

Foreword by the Editors

οὐπω γὰρ αὐτὸ τοῦνομα τῆς τύχης λέγοντες, εἰδότες δὲ τὴν τῆς
ἀτάκτως καὶ ἀορίστως περιφερομένης αἰτίας δύναμιν ἰσχυρὰν καὶ
ἀφύλακτον οὖσαν ἀνθρωπίνῳ λογισμῷ τοῖς τῶν θεῶν ὀνόμασιν
ἐξέφραζον, ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς καὶ πράγματα καὶ ἦθη καὶ νῆ Δία καὶ λόγους
καὶ ἄνδρας εἰώθαμεν δαιμονίους καὶ θείους προσαγορεύειν.
Plutarch, *Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat* 24a–b

The expression *theios aner*, alluded to in ancient Graeco-Roman sources, and studied in Bieler’s seminal essay in 1935, used to be generally equated with the concept of “holy man”, “divine man” or even “saint”: a charismatic leader, in Weberian terms, with a special aura of inspired wisdom and whose main prerogatives are the privileged role of mediator with the divine sphere and the cohesion of the community gathered around him. From the 1970’s onward Peter Brown and his school drew scholarly attention to the nuances between holiness, charisma and spiritual leadership focusing on the holy men of Late Antiquity. A distinction and categorization of sanctity, divinity, charisma, and spiritual leadership, among other areas of action of the *theioi andres* or, in other words, a classification of the *charismata* depending on the sources of their supernatural prestige, seemed at that time especially relevant. As Brown pointed out in his 1971 paper “The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity”:

“The holy man is frequently confused with the *theios aner* of late classical times, merely because both share an ability to perform miracles. This is a superficial parallel: for while the *theios aner* continued to draw his powers from a bottomless sense of occult wisdom preserved for him in and by society – whether this is the *palaios logos* of the Neoplatonists, the Egyptian temple lore of the astrologer or the Torah of the Rabbi – the holy man drew his powers from outside the human race: by going to live in the desert, in close identification with an animal kingdom that stood, in the imagination of the contemporaries, for the opposite pole of all human society”¹:

1 Brown 1971, 92.

This seems, even today, a basic task to be accomplished when studying this question. The sapiential tradition is, no doubt, a differentiating mark of divine men in the Graeco-Roman world, who often lived in the *polis*, in opposition to the ascetic saints of the desert, but these distinctive lines are frequently blurred if we consider that, sometimes, the *theios aner* draws his lore ultimately from divinity and transmits it to his fellow humans. That is the reason why we devoted a research project, funded by the Spanish Research Ministry,² to these basic questions: the functions of the “divine men” (and some “divine women”, as well, of course) as charismatic leaders and their cohesive role in a given socio-political community, especially in the cases of scholarly communities in late Antiquity. In fact, a sort of charismatic figure, with a deep socio-political influence, a *theios aner* between religion, philosophy, and politics, is present throughout Graeco-Roman Antiquity, from Archaic Greece to Roman times: we only need to mention such mythical names as Pythagoras of Samos or Apollonius of Tyana. But the core of the development of the *theios aner* as a socio-political key figure is no doubt to be found in the Roman World, combining the pagan tradition with the growing Christian influence, and based on charismatic leadership, social networking, and a henotheistic worldview, plus what we could call a ‘(neo)Platonic *vulgata*’. Arguably, the Late Antique version of the divine man is central to the later acceptance of this figure, in Christian or Islamic milieux. Its key aspects, the combination of philosophical contemplation and socio-political praxis, will be of great relevance for later times: if we were to summarise this, we could describe it as a trio of notions: holiness, charisma, and leadership.

Under such premises, we have addressed the basic questions on the notion of *theios aner*, its origin, typology, and repercussion in a series of research seminars and, finally, in an International Conference, “Charisma and Leadership in Late Antique Schools”, held at Complutense University, Madrid, from October 2–4, 2019. The contributions presented in this volume were discussed at this conference as the main result of the joint research team. This collective book aims to gather some of the methodological considerations and case studies presented then, regarding the key intersection of politics and religion in some well-known figures of the Graeco-Roman World (esp. 2nd–6th c.). The focus was laid not only on concrete individuals, but part of the contributors attempted to offer panoramic, transdisciplinary, and comparative views of divine men and women, in their cultural and intellectual context, and, above all, to examine what was the role of these figures during the Late Roman times as steps towards a social history of holiness in Antiquity. The scholarly contributions are organised along three sections – 1) ‘Holiness’, 2) ‘Charisma and Leadership’, and 3) ‘Transmission and Reception’ – aiming at an overall analysis of the patterns involving charismatic leadership of the intellectual and spiritual figures in the sources and in the socio-political context, with the central axis of Late Antiquity. It is, obviously, not a complete treat-

2 Project ref. EUIN2017–85631 and HAR2017–83613-C2–1-P.

ment or an exhaustive panorama of the matter, but rather a collection of tesserae in the mosaic of charismatic leadership in educational communities in the Graeco-Roman World.

Let us first review and summarise some of the views presented in the congress and gathered in the following pages.

The first section, entitled ‘Holiness: Concepts and Cases of Holiness in the Graeco-Roman World’ opens with some views on the philosophical and historical precedents of the θεῖος ἀνὴρ and its interaction with politics and society. They appropriately begin with the sage Pythagoras of Samos, considering his Late Antique biographic tradition in Porphyry and Iamblichus. His problematic definition as “shaman” or “divine man” is examined by David Hernández de la Fuente in the wake of diverse scholarly tendencies which favoured terminologies and historiographical categories sometimes outdated and some other reused. Not far from the idea of the θεῖος ἀνὴρ is the semi-legendary physician Hippocrates of Cos, addressed by Jorge Cano Cuenca. An analysis of *Letters* 1 and 2 of the pseudepigrapha is extremely useful to redefine Hippocrates’ therapeutic exceptionality in comparison with later figures of healing δύναμις and θαύματα. Thirdly, Ana Jiménez San Cristobal deals with some “holy women” of the cult of Dionysos, the *Frauengott*, for Bachofen. Dionysian communities of Classical and Hellenistic Times are addressed with the case study of the “Sixteen women” of the Greek city of Elis, as a precedent case for the later notion of female socio-political holiness. In the fourth chapter, Manuel Albaladejo Vivero presents a review of the sources on the “wise men” of India from the point of view of the Greek mentality of Alexander’s historians. The focus is laid on the encounter of the “wise men” from India with the expedition of Alexander the Great. The tradition of the gymnosophists in Greek literature will leave important traces for the history of philosophy, if we consider the impact of India as a “land of wonders and wisdom” in later *theioi andres* such as Apollonius or Plotinus. Chapter 5, by Haris Papoulias, draws attention to the meaning of the term ἰσόθεος in Longinus’ treatise *On the Sublime*, as a particular type of θεῖος ἀνὴρ, relating it both to the figure of the artist in the ancient world and with the long-lasting idea of *Deus Artifex* and *divino artista*, to put it with the expression of Ernst Kris and Otto Kurz. Ignacio Pajón Leyra, in the sixth contribution, examines the idea of the wise man in Cynicism as an *exemplum* of philosophical life in the biographic genre of figures such as Socrates or Diogenes of Sinope. José María Zamora Calvo, in the seventh paper of this section, studies the Plotinian school in Rome as a key attempt to systematise Platonic philosophy as the best way of life in the sense of the ascent of the soul to the divine. This section ends with the analysis by Aitor Blanco Pérez on the Platonic διαδοχή in the Eastern Empire, concretely in the region of Anatolia, and its socio-political influence from the local institutions to the imperial administration.

The second part of the volume, under the title ‘Charisma and Leadership’, begins with a methodological paper where Marco Alviz Fernández explores the concept of charismatic community, following the Weberian Sociology of Religion, and proves its significance for a better understanding of the social grounds of late antique higher education. Secondly, Edward Watts raises the question of the “romanness” of pagan philosophers in Late Antiquity, an interesting reminder of a key feature of the epoch which is usually forgotten: later on, Roman and Hellenic philosophy will, as Watts puts it, “no longer fit together”. In the third chapter of this section Clelia Martínez Maza offers a gender outlook on the legitimacy of women as philosophers in Late Antiquity, for pagan “divine women” appeared in the biographies not devoid from the ideological obstacle of prejudice. In this kind of works prodigies or θαύματα also appeared as the main characteristic of the *theios aner*, a topic with which Sergi Grau Guijarro deals with in Chapter 4, in accordance with the biographical literary tradition from Diogenes Laertius to Eunapius of Sardis. In this context, the fifth chapter, by Marina Díaz Bourgeal, approaches the alleged renewal of the imperial pagan religion through the scrutiny of the features of the priesthood, which she compares to the concept of θεῖος ἀνὴρ. Chapter 6, by Regina Fichera, studies the portrait of a late antique scholar of the so-called “divine Platonic succession”, Isidore of Alexandria, as seen in the apologetic biography written by his disciple Damascius. Still on the issue of the late antique biographies of charismatic “divine men”, the seventh contribution, by Sonsoles Costero Quiroga, reviews the Neoplatonic scale of virtues in which the Neoplatonist Proclus is devoutly placed by his disciple Marinus in his *Vita Procli*. In the same vein, the last chapter of this section, by Silvia Acerbi, brings us to the oneiric and therapeutic rituals which appear in Marinus’s almost hagiographical *Life*, specially to the *prodigium* described in the Athenian temple of Asclepius in 485 A. D. framed by the conflict between paganism and Christianity.

Thirdly, the perspective of classical tradition and the *longue durée* of the concept of *theios aner* gives coherence to a final section on ‘Transmission and Reception: from Holiness to Leadership’. This section presents seven chapters dealing with the transition of the traditional Graeco-Roman views on holiness and leadership in the pagan world to the new Christian worldview, from the Late Roman and Byzantine Worlds onwards: the case studies deal with religious models, literature, art, and power. This part begins with a pair of Christian holy men, from East to West: firstly, Raúl Serrano Madroñal examines the most renowned of the Stylites, Simeon the Elder, and attempts to redefine the concept of late antique θεῖος ἀνὴρ through his figure. Holy bishops as a major Christian development of our theme are addressed by the second paper, where José Ángel Castillo Lozano shows the literary portrait of the Late Antique Hispanian bishop Mazona as a saint intertwined with the political struggles of the Visigothic reign. The influence of Neoplatonism in poetry is addressed in the third chapter by Anne Sheppard, more specifically the use of pantomime dance as a metaphor of their cosmological doctrine in Nonnus’ mythological epic, the *Dionysiaca* (5th century). In

the same vein, Arianna Magnolo scrutinises in Chapter 4 Nonnus' Christian epic, his *Paraphrase to the Gospel of Saint John*. The focus is put on the words the poet employed to refer to the divinity and humanity of Christ. Chapter 5, by Johannes Niehoff-Panagiotidis, deals with the strong bond of Islamic schools of knowledge to Graeco-Roman *paideia*, with the example of the translation of Plotinus into Arabic. The philosophical doctrines of Platonic philosophy were swiftly adapted into what was to become a new Mediterranean language of the "holy men" of Late Antiquity: Arabic. Chapter 6, by Francisco López-Santos Kornberger, takes the research paths of gender studies and narratology in order to focus attention on the extraordinary charisma of the Byzantine empress Zoe Porphyrogenete. To finish with, the last contribution, both of the section and of the volume, deals with the reception of the concept *theios aner* in modern philosophy: Nuria Sánchez Madrid explores the legacy of this concept in the 20th century through the examples of Carl Schmitt and Hugo Ball.

This foreword is not, obviously, the place for a thorough discussion of the aforementioned themes: concepts such as holiness, sanctity, and divine status applied to human leaders, both in religion and politics are too complex to be addressed here. However, and after the fruitful discussions of the conference, we could define the wording *theios aner* as a conceptual articulation that comprised holiness, charisma, and leadership, following the motto of this volume. The *theios aner* is an individual who, as inferred mostly from the biographical sources, innately possesses an extraordinary capacity to attract or fascinate ("charisma") thanks to his mastery of a series of supernatural qualities (*theiai technai*) of the spiritual, socio-political, or pedagogical levels. Before all, needless to say, most of the figures dealt with in this volume are masculine, as the very coinage of the notion *theios aner* goes to show, but it is evident that this category includes also female figures, and some well-known "divine women" of Graeco-Roman *paideia* are also mentioned in this volume.

Regarding "holiness", firstly, most of the figures studied here show extraordinary spiritual qualities or some kind of supernatural aura. Secondly, regarding charisma and leadership, late antique figures, mostly of teachers, challenge and complement the traditional definition of charismatic community in Weber: this society "is generally characterised by a naturally emotional dedication to and trust in the leader, which tends to result in an inclination to follow the most extraordinary, most promising leader who deploys the most attractive means of persuasion".³ For the German philosopher, charismatic leadership stood in contrast to legal and traditional authority, the latter especially important for philosophical teaching⁴. But in the philosophical schools of the

3 Weber 2019, 408.

4 See the contribution by Alviz Fernández in this volume.

Roman Empire, especially in Neoplatonism, there was an evident and close connexion between the tradition of *paideia* and the charisma of religion.

Finally, neither arbitrary nor unfounded is the inclusion of the figure of the master as a charismatic individual in the studies on *theioi andres*, as Peter Brown himself justifies it in a recent contribution, where he defined late antiquity as “An Age of Teachers”.⁵ The question of the adequacy of Weberian categories to characterise *theioi andres* was especially addressed both in the research project and in the conference. Some of the features of Weberian charisma, such as the leaders’ succession and their recognition by the community, clearly apply to Late Roman “divine men”, but in philosophical or religious schools the weight of traditional and institutionalised authorities should be considered. Probably, Weberian charismatic society should be completed here with some features of traditional society and, as it was discussed in the conference, could be also explained by some other categories of contemporary philosophy, such as Gramsci’s cultural hegemony and Bourdieu’s *habitus*.⁶

In conclusion, we believe that this research endeavour has shown the value of an interdisciplinary revision of the concept of “divine man”. A reassessment of the notions of holiness, charisma, and leadership in its political and social contexts, both through the revision of the sources and the application of diverse historical-cultural paradigms and models, can shed new light upon some key figures for our understanding of the transition between the Ancient and the Medieval World. This group of scholarly contributions demonstrates, in our view, that it is worth approaching these questions from the perspective of the *longue durée* of Graeco-Roman Antiquity. We hope that this volume will open new perspectives for this historiographical debate.

Finally, the editors would like to thank the support of the Spanish Research Ministry, the Department of Classics, and the Barbaricum Association for the Study of Late Antiquity, both at the Complutense University, and especially both their chairwomen, Isabel Velázquez Soriano, and Rosa Sanz Serrano. We are grateful for the inspiring work, support and presence of Peter Brown and Pedro Barceló in the series of conferences “New Perspectives on Late Antiquity”, from which this volume ultimately stems, for this colloquium was the sixth within this series celebrated in Spain from 2009 to date, and inaugurated by both scholars.

5 Brown 2016, 29.

6 See the contribution by Díaz Bourgeal in this volume.

Part 1
'Holiness'
*Concepts and Cases of Holiness
in the Graeco-Roman World*

Θεῖοι ἄνδρες vs ‘Greek Shamans’ *The Case of Pythagoras and the Animals*

DAVID HERNÁNDEZ DE LA FUENTE

1. Introduction

In the framework of this volume dedicated to the figure of the *theios aner*, I propose to study the figure of Pythagoras in the wonderful biographies of late antiquity and with special attention to his relationship with animals and the miracles that are told about him. In addition, I will also address above all the current rebirth of this conceptual juncture of the “divine man” as compared to another historiographic category, that of “Greek shamanism”, which used to be fashionable for a time and then fell into disuse. Both junctures are controversial and have aroused a very lively debate in the last 100 years. It is curious to see how the advances that have been made in the sciences of religions, in the history of philosophy, or in classical philology throughout the 20th and 21st centuries have often been made based on the review of sources, themes, motifs, or forms transmitted by Greek antiquity upon historiographic categories from other disciplines which offered a new standpoint. But fashionable concepts and categories turn very quickly to be outdated. This is what happened throughout the 20th century with these two mentioned junctures, “divine man” vs. “Greek shaman”. The first one rose, as is well known, from the realm of theology and was developed from Bieler’s monograph at the beginning of the 20th century. But there were serious criticisms against the “*theios aner*” paradigm, which arose as a conflationary construct in the wake of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*.¹ The same happened to the idea of shamanism to explain several figures from the Greek world, but this time through the field of anthropology, ethnology, and folklore, with the use that was done by Meuli, Eliade and Dodds, among others. It was soon discredited as the school of Religious Studies questioned Eliade’s unorthodox work and labelled it as non-academic and literary.

¹ See e.g., Carl Holladay, *Theios aner in Hellenistic Judaism*; Barry Blackburn, *Theios Aner and the Markan Miracle Traditions*; M. David Litwa, *Jesus Deus: The Early Christian Depiction of Jesus as a Mediterranean God*, among other scholars).

Both categories have been applied with preference to certain characters of the philosophical and sapiential tradition, such as Pythagoras and specifically to some Late Antique sources. It is significant that the two categories flourished in the early and mid-20th century, then fell into disgrace at the end of the last century, and now they appear to be somewhat reborn. Therefore, in this contribution, the objective is, on the one hand, to review this conceptual juncture of “Greek shamanism” in parallel to that of “divine men”, following one of the purposes of this volume, which is to give an update to this notion. On the other hand, after reviewing some examples and problematizing how, to what extent and in what sense the idea of “Greek shamanism” has been rehabilitated lately by some scholars, we will then inquire whether it makes any sense to reuse any of them in the context of the divine man by analysing the case of Pythagoras. As a case study we will work on the relationship of the Samian sage with animals in miraculous legends. And then we will be able to ask ourselves if it makes any sense to use categories such as “divine man” or “shaman” to describe the activities of a figure such as Pythagoras. But let us take this in parts and start with antiquity.

In the Western world, the first figure of a divine man with political and sapiential charisma was undoubtedly Pythagoras of Samos. Wiseman, scientist, priest and politician, Pythagoras was considered already in antiquity “divine” (*theios*). The Greek vocabulary referring to this philosophical, religious, and political concept and its use in late antique literature can provide an overview of the characteristic features of the providential man.² This idea is expressed in all its fullness through the expression *aner theios* (“divine man”) which has traditionally been applied to Pythagoras and some so-called pre-Socratics such as Empedocles,³ and later to the pagan holy men during Hellenistic and Roman times.⁴

Intellectual inspiration was divine for the Greeks and the sages’ closeness to the gods is often underlined as, of course, was the case of the divine (*theios*) Homer and his work which was considered to be the “most divine” (*theiotaton*).⁵ It is also a concept applied to philosophy: in the Platonic tradition, the discourse also seems an independent and almost divine entity, a *logos theios*,⁶ inspired by a supernatural principle. The divine madness that inspires poets, priests, prophets, or philosophers, according to the famous classification of Plato’s Phaedrus,⁷ can be interpreted as a mystical alienation towards the divine whose maximum level is the final contemplation of the truth. By

2 Cf. Cornelli 2003, 59–80.

3 Kingsley 1995.

4 Bieler 1935–1936 is still a key reference.

5 Plutarch, *Cons. Apol.* 104.

6 Plato, *Phd.* 85b.

7 Plato, *Phdr.* 244a, 249d and 265b. Within divine madness: the first is poetic, due to the muses; the second, the mystical, to Dionysus; the third, the prophetic, to Apollo and the fourth, the amatory, to Aphrodite. According to the Platonic interpretation of love, this is, of course, philosophical.

such inspiration, the divine man differs from the normal one⁸ by participating platonically in the divine (*to theion*) or in divine things (*ta theia*).⁹ The derived adverb (*theiôs*) is also used in philosophy for divinely inspired speech.¹⁰

But in the Greek biographical tradition of exceptional characters, from Plutarch and his *Parallel Lives*,¹¹ to the lives of pagan saints (Porphyry, Philostratus, etc.) and Christians saints (Athanasius, the desert fathers, etc.), the idea of the man marked by divine signs is based on the adjective *theios* and some interesting derivatives. We cannot go into these interesting derivatives in detail, but several are covered in some chapters of this volume, such as the adjective *isotheos* ("similar to a god"),¹² the noun *theiotes* ("holiness") and the verbs *theiazô* ("to act as a god", "interact with a god", or "act in the name of a god") and its variant *theazo*.¹³ Nor can we address other ethics that refer to the soul or *daimon*.

In any case, these adjectives often appear in the context of biographies – or hagiographies – that are gestated, almost parallel to Christianity, in the context of the Neoplatonic Schools and around their charismatic teachers. Not only Plotinus, Iamblichus, or Proclus, in their well-known lives written by Porphyry, Eunapius or Marinus respectively, but also the ancient Pythagoras were taken as ideals. In addition to the biographical pages dedicated to the latter by Diogenes Laërtius, those who rescued Pythagoras were the Neoplatonists Porphyry of Tyre (c. 234–305) with his *Life of Pythagoras* and Iamblichus of Chalcis (c. 245–325), with *On the Pythagorean Life*. In these texts there is a thematic nucleus of ancient origin that refers to the religious doctrines of ancient Pythagoreanism combined with a new philosophical agenda at a time marked by the decline of paganism and by a transformation of classical traditions in the new context of an empire on its way to Christianization during Late Antiquity.¹⁴ The reader of the Neoplatonic lives of this sage of Samos will thus obtain a motley overview and a mixed vision of Pythagoras as a historical, forerunner, shamanic, and semi-divine figure¹⁵ that, in any case, produces an enormous revitalization of this philosopher and his school.

Thus, the two Pythagorean biographers mentioned above collect the traditions that seem most relevant to them about Pythagoras to make the legendary Samian philoso-

8 Plutarch, *Ad Colotem* 1119b.

9 Plato *Soph.* 232c.

10 Plato, *Teet.*, 154 d, Aristotle, *Met.* 1074.

11 Cf. for the origin of this tradition Gentili and Cerri 1983 on the birth of the subgenre of biography.

12 Homer, *Il.* II 565, *Od.* I 324, XX 124, Plato, *Phdr.* 255a, Isocrates II 5, 5,145, Antiphon I 47 2.

13 Thucydides, VIII 1, in the same way that *theiasmos* is also referred to as divination in VII 50. Cf. also Plutarch, Themistocles 126a, Camillo 137a, Damascius, *Vit. Isid.* 36. As *epitheazo* also, cf. Plutarch, *Quaest. Conv.* I 5 623c, Plato, *Leg.* 682a.

14 This field was reestablished in modern times since Peter Brown's 1971 classic book. See also the massive and thorough guide by Bowersock, Brown and Grabar, 1995.

15 Scharinger, 2017, 213–229.

pher the patron of the mystical and ascetic current that, progressively, Neoplatonic thought takes on certain issues. The figure of Pythagoras as mediator is a point of union for these two authors, who account for the various legends and teachings that were attributed to this wiseman some eight centuries after his death.¹⁶ The old Platonic idea of *theo homoiosis* is joined to the Pythagorean *akolouthein to theo* thanks to the idea of divine filiation of the wiseman, evident in the figure and concept of *theios aner*.¹⁷ Not only does Pythagoras appear as a model of a renewed type of pagan holy man, but it is also at the time of Septimius Severus when the key biography of Apollonius of Tyana¹⁸ appeared, which became the prototype of the neo-Pythagorean divine man. These texts will greatly influence later biographies of charismatic leaders of Neoplatonism, contemporary to the time or their precursors, in Rome, Syria, Athens or Alexandria: the Pythagorean heritage is very conscious and significantly vindicated in this golden chain.

Be that as it may, the concept and vocabulary around the divine man, that is to say that he acts as a god, will have a major revival in late antiquity, when Neoplatonism assumed and adapted the Pythagorean legacy: this combination of science, religion and philosophy, following a literary portrait such as the one outlined in this series of words, has suggested to modern scholars the idea to apply various categories – sometimes metaphorically or anachronistically – for the study of this type of figure, following diverse historiographic tendencies à la mode in each period, from the 19th century onwards. Thus, Pythagoras and Pythagoreanism witness, as Cornelli (2013) has studied, a long story of interpretations. For our purpose we can quote the description of the philosopher as a “divine man”, following a theological approach to the philological or philosophical sources, to the more anthropological approach of taxonomies such as “medicine-man”, “shaman”, “miracle-worker”, passing, of course, through categories more typical of the history of religious beliefs, such as “holy”, “deified”, “magician” or “sorcerer”. The debate on these notions in antiquity would surely need an in-depth survey in many sources, considering its *longue durée*: this is certainly not the scope of this contribution, although we will seek diverse examples throughout these centuries. But let us firstly focus on the idea of shamanism.

2. On the controversial juncture of “Greek shamanism”

The historian of religions Mircea Eliade once defined the concept of shamanism as a “technique of ecstasy” that can be used in various ways for the benefit of the human community and to obtain divine favours.¹⁹ Of course his controversial figure and theo-

16 O’Meara 1989 and Bonazzi, Lévy and Steel, 2007.

17 Lavecchia, 2006, Des Places, 1964, Alviz, 2016.

18 Bernabé, 2002, 14.

19 Eliade, 1968.