to philosophy in which the important questions are neglected at the expense of the trivial. In one of these Hemotimus is compared to a man pouring water into a mortar and attempting to powder it with an iron pestle. He thinks he is getting on with useful work, not realizing that even if he were to wear his shoulders out with the grinding, the water is going to stay water. The conjunction of water, pestle and endless, fruitless work is also reminiscent of the Sorcerer’s Apprasia.
4 As found in [Thesaurus of Tralles] De iure titulis herbarum 1.28 (Friedrich 1968:43-53) and [Democritus] Physica et Mystica 2 (Berthelot 1888:42, 21); Bidez & Comont
knowingly reflects and plays with the themes and concerns of the magical traditions found in the Greek magical papyri, but the choice of a peste in particular for animation as a domestic servant may also sound a further note of Cynic caution.
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