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Abstract

This thesis examines the evidence for divinatory practices in Roman Egypt, focusing on rituals for questioning deities, and using the so-called “Theban Magical Library” as the core corpus within which this practice is examined. The first chapter examines the evidence for this archive, its publication and reception history, as well as its form and contents, in terms of physical, scribal, linguistic, and ritual features. This analysis is then used to situate the Library within the cultural context of Roman Egypt, and the historical development of Egyptian magical practice. The second and third chapters focus on the “ritual of apparition”, setting out a structural approach that focuses on the way in which recurrent features are combined and elaborated into a wide array of individual rituals. Alongside a lexicographical discussion of Greek and Egyptian terms for such rituals, the second chapter discusses the social context within which these practices may have taken place, and sets out a hypothetical cognitive schema within which the rituals may have been understood and experienced as efficacious. The third chapter focuses on the particular components of these rituals, looking at the way in which objects and actions were fitted into larger rituals, and how variations in their employment affected the way in which they “functioned” as parts of the practitioner's ritual technology.
Il y a des évocations d'intelligence, des évocations d'amour et des évocations de haine; mais rien ne prouve, encore une fois, que les esprits quittent réellement les sphères supérieures pour s'entretenir avec nous, et le contraire même est plus probable. Nous évoquons les souvenirs qu'ils ont laissés dans la lumière astrale, qui est le réservoir commun du magnétisme universel.

DOGME ET RITUEL DE LA HAUTE MAGIE, ELIPHAS LEVI

“Ma non potrebbero essere le anime dei bibliotecari trapassati che fanno queste magie?”

IL NOME DELLA ROSA, UMBERTO ECO
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1. Introduction

Within the field that studies the nebulous topic of ancient Mediterranean magic, it is common knowledge that a single type of ritual seems to dominate the abundant material from the Roman period. It is also common knowledge that the bulk of our evidence for this period comes from a single collection of texts purchased from Jean d'Anastasy. These two topics, the divination rituals in which the ancient practitioners summoned deities to appear and answer questions, and the archive commonly called the Theban Magical Library, are intimately intertwined. The bulk of these apparition rituals are found in the Theban Library, and the bulk of the rituals in the Theban Library are intended to bring about apparitions. On the one hand, the ritual texts assigned to the Library by modern commentators comprise some of the best surviving evidence for the beliefs and cultic practices of their time, from obscure aspects of Greek and Egyptian mythography, to the lurid practices of exorcisms and erotic binding spells. On the other, the rituals of apparition speak to a still stranger aspect of ancient culture, confronting in their matter-of-fact claims about what would in any other context be transcendental mysticism.

Yet there seems to be a gap in the literature; despite numerous smaller works (surveyed in 3.1.3), there has been no systematic study of these rituals since Hopfner's *Griechische Ägyptische Offenbarungszauber* (1921), and while the Theban Library has been the subject of much speculation, the fullest discussion to date has been in William Brashear's survey of the Greek Magical Papyri (1995), a discussion that depended largely on secondary literature. Both the papyri and the practices they contain are individually worthwhile objects of study, but there is also value in a simultaneous approach. By digging deeper into the history and materiality of the Library, the cultural background of the rituals emerges more clearly, while the issues unearthed through an engagement with the rituals may help provide answers to questions of composition and textual dependence.

The purpose of this thesis, then, is two-fold. The first part provides the fullest discussion of the Theban Library to date, attempting both to present all the evidence from primary archival material in order to systematically evaluate the speculations that have accumulated in the two hundred years since Caspar
Reuven’s first recognized its existence. The second part surveys the evidence for apparition rituals, providing an account of their procedure, social context, and role within a larger body of practice.

The first methodological problem facing anyone discussing ancient magic in the early twenty-first century is whether their subject of study even exists. Since the early 1990s the validity of “magic” as a concept in the ancient Mediterranean has been hotly contested, with numerous solutions to the problem being suggested – redefining magic according to various emic or etic criteria, or jettisoning it entirely in favor of a new term. Although I discuss this issue in the course of surveying the history of the study and reception of the Theban Library (2.1.4), I do not attempt to provide any global theory or definition of either “magic” or “ritual”. For the purposes of this thesis I will use “magic” and related terms to refer primarily to the genre of texts which is represented by the Theban Library, the practices they describe, and others which are clearly related to them. The question of “ritual” is still more complex, but I will offer a working definition at a later point (3.1.1).

This is not to imply that the term “magic” describes either the self-understanding or the social position of the ritualists relative to their society, only that there is a recognizable genre to which most of the texts gathered under the title of the Papyri Graecae Magicae belong, that this genre includes practices for which our English term “magic” is a good first-order approximation, and that it is a label which has historically been attached to these texts. While other terms have been suggested as replacements – most prominently “ritual power” – these do not seem to solve the problem. At face value, “ritual power” might include not only the practices traditionally designated as “magical”, but also rituals of social, political, economic, and religious power – the act of prostration before superiors, the theatrical ritual of military triumphs, the symbolic value of the poll-tax, the manifestation of divine power in the Eucharist – and yet “ritual power” is generally treated as more-or-less contiguous with the older category of “magic” (2.1.4.7). This leads me to wonder if it is merely a new label for an old category, rather than a radical reconceptualization of our classificatory strategies.

More important, I would suggest, than a search for new terminology, is a sensitivity to the questions that the excavation of the term “magic” has raised: are rituals considered licit or illicit, pious or
impious, and by whom? Are they they practices which took place in reality, or in the imaginations of outsiders? Throughout this work I try to avoid importing assumptions from our category “magic” where they are not justified in the material. The nature of the evidence here ameliorates some of these problems, since we are dealing with a body of practice produced by insiders, whose coherence is based on their co-occurrence within individual manuscripts and archives, and attested by shared markers of genre, such as the use of onomata, kharaktēres, specialist vocabulary, and formulaic phrases. In practice, “magic” is recognised by papyrologists and ancient historians according to these, and similar genre markers, rather than by more abstract criteria.

My approach to this eclectic body of material has been, by necessity, eclectic. Some of the work presented here is of a very traditional sort – studies of word usage, archival research, and close reading of texts. The fact that the corpora of texts available to me – papyrological, epigraphic, and literary – and the means for utilising them, are so much larger than those available even in the relatively recent past, has nonetheless allowed me to draw some new conclusions. Wherever possible, I have endeavoured to place the Demotic, Greek, and Coptic texts on equal footing, looking for equivalences and disjunctures between the bodies of evidence. This approach will, I hope, complement the earlier methodology of Hopfner, who often privileged literary sources, and sought to present the apparition rituals as a coherent, unified system. While there are certainly correspondences between the literary and papyrological evidence, it is often worth listening closely to what the papyri themselves have to say, however diverse, idiosyncratic, or incomplete this may be.

Alongside the standard techniques of philology and papyrology I have, like many other scholars of ancient magic, adopted the methodologies of other fields where these seemed appropriate. Thus I make extensive use of statistical description in my attempt to contextualise the Theban Library within the larger setting of Roman-era magical practice(2.2.4.1), but attempt something like anthropological description in my exposition of divine apparitions (3.3.3). Elsewhere, in trying to provide an account of the plausibility and effectiveness of apparition rituals, I have drawn upon studies of hypnosis and

memory in the disciplines of cognitive science and psychology (3.3). If these different approaches do not quite fit together, I hope that the overall effect is that they overlap to the extent that the light cast by their sum will illuminate more than any one could individually.

The first part of this thesis looks at the Theban Magical Library as a collection, discussing what is known about its first modern owner, Jean d’Anastasy, and moving on to the evidence for its composition and coherence. While many authors have touched on this matter in the past (2.1.3), I have relied on archival sources unavailable or unconsulted by previous studies; given the importance of these documents I have chosen to reproduce the relevant sections as appendix 2. This is followed by a survey of the publication history of the texts of the Theban Library, with excurses drawing out particularly significant moments when the Library has had effects beyond the field of ancient magic studies. The next section contains a description of the manuscripts in the Library, from a physical, textual, and linguistic perspective, as well as an overview of its contents. Finally, I attempt to contextualise the Library, exploring at length suggestions about its origins, comparing it to other magical archives, and to literary and documentary texts more broadly, before discussing what can be known about its owners, their physical environment, and their cultural orientation, based wherever possible on evidence from the texts themselves.

The second part of this thesis, looking at the ritual of apparition, is divided into two chapters. The first gives an overview of the practice, defining both what I mean by “ritual” (3.1.1), and "ritual of apparition" (3.1.2), before setting out the structuralist methodology that will guide the rest of the discussion. (3.1.4) This is followed by a series of studies on the terms used for the rituals in Greek and Egyptian (3.2.2), setting out their range of meaning, their overlaps, and what can be known about their origins in either cultic practice, popular belief, or philosophical jargon. The next section focuses on the social position of these rituals, why they were carried out (3.2.3.1), and what literary evidence can tell us about actual performances (3.2.3.2). Finally, I attempt to provide an outsider’s perspective on insider belief: setting out how ritualists could have understood their practices as efficacious, how they might have coped with ritual failure, and how subjective experience and its encoding in memory might confirm or disprove their beliefs (3.3).
The last chapter provides a synoptic overview of ritual practice as described in the magical papyri, supplementing it where appropriate with evidence from earlier and later handbooks, as well as literary and documentary texts. The focus here is on description rather than explanation, and where explanations are provided these are based as closely as possible on statements found in the handbooks themselves. While any of the processes and objects used in rituals of apparition could be, and in many cases have been, the subject of full studies, I have chosen to follow this overview with more detailed analyses of two practices which are by no means unique to magical practice, but which are the best represented in the ritual texts: speech acts and offerings. Since these are abundantly described, and offer clear similarities and contrasts with ritual practice from outside the magical ritual, they are often more revealing than the more idiosyncratic procedures.

The magical papyri represent perhaps the fullest ritual texts to survive from late antiquity, although those who composed, copied, and made use of them remain almost without exception anonymous. Despite their position in a continuous process of ritual practice stretching back beyond them and forward to the present day, there is no group that can clearly claim to be their intellectual heirs. To some extent they represent a dead-end, one of the last documented manifestations of the ancient polytheisms and henotheisms of the ancient Mediterranean. But I think this makes the attempt to enter into their worldview all the more interesting, and important. Despite their strangeness, they are as much a part of the history of human culture and thought as the traditions which have outlasted them, and in reconstructing their experiences, however imperfectly, we bring into the light of memory a forgotten possibility, a way of being in the world lost with the death of the Library's last owner.
2. The Theban Magical Library

The Theban Library occupies an important place in the study of ancient Mediterranean magic as the largest single archive to survive from Roman times, with its texts constituting more than half of most editions of the *Papyri Graecae Magicae*. This chapter sets out what can be known about it, beginning with a discussion of its modern discovery and publication, then moving on to a description of its form and contents, before finally considering what can be known about its ancient context. This exploration will take care to situate the Theban Library within the broader context of Mediterranean magical artefacts and cultic practice, laying out the terms of the discussion of ritual practice in the following chapters.

2.1 Discovery, Composition and Historiography

2.1.1 Jean d’Anastasy

The story of the Theban Library begins with Jean d’Anastasy\(^2\) (c.1780-1860),\(^3\) who served as Consul-General of Sweden and Norway in Egypt from 1828-1857.\(^4\) Anastasy, a Greek from Macedonia,\(^5\) came to

---

\(^2\) There are several alternate spellings of Anastasy's name; here I use it in the form which appears in the Triplicata written by him (RMO Archief Humbert 19.3.1831). His first name appears as both Jean and Giovanni, while his second is variously written as Anastasi, Anastasy, d’Anastasi, d’Anastasy, d’Anastasis, d’Anasthasi, d’Anasthasy, and d’Anastazy. The Greek form of his name seems to have been something like Ιωάννης Δ’Αναστάσης (Ekaterini Karizoni-Chekimoglou, "Κόμης Δ’Αναστάσης. Ο Ἀφανής Πατριώτης," *Μακεδονική Ζωή* 331 (1993)).

\(^3\) The records of the Greek Community in Alexandria give his date of birth as 1765, but Chrysikopoulos (Vassilis I. Chrysikopoulos, "A l’aube de l’égyptologie hellénique et de la constitution des collections égyptiennes: Des nouvelles découvertes sur Giovanni d’Anastasi et Tassos Néroutsos" in *Tenth International Congress of Egyptologists* (Rhodes2008), p.2) finds this date implausible. *Who was in Egyptology* gives his date of death as 1860, but, confusingly enough, Madame D’Orbirney, writing of Anastasy’s final auction on 28th June 1857, referred to him as “the late Sign. Anastasi.” See British Museum Central Archives, Origina Papers 57, June 1857-Aug 1857 Folio 100. However, the latest signed letter from Anastasy in the Swedish National Archives is dated to 18 May 1858, making the date of 1860 the more likely; see Kabinettet ud Huvudarkivet E 2 FA: 40 (Kabinetter för brevåxlning: Skrivelser från konsuler 1809-80 vol 40).

\(^4\) Morris L. Bierbrier, *Who was in Egyptology (Fourth Revised Edition)* (London: The Egypt Exploration Society, 2012), p.18. He seems to have been serving as Vice-Consul by at least 1826; see the dedication page of his inscription catalogue reproduced on p.18 of H.D. Schneider, *De Laudibus Aegyptologiae: C. J. C. Reavens als verzamelaar van Aegyptiaca* (Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, 1985).

Egypt with his father, 6 who was apparently a purveyor to the French army. At some point his family suffered serious financial misfortune, usually attributed to the withdrawal of the French army in 1802. 7 Anastasy was able to recover from this setback, and, based in Alexandria, became both a close friend of the viceroy, Muhammad Ali, 8 and one of the wealthiest men in Egypt, thanks to a monopoly on the sale of grain; 9 it was probably this resource, traded with Sweden for pig-iron, that led to his consulship. 10

Alongside his commercial activities, Anastasy amassed one of the largest collections of Egyptian antiquities of his day. Part of this was the product of his own excavations at Saqqara, Memphis and Abydos, 11 while the remaining, and perhaps larger, portion, was purchased, either from native Egyptians (who did not need official permission to excavate at this point) or in private sales held by

---

6 I consider the date of his arrival as uncertain. Chrysikopoulos gives 1812 (Chrysikopoulos, "A l’aube de l’égyptologie hellénique et de la constitution des collections égyptiennes: Des nouvelles découvertes sur Giovanni d’Anastasi et Tassos Néroutsos ", p.2), but this would make him about 30 years old. The date of c.1797 given in Who was Who seems more plausible.

7 See for example Who was Who; Dawson, "Anastasi, Sallier, and Harris and Their Papyri." p.158; Cassandra Vivian, Americans in Egypt, 1770-1915: explorers, consuls, travelers, soldiers, missionaries, writers and scientists (Jefferson: McFarland & Company, Inc., 2012).69; Scholars, Travellers and Trade Ruurd B. Halbertsma, Scholars, Travellers and Trade: The Pioneer Years of the National Museum of Antiquities in Leiden, 1818-1840 (London: Routledge, 2003), pp.99-107. The Baroness Minutoli seems to have believed that this the misfortune took place while Anastasy was living in Malta, which would not seem to fit this picture (Recollections of Egypt (Philadelphia: Carey, Lea and Carey, 1827), p. 30). It is possible that she is referring to another incident, but this seems unlikely.

8 Vivian, Americans in Egypt, 1770-1915: explorers, consuls, travelers, soldiers, missionaries, writers and scientists, p.69.

9 Schneider, De Laudibus Aegyptologiae., 17.


11 Dawson ("Anastasi, Sallier, and Harris and Their Papyri", p.159) does not seem to think that Anastasy did any field-work himself, although his agents certainly did so on his behalf. Reuvenen mentions the American Barthow as supervising excavations for Anastasy (Hans D. Schneider, "Egypt Outside Egypt: the Leiden Chapter," in L’Egitto fuori dell’Egitto: Dalla riscoperta all’Egittolgia, ed. Cristiana Morici Covi, Silvio Curto, and Sergio Pernigotti (Bologna: 1991), p.394); and it seems that Anastasy’s agents excavated jointly with Giuseppe and Amalia di Nizzoli at Saqqara between 1823 and-1826 (ibid. p.400). Champollion, writing in 1828, mentions that when he was having difficulty acquiring a firman (permission to excavate), Anastasy, along with Drovetti, ceded to him those which they held (H. Hartleben, Lettres et journaux de Champollion, Bibliothèque Égyptologique (1909), vol.II, pp.44-45). Slightly later that year, Champollion was received at Girga by Piccinini, who was then in charge of Anastasy’s excavations in Upper Egypt (ibid., vol. II, p. 149). See also Amalia Nizzoli’s recollections of the period (Memorie sull’ Egitto e specialmente sui costumi delle donne orientali e gli harem scritte durante il suo soggiorno in quel paese (Libreria Pirotta, 1841), p.236).
other European collectors, in particular those of the Englishman Henry Salt and the Italian Bernardino Drovetti.12

This collection was dispersed throughout Europe in three sales. The first, in 1828,13 bought by the Dutch Government in Livorno, Italy, was the means by which Colonel Jean-Emile Humbert acquired about 5,600 objects, among them 147 papyri, for the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden in Leiden.14 Alongside the main catalogue, three items – a Byzantine helmet and two papyri – were subsequently sent by Anastasy as an added incentive for the prospective buyer.15 The second lot, purchased by the British Museum in 1839 after an extended negotiation, consisted of approximately 1,326 items, including 44 papyri.16 The final lot, prepared in 184617 was finally sold in 1857.18 Held in Paris, the public nature of this auction meant that the 1,129 lots listed in the sale were purchased by several different European collections.

In addition to these sales, Anastasy also made gifts of several items in his collection. Relevant here is the alchemical codex P. Holmiensis, donated to the Stockholm Museum at some point before the 27th August 1832, the date of a letter of thanks to Anastasy from the Kungliga Vitterhets-, Historie- och

---

12 Schneider, *De Laudibus Aegyptologiae*, pp.18, 20.
13 The catalogue for this sale is held by the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden as RMO inv. 3.1.6. Dawson (“Anastasi, Sallier, and Harris and Their Papyri”, p.159) lists this as the second, but as demonstrated by Klasens, he is confusing the initial sending of the collection to Livorno in 1826 with their purchase in 1828 (Adolf Klasens, "An Amuletic Papyrus of the 25th Dynasty," *Oudheidkundige mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden* 56(1975), p.20, fn.2)
15 This offer is explained in the triplicate letter (*Triplicata*) written by Anastasy to his agents on 18th March 1828 (RMO Archief Humbert 19.3.1831). The helmet is inv. I 15.
16 The catalogue for this collection is held by the British Museum, Department of Ancient Egypt and Sudan as AES Ar.246. For a discussion of this sale see Ulrich Luft, “Lepsius und der Verkauf der Sammlung d’ Anastasi in den Jahren 1838/39,” in *Karl Richard Lepsius (1810-1884). Akten der Tagung anlässlich seines 100. Todestages, 10.-12. 7.1884 in Halle*, ed. Elke Freier and Walter F Reineke (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1988). The number of items in the sale has been calculated from the outline given by Lepsius in the supplement to his letter to the Adjudant of the Prussian Crown Prince in September, 1838, reproduced on pp.300-302 of Luft’s article.
17 Dawson, “Anastasi, Sallier, and Harris and Their Papyri”, p.159. A handwritten catalogue of the collection is held by the British Museum, Department of Ancient Egypt and Sudan as as AES Ar. 232.
18 The catalogue for this collection is François Lenormant, *Catalogue d’une collection d’antiquités égyptiennes* (Paris 1857).
Antiqvitets-Akademien (Swedish Royal Academy of Antiquities) preserved alongside the papyrus. After being held at institutions in both Stockholm and Uppsala, the papyrus is now held at the Kungliga Bibliotek in Stockholm.

2.1.2 The Composition of the Theban Magical Library

It was Reuvens, the director of the Rijksmuseum in Leiden who first suggested that a shared provenance could be attributed to several of the Greek and Demotic papyri of Roman date, those whose contents he described as “gnostic”, and which are now generally characterised as “magical” and “alchemical”. The historiography of this collection, the Theban Magical Library, is discussed below, but it is worth briefly mentioning the ten papyri which can be assigned to it with some certainty. They are:

- **PGM 1**
  
  =P.Berl. Inv. 5025 + Warsaw MN 140159; Anastasi 1074 (1857)  
  A magical roll. Acquired by the Königliche Museen zu Berlin as part of the 1857 sale in Paris. Shortly after the Second World War, the first of the two fragments of which this papyrus is composed was transferred to the Muzeum Narodowe w Warszawie, Warsaw.

---

99 Otto Lagercrantz, *Papyrus Graecus Holmiensis (P.Holm.) Recepte für Silber, Steine und Purpur* (Uppsala1913), P.Holm., p.45

20 The Victoria Museum for Egyptian Antiquities, part of Uppsala University.


22 It is generally more common to refer to the majority “pagan” papyri of the *Papyri Graecae Magicae* (PGM) using Roman numerals (for example PGM IV), reserving Arabic numerals for the ‘Christian’ papyri contained at the end of volume 2 of the PGM (for example, PGM 5). Likewise, the Demotic papyri are usually given lowercase roman numerals (PDM xiv). I prefer the consistent use of arabic numerals for the “pagan” papyri. This has some precedent in older literature (Morton Smith, for example, used this system, albeit inconsistently), and is the form in which all the papyri appear on the online *Trismegistos* database. Where the Christian papyri are referred to, it is in the form “PGM Christian [number]”.

23 Since Preisendanz's annotated bibliography (“Der griechischen Zauberpapyri” *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* (1927)), Anastasi numbers have often been attached to the papyri. While these refer to catalogue numbers, there are in fact three catalogues involved, each with its own independent and concurrent numbering system, so that to refer to PDM 12 simply as “Anastasi 75” is rather misleading. To reflect this, I include the year of the auction in brackets after each number.

24 A number of Berlin papyri were sold in Warsaw in the aftermath of the Second World War, apparently looted by Soviet soldiers. Since many of these were found along train lines, it seems the glass in which some of them were kept was traded by the soldiers guarding the trains for food and other supplies, and the papyri abandoned. See the discussion of the other
• **PGM 2**

  =P.Berl. Inv. 5026; Anastasi 1075 (1828)

  A magical roll. Acquired by the Königliche Museen zu Berlin as part of the 1857 sale in Paris.

• **PGM 4**

  =P. Bibl. Nat. Suppl. gr. no. 574; Anastasi 1073 (1857)

  A magical codex. Acquired by the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris in the 1857 sale.

• **PGM 5**

  =P. Lond. 46; Anastasi 4 (1839)

  A magical codex. Acquired by the British Library as part of the 1839 sale to the British Museum.

• **P.Holm & PGM 5a**

  =P.Holm Royal Dep. 45

  An alchemical codex, with one loose leaf (p.42=PGM 5a) containing a ritual of apparition.

  Given as a gift to the Kungliga Vitterhets-, Historie- och Antiqvitets-Akademien Stockholm in 1832, it was originally held at the Statens historiska museum in Stockholm, which acquired ownership of it at some point, but in 1906 was moved to the Victoriamuseet in Uppsala. It was returned to Stockholm in 1927, where it is kept at the Kungliga Bibliotek, which acquired ownership of the papyrus in 2013.


25 The idiosyncratic numbering of the *PGM*, especially among the lower numbers, is apparently due to Preisendanz's collaborator Richard Wünsch, who established the numbering at the beginning of the project. This numbering was retained due to the working process established by the editors. In the case of PGM 5a it appears that Wünsch believed that the leaf might have mistakenly been excerpted from PGM 5, a codex of roughly similar dimensions (see 2.2.1); see Karl Preisendanz and Albert Henrichs, *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri (Vol. II)* (Stuttgart: Verlag B.G. Teubner, 1931 [1974]), p.v.


27 Private communication from Hendrik Mäkeler, 2/7/2013, citing information from the Victoriamuseet database, and from Anna Wolodarski, librarian at the Kungliga Bibliotek, 2/12/2014.
• PDM/PGM 12

=P.Leid I 384; Anastasi 75 + 75a (1828); P.Leid. V
A bilingual Greek/Demotic roll with magical content, with an earlier Demotic literary text, *The Myth of the Sun’s Eye*, on the other side (technically the front →). It was acquired by the Rijksmuseum as part of the 1828 sale. Half of the papyrus was included in the original sale, the second half was one of the additional papyri given by Anastasy as a gift.

• PGM 13

=P.Leid I 395; Anastasi 76 (1828); P.Leid W
A Greek magical codex, acquired by the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden as one of the additional papyri given along with the main sale in 1828.

• PDM/PGM 14

=P. Leid. I 383; Anastasi 65 (1828)
+ P.Lond.demot.10070; Anastasi 1072 (1857)
A bilingual Greek/Demotic magical roll. The Leiden half was part of the 1828 purchase, while the second part was purchased by the British Museum in the 1857 sale.

• PDM Suppl.

=P. Louvre E3229; Anastasi 1061 (1857)
Bilingual Demotic/Greek roll with magical content, acquired by the Musée du Louvre as part of the 1857 sale.

• P.Leid. I 397

=Anastasi 66 (1828); P.Leid. X
An alchemical codex purchased by the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden in the 1828 sale.

---

28 Strictly speaking this number is fictive, since this papyrus was not included in the auction catalogue and therefore did not have a number (it is no. 2 in the *Triplicata*). The number was assigned to it by Reuven’s ([Reuven’s *Lettres à M. Letronne*, 3rd Letter, p.146]).

29 Again, this number is fictive, since the papyrus was not included in the auction catalogue. This papyrus was designated as no.3 in the *Triplicata*.
There are several reasons to believe that these papyri constitute a single archive. Some of these, including the coherence of their content and their overlap in formal and physical features, are discussed at length later in this chapter. For now, the most salient points are the following:

- All the papyri derive from the collection of Jean d'Anastasy.
- All were assigned a Theban provenance in his catalogues.30
- Two sets were written in identical, or near-identical hands; these are:
  - The "Alchemical Group": PGM 5a/P.Holm., PGM 13 & P.Leid. I 397
  - The "Leiden Demotic Group": PDM/PGM 12 & PDM/PGM 14
- An annotation in the 1828 sale catalogue, repeated in Reuven's notes to PDM/PGM 12, tell us that it was "found with No.66 [P.Leid. I 397]."31 Without access to his archives and letters,32 it is unclear exactly what he means by this, but the most obvious inference is that he had been informed that both Theban documents were acquired from the same source.
- With the exception of PGM 5, they were sold in two lots, each of which contained at least (part of) one papyrus (PDM/PGM 14) from the groups with matching hands:
  - 1828: PDM/PGM 12, PGM 13, PDM/PGM 14 & P.Leid. I 395
  - 1857: PGM 1, 2, 4, PDM/PGM 14, PDM Suppl.

30 For the relevant sections of the catalogues, see the Archival Sources for each papyrus in Appendix 2. While it is possible that the provenances were simply fictitious, all of d'Anastasy's catalogues note provenances for the papyri, though not the other artefacts. The catalogue for the 1828 sale (RMO inv. 3.1.6) contains papyri attributed to Thebes, Memphis, Philae, and Elephantine; the catalogue of the 1838 sale (AES Ar.246) only contains papyri from Memphis and Thebes; the catalogue for the 1857 sale (AES Ar.232) contains papyri only from Thebes. The variability in the assigned provenances, as well as the presence of a large number of papyri from the 1828 sale which note that no provenance was known, imply that Anastasy, or his agents, did keep notes on where papyri were found or purchased.

31 "...ce papyrus le trouve avec le No 66"; Rijksmuseum van Oudheden. Inventaris 4. april 1829-okt. 1838, p.31. "[Av]ec le no.66"; Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, RMO inv.3.1.6, p.99. For full transcriptions of the relevant text, see the Archival Sources for PDM/PGM 12 in Appendix 2.

32 The Rijksmuseum van Oudheden are in the process of digitising their archive of letters (briefarchiv); hopefully access to this will shed further light on any communication between Reuvens and Anastasy and his agents.
• Lenormant, who wrote the catalogue to the 1857 auction, claimed that the magical papyri from this sale belonged to the same collection as the Leiden papyri. We should, however, question how much information he had about Anastasy’s collection, however; he does not include PDM Suppl. in his list of the papyri from the Theban Library (probably because he understood it to be a funerary text), and, as discussed below, he seems to have been mistaken about the manner in which Anastasy acquired the texts. For these reasons, I do not consider Lenormant’s testimony decisive.

It should be clear that these reasons, especially in the case of PGM 5, are highly suggestive, but not definitive, and it appears that, contrary to the assumptions of some, Anastasy himself never made a statement on the existence or coherence of the Theban Magical Library. Nonetheless, it is also clear that Anastasy held at least part of the Leiden Demotic Group until 1857, making it more plausible that the other magical papyri from Thebes in his collection belonged to the same archive. As Bagnall has pointed out, it is no more economical to suppose multiple origins than to hypothesise a single archive.

33 Lenormant, Catalogue d’une collection d’antiquités égyptiennes, p. 84. Since Lenormant mentions Reuven’s Lettres à M. Letronne, and was apparently called to write the catalogue for the auction at short notice, it seems quite possible to me that he simply made an inference based on the similarity of the texts in the 1857 auction to those in the Leiden collection.

34 Betz (The “Mithras Liturgy”: Text, Translation and Commentary, Mohr Siebeck GmbH KG, 2005, p. 7 fn. 22) cites the Triplicata written by Anastasy (RMO Archief Humbert 19.3.1831) as “confirming the origin in Thebes”; his source for this assertion is Fowden (The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind, Princeton University Press, 1993, p. 168 [cited as p. 169 by Betz fn. 48]). In fact the Triplicata does not mention the Library as a group, or the location where any of them were found – with the exception of the helmet (inv. I 15), which is said to have been found on a mummy (“sur une Momie”). Fowden, who did not have direct access to the letter, correctly notes only that Anastasy mentions the purchase of the papyri; for the relevant text of the this letter see Appendix 2, in the Archival Notes for PDM/PGM 12.

Drawing attention to the problems with the supposed unity of the Nag Hammadi Library, and known instances where Egyptian sellers often put together “attractive package deal[s]” for buyers by putting together unrelated finds (Olivier Dufault, “The Sources of Greek Alchemical Inquiry” (Diss. University of California, Santa Barbara, 2011), p. 202), Dufault raised the important problem of whether attributions of unity by the buyer or seller could be taken as proof of shared provenance. However, this argument relies on the assumption that the unity of the Library is dependent on the statements of either Anastasy or his Egyptian sellers, when in fact it relies primarily on the deductive work of Reuven and others since his time, taking into account factors such as their shared ownership by Anastasy, their more-or-less reliable attribution to Thebes, and, most importantly, their form and contents (ibid, pp. 197-203).

There is a common supposition that the Theban Library was found in a jar or box in either a tomb or temple on the west bank of Thebes. In part this seems to represent an echo of the discovery of the archive known as the “Ramesseum Papyri” (see 2.3.2.1), but it also represents a reasonable inference from the writings of d’Anastasy’s contemporary, Giovanni d’Athanasi, who notes in his memoirs that Demotic papyri were generally found in terracotta urns buried around the tombs. In fact, very little is known about how Anastasy acquired these papyri. In his triplicate letter to his agents dated 18th March 1828 he mentions that he found the second half of PDM/PGM 12

---

37 Giovanni d’Athanasi, A Brief Account of the Researches and Discoveries in Upper Egypt, made under the direction of Henry Salt, Esq. (London: John Hearne, 1836), p.79.

Some confusion has developed that Athanasi may be a pseudonym of Anastasy, but this seems impossible; Athanasi’s dates, 1798-1854, are close, but notably different from those of Anastasy, c.1780-1857. Athanasi’s memoirs make no mention of Sweden or Norway, and rather than being a consul or grain merchant he was an excavator working for Henry Salt, the British Consul General (see for example the discussions of the two in Bierbrier, Who was who in Egyptology (Fourth Revised Edition)). A succinct refutation of any connection between the two men can be found in Richard L. Gordon, “Memory and Authority in the Magical Papyri,” in Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World, ed. Beate Dignas and R.R.R. Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p.149, fn.12.

The mistake seems to have been originally introduced by Dawson ("Anastasi, Sallier, and Harris and Their Papyri", p.159 fn.6), who records the fact that he was lent a copy of the catalogue of the 1838 sale by Seymour de Ricci in 1930, giving the title as Catalogue / of the very / Magnificent and Extraordinary / Collection / of Egyptian Antiquities / the Property of G. Anastasi. In fact, this is Athanasi’s auction, curated by Sotheby’s in 1839; the correct title is Catalogue... of G. Athanasi, and either Dawson or de Ricci made a mistake which would have been quite understandable given the similarity of their names, and the closeness in date of the two sales. Records relating to Athanasi’s sale from the British Museum’s Department of Manuscripts, held at the British Library, make it very clear that they were dealing with the agents of two individuals; for references to Athanasi see for example Minutes: Acquisitions 1837-1840, Letter dated August 29th 1838, the minutes for the committee meeting of October 1838 [no page numbers].

The mistake was apparently magnified when Dieleman commented in a footnote that “Giovanni Anastasi was yet another name adopted by an enigmatic business man, traveler and archaeologist” (Priests, tongues, and rites: the London-Leiden magical manuscripts and translation in Egyptian ritual (100-300 CE)(Brill, 2005), p.12, fn.30). Presumably he was aware of Dawson’s mistaken naming of the auction catalogue, and tried to reconcile the difference in names by assuming a pseudonym.

The error finally entered the body of a major discussion of the papyri with Michela Zago, Tebe Magica e Alchemica: L’idea di biblioteca nell’Egitto romano: la Collezione Anastasi (Padova: libreriauniversitaria.it edizioni, 2010). Presumably based on Dieleman’s footnote, Zago took Athanasi’s memoirs as those of Anastasi, and looked in them for evidence of the discovery of the Theban Library in situ.

This idea has achieved quite wide circulation; other instances of its appearance include Dufault, “The Sources of Greek Alchemical Inquiry”, pp.199-200: “I have no problem believing that Giovanni Anastasi, ‘Armenian by birth’ and ‘son of a merchant of Damascus’ was yet another name adopted by an enigmatic business man, traveler and archaeologist” (dependent on Zago); Damon Zacharias Lycurinos, "Conjuring Magical Assistants in the Greek Magical Papyri," in Occult Traditions, ed. Damon Zacharias Lycurinos (Numen Books, 2012).p.19 fn.1: “Some believe he [Anastasy] was actually a Greek named Giovanni d’Athanasi, from the island of Lesbos” (probably dependent on Dieleman).
...in the hand of Arabs (who following their fraudulent custom probably detached it from the principal papyrus in order to receive a greater price by the double sale)...38

This would suggest that the papyri were bought (possibly by his agents in Thebes) rather than acquired in the course of his excavations. This is contrary to the statement of Lenormant, who wrote the catalogue to the 1857 sale:

...M. Anastasi [sic] during his excavations at Thebes discovered the library of a gnostic Egyptian of the second century...39

We might perhaps try to reconcile the two statements, for example by postulating that one of the Egyptian excavators found the papyrus during a dig under one of Anastasy's agents, and later attempted to sell half of it back to him, but since the triplicate letter explicitly refers to a “double sale” (*double vente*) we must assume that both portions were acquired by purchase rather than excavation. Since not only PDM/PGM 12, but also PDM/PGM 14 were sold as two separate fragments, we might guess that this papyrus was also cut by the anonymous “Arabs”, since Anastasy's explicit reason given in the triplicate letter for making a gift of the second half of PDM/PGM 12 was to keep the two halves in the hands of a single collector.40 If this was his policy, it is reasonable to ask why he did not also include the second half of PDM/PGM 14, which in turn leads us to the possibility that he did not at that time possess it. It is indeed possible that the reason for the staggered sale of the Theban Library texts is due, not to Anastasy, but rather to “the Arabs”, who may have sold him the papyri in small groups, according to financial or other exigencies. Thus, if the first collector of the Theban Library was not Anastasy, but one of “the Arabs”, we might ask whether the other papyri, which I have excluded from consideration since they do not derive from d'Anastasy's collection (see 2.1.3), might in fact belong to the Theban Library, having simply been sold by the initial collector to another buyer. This is a problem

38 “...de la main des Arabes (qui suivant leur frauduleuse coutume l'ont probablement détaché du papyrus principal afin d'en tirer un plus grand prix par la double vente).” (RMO Archief Humbert 19.3.1831, p.3)

39 “M. Anastasi, dans ses fouilles à Thèbes avait découvert la bibliothèque d'un gnostique égyptien du second siècle...” Lenormant, *Catalogue d'une collection d'antiquités égyptiennes*. p.84

40 “...je me fais un scrupule de le réunir comme membre au corps que je crois être le sien, et j'éprouve une véritable satisfaction de pouvoir procurer au possesseur de ma collection un avantage qui peut être précieux.” (RMO Archief Humbert 19.3.1831, p.3). Here, as elsewhere, I have retained Anastasy's idiosyncratic French orthography.
which I cannot fully resolve, but I justify my exclusion of these texts on two grounds. First, it is perfectly possible that d’Anastasy did possess all the texts in the library as of 1828, or shortly thereafter, but was, consciously or unconsciously, not as consistent in his policy as his letter would lead us to believe. Secondly, the last secure document from the Library (the second half of PDM/PGM 14) was prepared for sale in 1846, and was acquired by Anastasy by that year at the latest; the most commonly cited non-Anastasy-derived papyrus attributed to the Library, PGM 7, was acquired by the British Museum in 1888, more than 40 years later. Thus, while it does not seem impossible that a private Egyptian might have held onto a set of texts for about 20 years (c.1828-c.1846), to assume that they were sold over the course of 60 years (c.1828-1888) – an entire lifetime – seems considerably less likely.41

2.1.3 Alternative models of the Theban Magical Library

Alongside the 10 papyri already discussed, a further nine papyri have, at various times, been assigned to the Theban Magical Library by different authors. This section briefly discusses the opinions of these authors, and gives my reasons for excluding the additional papyri they have suggested.

---

41 Compare the comments of Giovanni Athanasi on “the custom of the Arabs of not choosing to sell at one time and to the same person, all the collection of antiquities which they happen to have; preferring [sic] rather to sell them from time to time, and to different travellers, in order that they may demand a higher price for them” (d’Athanasi, A Brief Account of the Researches and Discoveries in Upper Egypt, made under the direction of Henry Salt, Esq.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PGM 1</th>
<th>PGM 2</th>
<th>PGM 3</th>
<th>PGM 4</th>
<th>PGM 5</th>
<th>PGM 5a + P. Holm.</th>
<th>PGM 6</th>
<th>PGM 7</th>
<th>PGM 8</th>
<th>PDM/PGM 13</th>
<th>PDM/PGM 14</th>
<th>PDM Suppl.</th>
<th>P.Leid I 396</th>
<th>P.Leid I 397</th>
<th>P.Leid I 398</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reuven (1830)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin (1852)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenormant (1857)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wessely (1888)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legge (1901)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preisendanz (1933)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorissen (1934-5)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith (1979)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowden (1993)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gee (1995)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagnall (2009)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zago (2010)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufault (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon (2012)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model proposed here</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Models of the Theban Magical Library from 1828-2012**

Y  Accepted as probably belonging to the Theban Library.
Y? Opinion of the writer on whether the papyrus belongs to the Theban Library unclear from their discussion, but can be inferred from their criteria.
? Noted as possibly belonging to the Theban Library, with uncertainty expressed.
M Mentioned in the discussion, but not suggested to belong to the Theban Library.
The possibility that the Theban Library might have constituted a single archive was recognised from the very first publication which dealt with them; Reuvens, in the appendix to his *Lettres*, noted that PDM/PGM 12, PDM/PGM 14, PGM 13 and P.Leid. I 397 probably belonged to the same owner, based on their form, content, and sequence in the catalogue: PGM 13 (=Anastasi 65 (1828)) was followed by P.Leid 397 (=Anastasi 66 (1828)). As he noted, sequential catalogue numbering was often indicative of a shared origin. However he also suspected that the next papyrus in the sequence, P.Leid. I 396 (=Anastasi 67 (1828); P.Leid U; UPZ 81; *The Dream of Nectanebo*) should be included, taking into consideration not only its catalogue number, but its content, a story containing a dream oracle; he made this suggestion despite the fact that its provenance was said in the catalogue to be Memphite. In fact, as discussed by Wilcken, the papyrus is written in the hand of Apollonios, the younger brother of Ptolemaios the Katokhite, and thus certainly comes from the Memphite Serapeum. The date this implies, c.150 BCE, is also far earlier than any of the texts attributed with certainty to the library (II–IV CE).

The next author to comment on the papyri, Charles Wycliffe Goodwin, accepted Reuven’s attribution of the Leiden papyri (PDM/PGM 12, PGM 13, PDM/PGM 14, P.Leid. I 397) to a single collection in his 1852 edition of the London codex, PGM 5, and suggested that the London text might have belonged to the same collection.

Wessely, writing in 1888, ignored the Leiden papyri, but connected PGM 1, 4 & 5, excluding, for unknown reasons PGM 2, the second Berlin papyrus, and adding PGM 3 (=Louvre no.2391 (P. Mimaut frgs. 1-4)), a manuscript from outside the Anastasy collection. This papyrus, a roll consisting of 4 large fragments, and 29 much smaller ones, was purchased by the Musée du Louvre from Consul Jean-
François Mimaut (1773-1837) in the auction following his death, held in Paris in 1837. While Gordon has suggested that Mimaut purchased this papyrus from Anastasy in 1837, he seems to have inferred this from its habitual inclusion among the Theban Library rather than from any positive evidence. He makes the same assertion regarding PGM 7, in which instance he is certainly wrong (see below). Without any clear evidence tying it to Anastasy or Thebes, and in view of the fact that the writing is markedly different from those in the Theban Library, I consider its attribution to the archive unlikely.

Legge, writing a little over twenty years later, listed as the contents of the Theban Library PGM 1, 2, 4, 5 & 13, PDM/PGM 12, as well as PGM 6. Like Wessely, whom he cited, he gave little discussion of his criteria, save for the fact that his investigations had led him to believe that all of these papyri were acquired in Thebes. PGM 6 (=P.Lond 47; Anastasi 5 (1839)) was purchased by the British Museum from Anastasy in the same 1839 sale as PGM 5, although the sale catalogue states that it was found in Memphis, rather than Thebes, so Legge was simply mistaken in this instance.

It was 1933 before the first sustained discussion of the Library, by Preisendanz, who sensibly excluded PGM 6, and counted as certain PGM 1, 2, 4, 5, 5a, 12, 13 and 14, as well as the two “alchemical” codices (P.Holm. and P.Leid. I 397). In addition, he noted the possibility that the unprovenanced PGM

---

48 Bierbrier, Who was who in Egyptology (Fourth Revised Edition), p. 375.
49 The auction catalogue is J.-J. Dubois, Description des antiquités égyptiennes grecques et romaines, monuments coptes et arabes, composant la collection de feu M.J.F. Mimaut (Paris 1837). PGM 3 is no. 541, and described as follows: “Papyrus.- Fragment d’un manuscrit grec, en lettres onciales, et dont le sujet est astrologique. Ce manuscrit, divisé en un grand nombre de morceaux qui ne sont point encore assemblés, est opistographe, et divisé en colonnes de texte mêlé de quelques figures de fones monstrueuses, et d’une execution tout-à-fait barbare” (p. 86).
50 Gordon, “Memory and Authority in the Magical Papyri”, p. 149. This is further implied by the date he gives: the only known sale by Anastasy around this time was that purchased by the British Museum in 1839, and 1837 is in fact the date of Mimaut’s own sale following his death.
52 Ibid, pp. 41-42.
53 British Museum, Dept. of Ancient Egypt and Sudan, AES Ar.246; see the archival notes in Appendix 4. Preisendanz noted that the Memphite origin was noted on the containing sleeve of the papyrus (Preisendanz and Henrichs, Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri (vol. I), pp. 198-199), and I was able to confirm this myself in a visit to the British Library on 8/8/2013.
54 Karl Preisendanz, Papyrusfunde und Papyrusforschung (Leipzig, 1933), pp. 91-95.
3 from the Louvre,\textsuperscript{55} as well as PGM 7 (=P.Lond. 121) and PDM/PGM 61, both from held in London, might also be part of the Library. The first of these, PGM 7, was purchased, along with five other papyri, by Wallis Budge for the British Museum from Messrs Bywater, Tanqueray & Co., a London firm acting on behalf of “a native.”\textsuperscript{56} While there is no information in the purchase records of this papyrus which might suggest its provenance, evidence internal to the two other Greek papyri suggests that they may come from Hermopolis (modern Armant; see 2.3.2.5). This is of course quite close to Thebes, but the lack of a direct connection to the Theban Library, the difference in format (discussed in 2.2.4 \textit{passim}), and the fact that it was sold over 40 years after the last of the Library texts was acquired by Anastasy – leads me to believe that this text may belong instead to another group of texts with magical content, which I refer to here as the Hermopolis Magical Archive (on this see below, 2.3.2).

In the case of the second of the London texts he mentions, PDM/PGM 61, Preisendanz simply refers to the opinion of its original editors, Bell, Nock and Thompson, who thought that “[f]rom internal evidence it is not improbable that it belongs to the well-known group of Anastasi MSS”, namely PDM/PGM 12, 14 & PDM Suppl.\textsuperscript{57} In this they were really noting only that the text was similar to what were at the time the only known Demotic magical texts on papyrus; in fact there are noticeable differences in both the physical form and the contents of the papyrus (see 2.3.4.2). While nothing is known of its provenance, R. Parkinson has confirmed in a communication to J. F. Quack that the papyrus forms part of the British Museum’s “Old Collection”, which refers to items from the acquisition period before the purchase of the Anastasi collection.\textsuperscript{58} It is extremely unlikely, therefore, that this papyrus has any real relationship to the Theban Library.

\textsuperscript{55} ...woher der religionswissenschaftlich bedeutsame, von Richard Reitzenstein zuerst nutzbar gemachte Papyrus 2391 des Louvre (Sammlung J. Fr. Mimaut, 1837) kommt, wurde nichtbekannt - auch er (um 300 geschrieben) könnte der Zauberbiolothek in Theben wohl angehört haben.” Ibid.p.94.

\textsuperscript{56} British Library Manuscripts Department, Minutes: Purchases 1879-1888, pp.279-294. PGM 7 is described as follows: A roll, 8 feet long, containing Astrological and horological matters, perhaps of the 2nd century.


Discussing the history of the magical papyri in 1934-5, Gorissen presented yet another list of the contents of the Library; he included the by now familiar PGM 1, 2, 4, 5 & 13 and PDM/PGM 12 & 14, but repeated Legge’s mistake of including PGM 6, and somewhat mystifyingly also included P.Leid. I 398 (=Anastasi 74a (1828); Leemans Pap. Y; UPZ 1.147), bought from Anastasy in the 1828 sale, asserting that it was included by Preisendanz as PGM 41. In fact the papyrus is another text from the Serapeum in Saqqara, a Greek scribal exercise written over a Demotic palimpsest; again the Greek hand is that of Apollonios, writing mid-second BCE, and PGM 41 is in fact P.Rain.4 (=Vienna gr. 339).

Yet another, this time more minimalist, view, was put forward in a footnote by Morton Smith, suggesting that only the Leiden material sold in 1828 (PDM/PGM 12, 14 & PGM 13) came from the Library; he thought it “improbable” that the other papyri deriving from Anastasi’s collection came from the “same grave”, although presumably he would have accepted the inclusion of the two alchemical papyri. Smith’s discussion of the Library occurs in the context of an attempt to show that the PGM are representative of Graeco-Egyptian ‘magical’ practice as a whole (as opposed to Near Eastern practice), which would obviously be weakened if most of its contents came from a single cache; his argument is thus motivated by his need to make this point, and seems unfounded.

The next important discussion was by Brashear in his survey of the Greek Magical Papyri. While generally following the lead of Preisendanz, he suggested the addition of the largely Demotic PDM Suppl., and confirmed Preisendanz’s addition of PDM/PGM 61, mistakenly asserting that although both texts were unprovenanced, the hand was the same as that in the secure PDM/PGM 12 and 14. He

---

60 Ibid.p.191
62 Ibid., p.133, fn.1. LiDonnici (“Compositional Patterns in PGM IV (= P.Bibl.Nat.Suppl. gr. no. 574),” Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists 40(2003), p.143, fn.5) suggests that Smith also included PGM 5, but while Smith’s argument is not entirely clear, this does not seem to be the case.
64 This assertion is repeated in Magica Varia (Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1991),p.71. He cites Johnson ("Louvre E3229: A Demotic Magical Text," Enchoria 7(1977)) as a reference, but in fact her opinion, stated most explicitly on
disagreed, however, with Preisendanz’s addition of the unprovenanced PGM 7, and suggested that the apparently certain PGM 1 & 2 “do not seem to belong to the same Theban find as the other lengthy rolls and codices”, presumably because, unlike the other predominantly Greek papyri they are in roll rather than codex form, and are shorter than the more certain PDM/PGM 12 and 14;\(^{65}\) he attributed Lenormant’s mistake in attributing them to the Theban Library to the large number of papyri he had to catalogue.\(^{66}\) While his point is well taken, the certain material within the Theban Library – Demotic and Greek, rolls and codices – is already divergent enough that the addition of two shorter Greek rolls would not increase its diversity unreasonably.

The final model to be discussed at length here is that of Zago, published in 2010. This model was the most maximalist yet proposed, and would consist not only of the ten papyri I accept as belonging to the Theban Library, but also PGM 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11a, 36 and PDM/PGM 61. Most of these have already been discussed in the context of attributions by earlier authors, but three – PGM 8, 11a and 36, are unique to Zago.\(^{67}\) Two of these, PGM 8 (=P.Lond.122) and 11a (=P.Lond. 125 verso),\(^{68}\) were purchased by the British Library in the same 1888 sale as PGM 7; the same arguments against their inclusion apply as in the case of PGM 7, and Zago’s inclusion of these documents derived from the fact that they were purchased alongside with this more familiar text. As discussed below (2.3.2.5), it seems to me that Zago’s deduction about the relationship between these three texts was correct, although she erred in attributing them to the Theban Library. The last of these, the Greek roll PGM 36 (=P.Oslo 1.1), was included by Zago on the understanding that Preisendanz suggested it might belong to this collection;\(^{69}\) in fact he merely comments on its general similarity to the other texts, without denying the consensus

\(^{65}\) Widths: PGM I: ≥80.2cm; PGM II: 94cm; compare PDM/PGM 12: 360cm; PDM/PGM 14: 500cm; PDM/PGM Suppl: ≥114.5 cm. Looking at number of lines in translation (in Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*.) PGM 1 & 2 are still smaller than most of the other rolls: PGM 1: 283; PGM 2: 172; PDM/PGM 12: 1186; PDM/PGM 14: 1502; PDM Suppl.: 204. Note however that they are of similar length to PDM Suppl., as well as the codex PGM 5 (323 lines.).

\(^{66}\) Brashear, "An Introduction and Survey", p. 3404

\(^{67}\) Zago, *Tebe Magica e Alchemica*, pp.61-75

\(^{68}\) The probably Theban origin of this text was noted by André Bataille, *Les Memnonia* (Cairo: Imprimerie de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1952), p.317.

\(^{69}\) Zago, *Tebe Magica e Alchemica*, pp.58, 74.
view that the papyrus derives from the Fayum. As discussed below, there is a possibility that PGM 36 belongs to yet another group, which I call the Fayum Magical Archive (see 2.3.2.4).

Other discussions of the Theban Library (of which some are shown in table 1) – Fowden, Gee, Tait, Dieleman, de Haro Sanchez, Bagnall, Dufault, Gordon – rely upon the works of one or more of Brashear, Preisendanz, Gorissen, Dieleman, and Zago, mentioning them in the context of their overall discussions rather than advancing substantially new arguments.

2.1.4 The Publication and Reception of the Theban Magical Library

The first magical handbooks of their type to have been published in the modern era of papyrology, the Theban Magical Library constitute nearly 60% of the best known modern collection of ancient Greek and Demotic magic, Betz’s *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*. As a result, their value to studies of ancient religious, ritual and (al)chemical practice is immense, but their influence has reached outside this small sphere to touch aspects of modern anthropological and religious study and practice. While a full history of the interaction with the Theban Library with the modern world is beyond the scope of this work, this section will attempt to sketch out several diachronic threads of this larger cloth by briefly discussing some of the most important publications dealing with its texts, and giving a sense of their place both within and beyond the study of ancient magic.

---

70 “Im Fayumgebiet aber ist allen Anzeichen nach die letzte große Erwerbung auf diesem Gebiet niederer Literatur entstanden: die von S. Eitrem 1920 in Agypten gekaufte Rolle I der Universitätsbibliothek Oslo.” (Preisendanz, Papyrusfunde und Papyrusforschung, p.94).
71 Fowden, The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind, p.169.
75 Magali de Haro Sanchez, "Les papyrus iatromagiques grecs et la région thébaine," in «Et maintenant ce ne sont plus que des villages ... » Thèbes et sa région aux époques hellénistique, romaine et byzantine: Actes du colloque tenu à Bruxelles les 2 Et 3 Décembre 2005, ed. A Delattre and B Heilporn (Brussels: Association Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 2008).
76 Bagnall, Early Christian Books in Egypt, pp.82-86.
77 Dufault, "The Sources of Greek Alchemical Inquiry", p.205. The model presented in the table is Dufault’s "weak" or 'Common scribal education hypothesis’, relying on the shared handwriting between the groups I class as "Demotic" (with the addition of PDM 61) and "Alchemical" (see 2.2.2.4.1).
79 The 1996 edition of Betz, Greek Magical Papyri, consists of 327 pages of translation, of which 193, by my count, are devoted to texts from the Theban Magical Library, giving a rough total of 59.02%.
2.1.4.1 1828-1913: First Publications

The first discussion of any of the papyri seems to have been in Reuven's *Lettres à M. Letronne*, written in 1830 with the ostensible purpose of discussing with M. Letronne a Greek inscription on a marble owl (Leiden ZM-7) which Reuven had been unable to understand when they had met in Paris in 1825; he decided to delay his discussion of this monument in order to translate selections from the Theban Library papyri, which he believed furnished evidence for the practice of divination, use of abbreviations, and importance of the number four in antique religious writing, and would thus help him to explain the inscription on the owl's base, which states that it was dedicated by a diviner for four coins. Reuven's first letter discussed PDM/PGM 12 & 14, the two Leiden bilingual papyri, while he discussed PGM 13, and the probable relationship of the texts as an archive, in the appendix to the third letter. In his lengthy discussion of the contents of the magical texts he related their practices to the theurgy of the sort described in Iamblichus' *De Mysteriis*, as well Mithraism, Christian and Gnostic thought, and Egyptian theological concepts, drawing here upon the recent works of Champollion, as well as older sources such as Horapollo and the Hermetica. While many of his observations have been superseded, his understanding of the texts and the diversity of their cultural sources is

---

80 This sculpture, an owl 76cm in height including pedestal, has markings around its eyes reminiscent of Egyptian depictions of the Horus falcon, and is the subject of the first article of Reuven's second letter. See also F.L. Bastet and H. Brunsting, *Corpus signorum classicorum musei antiquarii lugduno-batavi* (Zutphen: Terra Pub. Co., 1982), no.118.
81 Reuven discusses the significance of this number in Egyptian, Jewish and Gnostic thought on pp.30-36, drawing upon the beginning of an invocation preserved in PGM 12.58-60: ἐξορκίζω σε κατά τοῦ κατέχοντος τὸν κ[ό]σμ[ο]ν και ποιήσαντ[ο]ς τὰ τέσσαρα ἑμέλλα καὶ μίξαντος τούς δʹἀνέμους. Reading 'κ(υκλο)ν for κ[ό]σμ[ο]ν, Reuven translates this as "je te conjure au nom de celui qui 'tient le cercle (apparemment du scarabée)...et qui a fait les QUATRE bases, et qui a mêlé les QUATRE vents." (Capitalization his.) (Reuven, *Lettres à M. Letronne*. I Letter, p.28). For the application of his observations to the owl see II Letter, pp.10-11, 16-17.
82 Reuven mistakenly describes the recto text of PDM 12 (*The Myth of the Sun's Eye*) as hieratic (for example at p.5 of the 1st Letter). It seems that, in a somewhat idiosyncratic fashion, he reserves the term "demotique" for alphabetic Demotic, using "hieratique" to refer to ideographic writings; this is contrary to the usage of Champollion, for whom hieratic was simply cursive hieroglyphic script, and Demotic a different writing system (*Précis du système hiéroglyphique des anciens égyptiens* [L'imprimerie Royale, 1824 [1828]].p.21).
84 Ibid. 1st Letter p.22.
86 Ibid. 1st Letter pp.15-17, 29-31.
87 See for his example his exposition of the deity Ονσου, understood as some form of lunar deity; the current reading is ὄν(ομα) σου (pp.20-21).
remarkably close to the present consensus. Famously, or perhaps, rather, infamously, he suggested that PGM 12 was “born under the influence of the doctrine of the sect of Marcus... the Marcosians”, mainly based on the use of vowel combinations, which, along with magical operations, were described by early writers on heresies as characteristics of this sect. Though we should note that he only made this attribution after a long discussion of the problems of attributing it to any particular gnostic sect, he came to the same conclusion regarding PGM 13 & PDM/PGM 14.

Reuvens had originally intended to publish the Greek sections in full, but he suffered an early death in 1835, and his complete transcriptions of the texts were inherited by his successor as conservator, Conrad Leemans (1809-1893). In 1840 Leemans became the first Egyptologist to publish a systematic catalogue of a major European collection of Egyptian antiquities, which included basic descriptions of the Theban texts. This was followed up by a publication of PDM/PGM 14 in 1843, with the Greek sections transcribed and translated, the Demotic reproduced on 14 plates, accompanied by an extensive discussion; a more thorough, though partial, publication of part of the Demotic was made by Maspero in 1879. A full edition of the Greek texts was not published until 1885, when they appeared in the second volume of Papyri Musei Antiquarii Publici Lugduni-Batavi (1885) with Latin translations and commentaries.

88 “Je serais cependant porté à considérer ce manuscrit comme né sous l’influence de la doctrine de la secte de Marcus susmentionné ou des Marcosiens, et du temps où cette secte était dans toute sa vigueur.” (Emphasis his; 1st Letter pp. 26-27.)

The Marcosians are described in Irenaeus, Adversus haereses 1.7-14.


95 C. Leemans, Description Raisonnée des Monuments Égyptiens du Musée d’Antiquités des Pays-Bas (Leiden: 1840). PDM/PGM 12 & 14 are described on pp.120-121, PGM 13 & P.Leid. I 397 on pp.122-123.


98 C. Leemans, Papyri Graeci Musei Antiquarii Publici Lugduni-Batavi (Vol. 2) (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1885). Although Leemans speaks of Reuvens’ “erudition vaste” (Monuments Égyptiens du Musée d’Antiquités des Pays-Bas à Leide p.2) and acknowledges his use of his predecessor’s unpublished manuscripts (Papyri Graeci Musei Antiquarii Publici Lugduni-Batavi (Vol. 1) (Leiden 1843), pp.v-vi) he has often been accused of simply publishing Reuvens’ work without making significant changes. Preisendanz believes the transcription to be primarily the work of Reuvens (Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri (vol. 1), p.vi-vii), while Wilcken (Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit. Volume 1, p.5) gave more credit to Leemans. Cohen (“La Papyrologie dans les Pays-Bas,” Chronique d’Égypte 6 (1931), pp.406-407) recognises that Leemans did
The idea that the London half of PDM 14 was part of the same document as the Leiden papyrus was first recorded by Samuel Birch (1813-1885) in his notes on the document, but it is unclear if he made this more widely known. Leemans' successor, Willem Pleyte (1836-1903), seems to have come to the same conclusion, and he communicated this discovery to Jean-Jacques Hess (1866-1949). Hess went to London and confirmed this, publishing the first edition of the London part in 1892; while his original intention had been to include the text with a critical apparatus, he ultimately found this to be unfeasible. Instead, his edition consists of a brief description of the provenance, language, hand and contents of the papyrus, followed by a translation of column 5 (ll.117-134), and a glossary, followed simply by black and white plates of the papyrus. The two halves were finally published in a single edition by Francis Llewellyn Griffith (1862-1934) and Herbert Thompson (1859-1944) in 1904, although the indices and hand copied plates of the text would not see publication until 1921. Responding to what he saw as the numerous flaws in Griffith and Thompson's edition, Eugène Revillout (1881-1914), who had previously published short selections and discussions on the papyrus, began a series of articles publishing large sections in hieroglyphic transcription and French translations between 1904 and 1907.

The earliest non-Leiden text to be published was PGM 5, the London codex; this was the subject of a short publication by Goodwin in 1852, drawing upon the previous work of Reuvens and Leemans. His some original work, but thinks that the haste with which volume 2 of Leemans' work was published led him to rely too closely on Reuvens' transcriptions, rather than doing his own; he notes that he repeats several of Reuvens' misreadings.

---

96 British Museum, Birch. Catalogue Slips of Papyri. Vol.2 10,000-10,332; Dept. of E. & A. Antiquities, notes to number 10070; see the transcription in the Archival Notes to PDM/PGM 14.
97 J.J. Hess, Der gnostische Papyrus von London (Freiburg: Universitäts Buchhandlung, 1892).
102 Goodwin, Fragment of a Greco-Egyptian work upon magic.
edition was ignored by Wessely, who republished it alongside PGM 3, 4 & 6 in 1888, but Kenyon, re-editing it in the first volume of Greek Papyri in the British Museum, did acknowledge his work.

The Berlin papyri, PGM 1 & 2, appeared in a publication by Parthey in 1865, only 8 years after their initial purchase, but the largest of the handbooks, PGM 4, underwent a far more protracted publication process. Lenormant, the author of the 1857 sale catalogue, and Keeper of Antiquities at the Bibliothèque Nationale, apparently intended to publish it shortly after its acquisition, but he was to die in 1859, and Goodwin, making enquiries around 1868, was told the papyrus had disappeared or was inaccessible. Three hymns from the codex were published as Hymnes Orphiques by Miller in 1868, though his failure to cite their source led Kopp to doubt their authenticity. The initial Coptic sections received attention from Revillout, Adolf Erman (1854-1937), Heinrich Brugsch (1827-1894) and Griffith between 1883 and 1900, their interest provoked in part by the parallel between the Coptic PGM 4.11-25 and the ll.627-635 from the already published Leiden half of PDM 14. The first full publication of PGM 4 was by Wessely in 1888, alongside PGM 5. Despite minor faults, among them a failure to properly represent many Coptic letters, this edition still has great value.

While PDM Suppl., unique among the papyri, would not be fully published until well into the 20th century, a summary of the whole, and translation of the most curious (curieux) sections was

---

103 Wessely, Griechische Zauberpapyrus von Paris und London.
108 M.E. Miller, "Hymnes Orphiques," in Mélanges de Littérature Grecque (1868).
113 Wessely, Griechische Zauberpapyrus von Paris und London.
114 Johnson, "Louvre E3229."
published by Maspero in 1875; he considered it too damaged for a full publication. With this sole exception, the final editio princeps of a Theban Library text was that of P.Holm. + PGM 5a, published by Otto Lagercrantz in 1913. Like many authors before him, Lagercrantz made extensive use of the work of Reuvens and Leemans, this time their publication of P.Leid. I 397.

While most of these original editions have been superseded, in particular by the editions published under Preisendanz, they form an important part of the history of the study of ancient magic, with many of the most important observations and parallels having been noticed before 1900. A striking exception is their initial reception as gnostic texts, asserted initially, as we have seen, by Reuvens, with Leemans following his lead. While in many cases the label may merely have been one of convenience, the most striking exception to this incipient dogma was found in Goodwin, who, though noting the more salient points of comparison to the Pistis Sophia than to the shadowy Marcosians, decided that the work was more properly pagan, ascribing it with astonishing prescience to an Egyptian priest of Isis or Sarapis. This assessment was to have important consequences, and its influence can be seen in King’s popular 1887 work on the Gnostics, which quoted extensively from Goodwin, but agreed that PGM 5 was not a Gnostic text, though its practices resembled those ascribed to those sects.

If the gnostic assessment was ultimately doomed, we can already see traces of the later battle-lines – Egyptian and Greek – being drawn, in the contrasting approaches of Classicists who reproduced parts

---

115 Gaston Maspero, Mémoire sur quelques papyrus du Louvre (Paris, 1875), pp.113-123.
116 Lagercrantz, Papyrus Graecus Holmiensis (P.Holm.) Recepte für Silber, Steine und Purpur.
117 See for example Leemans, Monuments Égyptiens du Musée d'Antiquités des Pays-Bas à Leide, pp.3-4, 17-19. PGM 12 & 14 are both described as Marcionite in Papyri Graeci Musei Antiquarii Publici Lugduni-Batavi (Vol. 2).
118 Parthey ("Zwei griechische Zauberpapyri", p.116) suggests gnostic influences for PGM 1 & 2, but seems to stop short of calling them Gnostic. Hess calls PDM 14’s owner a “heidnischen Gnostiker” (Der gnostische Papyrus von London, p.x), while Maspero more cautiously calls PDM Suppl. “du genre de ceux que les premiers égyptologues appelaient papyrus gnostiques” (Mémoire sur quelques papyrus du Louvre, p.113). Griffith and Thompson decisively reject the label (Demotic Magical Papyrus, volume 1 p.3).
119 Goodwin, Fragment of a Graeco-Egyptian work upon magic., pp.v-vi.
120 C.W. King, The Gnostics and their Remains, Ancient and Medieval (London: David Nutt, 1887). See for example his statement on pp.241-242 that artefacts such as PGM 5 were Gnostic only “in so far as those theosophists [Ophites, Valentinians, and other subdivisions of the Christian Gnostics] were especially given to the cultivation of the Black Art.” See also his use of PGM 5 on pp.221, 233-234, 244, 282, 308.
of PGM 4 as Orphic hymns, and Egyptologists who re-transliterated Coptic sections of the same papyrus back into hieroglyphs.

2.1.4.2 Excursus 1: Headless God and Bornless Rite

A good case can be made that modern anglophone magic was born in 1887, from the heady mix of Masonism, Rosicrucianism, Romanticism, comparative religion, and the search for an empirical, post-Darwinian basis to belief in the supernatural. It was in this year that the Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn was founded by three men, most prominent among them Samuel Liddell MacGregor Mathers, who was to be for many years its visible leader and sole channel to their supernatural “Secret Chiefs”. From this organisation, and its splinter groups, can be traced most contemporary magic and neopagan systems of practice, from Wicca\textsuperscript{121} to Chaos Magic and from the initiatory mysteries of the Western Tradition to the Church of Satan;\textsuperscript{122} through its most (in)famous disciple, Aleister Crowley, the self-proclaimed “Great Beast”, it may even have played a role in the development of Scientology.\textsuperscript{123}

Unsurprisingly for a group interested in reviving ancient magical practices, its members were intensely interested in texts surviving from pagan antiquity, in particular those from Egypt – the \textit{Book of the Dead}, available from 1895 in the translation of E. A. Wallis Budge, seems to have exercised a particular

\textsuperscript{121} The founding figure of modern Wicca is Gerald Gardner, who claimed to have been initiated by a surviving coven from the ancient religion in 1939, but he did not publicise this event until after his initiation by Aleister Crowley up to the fourth degree of the Ordo Templi Orientis in 1947. Hutton notes that an assessment of Crowley’s influence on Wicca depends upon whether one takes Gardner’s claim to have been initiated into an ancient religion as broadly correct, or largely fabricated; according to a minimalist position Crowley’s writings filled gaps in the liturgy which Gardner inherited, while according to a maximalist position Gardner’s interactions with Crowley were the main source of material for his development of a new religion (Ronald Hutton, “Crowley and Wicca,” in \textit{Aleister Crowley and Western Esotericism}, ed. Henrik Bogdan and Martin P. Starr (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012)).


\textsuperscript{123} L. Ron Hubbard, the founder of Scientology, was introduced to Crowley’s magical practices by Jack Parsons, a rocket scientist and occultist, known as the “James Dean of the occult” for his glamorous life and early death. The position of the Church of Scientology, communicated in December 1969, is that Hubbard was on an undercover mission to “[break] up black magic in America...[they were] dispersed and destroyed.” Hugh B. Urban, “The Occult Roots of Scientology?: L. Ron Hubbard, Aleister Crowley, and the Origins of a Controversial New Religion,” \textit{Nova Religio: The Journal of Alternative and Emergent Religions} 15, no. 3 (2012).
interest for many of them.\textsuperscript{124} It is in this context that Goodwin's translation of PGM 5, not only published in English, but identified by its translator as the work of an Egyptian priest, becomes important.\textsuperscript{125} It seems that it was Allan Bennett, adoptive son of the Golden Dawn's leader, Mathers,\textsuperscript{126} who first made use of part of the papyrus, using a part of the text titled the \textit{Stela of Ieou} (PGM 5.96-172) on 13\textsuperscript{th} May 1896, in a ritual to summon a spirit named Taphtharthareth.\textsuperscript{127} The \textit{Stela} was originally an exorcistic ritual, but the practices of the developing modern Western Tradition were for the most part evocations, intended to induce intense and meaningful spiritual experiences, and it was to this end that its coda, submitting all spirits to the power of the ritualist, was employed.

This original borrowing was relatively minor, consisting of the addition of what were a few lines (ll.163-170) in the original papyrus to a much longer invocation composed by Bennett; nonetheless, his choice of this ritual was to be highly significant. In 1899 Bennett met Aleister Crowley; both men were then in their twenties, Crowley the spiritually hungry and wealthy heir to a shares in a family brewery, and Bennett a penniless adept. Bennett moved into Crowley's flat, and was for many years his mentor, ultimately leaving for Sri Lanka (then Ceylon) in 1900, where he was to become a Buddhist monk.\textsuperscript{128} Crowley inherited Bennett's papers, and it seems that it was at this time that he first encountered the ritual that was to become one of the most important in his career.

The Order's head, Mathers, was a prolific translator of ancient magical texts,\textsuperscript{129} and in 1898 he completed a translation of the \textit{Goetia}, the first chapter of the medieval grimoire known as the \textit{Lesser

\begin{footnotes}
\item[125] It is quite possible that the text of PGM 5 became known to members of the Golden Dawn through Wallis Budge's \textit{Egyptian Magic} (1901), which quotes parts of the \textit{Stela of Ieu} (PGM 5.96-172) on pp.176-178. The sections of this text used by Bennett and Crowley are more extensive, however, than those quoted by Budge.
\item[127] An edition of the invocation used was published later by Crowley ("The Temple of Solomon the King," \textit{The Equinox} 1, no. 3 (1910)). Interestingly, he notes that "Soror S.S.D.D. [Florence Farr] altered Frater LA.'s [Allan Bennett's] ritual", and that he restored it; this implies, perhaps, that it was in more general use among members of the Golden Dawn. See the comments of King (\textit{Modern Ritual Magic: The Rise of Western Occultism}(Bridport: Prism Press, 1970 [1989]), p.52).
\item[129] Although in this case it seems that he may have simply transcribed, and perhaps edited, Goodwin's existing translation (ibid.p.xvii, n.19). For a discussion of Mathers' translations see King, \textit{Modern Ritual Magic}, pp.194-197.
\end{footnotes}
Key of Solomon or Lemegeton, and began to circulate it among the members of the Golden Dawn. Crowley later claimed that he had commissioned this translation, but it is difficult to be sure of the truth of this assertion. In the meantime, he had lost faith in Mathers' authority, believing that his erstwhile leader had become spiritually undone. Their relationship became openly hostile, and by 1905 Crowley was convinced that Mathers had attacked him magically, successfully killing all his dogs and making his servants constantly ill. Crowley retaliated by summoning to his defence Beelzebub and his 49 demons. More importantly for our purposes, Crowley, apparently without Mathers' permission, published the Goetia, adding to it the Stela of Ieou, and, on the inside front cover, a curse taken from PGM 14.675-694, calling upon Typhon to destroy Mathers. While the invocation of Typhon has had a relatively limited life in modern occultism, the Stela, thanks to its position as Preliminary Invocation of the Goetia, was to become one of its most important texts.

The invocation, printed in Gothic type and divided into verses numbered with Hebrew letters, was accompanied by generous, albeit cryptic, footnotes by Crowley. The contents, though based on

---

131 Crowley (The Confessions of Aleister Crowley: An Autohagiography (1969), p.361) claims that he had employed Mathers to translate the entire Lesser Key, but that by 1900 Mathers had “collapsed morally,” leading Crowley to step in and edit it.
132 The proximate cause of their falling out seems to have been Crowley’s temporary conversion to Hinayana Buddhism (King, Modern Ritual Magic, p.109).
134 The confused authorship of this work makes it difficult to tell whether it was Crowley or Mathers who added the adapted Stela of Ieou. Pasi (“Varieties of Magical Experience: Aleister Crowley’s Views on Occult Practice,” Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft Winter(2011), p.149-150) thinks it was Crowley’s doing; Crowley’s statement that he “prefixed’ the text would agree with his assessment, if it can be trusted (The Confessions of Aleister Crowley: An Autohagiography. p.361.). King asserts that Crowley acquired his copy of the Goetia from Bennett, which would suggest that he had nothing to do with its production (Modern Ritual Magic.p.196).
135 Crowley probably encountered the text through Waite, a fellow member of the Golden Dawn who had published it in an English translation (The Occult Sciences (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd., 1891), p.65). Waite’s source seems to have been Leemans (Monuments Égyptiens du Musée d’Antiquités des Pays-Bas à Leide, pp.12-13), who provides both the Greek text and a French translation, with the same reference – Papyrus 65, colunxv – used by Waite. Crowley’s text is somewhat idiosyncratic, calling Mathers ΤΟΝ ΔΕΙΝΟ ΜΑΘΕΡΣ, ‘the terrible Mathers’, either a pun or a misunderstanding of the original τον δεῖνα, and ends the ritual with ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΠΟΙΕΩ ΚΟΙΝΑ, understood now (and indeed, by Waite) to mean “for this reason I am doing this (add the usual)”, but by Leemans, and apparently Crowley, to mean “c’est pour cette raison que je fais ces (ceremonies) profanes.” From this shared understanding, and of course his use of the Greek, not included in Waite, it seems that Crowley had access to Leemans’ edition.
136 Jake Stratton-Kent, The Headless One (Hadean Press, 2012). includes it in his study of the Stela of Ieou as a comparable ritual invoking Seth (pp.7-8), although he does not comment on its history within modern occultism. Its text is set to music as Goetic Invocation on the album The Art of Vampirism (2000) by the Italian Black Metal band Ghoul.
Goodwin’s translation, were freely adapted, the most significant change being made to the first line: I call thee, the headless one (σὲ καλῶ τὸν ἀκέφαλον, l.97) became Thee I invoke, the Bornless One. While the originator of this alteration – Bennett, Mathers, or Crowley – is unclear, the rationale seems to have been that since in Hebrew the word resh (רֹאשׁ) could mean both ‘head’ and, by extension, “beginning”, the text referred not to a headless being, but to a deity who existed without beginning.  

The importance of this text in Crowley’s life is hard to overstate. Travelling to Egypt with his then wife and medium, Rose Edith Kelly, he used the ritual several times; in November 1903, in the King’s Chamber of the Great Pyramid, he reported using the ritual to set the room “aglow as if with the brightest tropical moonlight,” and in March the following year, again in Cairo, he attempted to use the ritual to summon sylphs to appear to Rose. Instead his wife began to repeat the words, ”They are waiting for you.” He recalls possibly repeating the invocation two days later, the result being the revelation that “the one who waited” was the god Horus. After interrogating Rose they went to the Boulaq Museum in Cairo, and were drawn to inventory number 666, the stela of the Theban priest Ankhefenkhons, showing the Theban priest offering to the god Ra-Horakhty. Shortly afterwards, Crowley received, through a process of revelation from Horus’ messenger Aiwass, the Book of the Law (Liber AL Vel Legis), in which “Ankh-af-na-khonsu” appears as scribe, speaker and Crowley’s alter ego.

This work was to become the core text of Thelema, Crowley’s own religion, whose central tenet it gave: “Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law”. 

Between 1905-6 Crowley travelled alone through China on horseback, using the Bornless Rite daily in an intensive meditative practice, and the fruit of his occult experiments were seen in 1924, when he republished the invocation, with an accompanying ritual, as an appendix to his Magick In Theory and Practice.
Practice, with the title Liber Samekh.\textsuperscript{144} Again, he altered the text, changing the names “Moses” and “Israel” to “Ankh-f-n-Khonsu” and “Khem”, and added a more elaborate commentary, interpreting various portions of the formula as invocations to the directions and the elements. This version was apparently dedicated to Frank Bennett, an Australian then resident at Crowley’s Abbey of Thelema in Cefalu,\textsuperscript{145} Italy, and its purpose was explicitly to bring the magician into ecstatic union with his higher self, the angel who was "himself made perfect."\textsuperscript{146}

This understanding of the ritual, as an ancient, archetypal text of revelation, was confirmed by Israel Regardie, once Crowley’s secretary, who remained an admirer of his work even after their personal estrangement; Regardie’s publications of Golden Dawn material broke their oath of secrecy but played a major role in the popularisation of their practices.\textsuperscript{147} He wrote in 1932 that The Bornless Rite was “perhaps, one of the best rituals known to him”,\textsuperscript{148} and in 1980 he republished it in an introduction to ceremonial magic which gave a history tracing the text’s use back to Bennett, defending Crowley’s decision to interpret the name of the central deity as the Bornless One, but criticising some of his interpretations of the text, and noting that its original function was as a exorcistic rite, although he reaffirmed its value as a mystical invocation.\textsuperscript{149} Nonetheless he published not Crowley’s altered version from the Goetia or Liber Samekh, but the Greek text and translation from Goodwin.

The ritual – used either in its original form or as one of the versions of the Bornless Rite – seems to have remained popular in the course of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, its reputation as a powerful and efficacious text only increasing over time.\textsuperscript{150} There is a report of one English group – The Order of the Cubic Stone

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{Regardie (Ceremonial Magic, p.63) sees in the title samekh a reference to the branch of the Kabbalistic tree of life named after that letter, which links Yesod with Tiphareth, and is associated with Sagittarius, the “path of the arrow”, representing the aspiration to rise higher.}
\footnote{Lon Milo DuQuette, The magick of Thelema: a handbook of the rituals of Aleister Crowley (York Beach:1993).}
\footnote{For a fuller discussion of this concept see Pasi, "Varieties of Magical Experience."}
\footnote{King, Modern Ritual Magic, pp.152-155.}
\footnote{Israel Regardie, The Tree of Life: A Study in Magic (York Beach: Samuel Weiser, Inc., 1932 [1972]), p.266.}
\footnote{Ceremonial Magic, pp.65-71.}
\footnote{Several modern handbooks include versions of the ‘Bornless Rite’: a by no means exhaustive sample includes Donald Michael Kraig, Modern Magick Modern Magick: Eleven Lessons in the High Magickal Arts (St.Paul: Llewellyn Publications, 2001), pp.415-416; Jason Augustus Newcomb, The New Hermetics. 21st Century Magick for Illumination and Power (Boston: Weiser Books, 2004), pp. 232-237, which includes the information that a CD of the ritual can be ordered from the author;}
\end{footnotesize}
– using the ritual on a series of occasions, the first time accidentally manifesting a yellowish female hand cut off at the wrist on the left side of the altar, the second producing disembodied whispering voices,\(^{151}\) and a story of another of Crowley's mediums, Leah Hirsig, foretelling the creation of the intercontinental ballistic missile through its use.\(^{152}\)

Nonetheless, an important shift in emphasis came with the publication of Betz's *Papyri Graecae Magicae* in 1986; as Goodwin had done 130 years before, Betz's work made ancient texts available to a popular anglophone audience, which inevitably included aspiring and practicing magicians. The availability of these texts has allowed modern practitioners to bypass the interpretations of Bennett, Mathers and Crowley to reach back for an archaizing, primitivist, and, by extension, more authentic, magical practice. Three examples of this, all from 2012, will serve to illustrate the development of the historicising tendency which began with Regardie's return to Goodwin.

The first, *Occult Traditions*, is a collection edited by Damon Zacharias Lycourinos, gathering together articles by individuals who are at once scholars and practitioners of magic. Among discussions of Wiccan, Canaanite and Icelandic practices, studies of Graeco-Egyptian texts, principally those of the Theban Library, dominate, and the collection is rounded out by a series of hymnic invocations to Greco-Egyptian deities. The *Stela of Ieou* is the subject of its own article by Matthew Levi Stephens,\(^ {153}\) in which a translation, based on that of Betz, prints *onomata* in Greek capitals, accompanied by a footnoted pronunciation guide. Characteristically, its overall approach is both traditional and archaizing: the text is presented as revelatory, rather than exorcistic, but the title *Bornless One* is rejected in favour of the more authentic *Headless One*.

The second work is Stratton-Kent's pamphlet, *The Headless One*, dedicated entirely to the *Stela of Ieou*. Alongside a discussion of the ritual's history, and texts of its different forms - the editions of Goodwin

---


\(^{153}\) Stevens, "Akephalos." Stevens makes a few telling mistakes, apparently confusing the discovery of the Theban Library with that of the Dead Sea Scrolls (pp.269-270).
and Crowley – there is a discussion of its use not only by Crowley, but also by the author himself over the course of two “retirements”, in which he describes his own experience of time passing backwards and numerous visual apparitions.\footnote{Stratton-Kent, \textit{The Headless One}, pp.23-27.}

The final example is that of Michael Cecchetelli, whose \textit{Book of Abrasax} reproduces texts from Betz’s \textit{PGM} alongside others from Meyer and Smith’s \textit{Ancient Christian Magical Texts}, the Codex Brucianus, and other English papyrus editions of Gnostic and magical texts. Again, the form is self-consciously archaizing, including Greek and Coptic characters and phrases,\footnote{His use of these is often questionable; the Greek terms on p.1 are not well represented in the magical papyri themselves, and his Coptic (pp.4, 7, 8) is often manifestly incorrect, although the problem may lie with the notoriously temperamental Coptic fonts rather than the author.} and going so far as to claim that the texts are “a representation of the true Christianity and the true teachings of the Master Yehshua, as known to the Coptic Egyptians”.\footnote{Michael Cecchetelli, \textit{The Book of Abrasax. A Grimoire of the Hidden Gods} (Nephilim Press, 2012).p.3. Cecchetelli seems to understand the magical texts generally as (culturally?) Coptic regardless of their language.} But it is also deliberately engaged with the academic community, including brief historiographical digressions engaging with both scholars and past magical practitioners,\footnote{For example ibid.p.3, where he comments on Betz’s exclusion of Christian magical texts.} and ending not only with a series of original gnostic parables, but with a bibliography of authors and papyri used. Like the works of Lycourinos and Stratton-Kent, it includes the \textit{Stela of Ieou} among its texts, uniquely using its own name, \textit{The Rite of Jeu}, and restoring its exorcistic function as a ritual for securing space.

The history of ritual and cultic practice is filled with tales of the rediscovery and reinstitution of lost ancient texts, so that the use of ancient ritual texts by modern practitioners represents a paradigmatic, and perhaps unusually, real, example of this venerable tradition. This reincorporation began shortly after the papyri’s first publications, and has only intensified as more have become available in modern languages, and popular editions and the internet have increased their reach. This trend is only likely to continue into the future, and as the engagement of modern magicians with the scholarly community deepens we may see a situation in which increasing numbers of those involved in the field are committed in some way to the epistemic claims of the texts they study; but this is already the situation
in many fields of religious research, and the insights of practitioners may well serve to deepen our understanding of the documents. Even from the few examples sketched out here, the capacity of rituals patterned after those of the Theban Ritual to induce powerful subjective experiences should be obvious, problematizing scholarly writing which seeks to dismiss ancient ritualists as charlatans. We should be careful, however, of drawing parallels too nearly, merely because we use the word 'magic' to describe both modern and ancient phenomena; the rituals of the Theban Library are usually directed towards quite specific purposes – changing human relationships, cursing, revelation, the aversion of malevolent fate – whereas the goal of modern magic is more often the experience of intensely powerful mystical states achieved through a praxis understood in many ways as a “Western” answer to the “Eastern” meditative, ritual and tantric practices of Buddhism, Hinduism and Daoism.

2.1.4.3 1885-1925: Necromancy and Neoromanticism

As the initial publications and translations of the Theban Magical Library were completed, and knowledge of their contents gradually spread, secondary works began to appear, subjecting the papyri to more careful analysis, and contextualising them within broader schemes of knowledge.

Marcellin Berthelot (1827-1907), chemist, politician and historian, seems to have become interested in the Leiden papyri while writing his 1885 work on the origins of alchemy,158 and he would go on to publish a translation of P.Leid. I 397 in his 1887 collection of ancient alchemical texts.159 He considered this text incredibly important, being the oldest alchemical manuscript then known, and thus probably an example of the type of books which served as the model for the more plentiful later works, but which he thought had been largely destroyed by Diocletian’s book burnings around 290 CE.160 Even more importantly, however, he believed that its simple and largely effective recipes it showed alchemy had not originated in the “purely chimerical imaginings” (imaginations purement chimériques) of its

---

158 Marcellin Berthelot, Les Origines de l’Alchimie (Paris 1885). Since Leemans’ edition of P.Leid. I 397 had yet to be published, Berthelot tells us that he relied on a photograph and a copy (presumably of Reuven’s transcription) of two pages (p.3). The same discussion on the Leiden papyri was reproduced in Introduction à l’Étude de la Chimie des Anciens et du Moyen Age (Paris 1889), pp.3-73.


160 Les Origines de l’Alchimie, p.80, 87; Collection des Anciens Alchimistes Grecs, p.4.
early theorists, but rather on tried and tested, practical methods for producing imitation metals. Berthelot’s interest, however, was not simply in the alchemical papyri – in each of his publications he spent time describing in detail the other Leiden papyri, seeing them as the collection of an ancient magician, in turn proof of the close link between the origins of alchemy and the history of Gnosticism and magic.

No discussion of the Theban Library would be complete without mention of Albrecht Dieterich (1866-1908). Suzanne Marchand, in her brilliant 2003 essay, has located Dieterich within the broader reaction against the liberal classicism of early 19th century Germany, as part of a generation of Classics scholars who embraced the hitherto taboo topics of “the East, sex, and religion”. Dieterich’s father-in-law and doctoral supervisor Hermann Usener (1834-1905) was one of these ‘mavericks’, among whose interests was the practice of sifting through late antique saints’ lives to find hidden pagan survivals. Dieterich was to apply this same technique to the Theban papyri, re-editing and commenting upon PGM 13 in his 1888 doctoral thesis, in 1891 discussing PGM 12 in a work composed of material intended for a Habilitationsschrift, but published independently when he realised a more conventional topic would better fit his career aspirations, and in 1903 tackling PGM 4.475-820, the ritual he designated the *Mithras Liturgy*. In the earlier of these works Dieterich had carefully drawn apart the strands of Greek, gnostic, Egyptian and Orphic influences, suggesting that many of the origins of the syncretistic formulae lay in older, more properly religious, hymns. The most complete application of this thesis was in the last of the three, in which he argued that buried in the “terrifying rubbish heap” of PGM 4 was a ritual belonging to an Egyptian Mithraic sect. While

---

161 Collection des Anciens Alchimistes Grecs, pp.19-20.
162 Ibid.p.7.
166 Eine Mithras liturgie(Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1910). I will continue to refer to the text by this name (*Mithras Liturgy*), since it is so well known; this should not be taken to imply that it is either a liturgy, or bears any real relationship to the cult of Mithras.
167 Ibid.p.29; quoted in Marchand, "From Liberalism to Neoromanticism", p.149.
his theory was by no means universally accepted, and his contemptuous attitude to the papyri themselves would later seem an anachronism, his approach was, and remains, extremely influential, and we owe him much for disseminating knowledge of the papyri within the broader study of religion.

One example of this influence can be seen in the work of Adolf Deissmann, a theologian intensely interested in Greek philology. Dieterich’s hand is evident throughout Deissmann’s Licht vom Osten (1908), a work which drew extensively on the magical papyri, in particular PGM 4, to illuminate the language and social setting of the New Testament, an approach which was, as we will see, to become extremely important in later studies. Along similar lines, Richard August Reitzenstein drew upon the Greek papyri in his works setting out the pagan context of early Christianity, among them Poimandres (1904), and Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen (1910).

Among the other studies of this type, Theodor Hopfner’s (1886-1946) Griechische-Ägyptische Offenbarungzauber, published in two volumes in 1921 and 1924, was particularly outstanding; its goal was to provide full editions and commentaries on the revelation rituals from all of the magical papyri then published, contextualising them firmly within the histories of Greek and Egyptian religion and philosophy.

Finally, the work of the Czech François Lexa (1876-1960) played an important role in introducing the magical papyri to the francophone world, and setting them firmly within Egyptology. His three-volume La Magie dans l’Égypte Antique discussed, published and translated texts dating from the Old Kingdom through to the Coptic period; among these were selected excerpts from PDM 14, Suppl., and the Coptic sections of PGM 4. His approach, using texts from distant periods of Egyptian history together to create a determinedly synchronic picture, would be followed by later Egyptologists such as Ritner and Koenig.

---

\[168\] For example in Robert K. Ritner, The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice (The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1993 [2008]).

\[169\] For example in Yvan Koenig, Magie et Magiciens dans l’Egypte Ancienne (Paris: Pygmalion, 1994).
2.1.4.4 **Excursus 2: Mauss, Mana and the Mithras Liturgy**

The name of Marcel Mauss is often invoked in discussions of the development of sociological and anthropological understandings of magic, but his immense contributions to modern theoretical understandings of religion and magic have rarely been made explicit,\(^{170}\) and the role of the Theban Library in his classic work on magic has never, to the best of my knowledge, been explored.

In 1899, together with the archaeologist and sociologist Henri Hubert, Mauss wrote *Essai sur la nature et la fonction du sacrifice*, a work which laid out the rationale of what they considered religion's most fundamental act – sacrifice – and its defining characteristic – the Sacred (*le sacré*). Three years later, in *Esquisse d'une théorie générale de la magie* they tackled magic.\(^{171}\) At the time they were writing, the dominant models of authors such as Frazer and Tyler posited an evolutionary model, in which magic represented a primitive form of religion, out of which science was in turn a more developed outgrowth.\(^{172}\) Within this schema, magic was understood in psychologising terms, a consequence of the attempts of “primitive” individuals to understand, control and project their own personalities into the outside world.\(^{173}\) Mauss and Hubert rejected this model, instead grounding magic in *mana*, a power

\(^{170}\) The most obvious exception to this is in Lévi-Strauss's essay on the work discussed here, where he claims that “Mauss's influence is not limited to ethnographers, none of whom could claim to have escaped it, but extends also to linguists, psychologists, historians of religion and orientalists; so that a whole constellation of French researchers in the social sciences and the human sciences have in some way got their bearings from him” (*Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss [Introduction a l'oeuvre de Marcel Mauss]*) , trans. Felicity Baker (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1950 [1987]), pp.1-2).

\(^{171}\) The sole authorship of this work is often attributed to Mauss, in part due to the fact that the work was republished in 1950 in a collection of his essays titled *Sociologie et anthropologie*, although a note was made of Hubert's joint authorship. This version was subsequently translated into English by Robert Brain in 1972, this time without acknowledgement of Hubert. This trend of citing Mauss alone as author is at present almost universal, at least in the English-language literature. For a discussion see the contemporary criticisms in Wendy James, "Review of 'A General Theory of Magic', by Marcel Mauss. Translated by Robert Brain," *African Affairs* 73, no. 291 (1974).p.234; Malcolm Ruel, "Review of Mauss, Marcel. 'A general theory of magic'; translated by Robert Brain," *Man* 10, no. 1 (1975), p.141.

Leacock ("The Ethnological Theory of Marcel Mauss," *American Anthropologist* 56, no. 1 (1954)) comments that it is difficult to know how work was shared between the collaborators, but that the close relationship between the members of the *Année Sociologique* group meant that “it is probable that almost any combination... would have produced much the same study”(p.62). The importance of Hubert's contribution is obvious when we consider his earlier independent work on Graeco-Roman magic, which came to the same conclusions as the later universalising study (*Magia,* in *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines. Volume 3 Part 1*, ed. Ch. Daremberg, Edm. Saglio, and Edm. Pottier (Paris: Libraire Hachette et C", 1900).


which it drew upon and manipulated, and which was determined not on the individual, but on the social level.\textsuperscript{174} The attribution of \textit{mana} to objects and acts was performed by society in general, and the individual could only draw upon these larger concepts. The consequence of this was that the sacred itself, the defining characteristic of religion, became merely one instantiation of \textit{mana}.\textsuperscript{175} As Émile Durkheim, Mauss's uncle and teacher put it: "We are now able to understand how it comes that magic is so full of religious elements: it is because it was born of religion."\textsuperscript{176}

Thus the outcome of Mauss and Hubert's attempt to define magic was to lose the term within the larger concept of religion, creating a new, though not immediately or universally accepted, category of 'magico-religion'.\textsuperscript{177} They attempted to retain the separation of the two by setting up numerous, but inadequate, sets of binary oppositions: religion is licit openly while magic is prohibited,\textsuperscript{178} religion is ordered whereas magic is formless and chaotic,\textsuperscript{179} religion is practiced openly but magic in secret.\textsuperscript{180}

---


\textsuperscript{175} Ibid, p.146.


\textsuperscript{177} On this idea (that Mauss and Hubert weakened the magic-religion dichotomy) see for example the discussion in Robert J. Fornaro, "Review of 'A General Theory of Magic'," \textit{American Anthropologist} 76, no. 1 (1974), pp.100-101, and Pocock's introduction to the English translation (Mauss and Hubert, \textit{General Theory of Magic}, pp.1-2). Ruel is more sceptical, asking rhetorically, "[c]an a book contribute to an effect which runs clean counter to the stated intention of its authors?", before concluding that "[t]he answer, I suppose, is that it can if it passes through the catalytic influence of Lévi-Strauss's mind" ("Review of 'A general theory of magic'", p.141).

The earliest citation in the OED for 'magico-religious' is from 1908 (R. R. Marett, "Review of Adonis 'Attis Osiris: Studies in the History of Oriental Religion' by Dr. Frazer," in ibid. 8(1908)), although the earliest English example on JSTOR is found in a review of an earlier edition of the same book by the same author from 1906 ("Review of 'Adonis Attis Osiris: Studies in the History of Oriental Religion' by Dr. Frazer," \textit{Man} 6 (1906)). I have found 5 scattered earlier instances from 1816-1901, but these generally seem to use it to imply a lower form of religion rather than an understanding that the two are indistinguishable or a continuum; a look at its frequency of employment on Google ngram viewer shows a dramatic increase in the phrase's use a little before 1910. The first person to use it (or rather, the French equivalent) in this sense may have been van Gennep (\textit{Mythes et Légendes d'Australie} (Paris1906), p.lxxxi and following), who, drawing upon Mauss and Hubert's concept of \textit{mana}, justified his use of "magico-relieux" by stating that "[d]ans tous ces cas il est impossible, quelle que soit la rigueur d'une définition des mots magie et religion, de décider à quel moment le rite est soit magique, soit religieux. Car ces rites sont l'expression d'une même idée dynamiste qui se trouve à la base même de ces deux catégories de croyances collectives" (p.lxxxiii).

\textsuperscript{178} Mauss and Hubert, \textit{General Theory of Magic}, p.27.

\textsuperscript{179} Ibid,p.108.

\textsuperscript{180} Ibid,p.29.
and whereas religion is abstract, magic is functional. Durkheim, who drew extensively on his nephew's works on sacrifice and magic, attempted his own definition – religion has a “Church”, that is to say it is bound to a defined social group, whereas, in his famous turn of phrase “[t]here is no Church of magic” – yet Mauss and Hubert had already spent a great deal of time locating magic within initiatory magical societies, “difficult to distinguish... from religious groups”.

Mauss and Hubert's work drew upon multiple sources, most noticeably anthropological studies of Polynesian, Melanesian, American and Australian native peoples, but alongside these were studies of the textual remains of ancient cultures, chief among which were the magical and alchemical papyri of the Theban Library; as sources for Greek practice they explicitly privileged these over the more suspect “magical tales and stories”. Already by 1900, Hubert had written an article on Greek and Roman magical practices in which he drew heavily upon the papyri published in the last fifty years, in particular the work of Dieterich on PGM 4 and 13. These, along with Berthelot's work on Greek alchemical material were extremely important sources for their study.

In their previous work, Mauss and Hubert had defined sacrifice as the key act of religion, and in the papyri they found this act inextricably entwined with magical rituals. In particular, they focused on the Oracle of Kronos (PGM 4.3086-3124), in which they observed that not only was there sacrifice, but also an exit rite (rite de sortie), one of the stages in their archetypal sacrificial model. Indeed, despite the frequency of references to sacrifice in their study, the Oracle of Kronos is, along with Hindu ritual, the only specific example cited, and of the two, the only one discussed at length.

Dieterich's influence on their approach to the papyri becomes particularly important when they turn to look for magical appropriation of religious material. They note that the hymns to Artemis and Helios (principally in PGM 4) are “very similar to [those] we are in the habit of calling religious”, and

---

181 Ibid., pp.174-175.
183 Mauss and Hubert, General Theory of Magic, p.54.
184 Ibid., p.21 fn.8.
185 They also refer briefly to PGM 7 (on p.65), but this papyrus does not play the same role in their study as PGM 4 and 13.
186 Mauss and Hubert, General Theory of Magic, pp.64-65.
187 Ibid., p.61.
use Dieterich’s derivation of the *Mithras Liturgy* (PGM 4.475-829) from a genuine Mithraic ritual as an instance of proof of their theory.\(^{188}\) While they cite a few instances from other cultures, the Theban example is, once again, the most fully developed. Indeed, Hubert had reached essentially the same conclusions about magic and religion using only Graeco-Roman material in his earlier discussion of *magia*, which relied to an even greater extent on Dieterich and the magical papyri.\(^{189}\)

Even their discussion of *mana*, named after a Polynesian concept, draws heavily on Greek sources, although in this case the alchemical manuscripts published by Berthelot alongside the Theban papyri play a more important role. They define *mana* as simultaneously a property, a thing, and a force,\(^{190}\) and compare it to the alchemical concepts of φύσις and δύναμις, described in essentially the same way.\(^{191}\)

But the influence of alchemical texts goes deeper; Mauss and Hubert argue that underlying magic is a basic concept of causality, in which sympathy and *mana* serve as the basic principles which later develop into the more fully realised laws of material relations and forces described by science. As proof of this they noted that magicians were not only the first poisoners and surgeons, but that they had “made real discoveries in the field of metallurgy”.\(^{192}\) It is clear that the authors are referring specifically to the “magicians” of the Theban Library, who owned not only magical texts, but, in P.Leid. I 397, a metallurgical treatise whose efficacy is compared by Berthelot to the near contemporary *Manuels Roret*.\(^{193}\) Thus the collecting habits of the owner of the Theban Library played a critical role in their conceptualisation of the relationship between magic and science.

The fact that examples drawn from the papyri played such an important role at each stage of Mauss and Hubert’s overall argument\(^{194}\) does not seem to have been picked up by later authors;\(^{195}\) their

\(^{188}\) Ibid, pp.68-69.

\(^{189}\) “[E]lle [magic] en prend les éléments dans les religions, mais elle désorganise ces éléments” (Hubert, “Magia”, p.1521). In this work too, Hubert devotes notes the presence of sacrifice and exit rites in the *Oracle of Kronos* (p.1520), alongside other themes which recur in his later collaboration with Mauss.


\(^{191}\) Ibid, pp.128, 144, 151.

\(^{192}\) Ibid.p.94, see also p.176.

\(^{193}\) Presumably he was referring to something like A.D. Vergnaud, *Nouveau Manuel Complet de Chimie Amusante, ou Novelles Récréations Chimiques*, Manuels-Roret (Paris, 1842).

\(^{194}\) Several other examples of their use of texts from the Theban Library at key points can be cited. They use the example of διαβολαί (and no other cultural model) to demonstrate that magic, like religion, has a concept of orthodoxy (p.107). The
scattershot approach to comparative ethnology, shared by Frazer, was soon to fall out of favour, in part
due to Mauss’s own intellectual development.\textsuperscript{196} The focus of early 20\textsuperscript{th} century anthropologists on
observable, “primitive” cultures rather than those accessed through texts may have also played a role
in this disciplinary forgetting, along with the choice to use the Polynesia term \textit{mana} rather than a
Hellenising \textit{dunamis} or \textit{phusis} as their overarching term for magical power.

Mauss’s name, and the specifics of his work, are often obscured by the more recent luminaries of
anthropology and sociology, not to mention Frazer, whose \textit{Golden Bough} is regularly wheeled out to be
pilloried in discussions of magic and religion. By the time his work on magic appeared in English
translation in 1972 its ideas had already been absorbed into anglophone sociology and anthropology.\textsuperscript{197}
Nonetheless, his influence, principally through Durkheim and Lévi-Strauss, is immense, and the
latter’s essay on the 1950 reprint of \textit{Esquisse d’une théorie générale de la magie} has become an
important work in its own right.\textsuperscript{198}

Within the study of ancient Mediterranean magic, many prominent authors have greeted the work of
Mauss and Hubert with enthusiasm. Graf, in his \textit{Magic and the Ancient World}, cites Mauss multiple
times, contrasting his work favourably with Tyler, Frazer and Tambiah, although his particular interest
lies in Mauss’s concept of the social construction of magic rather than \textit{mana}.\textsuperscript{199} Betz described Mauss’s

\footnotesize\textit{Eighth Book of Moses} is used as an example of initiation (p.52), and the suggestions of associations in the papyri are used as
evidence for magical societies (p.54). The papyri, and Greek practice more generally, are also discussed on pp.64, 76, 83, 99, 101.
\textsuperscript{195} The only reference to the Theban Library I have been able to find in anthropological literature drawing on Mauss is
Durkheim’s mention of “Greek magicians” who call upon “Egyptian, Assyrian or Jewish gods” when discussing the problems
of separating magic from religion (\textit{The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life}, p.43), but his only source for this is Hubert
and Mauss.
\textsuperscript{196} “[W]e have renounced that continuous comparison in which everything is mixed up together, and in which institutions
lose all local colour and documents their savour.” (Marcel Mauss, \textit{The Gift. The form and reason for exchange in archaic
Strauss, who uses the same quotation (Lévi-Strauss, \textit{Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss} pp.50-51).
\textsuperscript{197} See for example the comments of James, “Review of ‘A General Theory of Magic”, p.235.
\textsuperscript{198} Lévi-Strauss, \textit{Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss}.
\textsuperscript{199} Fritz Graf, \textit{Magic in the Ancient World}, trans. Franklin Philip (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), pp.9, 17, 61, 88,
among others.
work as "groundbreaking," while Gordon describes him as "the only one of the older theorists still worth reading." I would argue that it is not surprising that the theories of Mauss and Hubert should prove so conducive to the study of the magical papyri – it is not the case that the discovery of the magical papyri "corroborated" their model, as Kippenberg and Schäfer claim; they were one of the most fundamental sources for its development.

2.1.4.5 1927-1964: Papyri Graecae Magicae

If the specifics of Dieterich's studies on the magical papyri have, in most cases, been superseded or forgotten, his influence has been firmly established through the work he began, and his student, Karl Preisendanz (1883-1968), completed. The work originated with Dieterich's plan of re-editing PGM 4, in which he would work on the hymnic and metric sections, leaving the remainder of the work to his younger colleague. Upon Dieterich's death in 1908, Preisendanz, in co-operation with Richard Wünsch (1869-1915), his students Adam Abt (d.1918) and Ludwig Fahz, and Georg Möller (1876-1921), decided to embark on the far more ambitious project of creating a consolidated edition of all known magical papyri. The numbering of the papyri was apparently left up to Wünsch, who seems to have initially ordered them by their country of origin: Berlin (PGM 1-2), Paris (3-4), London (5-11c), Leiden (12-14), and so on.

While the galley proofs for PGM 1-4 had been printed when World War I broke out, the Great War claimed the lives of Wünsch and Abt, with Möller passing away three years after its end. To replace

---

203 The following discussion relies upon the excellent summary by Brashear ("An Introduction and Survey."", pp.340-341).
them, Samson Eitrem (1872-1966) and Adolf Jacoby joined the team. The first volume was published in 1928, and the second in 1931; a third, containing further texts, as well as editions of the hymns, and indices, was planned, but the printing plates were destroyed during an air-raid on Leipzig in 1943. \(^{205}\)

The initial publications of the two volumes contained all the papyri up to PGM 60, with 20 Christian texts, 5 ostraca and 2 tablets; among the more problematic additions were the oracle tickets, \(^ {206}\) seen by the editors as falling into the same “broad area of superstition” (weiteren Gebiet des Aberglaubens); \(^ {207}\) these were excluded in the influential translation of Betz. \(^ {208}\) More problematic, perhaps, was the decision to exclude the Demotic texts from the same papyri, but despite these relatively minor quibbles the work of Preisendanz and his collaborators on *Papyri Graecae Magicae* represented, quite simply, the most important project to date, and indeed since; without the *PGM* the study of ancient magic as it now exists would be unthinkable.

The fruits of this publication soon began to appear in studies which drew upon this corpus for insights into of ancient magic, philosophy and religion; among these are Eitrem’s 1947 study of the ancient oracles and mystery cults; \(^ {209}\) Campbell Bonner’s 1950 work on the “gnostic” gems, which he redesignated as “magical”; André-Jean Festugière’s four volume work on Hermeticism, understood in its broadest sense, included the magical papyri as indirect sources of evidence; \(^ {210}\) and E.R. Dodds’ groundbreaking, if outdated, 1951 work on the forces of irrationality in Greek history. \(^ {211}\)

One of the less happy consequences of this publication however, was the creation of a corpus of texts which were both conveniently defined as “magic”, and became increasingly homogenized by their designation merely as numbers of a single collection; for the Theban Library this often meant that its texts were no longer considered as part of a smaller coherent collection, but rather as pieces within

\(^ {205}\) As Brashear notes, however, photocopies of page proofs are widely circulated among the papyrological community (Brashear, “An Introduction and Survey”, p.3411).

\(^ {206}\) These are PGM 30a-f, 31a-c, 73-76, Christian 1.

\(^ {207}\) Preisendanz and Henrichs, *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, p.v.

\(^ {208}\) Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*. The Spanish language translation, however, retains them (José Luis Calvo Martínez and Dolores Sánchez Romero, *Textos de Magia en Papiros Griegos*, Biblioteca Clásica Gredos (Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1987).).


the amorphous fabric of Greek magic; from this point on the story of the Theban Library is essentially that of the *PGM*. But it was Preisendanz himself who created the strongest counter-current to this trend, reconstructing, in his 1933 survey of papyrology, the Theban Magical Library in its fullest form to date.

2.1.4.6 Excursus 3: Jesus and the Magicians

As we have already seen, the importance of the Theban Library and similar magical texts for the study of early Christianity was recognised almost immediately, but their use in this field of study has increased over time. Writing in 1980, Aune viewed this tendency of New Testament scholarship as part of a larger program intended to place Judaism and Christianity within their broader Graeco-Roman context. Indeed, the Betz-edited translation of the PGM falls into this movement, originating as a contribution to the *Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*, and one intended aspect of the overall project that produced it was a collection of parallels between the magical papyri and early Christian literature.

The field of early Christian studies is vast, and so this discussion will by necessity be impressionistic at best. I will endeavour to map out the principle approaches to the magical papyri adopted by scholars whose main interest is in Christianity, focusing in particular on work from the last forty years.

The most common use of the magical papyri, among which the Theban Library texts are the most often used, is as witnesses of *koinē* Greek, with whose help the writings of the New Testament and Church Fathers can be better understood. While Deissmann represents one of the earliest exemplars of this approach, the most important English work in this regard is the *Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (BDAG), translated by F. Wilbur Gingrich, William

---

212 Preisendanz, *Papyrufunde und Papyrusforschung*, pp.91-95.
214 Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, pp.ix-x.
215 The best discussions of the influence of the magical papyri on studies of early Christianity are in [Hull] and Aune, "Magic in Early Christianity."
F. Arnold, and their successor F. W. Danker, from Bauer’s German *Wörterbuch*. Inspired by Deissmann, Bauer drew upon Preisendanz’s edition of the magical texts as one of his major sources; the Theban Library texts, along with the other longer formularies (PGM 7, 36) are identified as particularly important. More specific uses of the papyri as instances of *koinē* include Lee’s use of PGM 5 & 13 in a discussion of the speech of Jesus in Mark, and Paige’s discussion of the cultural background of πνεῦμα in the New Testament.

Closely related to the use of the papyri to set out the linguistic landscape of early Christianity is the practice of drawing upon them for cultural details to help explain otherwise confusing or imperfectly understood aspects of texts. One of the most audacious early examples of this is Kraeling’s reading of accusations of necromancy into Herod’s fear that John the Baptist had risen from the dead and was working through Jesus (Mark 6.14-16). Similarly, some authors have compared the onomata used in many of the papyri to the phenomenon of speaking in tongues mentioned in Acts and the Pauline letters, and others have used them to illuminate areas as diverse as the punishment of sorcerers on wheels of fire in the Ethiopic *Apocalypse of Peter*, the interweaving of two healing miracles in Mark 5.22-43, the identity of the “ruler of the power of the air” (ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος) in Ephesians 2.2, the star seen by the magi in Matthew 2.9-10, and the imagery of the Apocalypse.

---


220 For a discussion see Aune, “Magic in Early Christianity”, pp.1549-1551, who does not support the connection.


222 Roy D. Kotansky, “Jesus and the Lady of the Abyss (Mark 5:25-34): Hieros gamos, Cosmogony, and the Elixir of Life,” in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70th Birthday*, ed. Adela Collins, Hans Dieter Betz, and Margaret Mary Mitchell (Mohr Siebeck, 2001). See especially p.102, where PGM 5.101 is cited, and p.104, where the lunar hymns of PGM 4 are listed as evidence of the connection between the lunar goddess and
By extension, the papyri are also used to exemplify phenomena described in the New Testament; most prominent here is the use of the Theban formularies, in particular PGM 4, as exemplars of the kind of magical books burned by the converted Ephesians in Acts 19.19, as well as the use of the name of Jesus by Jewish exorcists (Acts 19.13-17), paralleled by the appearance of his name in the magical papyri.

More complex engagements with the material in the Theban Library generally take the form of comparing and contrasting the miracles of Jesus and his followers with the rituals of the magical papyri. Most obvious in this regard is the exorcistic practice of Jesus, often compared to the rituals described in PGM 4, 5 & 13. In his 1993 book, Jesus the Exorcist, Graham Twelftree compared Jesus’ techniques to those of other ancient exorcists, including the users of the magical papyri; while he noted a few similarities – the demand for the daimōn’s name, for example – he was more interested in the differences he identified: Jesus invoked no higher “power-authority”, nor did he use the chthonic realm. Kotansky understands the healing of the woman with flowing blood and the raising of Jairus’ daughter as drawing on complex “metaphorical and mythological motifs” (pp.118-120).


224 Roy D. Kotansky, “The Star of the Magi: Lore and Science in Ancient Zoroastrianism, the Greek Magical Papyri, and St. Matthew’s Gospel,” Annali di storia dell’essegesi 24, no. 2 (2007). Kotansky compares the star in Matthew 2.9 (ὁ ἀστὴρ δειέτου... ἐλθὼν ἐτάθη ἐπάνω οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον) to that described in PGM 1.74-75 (ὁ ἀστήρ αἴθων κατελθὼν στήσεται εἰς μέσον τοῦ δώματος).


228 Aune (“Magic in Early Christianity”, p.1523) lists them as follows: (1) the Demonic in the Synagogue (Mark. 1.23 - 27; Luke 4.33 - 36); (2) the Gerasene Demoniac (Mark 5.1 - 20; Matthew 8.28-34; Luke 8.26-39); (3) the Daughter of the Syrophoenician Woman (Mark 7.24 - 30; Matthew 15.21 - 28); (4) the “Epileptic” Boy (Mark 9.14-29; Matthew 17.14-21; Luke 9.20-41); (5) the Dumb Demoniac (Matthew 9.32-34); (6) the Blind and Dumb Demoniac (Matthew 12.22-23; Luke. 11.15).

229 These are contained in PGM 4.1227-1264, 3007-3088; PGM 5.96-172; PGM 13.242-244.

230 Twelftree, Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus, p.84-86.
“incantations”, prayer or tangible aids.\textsuperscript{231} By contrast, Aune argued that the difference between exorcism in the practice of Jesus and the magical papyri was quantitative rather than qualitative, and that the longer, more complex formulae in the papyri simply represented a later, elaborated tradition, though one which was essentially the same; The “short, authoritative commands of Jesus”, he argues “are formulas of magical adjuration”.\textsuperscript{232}

Aune represents the fairly rare instance of a new definition of magic substantially changing the material to which he was willing to apply the label; having defined it as a socially deviant and individualistic form of religion,\textsuperscript{233} he accepts that Jesus’ actions must be considered magical within this framework,\textsuperscript{234} even if he is unwilling to call Jesus a magician.\textsuperscript{235} But this step had already been taken by Morton Smith, who, principally in two works,\textsuperscript{236} had drawn a long list of correlations between the picture of Jesus presented in the gospels and the magical papyri: the descent of the spirit as a dove at his baptism was compared to the descent of a falcon in PGM 1.42-195 and 4.154-285,\textsuperscript{238} the Eucharist to a ritual of erotic compulsion in PDM 14.428-450,\textsuperscript{239} and so on, building a picture of a Jesus whose

\textsuperscript{231} Ibid, pp.159-163. In his later writing (for example “Jesus the Exorcist and Ancient Magic,” in \textit{A Kind of Magic: Understanding Magic in the New Testament and its Religious Environment}, ed. Michael Labahn and Bern Jan Lietaert Peerbolte(London: T & T Clark, 2007).) Twelftree would contradict these conclusions, agreeing that Jesus used the Holy Spirit as a power-authority, and that the pigs used to exorcise the Gerasene demoniac represent a tangible aid. He still insists on some differences, however: Jesus does not make use of written (magical) texts, his commands are briefer, even if they are substantially the same, and he has no interest in techniques for the broader control and warding-off of daimons.


\textsuperscript{233} Aune, “Magic in Early Christianity.” pp.1515-1516. His full definition is as follows: “[M]agic is defined as that form of religious deviance whereby individual or social goals are sought by means alternate to those normally sanctioned by the dominant religious institution.”

\textsuperscript{234} Ibid., p.1538.

\textsuperscript{235} Ibid., p.1539.

\textsuperscript{236} Smith, \textit{Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark, Jesus the Magician}(New York: Barnes & Noble, 1978 [1993]).

\textsuperscript{237} The full story is more complex than this. Smith presents the figure of “Jesus the Magician” as the figure seen by his opponents, (\textit{Jesus the Magician}, pp.vii, 149), and which he seems to imply was largely correct, but at other points he suggest that Jesus and his followers may have understood him to be a ‘divine man’ like Apollonios of Tyna, although he suggests that these categories are essentially two perspectives on a single underlying type (ibid, pp.74-75, 80; \textit{Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark}, pp.227-229).

\textsuperscript{238} Jesus the Magician, pp.96-99.

\textsuperscript{239} \textit{Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark},p.217-218. For a longer list of parallels, see pp.224-226.
esoteric teachings involved a magical ritual of heavenly ascent,\textsuperscript{240} whose offer of salvation was a form of possession,\textsuperscript{241} and whose libertinism and magical miracles had led to his death.\textsuperscript{242} Despite its popular uptake, and Aune’s enthusiasm for Smith’s work,\textsuperscript{243} its effect on the broader field seems to have been limited. A large part of this is due, no doubt, to the accusations of forgery surrounding the *Secret Letter of Clement of Alexandria*;\textsuperscript{244} it was in his publication of this text that Smith had first made a case for a magical Jesus. This aside, Smith’s picture of Jesus is so alien, and his comparisons often so cursory, that his argument at times feels incomplete. Before his death in 1991 Smith had been working on a further volume, titled *Paul the Possessed*, drawing comparisons between the magical papyri and the life and writings of the Apostle Paul;\textsuperscript{245} we will never know whether this would have developed his case into a more palatable form.

Smith’s approach highlights one of the recurring issues in the use by historians of the magical papyri. While he understands ‘magician’ (μάγος) as a pejorative, outsider term,\textsuperscript{246} he sees no contradiction in insisting that Jesus’ practices were “magical”,\textsuperscript{247} reifying ‘magic’ as a subterranean religion, with its own distinctive and identifiable symbols and practices. These are inevitably drawn from the Egyptian papyri, understood as documents of some archetypally dark and primordial Mediterranean magical cult,\textsuperscript{248} the “substructure of all religions” as Aune calls it with uncharacteristic lack of care,\textsuperscript{249} rather than culturally and temporally located ritual practices.

This same tendency appears in other studies where aspects of the New Testaments and other early Christian texts are compared to the magical papyri, against which the phenomena they describe can be either confirmed as historically authentic or set apart as uniquely Christian. This is not to say these

\textsuperscript{240} Ibid., pp.237-251.
\textsuperscript{241} Ibid., p.232.
\textsuperscript{242}Ibid., p.220, 235; *Jesus the Magician*, pp.19, 37, 43-44.
\textsuperscript{243} Aune, “Magic in Early Christianity”, p.1508.
\textsuperscript{244} For a brief, though openly partisan, introduction to the controversy, see Scott G. Brown, “The Question of Motive in the Case against Morton Smith,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125, no. 2 (2006).
\textsuperscript{246} Smith, *Jesus the Magician*, pp.74-81.
\textsuperscript{247} For example in *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark*.p.220.
\textsuperscript{248} Smith implies that Jesus may have learned magic in Egypt (for example in *Jesus the Magician*, pp.47-48, 58, 146, 151), but he makes no sustained argument that Jesus’ practice represents a specifically Egyptian form.
\textsuperscript{249} Aune, ”Magic in Early Christianity”, p.1520.
studies are without value; to the contrary, they have, and will continue, to produce results valuable not only to the study of early Christianity and ancient magic, but to the fields of ancient history and religion more broadly.

2.1.4.7 1973-1996: Magika Hiera and Ritual Power

Preisendanz passed away in 1968, but his influence on the study of ancient magic and religion has only grown as the PGM has become the primary vehicle through which the magical papyri are accessed.

The year of Preisendanz's death, Teubner Verlag commissioned Albert Heinrichs to prepare a new edition of the PGM; this edition was printed 1973-1974, with major revisions to certain papyrus editions (though none from the Theban Library), and the second volume containing much of the material originally planned for the destroyed third: new indices, 21 new “pagan” texts, 4 new “Christian” texts, and separate editions of the hymnic sections.\textsuperscript{250} Alongside this new edition of the PGM, Hopfner's Offenbarungszuaber was reprinted, this time typeset and extended from two to three volumes. The first of these appeared in 1974, the second in 1983, and the last in 1990.

In the same encyclopaedic spirit of the PGM was Robert Halleux's Les Alchimistes Grecs, intended as a series of publications to contain all the major Greek alchemical texts; volume 1 (1981) consisted of re-editions and translations of both of the Theban alchemical texts, as well as four fragmentary papyrus texts, among which were the recipes from PGM 12 (ll.193-201).

With Preisendanz and his collaborators having completed the task of gathering together all, or seemingly all, of the Greek magical papyri, further publications often focused more narrowly on more detailed editions of one or two texts. Among these were the re-editions of PGM 12 & 13,\textsuperscript{251} and the Coptic sections (ll.1-25) of PGM 4,\textsuperscript{252} by Robert W. Daniel and Terrence DuQuesne respectively, both in 1991. Again, in the same year, William Brashear published the first, extremely tentative, edition of the

\textsuperscript{250} Brashear, "An Introduction and Survey", p.3411.


Greek text on the verso of PDM Suppl,\textsuperscript{253} whose existence had been noted when Janet Johnson published the first full edition of this text in 1977, 120 years after its initial purchase by the Louvre;\textsuperscript{254} a few years before (1975), Johnson had also published the first true edition of the Demotic texts of PDM/PGM 12.\textsuperscript{255}

Jonson's doctoral work had been on Demotic grammar, which made particular use of PDM 14, and the fruits of this work were \textit{The Demotic Verbal System} (1976), which drew extensively on the Theban Texts, as well as her study of the PDM 14’s dialectal features (1977).\textsuperscript{256} At almost the same time Pierre du Bourguet published his French-language learning grammar of Demotic (1976), which relied on PDM 14 for most of its examples.\textsuperscript{257}

Arguably the most important event of the post-\textit{PGM} period, however, has been the publication in 1986 under the editorship of Hans Dieter Betz of an English translation of the texts, an idea first suggested by Morton Smith.\textsuperscript{258} Not merely a translation, editorial choices played a distinctive role in the shaping of the texts' reception. An additional 50 texts were added, including all four Demotic texts then known (PDM 12, 14, 61 & Suppl.), uniting for the first time the Greek and Demotic sections of the Theban Library (though not, of course, the alchemical books). While the second edition (1992) did not add further texts, recognising that the quest for comprehensiveness was a Sisyphean task, a bibliographical appendix was added, and corrections were made. The effect of this publication on the studies of magic and religion, and indeed, as we have seen, popular culture, was immense and overwhelmingly positive, but it is worth noting a few, no doubt unintended, consequences. First, the apparent reliance of the text on the edition of Preisendanz and critical editions rather than the original papyri meant that mistakes in the German edition were retained and occasionally exacerbated; most visibly the \textit{khataktēres} and illustrations were often imperfect copies of those published in the older edition with a

\begin{thebibliography}{9}

\bibitem{Brashear} Brashear, \textit{Magica Varia}, pp.71-73.
\bibitem{Johnson} Johnson, "Louvre E3229."
\bibitem{Betz} Betz, \textit{Greek Magical Papyri}, p.ix.
\end{thebibliography}
reduced resemblance to their originals. Secondly, the decision not to include any papyrological
discussion of the texts in the body of the translation, as Preisendanz had done, and as other translators
would do, only increased the degree to which the texts merged into one undifferentiated mass of
magical papyri, with transitions between recipes from different manuscripts, centuries and collections
equally unmarked.

More faithful to Preisendanz was the 1987 translation of the PGM corpus into Castilian Spanish, by
Calvo Martinez and Sánchez Romero;259 accompanied by a short introduction and bibliography, it
adhered to the list of papyri in the Heinrich’s edited second edition. The principal importance of this
publication for our purposes lies in the fact that it stimulated interest in the PGM among
hispanophone scholars, many of whom were to contribute to Μηνη, the journal of ancient magic and
astrology edited by Calvo Martinez, whose first edition was published in 2001.

1994 saw the publication of Marvin Meyer and Richard Smith’s Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of
Ritual Power (ACM), an attempt to bring together in English a corpus of Coptic texts similar in scope, if
not in scale, to the PGM.260 Included among its 135 texts were three rituals from PGM 4.261 The subtitle
of this work, Texts of Ritual Power, is revealing, for the 1990s were the decade that the study of ancient
magic confronted its most serious challenge to date: the idea that the category of magic itself might be
invalid.

While it may not have been the very first stirring of this new awareness, Versnel’s 1991 article titled
Reflections on the Relationship Magic-Religion is emblematic of the problems it raised. “Scholars in
earlier decades of this century were luckier” –wrote Versnel –“they knew both what magic was and
how to find it”.262 Spurred by his own work on the category of curse tablets he called “judicial prayers”,
which seemed closer to religious invocations than stereotyped curses. Versnel turned to anthropology, and concluded that neither magic nor religion existed as real objects; instead they were only concepts, and the different designations had originated as value judgements. He acknowledged Jonathan Z. Smith's attempts to incorporate sociological insights, but noted that even Aune, his "most faithful follower", confused essentialist and functionalist definitions. It is astonishing to consider that, in nearly two hundred years of ancient magic studies, Versnel was the first person to clearly articulate this problem; and in view of the history we have traced so far, it is a strange serendipity that the anthropologist who he relied upon, Robert R. Marett, depended in his own work upon Mauss and Hubert's *Esquisse* (see 2.1.4.4).

The problems highlighted in Versnel's reflections have yet to be satisfactorily answered, but no serious study since has been able to avoid addressing them. Meyer and Smith's adoption of the term "ritual power" represents one response; another was represented in the 1991 essay collection *Magika Hiera*, which, taking its title from PGM 1.127, asked its authors to consider "whether the traditional dichotomy between magic and religion helped in any way". The responses to the question varied, from Faraone's conclusion that the category "magic" was not of any help, to Graf's adoption of a Maussian social definition, and Betz's assertion that "a high degree of sensitivity to the inner life and thought..."

---

263 Ibid.p.191.
264 Ibid.p.177.
266 Ibid.p.180.
267 The work mentioned by Versnel is R.R. Marett, *The Threshold of Religion*, 2nd ed. (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1909 [1914]). Marrett acknowledges the importance of Hubert and Mauss's work on p.xii; although it is clear that his interest in the problem preceded their *Esquisse* (1904), it is worth noting that the first instance of his use of the term "magico-religious" in the collection occurs in his 1907 article *Is Taboo a Negative Magic?* (pp.73-98).
268 While the articles were almost certainly solicited before Versnel's article was published, its editors note that "many of the phrases" used in the opening paragraph of the essay that laid out the questions drew upon an unpublished work by Versnel, and the editors, both in their introduction and their own essays, mention him frequently (Christopher A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink, *Magika Hiera. Ancient Greek Magic & Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp.v, vi-vii.).
of the cults in question” would help the scholar draw the line between the two phenomena; a thirty-year old article by Eitrem was included, alongside an apology for his Frazerian evolutionism.

Other attempts to answer this question were legion; prominent among them are Georg Luck’s Arcana Mundi (1985, reprint in 2006), which stressed the overlap between religion and magic, and located the origin of both in “shamanism”; Abrasax (1990-2001), by Reinhold Merkelbach and Maria Totti, which studied the hymns and prayers of the papyri, describing them as simultaneously magical and religious; Graf’s La Magie dans l’Antique gréco-romaine, in which he further developed his understanding of “magic” within a Maussian social framework; and Robert K Ritner’s 1993 Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice, which located all Egyptian ritual within the workings of heka, the force generally translated as “magic”.

2.1.4.8 Excursus 4: The Book of Abraham and the Theban Library

Joseph Smith (1805-1844) was a religious leader in early 19th century America, prominent as the founder of the Latter Day Saints, a movement from which a number of modern church groups trace their origins, most prominent among them the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS). Particularly distinctive about these groups, to many outsiders, is their acceptance of numerous scriptures outside of those considered canonical or apocryphal by the larger Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox denominations, all of which can be traced back to Smith himself in his role as prophet. Best known among these is the Book of Mormon, which has given the movements' members their most common appellation, “the Mormons”, but another text, The Book of Abraham, is distinctive in being understood as an inspired translation by the American prophet of an Egyptian papyrus acquired by the church in 1835 from a traveling exhibition. The curator of the exhibition, Michael H. Chandler,

---

273 This is the most common account of the origins of the text, although Gee ("Some Puzzles from the Joseph Smith Papyri," FARMs Review 20, no. 1 (2008), pp.114-115) points out that the LDS Church has no official position on the matter, and that (according to his informal survey) the minority of church members believe this to be the case; by this account about a third
heard that Smith, then resident in the tow of Kirtland in Ohio, could read Egyptian texts, the Book of Mormon itself being apparently written in a script he described as “reformed Egyptian”. He invited Smith to read his papyri, and with Smith apparently proving able to do so, the Church decided to purchase the five papyri and four mummies in the collection. Between 1835 and 1842 Smith produced a partial translation of one of the texts, which he described as containing a lost scripture written by the patriarch Abraham, giving an account of his escape from attempted human sacrifice, his journey from Chaldaea to Egypt, and his vision of the divine realm and creation. Excerpts from the text were published in 1842 in the Times and Seasons, and in 1851 it was added to the larger collection known as the Pearl of Great Price. This text contains several doctrines of importance to the Latter-Day Saint movement, in particular the plurality of gods and inhabited worlds, the nature of the divine priesthood, pre-mortal existence and the afterlife, and the existence of Kolob, the star closest to the throne of God, and subject of the popular hymn If You could Hie to Kolob.

of church membership believe there is no relationship between the Book of Abraham and any ancient papyri, and about half “do not care where the Book of Abraham came from”.

The subtitle of the Book of Abraham from the edition of the Pearl of Great Price currently available from the LDS Church website, apparently modified slightly from the original publication, reads: “TRANSLATED FROM THE PAPYRUS, BY JOSEPH SMITH. A Translation of some ancient Records that have fallen into our hands from the catacombs of Egypt. The writings of Abraham while he was in Egypt, called the Book of Abraham, written by his own hand, upon papyrus. (The Book of Mormon. Another Testament of Jesus Christ. The Doctrine and Covenants of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The Pearl of Great Price, (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2013).p.899).

274 See for example 1 Nephi 1:2: “Yea, I make a record in the a language of my father, which consists of the learning of the Jews and the language of the Egyptians; Mormon 9.32 And now, behold, we have written this record according to our knowledge, in the characters which are called among us the reformed Egyptian.” The reason for this seems to have been that “reformed Egyptian” was considered more compact than Hebrew script, presumably because of its highly symbolic nature; compare Mormon 9.33 “And if our plates had been a sufficiently large we should have written in Hebrew...”

275 There had originally been 11 mummies in the collection. The remaining seven were sold in Philadelphia “and other eastern cities” (Bierbrier, Who was who in Egyptology (Fourth Revised Edition), p.117).


The purported translation of an Egyptian text immediately raised the suspicion of some within the developing discipline of Egyptology, with T. Devéria, J. H. Breasted, W. M. F. Petrie and A. H. Sayce all denouncing the translation, and identifying the papyri, from the plates published alongside the *Book of Abraham*, as standard funerary texts.  

The controversy was reignited when 11 fragments of the papyri, which had passed into the hands of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York after Joseph Smith’s death, were given to the LDS Church as a gift. Over the course of the following decades these were studied, in the form of photographs, by several Egyptologists, including Richard A. Parker of Brown University, and John A. Wilson, Klaus Baer and Robert K. Ritner all of the University of Chicago. These scholars confirmed without exception that the fragments belonged to a number of funerary texts: one of the four papyri belonged to the genre known as the *Book of Breathings*, while three were more-or-less fragmentary copies of the *Book of the Dead*, and the fifth was a hypocephalus. All were dated to the late Ptolemaic or early Roman period.

In 1991, one of Robert Ritner’s former students, John Gee, published an article in the Brigham Young University-affiliated journal *Insight* which noted that the name of Abraham had been found in two ancient Egyptian papyri, namely PDM/PGM 12 & 14. He attributed the discovery to David Cameron,....
a theology student at the University of Toronto, and it seems most likely that it was the publication of Betz that facilitated this discovery. What particularly interested Gee were several apparent correspondences between the Book of Abraham and the Theban texts: firstly, that the individual who had acquired the Joseph Smith Papyri, Antonio Lebolo, had apparently dealt with Anastasy, secondly, that the section of PDM/PGM 12 which mentioned Abraham in a string of onomata (ll.135-146) was adjacent to an image of Anubis embalming Osiris, a scene which, in a damaged form, was associated with the sacrifice of Abraham in the Mormon scripture; finally, he noted that Abraham was referred to as the “pupil of the wedjat-eye” (df n ḫr t n wḏji.t) in PDM 14.228, which he took as a reference to a hypocephalus. The next year he wrote a slightly longer piece in the LDS journal The Ensign in which he discussed at greater length five mentions of Abraham in the Theban Library – PGM 5.458-475; PDM 12.6-20, 135-164; PGM 12.270-321; PDM 14.228-229 – as well as one, PGM 36.295-310, from outside it.

Gee’s claims about the papyri were relatively modest; he insisted in his 1992 article that proof of scriptures could only from the Holy Ghost, and that even a full Egyptian text of the Book of Abraham dating from the time of Abraham, would not convince unbelievers. His understanding of the relevance of these texts then, was not explicit; these Roman Egyptian texts could not tell us anything but that stories about Abraham were circulating at this period of time – but, he tantalisingly added “[t]raditions, we must remember, often stem from older truths”.

Gee’s relatively modest claims were almost immediately the subject of heated criticism. Jerald and Sandra Tanner, ex-Mormons and prolific authors, penned an article in 1992, pointing out that the references to Abraham had to be seen within the syncretistic religious background of the magical

---

287 Lebolo was apparently working as an agent for Bernardino Drovetti at the time he unearthed the mummies from a pit-tomb in Qurna, which the papyri were unwrapped (“Some Puzzles from the Joseph Smith Papyri”, p.115; H. Donl Peterson, “Antonio Lebolo: Excavator of the Book of Abraham,” BYU Studies 31, no. 3 (1991), pp.10-13). One of these appears to have been sold to Anastasy, while others were acquired by Minutoli, Cailliaud and Salt (Bierbrier, Who was who in Egyptology (Fourth Revised Edition), p.314).

288 It is not clear to me that ϯⲃⲣⲁⲙⲣⲉ is the correct reading at PDM 12.16. ϯⲃⲣⲁⲙⲏ would seem to fit better here.

papyri, rather than any specifically Egyptian Abraham tradition dating to the patriarch's own time, and pointed to the Judaean presence in Graeco-Roman Egypt as their likely source.290 A year later, Edward Ashment wrote a short pamphlet making many of the same points; among the points unique to him are his noting of the existence of the Septuagint as a likely source for Abraham-lore, and the observation that the name “Abraham” fitted the model of abra- names – most prominently Abrasax – common in the magical papyri.291

Gee published a lengthy response to both articles in 1995.292 Alongside an extended rebuttal of Ashment and the Tanners, he clarified his original reason for citing the magical papyri, to refute two anti-Mormon claims which he summarised as, firstly, the idea that the name Abraham never appeared in Egyptian papyri,293 and secondly, the idea that other fragments of papyrus from the Theban tombs would of necessity be funeral texts.294 Gee’s most substantial point in this article is, perhaps, the suggestion that since both the Joseph Smith Papyri and the Theban Library had belonged to Theban priests, they should be studied together.295

290 Jerald Tanner and Sandra Tanner, “Solving the Mystery of the Joseph Smith Papyri,” Salt Lake City Messenger 82 (1992). The Tanner’s article, and perhaps the whole affair, was precipitated by Charles M. Larson, By his own hand upon papyrus. A new look at the Joseph Smith Papyri (Grand Rapids: Institute for Religious Research, 1985 [1992]), a critical treatment of the Book of Abraham which its author had posted without charge to 30,000 LDS members. Gee himself had written an extended response to this work (Gee, “A Tragedy of Errors”).

291 Edward H. Ashment, The Use of Egyptian Magical Papyri to Authenticate the Book of Abraham: A Critical Review, Salt Lake City: Resource Communications (1993). As Gee observes, Ashment may be taking this too far when he suggests that ⲁⲃⲣⲁⲭⲁⲙ in PDM/PGM 12 is not a reference to the Biblical Abraham, but this may be to misconstrue Ashment’s larger point – that the ritualists who used the papyri may have understood Abraham primarily as an efficacious name rather than a historical individual (Gee, “Abracadabra, Isaac and Jacob”, pp.29-35). Confusing the matter further is the fact that may not be the correct reading; see fn.288 above.

292 “Abracadabra, Isaac and Jacob.”

293 Ibid.p.23. Gee quotes as an instance of this argument the Tanners’ The Case against Mormonism (3 volumes) 2.159, 3.30, “that Egyptian papyri ‘have nothing to do with any scripture written by Abraham’”. He calls the stronger argument which he is addressing a “degene[ration]” of this claim.

294 Ibid.p.23. The importance of this fact for his larger argument depends on his calculation of the original size of Hor’s Book of Breathing as about 1250.5cm long, allowing several other lengthy texts, including, potentially, the Book of Abraham, to be written on the same sheet (“Some Puzzles from the Biblical Abraham”, pp.117-123); in an earlier publication he gave c.320cm as its original length (A Guide to the Joseph Smith Papyri, pp.12-13). By contrast, Baer (“The Breathing Permit of Hôr”, p. 127 fn.113), Ritner (“The Breathing Permit of Hôr” Among The Joseph Smith Papyri”, p.166 & n.33), as well as Cook and Smith (“The Original Length of the Scroll of Hôr,” Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought (2010)), calculate a total length of 150-155cm, leaving a little less than half of the length unaccounted for.

295 Gee, “Abracadabra, Isaac and Jacob”, p.71. The idea that Egyptian priests may have had access to Abraham-traditions is repeated in A Guide to the Joseph Smith Papyri, pp.15-16.
The influence of the Theban Library texts on the Latter Day Saint movement’s relationship to the *Book of Abraham* is difficult to gauge. On the one hand, Gee has argued that the *Book of Abraham* should be seen as a peripheral work within the Mormon canon; on the other hand, C. Smith points out that while the golden plates from which the *Book of Mormon* were reportedly translated were retrieved by an angel, and the other prophetic works of Joseph Smith were received through direct revelation, *Abraham* holds a unique place among the scriptures as a document whose source survives, at least in part, to be scrutinised by modern eyes. The disjuncture between the contents of the *Book of Abraham* and modern Egyptological interpretations does seem to have important consequences for some believers. While data on these effects is hard to come by, one small 2012 study of ex-Mormons found that the *Book of Abraham* was among the top four reasons given by respondents for leaving the church. The apologetic responses to this problem regularly draw upon the Theban Library papyri, in particular PDM/PGM 12’s vignette, as evidence: to cite only a few examples, Michael D. Rhodes mentions the vignette in both his review of Charles M. Larson’s *On His Own Hand Upon Papyrus*, and his translation of the hypocephalus text, while Muhlestein argues that since an Egyptian priest owned the Theban Library, Hor, another priest, might well have found enough value in the *Book of Abraham* to have it copied onto his *Book of Breathings*; in a more popular vein, M. Tanner has used

---

296 “Although the concept of preexistence is alluded to in various Latter-day Saint scriptures, the clearest discussion comes from the Book of Abraham, and it is almost the only reason that Latter-day Saints use that book” (“Some Puzzles from the Joseph Smith Papyri”, p.113). The same argument is made in *A Guide to the Joseph Smith Papyri*, p.44. Compare the opinion of Karl C. Sandberg, another member of the LDS, who calls the *Book of Abraham* “one of the prime source documents of Mormon theology” (“Knowing Brother Joseph Again: The Book of Abraham and Joseph Smith as Translator,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 22, no. 4 (1989), p.18). A recent statement by the LDS Church can be find at The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, “Translation and Historicity of the Book of Abraham,” lds.org/topics/translation-and-historicity-of-the-book-of-abraham.


298 Traci K. Burnett, “This Was the Place: Apostasy from the LDS Church” (MSc Thesis. Utah State University, 2012). A 2007 survey of 111 narratives posted by ex-Mormons online found that the *Book of Abraham* was mentioned in between 15% and 12% of narratives; Seth R. Payne, "Purposeful Strangers. A Study of the ex-Mormon Narrative," SSRN Working Papers (2007).


PDM/PGM 12's closeness to the Book of Abraham as evidence that Joseph Smith had access to information then unknown to Egyptologists.302

2.1.4.9 1995-2013: Digital Magikē

The last twenty years has seen a huge proliferation in scholarly writing about the Theban Magical Library, usually in the context of discussions of the Greek Magical Papyri in general; here I will simply note a few trends, along with some examples of each.

In 1995 the series Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt published a volume containing literature reviews of Demotic and Greek and Coptic magic, the former by William Brashear, the latter by Robert Ritner.303 These were by no means the first reviews of their kind; in 1927 Preisendanz had produced an impressive 63-page survey of publications on ancient Greek magic.304 Brashear's update consisted of 104 pages, providing an introduction to Greek-language magical texts and artefacts, bibliographies for published texts, as well as lists of texts not included in the large collections of the PGM and Supplementum Magicum (SM); it also included a discussion of the texts by then attributed to the Theban Library (see above, 2.1.3). Ritner's contribution was far shorter by reason of the smaller number of Demotic texts, although he did note the existence of four texts or text groups not included by Johnson in Betz's edition of the PGM. His discussion was also rather polemic, arguing persuasively and with force that even the Greek papyri should be understood as fundamentally Egyptian, and that authors should avoid the “fundamental confusion between Greek language and ethnic Greek culture.”305 A similar Spanish-language review was written by Martínez for Μηνη in 2001;306 the bibliography he provided including not only writing on Greek magic, but also that of other Mediterranean and Near Eastern cultures, as well as anthropological and sociological texts, and

304 Preisendanz, "Der griechischen Zauberpapyri".
305 Ritner, "Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire", p.3359.
making the important distinction between what he termed “real magic” (la magia “real”) and “literary magic” (la magia litteraria).

Various other works appeared providing new translations, editions or linguistic tools for researchers. Most prominent here is the online Léxico de magia y religión en los papiros mágicos griegos (LMPG), part of the larger Spanish language Diccionario Griego-Español project, which aimed to provide a contextual dictionary for the terms found in the magical papyri. Also important for Francophone scholarship was M. Martin’s 2002 translation of selections from the PGM; this version contained the texts of only eight of the longer Greek formularies, five of which belonged to the Theban Library. Selections from PDM 14 & Suppl. were translated for the first time into German by Joachim Quack as part of a larger project on divinatory and magical texts from the ancient Mediterranean and Near East in 2008. Quack is also responsible for numerous important articles on Demotic magical texts, in particular an extended discussion of the language of PDM 14, published in 2006. New editions included Betz’s re-edition of the Mithras Liturgy, which also functioned as a tribute to the life and work of Dieterich, and Richard L. Phillips’ re-edition of the invisibility rituals (PGM 1.22-221, 247-262; PGM 13.234-237, 267-269, 270-277).


---

308 M. Martin, Les papyrus grecs magiques (Éditions Manuscrit-Université, 2002).
309 Included are PGM 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 13 (Theban); PGM 3 (unknown provenance); PGM 7 (Hermonthis?); PGM 36 (Fayum).
310 Omina, Orakel, Rituale und Beschwörungen, Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments. Neue Folge (Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2008), pp.332-356. Also included was PDM 61 (pp.356-359). Andrea Jördens was responsible for a selection of Greek magical texts from Egypt (pp.417-446), but with the exception of PGM 4.296-434 on pp.436-437 (where a parallel text from SM 47 is discussed), none of the texts are taken from the Theban Magical Library.
312 Betz, The "Mithras Liturgy": Text, Translation and Commentary.
(2005), Officina Magica (2005), Continuity and Innovation in the Magical Tradition (2011). Common to all of these collections is a sensitivity to the terminological problems raised in the early 1990s, and an engagement with anthropological, sociological and philosophical approaches, often made explicit in articles laying out the historiography of the term “magic”.314

Among the numerous surveys which used the Theban Papyri for broader historical purposes were David Frankfurter’s Religion in Roman Egypt (1998), which used the papyri as evidence both of the survival of a popular religious tradition during the decline of the temples, and for the adaptation of the priests to an orientalising and hellenising model of identity as they shifted from priests to “oriental guru[s]” and magicians;315 Faraone’s Ancient Greek Love Magic (1991) used the papyri, especially PGM 4, alongside literary and archaeological remains to argue for a continuous Greek erotic tradition; Andrew Wilburn’s Materia Magica (2005) took a heavily archaeological approach to magical practice, providing very useful contextual insights; and Gideon Bohak’s Ancient Jewish Magic (2008) used the magical papyri to illuminate parallel Jewish practices.316 Many more works could be discussed here, including Naomi Janowitz’s Magic in the Roman World (2001) and Icons of Power (2002), Matthew W. Dickie’s Magic and Magicians in the Roman World (2001) and Eleni Pachoumi’s The Greek Magical Papyri: Diversity and Unity (2007).

This period also saw the first sustained works paying attention to the Theban Magical Library; most influential, certainly, is Jacco Dieleman’s Priests, Tongues and Rites (2005), an in-depth study of the


Leiden Demotic scrolls (PDM 12 & 14). Both W.J. Tait (1995)\(^{317}\) and Magali de Haro Sanchez (2008)\(^{318}\) have also provided shorter works discussing the collection as a whole. The most sustained study of the group to date has been Michela Zago's *Tebe Magica e Alchemica* (2010), which attempts to provide a definitive discussion of the Theban Library, describing its contents, its practices, its worldview, and its development.\(^{319}\)

My own study very much falls into this trend of renewed interest in the Library as an archive, of republishing parts of its texts and paying particular attention to physical and scribal features of the text. As of writing, a new edition of PGM 4 is in preparation by de Haro Sanchez and Koenig, and a new edition of PDM 14 by Dzwiza,\(^{320}\) and two major projects are underway at the University of Heidelberg and the University of Chicago. The first of these, *The Magic of Transculturality*, led by Joachim Friedrich Quack and William Furley, aims to focus on analysis of the divination spells in the Roman handbooks, and secondarily to investigate questions of fusion and plurality.\(^{321}\) The second, led by Christopher A. Faraone and Sofía Torallas Tovar, *Transmission of Magical Knowledge in Antiquity*, aims to republish new editions, translations, and commentaries on all the major formularies. Both of these projects hold the promise of new and unexpected methodological approaches and insights.

### 2.2 Form and Contents

#### 2.2.1 General Description

All of the finds associated with the Theban Magical Library are written on papyrus in one of two identifiable languages - Greek and Egyptian - and four scripts - Demotic, hieratic, Coptic and Greek. Six of these (PGM 1, 2, 7; PDM/PGM 12, 14 & Suppl.) are in the form of rolls, and all but two of these (PGM 1 & 2) are written both front and back. Four (PGM 4, 5, 12, P.Holm. + PGM 5a, P.Leid. I 397) are

\(^{317}\) Tait, "Theban magic."

\(^{318}\) de Haro Sanchez, "Les papyrus iatromagiques."

\(^{319}\) Some problems with Zago's study are discussed at fn.37 and section 2.1.3

\(^{320}\) For details see http://www.uni-heidelberg.de/fakultaeten/philosophie/zaw/aegy/forschung/projektdzwiza.html.

\(^{321}\) See http://www.asia-europe.uni-heidelberg.de/en/research/interdisciplinary-research-groups/mcio-cultural-plurality/mcio-the-magic-of-transculturality.html
single-quire codices, although they now survive only as loose pages, the binding having been torn. P.Holm. contains an additional leaf, PGM 5a, presumably inserted into it in antiquity. Two of the codices (PGM 4 & 5) belong to Turner Group 8, abberant 1, being much taller than they are broad, which Turner characterises as being an “early” format, suited to the large number of lines in the “developmental period” of the codex; PGM 13 belongs to Group 7, being about half again as broad as PGM 4 and 5. P.Holm. + PGM 5a belongs to Group 6 and P.Leiden I 397 to Group 5; both of these are quite similar, being slightly larger than PGM XIII, but all three have very similar height to width ratios (approximately 3:2). The codex format designations are not much help in determining dates: all of the groups are found between the second and fifth centuries CE. All categories include literary and biblical texts, and none can be considered “standard” for “magical” or “alchemical” codices. This range of sizes is not out of place in a single collection; the thirteen codices to of the Nag Hammadi collection are similarly spread across three groups (Group 5: Codex VII; Group 7: III, V, IX; Group 8: I, II, IV, X, XI, XIII, Aberrant 2: IV, V.

323 Ibid. pp.19, 143.
324 Ibid. p.143.
325 Ibid. p. 143.
326 Turner notes that Group 6 could be reclassified so that some are special cases of Group 5; P.Holm. + PGM 5a would fit into this category.
327 Turner is slightly more specific than this. Group V date largely to III-V CE and later, Group 6 to III-IV CE, Group 7 to III-IV CE, Group 8, abberant 1 to II-IV CE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papyrus</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Turner Type</th>
<th>H (cm)</th>
<th>W (cm)</th>
<th>H:W Ratio</th>
<th>Total no. pages (codex)</th>
<th>No. written pages (codex)</th>
<th>Cols. front (→)</th>
<th>Cols. back (↓)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGM 1</td>
<td>Roll</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 2</td>
<td>Roll</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>≥94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 + x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4</td>
<td>Codex</td>
<td>8, abb.1</td>
<td>27-30.5</td>
<td>9.5-13</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 5</td>
<td>Codex</td>
<td>8, abb.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Holm + PGM 5a</td>
<td>Codex</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29.6-29.7</td>
<td>15.5-16.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>30 + 2&lt;sup&gt;330&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28 + 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM/ PGM 12</td>
<td>Roll</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(22)&lt;sup&gt;331&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;332&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 13</td>
<td>Codex</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.5-27</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM/ PGM 14</td>
<td>Roll</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM Suppl.</td>
<td>Roll</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>≥114.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Leid. I 397</td>
<td>Codex</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2: Physical Details of the manuscripts of the Theban Magical Library

The hands of the Theban Library pose several problems, but it is important to discuss them since the papyri can only be dated palaeographically. This discussion is not intended to be definitive, but rather a summary and commentary on the work of previous scholars.

<sup>330</sup> The additional figure given here and in the next column represents the loose leaf, PGM 5a.

<sup>331</sup> The figure here is for the *Myth of the Sun’s Eye*, written roughly a century earlier than the rest of the papyrus; see section 2.2.5.3 for further details.

<sup>332</sup> This includes seven predominantly Demotic columns (*III-I, IV-I) as well as the thirteen Greek columns; see Dieleman, *Priests, tongues, and rites*, pp.31-35.

<sup>333</sup> I have been unable to find a published figure for the widths of the fragments of this papyrus, but the size is recorded on the Musée du Louvre database, accessed 5/2/2015.
PGM 1 and PGM 2 are both written in similar, though not identical third-century hands (A and B), with rounded, slightly cursive, bilinear forms, and very little variability in shading. Although noticeably different from these first two manuscripts, the Greek hands of the three bilingual manuscripts, PDM/PGM 12 & 14, and PDM Suppl., display similar general tendencies in letter formation, and also appear to date from the third-century. Nonetheless, the Greek hands are noticeably different in all three of these papyri, and the fact that the same scribe seems to have been responsible for both the Greek and Demotic content on each roll implies that the Demotic hands, though similar, cannot be considered the same. The Greek hand of PDM/PGM 14 (H) is formed with separate capitals, both in glosses and sections of text, with slight serifs on some letters. PDM/PGM 12 (F) is much more cursive, rounded, and uniformly shaded, and displays much more variation in letter-height than the bilinear writing of PDM/PGM 14. The Greek hand of PDM/PGM Suppl. (J), though only clear in the short glosses, is markedly different from both. Even if they do not seem to be the products of a single hand, the Demotic writing on these papyri shows remarkable similarities both in terms of the forms of signs and orthography, which suggest a similar context of production. While the writing on the backs of PDM/PGM 14 and PDM Suppl. is noticeably less neat than that on the fronts, the hands

---

334 Parthey suggests that a second, more cursive hand may be responsible for PGM 2.162-183, as well as the marginal note to the left of ll.10-12 and the text next to the illustration of scarab at l.160 (Parthey, "Zwei griechische Zauberpapyri", pp.12-133), but my own examination of digital photographs suggests that the differences in writing are minor, with the letter formation substantially the same.

335 I follow here the dating of Bagnall, Early Christian Books in Egypt, pp.83-85. Preisendanz dates both of these papyri to the fourth century (Preisendanz and Henrichs, Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri (vol. I), pp.1, 18). To my eyes the hands of these papyri resemble P.Oxy. XXXVI.2777 (212 CE) and P.Oxy. L.I.3614 (200 CE), both from Oxyrhynchus.

336 The older consensus was that PDM 12 dated to the fourth century (Daniel, Two Greek magical papyri., pp.ix-x), but Dieleman (Priests, tongues, and rites, pp.41-44) has argued persuasively for an early third century date for both PDM/PGM 12 & 14, which has been accepted by Bagnall (Early Christian Books in Egypt, pp.83-85). PDM Suppl. has been dated by both of its recent editors to the third century, although Brashear thinks it might belong to the latter part (Johnson, "Louvre E3229", p.88; Brashear, Magica Varia., p.71).

337 Brashear has often claimed that the hands of all three are the same ("An Introduction and Survey", pp. 3402-3404 and Magica Varia, p.71), citing Johnson (Johnson, "Louvre E3229.") as a reference, but in fact her opinion, stated most explicitly on pp.88-89, is that only PDM 12 and 14 are by the same scribe. PDM Suppl. is similar enough to these that it might belong, while, as already mentioned, PDM 6i is quite divergent; see below at 2.2.3 and 2.3.4.1.1 for further discussion. Johnson has confirmed her opinion on this matter to me in a private communication (3/7/2013). The idea that the hands are the same has also been disputed by Quack ("Griechische und andere Dämonen in den spätdemotischen magischen Texten", p.429). See also above, section 2.1.3.

338 As Johnson (see fn.64 above) points out, there are also similarities between these papyri and PDM 6i, although these are less striking; most obviously the writing on PDM 6i is much larger than that on the Theban Library papyri.
The hands of the remaining papyri, all of them codices, again display similarities, due no doubt to their shared fourth century origin.340 They are more angular than the third century hands, and show a greater tendency towards unimodularity and bilinearity, with each letter taking up almost the same vertical and horizontal space. There are also noticeable differences in letter formation, with the letter beta noticeably elongated in many instances in the third century hands, and upsilon generally formed with two strokes in the fourth-century papyri, and one stroke in the third. The most striking feature of this group is the hand shared by the Leiden and Stockholm codices (C),341 with very angular writing, some variability in shading, long oblique strokes, and slight serifs on many letters. Although there are minor variations between the codices, this hand would seem to be the same throughout, except on the last five pages of PGM 13,342 where a similar, though more cursive hand (G) takes over. This second hand seems to have made notes on pp.4, 9 & 19 of the same codex.343 PGM 4 and 5 have similar hands (D and E) – separate, unornamented capitals with strong tendencies towards bilinearity, and dark, though slightly variable, shading. The inside front cover of PGM 4 has an annotation written separately to the rest of the codex, which appears to be in a different hand, more angular, and slightly less regular. This appears to me remarkably close to the hand of the Leiden and Stockholm codices (C), although this conclusion must remain tentative without autopsy of the Paris manuscript. Thus, excluding the scribe responsible for copying out the Sun’s Eye (α), it would appear that at least 10 individuals (A-J) are responsible for the writing of the texts of the Theban Magical Library.

339 This raises the problem of whether different “hands” may be produced by the same scribe writing in different styles, or if a “hand” necessarily refers to the work of a single scribe. For the present discussion I will use “hand” to refer to a distinctive style of writing, and leave aside the very difficult question of definitively deciding if each hand is that of a different scribe.
340 The dates of these papyri are far less controversial than those of the third century group; see Bagnall, Early Christian Books in Egypt, pp.83-85.
341 This includes the loose leaf, PGM 5a, which accompanied P.Holm. Lagercrantz (Papyrus Graecus Holmiensis (P.Holm. Recepte für Silber, Steine und Purpur, pp.54-55) thinks that the hand and content are sufficiently different that the leaf does not belong with the codex, but Bagnall (Early Christian Books in Egypt, p.84) suggests the hands are the same, and an inspection of images of the codex and leaf leads me to the same conclusion.
342 The similarity in the two hands make it difficult to tell where the second one takes over; conceivably it could be anywhere between l.933, where a new text begins, and l.937, where an alpha in the left margin may mark the change.
343 Daniel, Two Greek magical papyri, pp.x-xi.
Some of the papyri contain marginal notes suggestive of their practical use; although these are in some cases difficult to distinguish from simple corrections (insertion or removal of letters, words, and so on), in other cases they are far more extensive. PGM 1 has a single notation in the same hand as the body of the text, clarifying the materia to be used in a ritual.  

344 PGM 2 has numerous instances of marginal text, apparently in the same hand as the main body, although it is not always evident whether these are corrections rather than later working annotations.  

345 PGM 4 contains two short invocations which were apparently written subsequent to the writing of the main body of the text, the first (Hand C)
written on the inside cover of the codex, the second within a space apparently left for an illustration in the same hand as the main body of the text (D).

PGM 5 has several marginal notes, written in a different hand to the body of the text; these are either notes for alternative uses for formulae or insertions of alternate or supplementary formulae. PGM 13 has a marginal comment noting a difference between two recensions of the same text, two pieces of additional information on the performances of a ritual, a comment that one of the onomata is “very powerful”, and a list of numbers next to the cosmogony of the Eighth Book of Moses, keeping count of the seven deities produced by the creator god. Some of these may be in the second hand (G) which is responsible for at least four of the pages of writing, but it is difficult to be certain given the small size and limited text present in the notations. The alchemical papyrus P.Holm. also has minor additions and corrections, but these seem to have been carried out while the ink was still wet and could be erased.

---

346 At ll. 1-5: The edition of Betz somewhat misleadingly reproduces this text as part of the invocation beginning on the next page. The covers (pages r1, v1, r36, v36) are otherwise entirely blank, presumably in keeping with the intentions of the original scribe.

347 At ll.1265-1274, whose lines are slightly inset, and perhaps in a different orientation, to the surrounding text; see LiDonnici, "Compositional Patterns in PGM IV", p.149, fn.28.

348 For example the text to the right of ll.95-98, which Preisendanz (Preisendanz and Henrichs, Papyri Graecae Magicae, p.184) interprets as χρῆσιμον ὄνομα πιάσαι τον κλέπτην, “a useful name for catching the thief”.

349 For example above ll.151 & 334; the latter appears to be a copy of text which is written in a circle as part of an illustration on the same page; it may be that the annotator felt the need to have the text written in full in one orientation for ease of reference.

350 Above l.130: πρ/ πρωτον εφάνη φωc αυγη διηcεcτηcε τα/ παντα εγενετο δε θεοc κατ ουτοι γαρ ειcι ουτωc/ o ειχε το αντιγραφ. This notation relates to to ll.165-166, and reproduces (with minor orthographic errors) the parallel text contained at ll.475-477.

351 Above l.345 and below l.391.

352 Next to ll.506-507, πολου ι<σ>χυρον.

353 At ll.475, 479, 486, 491, 494, 508, 522; Other notes include απον\ θ/ (l.472), interpreted by Preisendanz as ἀπ’ ὀμ(όματος) θ(εοῦ), and the numeral α written next to l.938, presumably to indicate that the name βορκαφριξ, which is written twice, the first instance crossed out, is to be spoken only once. Additionally there are marginal additions at l.377-380, 716, 860-862, 866 which are probably best understood as corrections.

354 Daniel, Two Greek magical papyri, pp.x-xi.
2.2.2 Language & Scripts

2.2.2.1 Bilingualism and Digraphism

The Theban Library is bilingual, being written almost exclusively in Greek and Egyptian, the latter being written mainly in one of two scripts, old Coptic and Demotic. These three are intertwined in such a way that there can be little doubt that the intended reader of the bilingual texts was expected to be functionally literate in both languages.

Three of the texts (PDM/PGM 12, 14, Suppl.) make use of glosses in Greek characters written above the Demotic text; in most cases this seems to function to express more clearly the fully vocalised pronunciations of *onomata*, sometimes they mark the pronunciation of more common Demotic vocabulary items, but in a few cases they are Greek-language equivalents of the words they gloss;\(^{355}\) in some of these cases it is likely that the text was originally written in Greek, and the gloss preserves a word for which the Egyptian equivalent was found to be insufficiently precise.\(^{356}\) In the case of PDM/PGM 14, these Greek glosses include some Old Coptic characters derived from Demotic script; despite the usual description of the glosses in the other texts (PDM/PGM 12, Suppl.) as old Coptic,\(^{357}\) they do not contain any Demotic-derived characters, and are therefore more properly written in Greek script. Noting this peculiarity, Dieleman suggests that this may be an indication that they are older than PGM 14, with the old Coptic/Demotic-derived characters representing an innovation.\(^{358}\) The glosses are treated unevenly in the three Demotic manuscripts. In most cases, the glosses in PDM 12, 14 & Suppl. are written left to right over the full Demotic word they gloss; as is standard for Demotic, this is written right to left. In each papyrus, however, there are a few examples of words where the gloss is written right to left. This occurs once in PDM 14 (l.8), and in four glosses in the first eleven columns IV

---

\(^{355}\) The only clear instances of this are in PDM/PGM 14; in PDM/PGM 12 & PDM Suppl. the glosses indicate *onomata* in every instance where their function is clear.

\(^{356}\) See Dieleman, *Priests, tongues, and rites*, pp.125-126, specifically referring to the glosses to PDM 14.93-114.

\(^{357}\) For example Johnson, "Louvre E3229," p.58.

\(^{358}\) Dieleman, *Priests, tongues, and rites*.p.35.
of PDM 12, in one place (l.152) of PDM Suppl. in these cases Greek letters are written immediately above the Demotic signs it is glossing. In some cases this results in the Greek being written in short groups corresponding to the Demotic signs they gloss (see table 4). While the signs within these “groups” of Greek text are to be read left to right, the groups as whole are to be read right to left, following the Demotic reading order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall reading direction</th>
<th>←</th>
<th>←</th>
<th>←</th>
<th>←</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading direction within groups</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek gloss</td>
<td>πα</td>
<td>π</td>
<td>κα</td>
<td>κα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demotic text</td>
<td>p'</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>g'</td>
<td>g'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4: Greek Gloss in PDM Suppl.52

Another interesting case occurs in PDM 14.42, an invoked deity is asked to appear “not fearfully or deceitfully, truthfully”. This is expressed in a Greek language phrase inserted into an otherwise Egyptian formula, transliterated into Demotic, and glossed with Greek above. This phenomenon of formulaic phrases in one language being carried over untranslated into formulae in the other recurs elsewhere in the magical papyri (see 4.2.2.5).

359 Damage to the papyrus, as well as the glossy covering applied in the 19th century in a misguided attempt at preservation, makes it difficult to confirm this with absolute certainty, although this does seem correct. See Johnson, “The Demotic Magical Spells of Leiden I 384”, pp.48-50. The glosses in question are at PDM 12.57, 58, 59 & 60.
360 Johnson (“Louvre E3229.”) does not comment upon this phenomenon. Equally strange are the glosses in ll.74 & 86, the first of which seems to gloss an unknown word, the second of which bears an unclear relationship to the Demotic word below. Theoretically either of these could be written either left to right, or right to left.
361 The intended Greek is ἀφόβως ἀψεύστως ἐπ’ ἀληθείᾳ, transcribed into Demotic as rph'iyb's 'pseswst's ep'sletys', and glossed as ἀφοβος ἀψευστος επιλησθαι, each word written in full, left to right, above the Demotic word it glosses. Compare the Greek invocation later in the same papyrus, “prophesy in truth, truthfully, without lies, without ambiguity, concerning this matter” (χρημάτισον ἐπ’ ἀληθείᾳ ἀλήθως ἀψευδῶς ἀν/αμφιλόγως περὶ τούδε πράγματος, ll.14-15).
In several texts\textsuperscript{362} the scripts are mixed in such a way that the instructions for a ritual are in one language, while the invocations or formulae are in another; in this instance it seems that the force of the words in their original language was considered important enough to retain the formula without translation, while the instructions could be translated into whichever language the owner felt more comfortable using. An even more surprising example of this tendency occurs in PDM 14.451-458, where the same invocation is given in both Egyptian and Greek.\textsuperscript{363} In a third case of language mixing, PGM 12 contains Demotic titles for texts written otherwise entirely in Greek.\textsuperscript{364} Finally, alongside glosses, two of the Demotic texts (PDM 12 & 14) incorporate Greek script directly into the Demotic text, in most cases to write \textit{onomata}, but in a few sections we find intelligible Greek and Egyptian words.\textsuperscript{365}

\textbf{2.2.2.2 Demotic}

\textbf{2.2.2.2.1 Demotic Script}

The three texts containing Demotic (PDM 12, 14, Suppl.) have been dated palaeographically to the early third century CE, and represent some of the latest texts written in this script. All three texts are written in hands dated to the Roman-period, with rubrics used to mark headings, numbers, key words and the beginning of recipes, invocations and verse points.\textsuperscript{366} These points have not been consistently studied, and would seem to appear (albeit inconsistently) only in PDM 14.\textsuperscript{367} The writing areas of the fronts of two of the Demotic papyri (PDM/PGM 14, PDM Suppl.) are delineated with rectangular guidelines drawn in red and/or black ink; these seem to have been drawn before the text was written,

\textsuperscript{362} For example PGM 4.11-25, 88-93, 94-153 (Coptic invocations, Greek instructions); PDM 12.76-107, 135-146, 147-164 (Greek invocations, Demotic instructions); PDM 14.1-92, 93-114, 451-458, 675-694, 1003-1014, 1078-1089, 1141-1154, 1163-1179 (Greek invocations, Demotic instructions).

\textsuperscript{363} On this text see Dieleman, \textit{Priests, tongues, and rites.} pp.127-128.

\textsuperscript{364} At ll.201, 270, 365; The last is not included in the edition of Betz.

\textsuperscript{365} PDM 12: ll.16-17 (onomata), 85 (onoma); PDM 14: at ll.410 (vowel series), 518 (onoma). Verso: at 26 points in ll.886-969, 985-1002, 1007 (where the Greek names of materia and medical conditions are given, and subsequently described in Demotic); l.1077 (Greek title of ritual given at the end), 1199-1200 (onomata).

\textsuperscript{366} Dieleman, \textit{Priests, tongues, and rites}, pp.36-37. Dieleman is referring to PDM 14, but an inspection of images of PDM 12 reveals that red ink is used in certain sections of this papyrus. For PDM Suppl. See Johnson, "Louvre E3229", p.58.

\textsuperscript{367} Dieleman, \textit{Priests, tongues, and rites}, pp.36-37.
since the text does not consistently remain within their borders. The use of frames in PDM/PGM 14 is more complex than in PDM Suppl.: the twenty-nine columns on the front vary between columns with full frames ruled vertically and horizontally (cols. 1-14, 27-29), frames ruled only horizontally (cols. 15-23), and columns written without frames (cols. 24-26). This suggests a fairly complex process in which text was gradually added, with the aesthetic norms changing slightly at each point. The backs of PDM/PGM 14 and PDM Suppl. are divided less carefully into columns, apparently representing later, opportunistic additions in contrast to the planned text of the recto; as noted above the hands are also less regular. PDM/PGM 12 has a second century CE Demotic literary text on the other side, *The Myth of the Sun’s Eye*; this is briefly discussed at 2.2.5.3.1. Occasional visual copying errors in the Demotic imply that at least some of the text in PDM/PGM 14 was copied from a written exemplar.

Intermixed with Demotic writing is the older hieratic script; a detailed study of two of these by Dieleman, PDM 12 and 14, reveals that the hieratic is used in three distinct ways. First, in some instances hieratic signs are used as "scriptural and lexical clusters within a larger Demotic unit", that is, they represent words, generally archaic or religious, inserted seamlessly into the overall grammatical structure. Secondly, hieratic and Demotic may be combined to form a single hybrid unit. Thirdly, hieratic may be used to transcribe and gloss *onomata*; in this last case Dieleman remains unsure of the underlying reason for the use of hieratic: like Demotic it functions in this case purely as a form of transliteration, and therefore adds no further information. He notes that there is no reason to think that hieratic, despite the association with sacred texts which led to its name, was accorded any special prestige in these texts. Johnson attributes its use in PDM Suppl. to “the conservatism of religious texts in general”, specifically suggesting that sections including hieratic may have been copied from

---

368 Johnson, *Louvre E3229*, p.57; PDM 14 is slightly different, in that the frames are formed by upper and lower lines in red ink extending the length of the columns (except for cols. 24-26), which are subdivided (except between cols.15-27) by vertical lines in black ink. Dieleman, *Priests, tongues, and rites*, p.36.
369 A preliminary analysis suggests that these blocks show some correspondence with the type of texts each section contains; I hope to explore this phenomenon further in the near future.
370 See for example the *r/f* confusion in l.126, where the Demotic has *bibel* but the gloss preserves the presumably correct *бавηγ*, and l.417, where we find *имвы*‘*к* *трым*‘*м*‘*тис*, apparently a transcription of the Greek Ἀμμωνιακοῦ θυμιάματος; *tr* in the second word should probably be *th*.
372 Ibid., p. 62.
older papyri, although as Griffith and Thompson already noted, the hieratic sections of PDM 14 include content, including the name $\text{Αβρασαξ}$ (l.698), which is almost certainly not archaic. This mixing of native scripts is unusual in the corpus of Demotic texts, but not unique; apart from the *Apis Embalming Ritual* (P.Vienna 3873; late II CE) noted by Dieleman, other Demotic texts with significant hieratic writings include several copies of the *Book of Thoth*, the possibly astrological P.Vienna 6614, and the mythological *On the Primaeval Ocean*. While all of these texts possess a religious character, it is difficult to make more general deductions about the significance of the presence of hieratic; Vos, editing the *Embalming Ritual*, came to the conclusion that the hieratic sections represent the older, original script of the text, while Jasnow and Zauzich, editing the *Book of Thoth*, came to the opposite conclusion, that the original was probably composed in Demotic, with the hieratic copies and intrusions representing archaising tendencies by individuals literate in both scripts. In view of this ambiguity, it is safest to see the hieratic as a similar indication of advanced literacy on the part of the Demotic scribe, rather than necessarily an indicator of greater antiquity.

### 2.2.2.2.2 Demotic Language

As Quack points out, we still do not possess a general theory of the linguistic, rather than palaeographic stages, of Demotic. He has nonetheless divided the Demotic content of the three papyri of the Theban Library loosely into two groups: late (*démotique tardif*) sections displaying a

---

374 Griffith and Thompson, *Demotic Magical Papyrus*, volume 1 p.13.
378 A. E. Reymond, *From Ancient Egyptian Hermetic Writings*, vol. 2, From the Contents of the Libraries of the Suchos Temples in the Fayyum (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer) (Vienna: Verlag Brüder Hollinek, 1977), p.143. The suggestion that it may be astrological was made by Ritner ("Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire", p.3343).
382 Quack, "En route vers le copte", p.191.
proportionally greater number of forms typical of the Coptic stage of the Egyptian language, opposed
to comparatively more archaic (archaïque, traditionelle) sections,\textsuperscript{383} with forms more characteristic of
earlier Demotic. Thus PDM Suppl. is characterised as having some archaic\textsuperscript{384} and some late\textsuperscript{385}
content;\textsuperscript{386} PDM/PGM 14 is characterised as largely late, with some brief archaic sections,\textsuperscript{387} and
PDM/PGM 12 is classified as late.\textsuperscript{388}

In terms of geographic dialect, Johnson has demonstrated that PDM 14 shares the palaeographic and
grammatical propensities, as well as two otherwise unattested verbal forms, with the \textit{Gardener's
Agreement} (Medinet Habu Ostracon 4038),\textsuperscript{389} dated by its editor to sometime after 271 CE, and found
in situ by an archaeological survey in the temple of Medinet Habu in Thebes. While she notes that
their shared scribal habits may be the result of their shared temporal rather than geographic origins,
the similarity at least supports the possibility of a Theban origin for the texts; she extends these
observations to the two other Demotic handbooks, PDM 12 and PDM Suppl.\textsuperscript{390}

\subsection*{2.2.2.3 Coptic}

The term “Coptic” here refers to a stage of the Egyptian language written with Greek characters
supplemented by Demotic-derived signs; this broad term disguises within the Theban Library a
language which may vary from one close to the more-or-less standardised dialects represented in
Christian texts, to something closer to the stage of Egyptian referred to as Demotic, representing a
more conservative and perhaps deliberately archaizing form. Here we will briefly discuss features of

\textsuperscript{383} Ibid. p.192. Compare the comments of Helmut Satzinger, "Die altkoptischen Texte als Zeugnisse der Beziehung zwischen
\textsuperscript{384} At ll.60-184.
\textsuperscript{385} At ll.1-60, 185-208.
\textsuperscript{386} Quack, "\textit{En route vers le copte}", p.192 n.6; compare the comments in Johnson, "Louvre E3229", p.88: "...many of the
peculiarities noted in the commentary are also archaisms, of grammar or vocabulary and phraseology."
\textsuperscript{387} The archaic sections are at ll.155-191, 309-39; perhaps 239-295, 428-450; Quack, "\textit{En route vers le copte}", p.192. In Griffith
and Thompson, \textit{Demotic Magical Papyrus}, It is suggested that ll.366-375 may also be archaic.
\textsuperscript{388} Quack, "\textit{En route vers le copte}", 192 n.7.
\textsuperscript{390} Ibid, pp.131-132; "Louvre E3229", p.88; she also applies this generalisation to PDM 61, which I do not accept as belonging
to the Theban Library.
the use of Coptic language and script, in particular focusing on the dialectal features which are a key aspect of current Coptic linguistics; since these are determined not only by grammar and lexis, but also by the orthographic habits which suggest the underlying phonology, these aspects will not be divided as they are in the discussions of Demotic and Greek.

Coptic script appears in two papyri, PGM 4 and PDM 14, while sections which write Egyptian words in Greek script without Demotic-derived letters appear in PGM 1. Consequently the short text in PGM 1.252 lacks an expected resumptive pronoun (-ŋ) not easily represented in Greek; the dialect of this section is characterised by Satzinger as “a kind of Sahidic”, while the glosses found in PDM/PGM 12 and Suppl. are described as “a kind of Akhmimic”.

Further supralineal glosses appear in PDM/PGM 14, where they utilise a further eleven Demotic-derived signs in addition to the 24 signs of the standard Greek alphabet, of which only two, θ and δ, survive as part of the standard Coptic alphabet (the latter only in the Bohairic and Dialect P). A further one of these, known as the miniscule-alpha grapheme is the ancestor of the later djandja. Griffith compares the Coptic here to that of PGM 4.94-153 (Block IV in the discussion below).

In her study of PDM 14, Johnson suggested, based on the frequent confusion of κατά and γάμμα in the Greek/Coptic glosses, that the scribe was unable to reliably distinguish the two phonemes; this would suggest that their mother tongue was Egyptian, in which voiced and unvoiced stops were not distinguished. Among several other pieces of phonetic evidence, she notes that the clear distinction between /r/ and /l/ suggests a non-Fayumic origin, while the lack of distinctively Bohairic aspirated

---

390 ll.1.251-252: όνοκ άνοιγ άνοικ οσφφηρ άνοικ ω/σφτ σοφσνουερ άνοικ πε ουicus ρεντα σει τακο<ŋ> ("I am Anubis, I am Osiris-Phre, I am ὁστό σόρομιερ, I am Osiris whom Set slew.") Compare τβάιν, PGM 4.18 ("the one on (his) mountain"), where the same suffix-pronoun would be expected; the older form is τπύ-δρο-f (LGG 7.393).


395 Johnson, "The dialect of the Demotic Magical Papyrus of London and Leiden", p.112-114

396 See, for example, Carsten Peust, Egyptian Phonology: An Introduction to the Phonology of a Dead Language (Göttingen, 1999), p.89.

stops, and treatment of the k-family both suggest a non-Bohairic origin. While Satzinger has argued persuasively that her comparison of the treatment of /š/ and /x/ to the dialects P and İ is incorrect, we are still led to the conclusion that the form of Egyptian represented belongs, like the glosses, to a southern dialect, perhaps something like Akhmimic with Sahidic influence. Johnson complicates this picture by suggesting that the glosses were aimed at a Greek speaker: this conclusion is drawn from the lack of indication of aspiration where such would be automatic in native Greek speech, and the fact that allophonic variation present in Greek pronunciation is noted in the Demotic writings of words, but not in their Greek/Old Coptic glosses, implying again that the intended reader would be a Greek speaker who would instinctively produce the correct allophones. I would make a more tempered claim that the intended audience of the glosses was expected to approximate a Greek accent when reading that script, including aspiration and palatalisation, but that this need not be a native Greek-speaker.

The situation in PGM 4 is more complicated than that of PDM 14. The language of the Coptic sections falls into four blocks, I (1-4), II (5-10), III (11-92), IV (94-153) and V (1232-1236), each of which displays variations in their use of script, vocabulary and grammar; some of these will be briefly summarised below.

---

398 These are /g/, /q/, /k/, /ḏ/, /ṯ/.
400 Ibid, pp. 122-123. 1 is the dialect of the Ascension of Isaiah, also known as 'Proto-Lycopolitan/Diospolitan'. See Rudolph Kasser, "Dialect İ (or Proto-Lycopolitan or Proto-Lyco-Diospolitan)" in The Coptic Encyclopedia, volume 8, pp.79-82. For Dialect P see Kasser, ibid., pp.82-87.
401 Satzinger, "Die altkoptischen Texte", p.143 fn.110. As he points out, PDM 14 distinguishes between /š/ and /x/, but not /x/ and /ç/; this puts it closer to Akhmimic than P or İ, which are very conservative in the rich range of palatals they preserve.
402 Ibid., pp.142-143; see also Satzinger, 'Old Coptic', The Coptic Encyclopedia, volume 8, p.172.
404 In particular the indication by /š/ of palatalisation before /i/.
406 We might in fact expect a native Greek speaker reading the Demotic to use the appropriate allophones even when reading them from Demotic, in which case there would be no reason to indicate them.
407 Section A in Erman, "Die ägyptischen Beschwörungen".
408 Section B in ibid.
409 Discussed as C-K or I in ibid.
410 Discussed as L-Q or II in ibid.
Block I is a brief invocation added after the rest of the text had been written; block II is similarly brief, consisting entirely of onomata. Block III, a longer invocation to Osiris, is paralleled by a Demotic text in PDM 14. These sections are generally characterised as being close to Sahidic, though with important variations from the later, more standardised form of the dialect, suggesting an affinity with Lycopolitan or Bohairic.\footnote{See Satzinger, *Old Coptic* p.172 and Satzinger, "Die altkoptischen Texte", p.144, who notes a Lycopolitan-like idiom in some words; Paul E. Kahle, *Balaʿizah: Coptic texts from Deir el-Balaʿizah in Upper Egypt (2 volumes)* (London: Oxford University Press, 1954), p.243 sees Bohairic influence.}

Block IV, an love spell containing a historiola in which Isis complains to her father Thoth about the infidelity of Osiris, has received the most attention from scholars. Most commentators agree that the primary dialect has affinities to Bohairic, but disagree in the variant dialectal features, with Kahle seeing an important Sahidic component;\footnote{Helmut Satzinger, "An Old Coptic Text Reconsidered: PGM 94ff," in *Past, Present and Future: Studies in Honour of Rodolphe Kasser*, ed. Rodolphe Kasser, et al. (Leuven: Peeters, 1994), p.220. Compare his earlier comments in "Die altkoptischen Texte", p.144-145, in which he stated that it was either a mixed dialect between Bohairic and Sahidic, or Lycopolitan with Middle-Egyptian influence.} Satzinger Lycopolitan, Mesokemic and Fayumic;\footnote{Griffith, "The Date of the Old Coptic Texts", p.79. See Kasser’s discussion of the history of the term "Memphitic" in the *Coptic Encyclopedia*, volume 8 pp.159-166; I draw this conclusion since Griffith distinguishes it from its other main referent, Bohairic. Although he also separates it from Fayumic, by this he seems to mean what Kasser describes as "Fayumic in the strict sense (with regular lambdacism, etc.)."} Griffith, writing much earlier, characterised the secondary dialectal influence as “Memphitic”, by which he seems to have meant a form of Fayumic.\footnote{For example at ll.121-122: ḫεξῆ/ ΤΙΟΤΙ ΤΙΧΤΕ ("At once, at once.")} In addition, this block shows some intriguing orthographic irregularities: supralineal glosses and corrections, mainly of the vowels, provide phonological variants of words, so that not only are several dialectal variants represented simultaneously, but repetitions of the same word in the main text itself may show orthographic variation.\footnote{Old Coptic' in *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, volume 8, p.174.} Satzinger concludes that the purpose of this practice was to “encompass several Coptic dialects simultaneously” in order to allow the reader to “use the spells in his own vernacular idiom”.\footnote{Ibid., p.174.} Since he believes the compiler to have been a Greek, this may have meant the idiom(s) with which he was most familiar.\footnote{Ibid., p.174.} This explanation of the phenomenon contradicts the usual explanation for the glosses in the Demotic texts, namely to
ensure the transmission of a single correct phonetic standard. While there is insufficient space to explore the question here, I wonder if the variation and correction/supralineation might be better understood as fulfilling a ritual purpose, with vowel-variation taking on a non-linguistic significance. Additionally, we should once again note the difficulty of assigning an unproblematic “Greek” (or indeed “Egyptian”) identity to the text's user or compiler, discussed more fully at 2.3.5.

Block V, a short invocation to the god of Abraham, is clearly Coptic in its language, but uses only one Demotic derived letter, σ, using c for /š/ and φ for /f/, and aspiration marked either by the spiritus asper, or an aspirated consonant. Kahle characterises the dialect of this section as Bohairic, with some Sahidic forms.

Two diacritic marks are used in the Coptic, but not Greek, sections of PGM 4: in blocks II-V the rough breathing is used to mark the phoneme /h/, while the acute accent marks word stress; while these stress indications generally appear where we would expect them, based on reconstructions of Egyptian prosody, they do not seem to be used consistently, and Peust notes some instances where they would be expected but are not present; while this may be readily attributed to the general variance found in scribal practice from this period, we may also wonder if the stress pattern used in these invocation sections was somewhat different from that of regular speech. High points are also used to mark divisions between clauses and onomata.

In addition to their orthography, the Coptic sections of PGM 4 display a lexical range quite different from that of the later dialects, several words, in particular relating to pagan cult are present which
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418 Compare, for example, the mode of enunciation prescribed in the papyri, discussed at 4.2.1.2.
419 See Preisendanz and Henrichs, Papyri Graecae Magicae, p.115 fn.1 for a reconstruction of part of the invocation with Demotic-derived letters added.
420 ΨΗΡΙ for ΠΗΡΙ, 1234; ΧΑΦΕ/ΣΑΧΦΙ for ΧΑΦΙ, ll. 1234, 1235; ΣΑΒΗ for ΣΑΒΗ, 1236.
421 ΣΑΧΦΕ/ΣΑΧΦΙ for ΣΑΧΦΙ, ll. 1234, 1235; ΕΙΝΙΔΟΦ for ΕΙΝΙΔΥ, 1239.
422 ΕΠΑΡΗ for ΕΠΑΡΗ, l.1234; ΕΤΣΑΧΦΕΙ for ΕΤΣΑΧΦΕΙ, ll. 1234; ΕΙΝΙΔΟΦ for ΕΙΝΙΔΥ, 1239.
423 Kahle, Balaa'izah, p.244.
424 Peust, Egyptian Phonology: An Introduction to the Phonology of a Dead Language, p.272.
425 Except for αγγελος "angel" in ll.5, 16; αερ "air" in ll.5, 23.
are obsolete in the later dialects.\textsuperscript{426} In blocks II-III there is a noticeable absence of Greek loanwords, although I, and to a greater extent IV, use them quite freely.\textsuperscript{427}

In addition to these linguistic features of the Coptic in PGM 4, the script itself is differentiated from the Greek text into which it is embedded, an instance of digraphism, the use of two distinct scripts within a single text. The writing of the Coptic text of Blocks I-V is larger than the Greek, with greater space between lines. In part, this may relate to the fact that these texts are invocations, with the more expansive writing allowing for easier reading; this phenomenon appears in other sections intended for recitation, but also in sections where onomata appear without instructions for oral recitation.\textsuperscript{428} Alternatively, it may simply reflect a desire to mark paralinguistically the difference between the two languages.

The complexity of the Coptic passages, in particular those of PGM 4, makes it difficult to draw conclusions about the geographical or linguistic origins of their composers or copyists. The presence of Akhmimic forms in later non-literary texts suggests that this was the spoken dialect of the Theban region,\textsuperscript{429} but Sahidic is attested in the region from the earliest written evidence, so that it seems that the situation was one of diglossia, with an early form of Sahidic as the standard literary language of Upper Egypt.\textsuperscript{430} If the presence of Akhmimic and Sahidic forms in Theban texts is therefore quite explicable, the reason for the presence of Bohairic and Fayumic forms, associated with more northerly regions, is less straightforward. As Kahle notes, this may mean that “the fusion of dialects before the

\textsuperscript{426} Those highlighted by Satzinger (\textit{Old Coptic} p.174) include ṭⲙⲃⲣⲁⲧⲱⲩ, l.18 (“the one on (his) mountain”); ci/-ci n- (“son of”); ⲧⲃ, l.23 (“Duat”, i.e. the ‘underworld’); Ⲝⲣⲟⲩⲩ, l.117 (“liver”); 60l, ll. 123, 138 etc. (imperative “rise” (?) ); 6ⲡⲉ, l.15 (“strong”); ⲣⲟⲩ l.122 (“limbs” (?) ); Ⲫⲡⲧⲧⲧ l.149-150 (“to enchant”). To these we may add ⲁⲡⲟⲩⲫⲧⲧ, l.11 (“praise to…”); ⲫⲧⲡⲧⲡ, l.100 (“female companion”); ⲥⲧⲡⲧ l.138 (“noblewoman”); xo, l.140 (“bull”).

\textsuperscript{427} See for example ⲯⲧⲡ ⲧⲧⲧ, ll.1231-2; ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ, l.123; ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ, l.1238.


\textsuperscript{429} Satzinger, “An Old Coptic Text Reconsidered”, p.220

Coptic period was even greater than has been assumed";\textsuperscript{43}\textsuperscript{1} or, more likely, that in the redactional process behind the texts, exemplars from Lower Egypt were copied by a southern scribe, or vice versa.

2.2.2.4 Greek

All of the manuscripts of the Theban Magical Library contain Greek, in several cases as the only recognisable language (PGM 2, 5, 13, P.Holm., P.Leid. I 397). Despite the large number of hands contained in the archive, all of the hands write in a bilinear, unimodal majuscule, which has been dated palaeographically to either the third or fourth century CE (see 2.2.1). This discussion will focus on two aspects of the use of Greek: paralinguistic features such as diacritics, and style, understood as grammar and lexis.

2.2.2.4.1 Paralinguistic features

Within the Greek texts, numerous scribal features are used, either to add paralinguistic information, or to reduce the writing area required. Several texts utilise supralineation to mark onomata or divine names either in Greek (PGM/PGM 12, 14; PGM 13) or Demotic (PDM/PGM 12, 14); one has a comparable instance of sublineation (PGM 4), and in one Demotic text (PDM Suppl. L48) onomata are contained in an oval. The rationale behind this is unclear, but seems to indicate that they are in some sense special, and serves to differentiate them from the surrounding text; there may be some relationship here with phenomenon of nomina sacra, usually associated with the Christian tradition, in which contracted divine titles are marked with a supralineal stroke; the practice of superlining divine names is common in other magical texts in both Greek and Coptic, as well as in several of the Nag Hammadi texts. The subtleties of the approach employed by the scribes of the library are often lost in editions and translations of the texts, where onomata are often consistently marked in small caps regardless of their treatment in the original papyri; an example pointed out by Dieleman in PDM 14. 686 invokes a deity as $\text{ΤΥΦΩΝ Σ}$, where the supralineation of only part of the apellation may mark

\textsuperscript{43}\textsuperscript{1} Kahle, Bala'izah, p.245.
it as possessing the deity’s “efficacious hidden essence” in contrast to the more straightforwardly referential, and un-marked, name.432

Various diacritic marks are used on the Greek text, though far more sparingly and less consistently than in the Coptic sections of PGM 4. These are: accents (PGM 2, 4, 5), apostrophe (PGM 2, P.Holm, P.Leid. I 397), rough breathings (PGM 2, 4, 5, P.Holm., P.Leid. I 397) as well as dieresis on iota (PGM 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14, P.Holm, P.Leid. I 397) and upsilon (PGM 5, P.Holm., P.Leid. I 397). High points are used in several papyri to mark divisions between clauses and onomata (PGM 1, 2, 4, 5, P.Holm., P.Leid. I 397), along with double oblique lines (PGM 2, 4, 5), and paragraphos, either simple or diplē to mark divisions within or between recipes (PGM 1, 2, 4, 5, 13). P.Holm. displays two unique features – the use of one ornate paragraphos, and the marking of page numbers, although the loose sheet, PGM 5a, is unnumbered).

Several of the papyri use abbreviation, marking the abbreviation either with a raised final letter (PGM 5, P.Holm.), an oblique stroke (PGM 2, 4) or supralineation (PGM 4, P.Holm.); in this last case the contraction of divine titles, such as θ(εὸ)ς ζ (θζ), resemble exactly the treatment of nomina sacra in Christian texts.433 Alongside these abbreviations are several common symbols, either formed from 2-letter abbreviations or the repertoire of sigla used in Greek papyri more broadly, often specific to (al)chemical or astrological contexts; these include the signs for weights and the planetary symbols, the latter used to represent not only the celestial bodies, but also the deities and metals associated with them. The usage of these symbols is never consistent, with sigla alternating freely with full writings.434

2.2.2.4.1 Grammar and Lexis

Despite the general interest in the Theban Library, and the magical papyri in general, relatively few studies have focused on their grammatical and lexical aspects in general, synthesising the vast amount

433 For a discussion of these see A.H.TR.E. Paap, *Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries A.D. The Sources and Some Deductions*, Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959), especially pp.119-127. He concludes that Hellenised Judaeans in Alexandria may have originated this practice in order to mark the word θεός as distinctive.
434 See for example the full writings of the planetary names at PGM 4.835-849.
of text critical work which has gone into their publications.\textsuperscript{435} The texts are for the most part written in the contemporary stage of the Greek language known as \textit{koinē}, although the hymnic sections which occur in several invocations tend towards a more markedly poetic style with affinities to the Orphic hymns as well as the Chaldaean and Clarian Oracles, drawing on a lexicon rich in both epic vocabulary and new coinages.\textsuperscript{436} These sections are generally written in meter, often faulty: usually dactyls,\textsuperscript{437} but less often iamb\textsuperscript{s}\textsuperscript{438} or anapaests.\textsuperscript{439}

Assessments of the nature of the Greek content vary, and given the fact that the Theban Library contains hundreds of individual texts with their own compositional histories we should not necessarily expect stylistic uniformity. Ritner\textsuperscript{440} suggests that many of the Greek terms should be understood as direct calques of Egyptian-language concepts, resulting from the linguistically and culturally Egyptian background of the compiler; he terms the resulting register “translation Greek”. This kind of direct translation is apparent in other texts whose direction of transmission is undisputed, such as the \textit{Dream of Nectanebo}\textsuperscript{441} and \textit{The Myth of the Sun’s Eye},\textsuperscript{442} but further work is needed to demonstrate this for the magical papyri. Riesenfeld provides a more limited argument in the same

\textsuperscript{435} As Delgado comments, “No obstante, a pesar de esta abundancia bibliográfica, no existen, como decimos, demasiados estudios de tipo estrictamente lingüístico sobre la magia y la religión en época helenística”; “LMPG en línea”. \textit{Introducción}.

\textsuperscript{436} For a list of some of these see Eleni Pachoumi, “A List of epithets from the "Greek Magical Papyri" that are not recorded in the LSJ and LSJ "Supplements"," Glotta 87 (2011). The hymns themselves are collected in Preisendanz and Henrichs, \textit{Papyri Graeceae Magicae}, pp.237-266, and discussed in Brashear, "An Introduction and Survey", pp.3420-3421.

\textsuperscript{437} Dactylic hexameter: PGM 1.296-325, 342-345; PGM 2.2-7, 81-101, 133-140, 163-166; PGM 3.198-229; 559-558; PGM 4.261-273, 436-461, 939-948, 1399-1434, 1459-1469, 1471-1479, 1957-1989, 2522-2567, 2714-2783, 2786-2870, 2902-2939; PGM 5.400-420; PGM 12.244-252; these are the evaluations of Eleni Pachoumi, “The Greek Magical Papyri: Diversity and Unity” (Newcastle University, 2007), pp.147-148.

\textsuperscript{438} Iambic trimeter: PGM 4.179-201, 2242-2417. Iambic trimeter acataleptic: PGM 4.2574-2610, 2643-2674; these are the evaluations of ibid, pp.147-148.

\textsuperscript{439} PGM 5.172-179; evaluation of Brashear, "An Introduction and Survey", p.3420.

\textsuperscript{440} Robert K. Ritner, "Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire: the Demotic Spells and their Religious Context," ibid, pp.3363-3367.


direction, claiming that what he called the “qualifications” used to describe deities – apposed participles, or predication, generally addressing the god in the second person – were evidence of an “Oriental” pattern of hymns, and evidence of a descent from Egyptian models.\footnote{Harald Riesenfeld, “Remarques sur les hymnes magiques,” Eranos 44(1946).}

Garcia Teijeiro, the scholar responsible for the most detailed studies of the language of the magical papyri to date,\footnote{His most extensive study (M. García Teijeiro, “Sobre la lengua de los documentos mágicos griegos,” in Las lenguas de corpus y sus problemas lingüísticos, ed. José Antonio Fernández Delgado, Agustín Ramos Guerreira, and Ana Agud Aparicio (Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas, 1996)) focuses on rhetorical features, so is not considered here.} denies significant Egyptian or ‘oriental’ influence, except in the cases of onomata and the names of individuals and deities;\footnote{“Consideraciones sobre el vocabulario técnico de la magia,” in Corollando Complutensis. Homenaje al profesor José S. Lasso de la Vega (Madrid: Editorial Complutense, 1998), p. 100.} this is somewhat too strong, however, since there are clearly a few Egyptian loanwords present. Among these we might count βάϊς, βᾶρις, ἑσιῆς, κῦφι, οὐάτιον, στίμι, and οὐφωρ, all connected with Egyptian religious beliefs and practices.

More noticeable in the Greek texts is what Teijeiro classifies as the technical vocabulary (vocabulario técnico) of this genre;\footnote{García Teijeiro, “Consideraciones sobre el vocabulario técnico de la magia,” p. 104} we should consider this vocabulary common not only to the texts usually described as “magical papyri”, but also contemporary texts surviving in the manuscript tradition – lapidary, astrological, botanical, medical and philosophical works (see section 2.3.4.4). Among the categories of terminology highlighted by Delgado\footnote{Delgado, “LMPG en línea”, Introducción.} are terms for ritual actions,\footnote{“Acciones rituales: ἀγνίζω, καθαρεύω, σπένδω, ῥαίνω.”} materia (plants,
animals, utensils, metals and so on), times and places, divine actions and non-human entities. Most of these terms are not new coinages, and are used in other genres of text; what distinguishes them here is their specific referents, their frequency of employment, and their collocations, which combine to produce a distinctive lexical set.

In terms of their characteristic verbal forms and constructions, Levi and Teijeiro note that the ritual instructions in the magical papyri generally are characterised by second person singular imperatives, combined with participles, with little subordination and regular use of the conjunction καί. While similar phraseology is found in texts such as the Cyranides, they note the particular similarity of these texts to instructional botanical and culinary texts, such as Theophrastus’ De Plantis and the Latin Apicius, though not to medical or surgical treatises, as might have been expected.

2.2.2.5 Other Scripts & Languages

2.2.2.5.1 The Cipher Script

An alphabetic cipher-script, consisting of 36 letters and written left to right, is found within the Demotic sections of PDM/PGM 12, 14 and Suppl. As there is only one, broken, word, in each of PDM

---

457 “Momentos de realización de las prácticas: ἀνατολή, μεσονύκτιον, ὥρα.”
458 “Lugares de realización de las prácticas: βαλανεῖον, μνῆμα, σῆμα.”
459 “Acciones realizadas por la divinidad: γεννάω, ἀλλάσσω, καταδείκνυμι, ζωογονέω.”
460 “Todo tipo de entidades no humanas: σκιά, νεκυδαίμων, φάντασμα, βίαιος.”
463 As we might expect, the existence of the cipher alphabet was first noticed by Reuvens (Reuvens, Lettres à M. Letronne. 1e Lettre p.49). The decipherment of the alphabet was discussed in William Groff, "Étude sur la Sorcellerie ou le rôle que la Bible a joué chez les sorciers," Mémoires présentés à l’Institut Égyptien 3 (1900),pp.358-370.
the following discussion will pertain only to the instances in PDM 14. Words in cipher do not occur in spoken formulae, but only in instructions and lists of materia, and may be either of Greek (10 instances), or more often Egyptian origin (11 verbal forms, 53 nouns). The cipher consists essentially of two parts: 27 graphemes representing phonetic values found in Greek, of which five derive from Demotic, and a further six graphemes corresponding to Egyptian sounds, which are attested in ‘old Coptic’ scripts; for this reason Dieleman calls it an “upgraded version” of a pre-existing cipher alphabet whose original purpose was to write only Greek. More recently, Zago has suggested that the forms of some of the characters of the cipher alphabet may be derived from Greek musical notation; it is known that the cryptographic system used in another papyrus (PGM 57 + 72) may have such a derivation, although the two ciphers do not overlap, and a comparison of the cipher with the musical notation preserved by Aristides Quintilianus and Alypius of Alexandria (both IV CE) shows that fourteen of the symbols (12 for Greek phonemes, 2 for Egyptian) show a marked similarity. Zago suggests that the creators of the cipher may have been familiar with musical notation from its liturgical use, presumably in the context of Egyptian temples, although there seems to be no surviving evidence for the use of the system in such a context. While the resemblance of the two systems (the cipher alphabet and musical notation) may simply derive from the fact that they both use modified versions of the Greek alphabet, the similarity is marked, and the hypothesis worth noting.

The lack of a sign for the aspirate, the lack of differentiation between τ and χ, and the occurrence of three signs occurring only in Greek words, implying a differentiation clear only to native Greek speakers, suggested to Griffiths and Thompson that the cipher was originally created by someone whose primary language was Greek, not Egyptian; additionally they cite the fact that the Demotic-

---

464 At l.51, see Johnson, "The Demotic Magical Spells of Leiden I 384", pp.47-48 who reads ω.80τ.τ., the name of an unidentified animal whose dung is to be used in a ritual.
465 At l.55, see "Louvre E3229", pp.78-79 who reads ω(ε/τ)(Δ/τ), but does not make a suggestion for how to read the word.
466 Dieleman, Priests, tongues, and rites, pp.87-88.
468 Signs 18, 28, 31.
derived letters could have been easily deciphered by an individual literate in Demotic, and so would not have served as a useful cipher in an Egyptian context. While this assessment of the purpose and origin of the cipher alphabet is upheld by Johnson, and broadly by Dieleman, Ritner points out that “few Egyptians - and no Greeks” would have known the values of the additional Demotic signs, and adds that the use of ciphers, in particular cryptographic hieroglyphs whose decipherment would not pose a serious problems for those who could read standard hieroglyphic script, are well attested within the native tradition, and provide a parallel to the cipher script used here.

The two-stage development of the cipher indicated above implies that the script was originally developed to transcribe Greek, but was later adapted by an individual literate in Demotic, to write Egyptian words, without, however, providing the full phonetic inventory we might expect; this suggests a transitional stage in which certain conventions – the lack of aspirate, the representation of palatalised Egyptian consonants were marked by their unpalatalised Greek equivalents – had become to some degree standardised. It was this final version used in the Theban Library; thus the origins of the script are of less use for determining the cultural or linguistic associations of the scribes who later used it. Dieleman makes a persuasive argument that the original purpose of this final script in the source texts of PDM 14 was to protect sensitive parts of the rituals (items of material, details of praxis, the function of anti-social rituals) from others who could already read Demotic, but not the cipher; this original purpose is moot in the compilation we have before us, since it contains parallel texts in which the same ritual details are written both in cipher and in Demotic.

2.2.2.5.2 Foreign, divine and animal languages

In addition to Greek and Egyptian, there are short passages ostensibly written in other languages. These generally fall under the category of onomata, more often referred to as voces magicae or nomina.

---

469 Griffith and Thompson, *Demotic Magical Papyrus*, volume 3, p.108.
471 Dieleman, *Priests, tongues, and rites*, pp.87-96.
472 Ritner, "Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire", p.3335 fn.15.
473 Dieleman, *Priests, tongues, and rites*, pp. 88-96
474 For example PDM 14.376-394 & 1206-1218.
barbara. In some cases, these are recognisable to us, if not to their practitioners as either Egyptian, \footnote{In some instances, the scribe of PDM/PGM 12 & 14 seems to have been unable to recognise certain Egyptian terms transcribed in the Greek Vorlage, transcribing them into alphabetic Demotic rather than writing out the component lexemes in their usual Demotic form. For a discussion of this phenomenon see Dieleman, Priests, tongues, and rites, pp. 72-75.} Greek or another language, most often some Semitic language understood to be either Hebrew or Aramaic. \footnote{For a discussion of possible, probable and unlikely Hebrew and Aramaic phrases in the magical papyri see Gideon Bohak, "Hebrew, Hebrew everywhere? Notes on the interpretation of Voces Magicae," in Prayer, Magic, and the Stars in the Ancient and Late Antique World, ed. Scott Noegel, Joel Walker, and Brannon Wheeler, Magic in History (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003).} In many these semantic elements are combined in such novel ways that Zago characterises them as constituting a kind of artificial anti-language, that is one deliberately inaccessible to outsiders. \footnote{Zago, "Al modo dei profeti” Strategie di scrittura e di enunciazione in alcuni testi rituali greco-egiziani”, p.835. For the classical treatment of anti-language as a concept see M. A. K. Halliday, "Anti-Languages," American Anthropologist 78, no. 3 (1976).}

In several cases the text specifically states that onomata are understood to be Hebrew \footnote{For example at PGM 5.475; PGM 4.3084; PGM 13.150, 458, 594. 985-6.} or Syrian, but in most cases the phrases are not recognisable as such, leading us to think the claim is merely drawing on the mystique attached to those languages; see for example the alchemist Zosimos’ interest in the interpretation of Hebrew names, \footnote{Zosimos, On the Letter Omega 79-82, 85-86, 111-118, 145-151.} or Lucian’s dismissal of Alexander of Abonoteichus’ babbling in Hebrew or Phoenician.

A similar, though rarer, case occurs in two instances where short formulas are said to be in Kushitic \footnote{PGM 5.472; PGM 13.966.} again, there is some indication that the people of Kush were believed by the Egyptians to have the magical proficiency often attributed to foreigners: \footnote{Lucian, Alexander 13.18-22.} the Demotic novel Setna II contains an account of a magical duel between a reincarnate Egyptian priest and his Kushite rival, and there are instances of names said to be Nubian \footnote{PDM 14.1097-1101. Outside the Theban Library Kushite is also mentioned in PDM 61.95-99.} in older Egyptian ritual texts. \footnote{See for example the discussions in Dieleman, Priests, tongues, and rites, pp.138-143; and Yvan Koenig, "La Nubie dans les textes magiques,” Revue d’Égyptologie 38 (1987).} This reference is
intriguing, and there is some evidence that a real language, possibly Meroitic, is preserved in these passages, although they remain almost entirely undeciphered.\textsuperscript{485}

Still less likely are references in PGM 4 & 13 to the language of baboons, falcons and birds,\textsuperscript{486} alongside references to names in the Egyptian, Hebrew, Hieratic and Hieroglyphic languages,\textsuperscript{487} although the contents of these are indistinguishable from the onomata more generally; the name λαίαμ, described as “Hieroglyphic” in PGM 13.82, 149, 458, 592, probably derives either from Greek or Hebrew.\textsuperscript{488} These are probably best understood not as languages in a strict sense (distinctive vocabularies arranged according to generative syntaxes), but rather as terms imagined to be used in particular texts, contexts, or by certain groups: by Egyptians or Judeans, in hieratic contexts, and in hieroglyphic texts.


For other potentially Nubian words occurring in Egyptian texts see Zilebius-Chen, \textit{Nubisches Sprachmaterial}. Compare P.British Museum 10059 6.6-6.13 where a recipe to cure the $hmkt$-disease includes a formula in an unspecified foreign language (\textit{md.t n h'is.t}) which may be northwest Semitic, and the same papyrus, 7.4-6, where another recipe to cure the “Asiatic Disease” (\textit{ti-n.t $s^3m.w$}) consists of a formula which is said to be ‘in the language of Kfyyw (probably Crete; Christian Leitz, \textit{Magical and Medical Papyri of the New Kingdom}, Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum (London: British Museum Press, 1999), p.63). The intermediate and following rituals up to line 7.7 contain non-Egyptian, but unspecified, sections. Similar non-Egyptian sections appear in the Ramesside Harris Papyrus (P.BM EA 10042); Vernus notes the language may be Semitic ("Vestiges de Langues Chamito-Sémitiques", p.479).

\textsuperscript{485} For a discussion Karola Zibelius-Chen, \textit{»Nubisches« Sprachmaterial in hieroglyphischen und hieratischen Texten Personennamen, Appellativa, Phrasen vom Neuen Reich bis in die napatanische und meroitische Zeit Mit einem demotischen Anhang}(Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011), p.295 (PDM 14); pp.281, 291, 292, 293 (PDM 61); see also p.294, where Zibelius-Chen offers a partial Meroitic etymology for $s(?)$iplina, an epithet of the star Sirius (Sothis) in PDM. Suppl.165, suggesting a meaning of “Lady, Mistress”, from comparison with names known from the Book of the Dead and Meroitic Inscriptions.

\textsuperscript{486} ὡς κυνοκέφαλος, PGM 4.1003-1004, 1006-1007; ὡςλεγομοντος, PGM 13.81, 148, 455; κυνοκεφαλική, PGM 13.84; κυνοκεφαλικές ἅλκες, PGM 13.154-155, 464-465; ἱεραική, PGM 13.85; ἱεραξ ἰδίᾳ φωνῇ, PGM 13.157, 467.

\textsuperscript{487} PGM 13.84-86, 149-160, 457-470.

\textsuperscript{488} See discussion in Phillips, \textit{In pursuit of invisibility}, p.94. The name also appears, without identification as “Hieroglyphic” in PGM 1.226; PGM 2.117; PGM 3.414, 430; PGM 4.947, 1625, 1801, 1978; PGM 5.348, 351, 365, 476; PGM 7.361, 406, 663, 859, 979; PGM 7.167.
2.2.2.6 Summary of scripts and languages

2.2.2.6.1 Language change in the Theban Magical Library

We know that the Theban Library was written by multiple scribes over a period of at least a hundred years – perhaps two hundred if we include the Myth of the Sun’s Eye. Nonetheless, all ten manuscripts were destined to be collected by a single group or individual. Here I will briefly discuss the diachronic change in linguistic competence implied by the development of the Library, drawing upon the insights of Bagnall, who pointed out the shift in collecting practices between the third and fourth centuries CE, as the collector(s) switched from scrolls to codices.⁴⁸⁹

---

⁴⁸⁹ Bagnall, Early Christian Books in Egypt, pp.82-86
The first stage of the production of the Library comes in the second century CE with the writing of *The Myth of the Sun’s Eye* on the front of the papyrus that will later be used for PDM/PGM 12. The scribe who wrote this text was literate in Demotic, and thus almost certainly an Egyptian priest; the context for its creation, and later use, was probably the library of a temple within the Egyptian religious tradition (see 2.2.2.6.2).

The next stage came in early third century CE with the decision of a scribe to use the verso of this scroll to write a series of magical recipes, in both Demotic and Greek. PDM/PGM 14 and PDM Suppl., with very similar formal features, were probably produced in similar circumstances, although they both contain a much higher proportion of Demotic text. Since the Greek glosses in PDM Suppl. do not make use of Demotic-derived characters, and the treatment of the cipher is more variable, it seems likely that it was produced before PDM/PGM 14.

Together, these three texts, unified by languages, format, and the use of the cipher script (see 2.2.2.5.1) constitute the Demotic Group. As its name suggests, Demotic is the primary language, constituting 78% of its content, although Greek makes a substantial 22% contribution to the collection as a whole, and 85% of PDM/PGM 12.490 Coptic script is used only in glosses.

---

490 Comparing the different contributions of three languages (Greek, Demotic Egyptian and Coptic Egyptian) written in four scripts (hieratic, Demotic, Greek, old Coptic) poses a particular challenge; the solution adopted here is intended to give a rough estimate of the information conveyed in each language in such a way that differences such as morphological structure, script, word division and size of handwriting are disregarded. This has been achieved in most cases by counting the lines in translation in a publication containing the majority of the texts (Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*). Lines are counted when they cover more than half the page area horizontally. *The Myth of the Sun’s Eye* has not been counted, since it belongs to an earlier stage of production. There are several texts not included in Betz, requiring alternative English translations to be used: Earle Radcliffe Caley and William B. Jensen (editor), *The Leiden and Stockholm Papyri: Greco-Egyptian Chemical Documents From the Early 4th Century AD* (Cincinnati: Oesper Collections in the History of Chemistry, 2008) for the bulk of the alchemical papyri; Tess Anne Osbaldeston, *Dioscorides. De Materia Medica* (Johannesburg: Ibidis Press, 2000) for those sections not included by Caley. Average line lengths were calculated for these three texts, and a multiplier applied to the counts for Caley and Osbaldeston to provide data comparable to Betz (12 words/line). The Greek of PDM Suppl. was more difficult to deal with, since there is no translation and it is extremely fragmentary. In this case it was necessary to use the untranslated Greek text to get a rough idea of quantity. The only complete line has 7 words, which was multiplied by 10 (the number of surviving lines), and divided by the Betz average of 12. This method is not ideal, but gives a better sense of the comparative contributions of the languages than original language word or line counts.
The second third century CE cluster is represented by the Berlin Group, PGM 1 and 2. These texts are both scrolls of comparable length and physical size, and written in very similar hands. These texts are written entirely in Greek, with the exception of a short Coptic phrase in PGM 1.

By the end of the third century CE, the Library would have consisted of 5 manuscripts, with over nearly two-thirds (65%) of the content in Demotic, and a significant minority (35%) in Greek. This assumes, of course, that the two groups had been brought together by this point, a proposition which cannot be ascertained.

---

491 Measured by lines in English translation according to Betz (1984); for methodology see fn.490.
The two fourth century groups, the Alchemical Group (PGM 5a+P.Holm., PGM 13, P.Leid. I 397), and
the Group 8 Codices (PGM 4, 5), are both written predominantly in Greek, and are both in codex form;
their dimensions are similar, though the Alchemical Group codices are larger. The Alchemical Group
is written almost entirely in a single hand, and its manuscripts show important similarities in content
(see 2.2.4.3.3). The two Group 8 Codices, by contrast, are written in quite different hands, display a
disparity in size (72 pages for PGM 4, 14 for PGM 5) and language, with PGM 4 containing an important
Coptic component (4% of content). As a result, this group is more ad-hoc than the others, which show
greater unity of content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/Period</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
<th>Demotic/Hieratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demotic Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alchemical Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 8 Codices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TML III CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TML IV CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7: Theban Magical Library and Component Groups by Language and Century (Percentage composition)

Even if the four component groups developed separately, we can assume that by the end of the fourth
century CE, if not earlier, they were united in the collection of a single owner or group. This owner
would have to be literate in Greek, and have at least an interest, if not fluency, in Coptic. It is tempting
to assume that they would also be literate in Demotic; PDM/PGM 14 and Suppl. have very little Greek
content. Nonetheless, it is possible, if unlikely, that a monolingual Greek speaker could have collected
them purely for the numinous power or prestige that they may have attributed to the Egyptian
language. At this stage a major shift would have taken place, with Greek increasing from 35% to 77%
of the content from the third century CE, and Demotic shrinking from 65% to 22%. Coptic, still by far
the minority language, constituted 1% of its content. In the final traceable stage prior to the Library’s
deposition repairs were made to to PDM/PGM 12 in which a Demotic column from the end of the roll
was cannibalised to mend damage from usage by covering the Demotic literary text on the front,
implying that the owner(s) were no longer literate in Demotic (see 2.2.4.3.1); again, the point at which
this happened relative to the stages already sketched above is unclear.

The Theban Magical Library would seem to exhibit very neatly two important shifts in Egyptian
literate culture. The first, already noted by Bagnall, is the shift, around the turn of the fourth century,
from the use of scrolls to codices.492 The second, just as significant, is the shift from Demotic to Greek,
followed by the emergence of Coptic as an important written language. The decline of Demotic, the
dominant language and script from the Saite period, is often dated to 146 BCE, when the Ptolemaic
dynasty decreed that all Demotic contracts had to be registered in Greek at a central grapheiōn, and
further policies discouraging the use of this language during the Roman period result in a
disappearance of documentary texts over the course of the second century CE.493 As a result,
documentary texts in Demotic are restricted to the Fayum by the second century, and all text types
become scarce by the third century. The Demotic papyri of the Theban Library, in fact, represent some
of the latest Demotic writing on papyrus. Demotic literacy continued into at least the fifth century in
some areas: the latest attested text, a graffito from Philae, is dated to 448 CE, which means that some
still more restricted literary almost certainly continued for some time after this.

This shift in the sphere of more quotidian documentary texts crept into other fields; the priesthoods of
the Egyptian temples were the primary users of Demotic, but increasingly many of them seem to have
conducted temple business in Greek. An excellent illustration of this can be found in the use of oracle
tickets, one of the most plentiful pieces of evidence for religious activity in Graeco-Roman Egypt.

The trend over time is clear, with Demotic oracle tickets declining from their height in the second century BCE, until they apparently disappear from use by the turn of the millennium. There is a corresponding increase in the use of Greek texts; despite the change in language, it seems that these texts were still being produced by the staff of temples working within the Egyptian cultural tradition. The decline in the use of Greek oracle tickets over the course of second century CE corresponds with the collapse of Egyptian temples over the course of that century, due to reduced imperial patronage and legal changes to their running which further diminished their revenue.495

There is a brief increase in the use of oracle tickets in both Greek and Coptic from the fifth to eighth centuries CE; this represents the revival of the practice of oracle tickets within the Christian tradition; despite the slight gap in continuity we can see in this a further indication of the trend of language usage change from Demotic to Greek to Coptic.

494 Texts gathered from the Trismegistos database (http://www.trismegistos.org/magic)
495 Pauline Ripat, argues that this shift in language should be seen as a result of the demands of the Roman administration, which required oracles to be written in Greek as a symbolic assertion of power, and so that they would be in a langage comprehensible to its functionaries; Pauline Ripat, "The Language of Oracular Inquiry in Roman Egypt," Phoenix 60, no. 3/4 (2006).
Thus, compared to the use of languages in oracle tickets, we can see that the Theban Library is more conservative in its use of Demotic; oracle tickets in that language are no longer attested by the third century CE, when the texts were written. By contrast, they are innovative in their use of Coptic, adopting the practice of writing Egyptian in a modified Greek alphabet from the third century onwards.

We can see some indication of this shift occurring in other magical texts by looking at the distribution of formularies – handbooks containing one or more recipes for “magical” ritual practices – from the fourth century BCE to the seventh century CE. This data would seem to be unreliable for the Demotic; the extremely small number of texts in that language, and the fact that they belong almost exclusively to the Theban Magical Library leads me to believe that the numbers we see here are more a reflection

---

496 For the methodology used in compiling this graph, see Appendix 5.
of the accidents of survival, discovery and publishing than a real underlying phenomenon. The documented shift in predominance from Greek to Coptic over the course of the fifth to sixth centuries seems more certain.

As we have seen, the Theban Library stands at a crossroads, between the shift from scroll to codex, from Demotic to Greek, and from Greek to Coptic. If it represents a typical example of the first of these shifts, and a late example of the second, then, within the tradition of magical handbooks, it stands early in the history of the third shift, from Greek to Coptic. If the final collectors had lived longer, or their tradition had carried on beyond their own lives, we might expect subsequent additions to show the increasing predominance of written Coptic.

2.2.6.2 Excursus: Demotic and Old Coptic Literacy in the Roman Period

While there are rare instances of individuals who seem to be ethnic Greeks learning Demotic during the Ptolemaic period, there are no reliable instances known from the Roman period. As we have seen, this era saw a decline in the use of this language first in documentary, and then in other, text types. In this context, Demotic literacy, probably already largely the preserve of the priestly class, became even more restricted in sphere, and it seems that it was transmitted only through temple schools and private training, probably within families in most cases.

Old Coptic is defined here as a stage of the Egyptian language written in a combination of Greek and Demotic characters, whose repertoire of the latter is at variance with the standardized alphabets of

---

497 See for example Ritner’s mention of 20 unpublished Demotic magical papyri from the Ptolemaic period; to the best of my knowledge these texts remain unpublished to this day ("Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire", p.336). These papyri alone would significantly change our picture of the situation.

498 For example UPZ 1.148, where a woman writes to a man in Greek to express happiness at his learning Demotic, since he will be able to train slaves in Egyptian medical practices.

later dialects whose writings are predominantly Christian in content. The texts written in this form of the language dating from the first to fourth centuries CE consist of:

- A petition to a god: ACM 1
- Horoscopes: P.Lond.98, P.Mich.Inv.613
- Magical Texts: PGM 3 & 4; P. BM 10808
- Glosses to magical texts: PDM 14
- Mummy Labels
- Glosses to Hieratic texts: P.Carlsberg 180; OMM 872, 1063+204, 1263, 1311, 1316, 1323, 1367, 1454
- Glosses to a Demotic text: Demotica II.30
- Written greetings (?): Kellis D/1/234

---


504 I include this manuscript since it is an Egyptian-language document written in a combination of Greek and Demotic characters; the language represents a more conservative stage than the other examples, being written in traditional Egyptian (l'égyptien de tradition), a form of the language based on Middle Egyptian. For this text see Walter E. Crum, "An Egyptian Text in Greek Characters," The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 28 (1942); Jürgen Osing, Der spätägyptische Papyrus BM 10808 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1976); Val Hinckley Sederholm, Papyrus British Museum 10808 and Its Cultural and Religious Setting (Leiden: Brill, 2006); J. Dieleman, "Ein spätägyptisches magisches Handbuch Eine neue PDM oder PGM?," in Res severa verum gaudium. Festschrift für Karl-Theodor Zauzich zum 65. Geburtstag an 8. Juni 2004, ed. F. Hoffman and H.J. Thissen (Leuven: Peeters, 2004).


506 Paolo Gallo, Ostraca Demotici e Ieratici dall'Archivio Bilingue di Narmouthis II (nn.34-99) (Pisa, 1997).

507 Wilhelm Spiegelberg, Demotica II, Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (München, 1928).
It would seem reasonable to assume, *a priori*, some connection between the early Coptic scripts and the priesthood, given the use of Demotic-derived graphemes, whose names, even in the later standardised alphabets, seem to be drawn from their corresponding Demotic names.\textsuperscript{509} But the use of old Coptic in glosses in conjunction with hieratic, an even more restricted script, makes this case even stronger. There is also some reason to think that many of the other the Old Coptic texts, most of them clearly associated with traditional Egyptian deities, might derive from a temple context, where we would expect to find magic, astrology and divine petitions,\textsuperscript{509} and insofar as we can determine the origin of the texts, this is indeed the case: P.Mich.Inv.6131 was discovered in House no.I-112 in Soknopaiou Nesos, belonging to Melas, son of Horion and priest of Soknopaios;\textsuperscript{510} the hieratic practice texts from Narmouthis (OMM) were found within the temenos walls, and seem to have been produced by a temple school; and the short greetings formula from Kellis was found in a collapsed well within a complex of storage chambers within the temenos walls of the temple of Tutu.\textsuperscript{512} Together, these details strongly imply that early Coptic texts, in particular those of the type known as Old Coptic, were in most, or all cases, produced by individuals associated with the traditional Egyptian priesthood.

2.2.2.4.3 The Linguistic Background of the Scribes of the Theban Magical Library

Based in part on the evidence discussed above, several authors, most prominently Goodwin, Ritner, Frankfurter, and Dieleman, have suggested that the owner or owners of the Theban Library were Egyptian priests. Their arguments have been based principally on the presence of Demotic in the archive, and to a lesser extent the contents of the texts, and the general principle that priests were the mediators of magic during this period.

\textsuperscript{511} Worrell, "Notice of a Second-Century Text in Coptic Letters", p.84.
\textsuperscript{512} Gardner, "An Old Coptic Ostracon from Ismant el-Kharab?", p.195.
As we have seen, the evidence for the restriction of Demotic to the priestly class in the Roman period is uncontested, and we can extend this to the text containing Old Coptic – PGM 4. Within the Greek texts, non-standard orthography often implies an underlying Egyptian phonological representation on the part of the scribes – that is, their Greek was Egyptian Greek.³⁹³ Taken as a whole, this would tend to imply that most, if not all, of the Theban Library texts can be safely assumed to have been produced by, and probably intended for, individuals whose first language was Egyptian, and who had received training in Egyptian scripts (Demotic and/or old Coptic) through a temple school, or tuition from an individual within the priestly tradition. Nevertheless, they clearly would have possessed a high level of Greek literacy, and an understanding of, if not a consistent adherence to, Greek orthographic norms, as well as lectional signs (breathings, accents, paragraphos, and so on) associated with high-quality scribal productions. Such high degrees of Greek literacy are by no means unknown in Egyptian priests, or Egyptians more generally: as already mentioned, the temple school at Narmouthis contains dozens of practice texts written by bilingual students, and famous authors such as Manetho, Chaeremon and Horapollo are only the best known of Greek-language authors whose origins lay in the priestly class – Isidorus, author of the hymns to Isis at the Narmouthis temple is still another example.

Johnson’s work on the Demotic texts of PDM 12, 14 & Suppl., as well as Satzinger’s work on the Greek/Coptic glosses of those texts, suggest a straightforward Theban origin, showing influences from the two main dialects of this region – Akhmimic and Sahidic. This would also fit the earlier Coptic ³⁹³ The clearest example of Egyptian-substrate influence is the lack of contrast between the voiced and unvoiced, and aspirated and unaspirated stops: /k/-/g/-/kh/ and /t/-/d/-/th/. The confusion of the labial stops /p/-/b/-/ph/ may be another indicator of substrate interference from Egyptian, but this is far less frequent than for the other stops, since an analogous distinction between the unvoiced labial plosive /p/ and the voiced labial fricative /β/ did exist in Egyptian; as a result there are very few examples of pi and beta confusion. Also diagnostic is the confusion of /s/ and /z/ in conditions other than before a voiced nasal; this is relatively rare in the Theban Library, but does occur. Finally, there is the phenomenon in Egyptian of the assimilation of unstressed vowels in to the schwa /a/, which can result in the graphic interchangeability of most vowels in such positions in Greek; this is attested in several of the papyri, in particular those from the Alchemical group. I hope to publish a fuller discussion of these features in the future; on the phonology of Greek in Egypt see E. Mayser, Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. II Teil. Konsonantismus, Stuttgart 1900; F. T. Gignac, A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, Milano 1977; P. Probert, ‘Phonology’, in Egbert J. Bakker (ed.) A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language, 2010; S. Torallas Tovar, ‘Greek in Egypt’, in Egbert J. Bakker (ed.) A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language, 2010, pp.253-266; M. Vierros, ‘Bilingual Notaries in Hellenistic Egypt. A Study of Language Use’, (Diss. University of Helsinki, 2011).
parts of PGM 4, which seem to reflect a proto-Sahidic dialect. Underlying this, in blocks IV and V, are suggestions of more northern dialects (principally Bohairic, but to a lesser extent Lycopolitan and Mesokemic), which may be understood as either the primary dialect of the scribe, or the text of the original from which the current version was copied. Here we might recall Dieleman’s suggestion, made originally in regards to PGM 12 & 14, that some of the texts may have been copied from exemplars produced in more heavily Hellenised cities – Alexandria, Hermopolis, Oxyrhynchus, Panopolis, Ptolemais, and so on – whose dialects might be close to those discussed. The Greek texts, showing the phonological influence of individuals whose Egyptian dialect belonged to the Nile Valley south of Memphis, would fit either a local Theban, or a more northern, origin.

All this does suggest strongly that the scribes, and, given the presence of numerous marginal notes in the original hands, the users of the Theban Library, were bilingual individuals, whose first language was Greek, and who had received training in the Egyptian priestly tradition. We should remember, however, that this conclusion may not hold equally for all the Library’s scribes or users, and that the meaning and position of the Egyptian priesthood in late Roman Egypt was different to that in earlier periods.

2.2.3 Illustrations, Non-linguistic Signs and Text Formations

*Kharaktēres,* also known as “ring words”, appear in seven of the papyri (PGM 1, 2, 4, 5, 13; PDM/PGM 12, 14), in all but one case (PGM 14.1071) in Greek sections of the texts. In every text they are exemplars to be copied onto objects used in ritual processes, frequently alongside *voces magicae*, formulae, and in a few cases as part of a larger image or diagram. As noted by Gordon these signs were often omitted by earlier editors of the papyri, and even in the edition of Betz *kharaktēres* are often

---

54 Dieleman, Priests, Tongues, and Rites, pp.284-294.
56 “Signa nova et inaudita." pp.36-37.
reproduced inaccurately or missing entirely. Occasionally these symbols are identifiable as, or at least resemble, symbols which are known from other contexts; these include the ŋnḫ, ŕn.w, Knoumis, sun and moon signs; in other cases they may either resemble enlarged Greek letters in undecipherable combinations, or other common shapes such as the asterisk.

At four points in PDM symbols resembling hieroglyphs appear beside the main text, as illustrations of symbols to be drawn onto materia used in rituals. While these have defied translation as true hieroglyphs, in three of the four instances the same sequence is repeated consistently and glossed as βαχυχσιχυχ, often interpreted as “soul of darkness, son of darkness”, while the fifth occurrence, on the verso shows six symbols without a gloss. While they differ markedly from the kharaktēres in appearance, it is difficult not to see a connection between the two systems of pseudo-writing, and similar pseudo-hieroglyphs are known from amuletic gems.

---

517 For example, at PGM 13.1054-1056.
518 As is the case at PGM 5.96.
519 PGM 2.27-28, identified as such in Betz, Greek Magical Papyri.
520 PGM 2.42, 80, identified as such in ibid.
521 PGM 4.409-434, 1264. The latter, identified by Betz (ibid.), resembles the standard sign to a far lesser degree; if it has been correctly identified it is abbreviated. The symbol, identified with the decan kmn.t appears in its full form as a horizontal serpent crossed by three vertical ones, in numerous Ptolemaic and Roman astrological scenes in temple contexts, and in a schematised form on numerous amulets. For a discussion see Drexler, “Knuphis” in Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie, volume II, pp.1250-1264.
522 PGM 4.2706.
523 For example, in PGM 14.1071.
524 Two examples can be found in PGM 4.409-434
525 At ll.124a-126a; 174a-176a; 835a-837a; supra 1063.
526 As is the case with the kharaktēres, the edition of Betz is not entirely reliable in reproducing these, omitting the third instance.
527 The eye of Horus hieroglyph is almost identical to that used at ll.238, 251 et al. with the value wd3.t, ‘sound eye’.
528 Dieleman (Priests, tongues, and rites, p.101) concludes that the treatment of these pseudo-hieroglyphs is essentially the same as that of the kharaktēres. Magical gems including pseudo-hieroglyphs comparable to those in PDM 14 include CbI-81, 99, 147, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 531, 532, 533, 556, 557, 559-963, 1130, 1221. Compare the “visual poetry” (visuelle Poesie) of the ram and crocodile “scripts” from Esna, consisting entirely of animals, each with slightly different attributes; Ludwig D. Morenz, “Schrift-Mysterium. Gottes-Schau in der visuellen Poesie von Esna insbesondere zu den omnipotenten Widder-Zeichen zwischen Symbolik und Lesbarkeit,” in Ägyptische Mysterien?, ed. Jan Assmann and Martin Bommas (Munster: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2002).
Illustrations, or *figurae magicae*,⁵²⁹ appear in three papyri (PGM 2, 5; PDM/PGM 12), and there are four spaces in the text of PGM 4⁵³⁰ and one in PGM 5⁵³¹ which may imply that illustrations were planned, but never drawn.⁵³² In almost every instance these are images to be copied by the ritualist in the course of the ritual, for an amulet or other object of power. In many cases the illustrations include textual as well as pictorial and geometric elements, including Greek text, often written in various formations, and *kharaktēres*; text is sometimes written across the bodies of deities to express their identities, as is common in the highly illustrated Greek text from the Fayum, PGM 36, as well as the later Coptic handbooks. In some cases text (usually *onomata*) is to be added to the image when it is copied during the ritual, although it is not always shown on the illustration.

The format used for inserting the illustrations into the text is termed by Weitzmann the “column picture”, one in which single images are inserted into columns of text, either occupying the whole width of the column (isolated), or inset to the right or the left of the text. All three variations occur in Greek papyri as late as the eleventh to twelfth centuries CE,⁵³³ but the preference in Greek texts is for the image to occupy the whole width, while in Egyptian models miniatures on the left are preferred, since in the case of hieratic or Demotic papyri written from right to left, the left side would typically be more open;⁵³⁴ the opposite is true of Greek, where the right is the more open, and hence more suitable side for an illustration. On the basis of these tendencies Weitzmann suggests that the “slight incongruity” of PDM/PGM 12 placing images on the left side is due to “a mechanical adaptation of the Egyptian system of illustration”.⁵³⁵ This incongruity is very slight, however, since only one of the three illustrations occurs in a Greek text, although it is indeed aligned in this case to the left of the column.

---

⁵³⁰ After ll.1264, 1871, 2067, 2358; l.3085 ends in a colon, and has a short space which may have been intended for a small illustration or *kharaktēr*.
⁵³¹ LiDonnici, "Compositional Patterns in PGM IV", pp.149-150.
⁵³² LiDonnici, "Compositional Patterns in PGM IV", pp.149-150.
⁵³⁵ Ibid,p.66.
In general, most of the illustrations in the Library are isolated, although those which are inset are generally on the left, with the exception of the scarab drawn at PGM 1.155, which has text on both sides, but is further to the right; it appears in this case that the scribe was running out of space in which to write.

Various text formations[^536] - also known as word-shapes, *technopaignia* and *carmina figurata* - appear in five texts (PGM 1, 2, 4, 5, 13); these are words - generally *onomata* or vowel strings - arranged to form squares, triangles, and occasionally other shapes. As is the case with illustrations and *kharaktēres* these are exclusively used as exemplars to be copied in the process of rituals. As is largely the case with the *kharaktēres*, these appear solely in sections of Greek script; there is no parallel in the Demotic sections. Secondly, they are regularly combined with *kharaktēres* and pictorial drawings.

A phenomenon related to text formations is the use of tables and diagrams for consultation; two reference tables appear in PGM 12 (ll.355-365, 408-444), and two versions of the same two tables appear in PGM 13, at ll.216-224 & 722-730. PGM 13.836-741 contains a further simple diagram serving to show the vowels to be spoken in each direction. An invocation at PGM 12.336-350 is written in three neat columns, but seems to be intended purely for recitation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papyrus</th>
<th>Illustrations</th>
<th>Kharaktēr groups</th>
<th>Pseudo-Hieroglyphs</th>
<th>Text Formation groups</th>
<th>Reference tables</th>
<th>Diagrams</th>
<th>Length (lines in translation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGM 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (0.4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (0.4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 2</td>
<td>2 (1.7)</td>
<td>4 (2.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (0.2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (0.1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 5</td>
<td>2 (0.6)</td>
<td>2 (0.6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (0.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Holm + 5a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM/PGM 12</td>
<td>4 (0.7)</td>
<td>2 (0.4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
<td>2 (0.4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (0.1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (0.1)</td>
<td>2 (0.3)</td>
<td>1 (0.1)</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM/PGM 14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (0.1)</td>
<td>4 (0.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM Suppl.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Leid. I 397</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 3</td>
<td>3 (0.7)</td>
<td>2 (0.4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7</td>
<td>5 (0.6)</td>
<td>18 (2.2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (0.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 36</td>
<td>7 (2.9)</td>
<td>3 (1.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (0.8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM/PGM 61</td>
<td>3 (2.2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (0.7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10: Non-linguistic scribal features in the Theban Library papyri and other selected Greek Handbooks

The range of non-linguistic scribal features in the Theban Library texts is comparable to that of other formularies of similar length and period, PGM 3 (III CE), PGM 7 (III CE, Hermontis?), PGM 36 (IV CE, IV CE, 537 This is based on the translations in Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*. For a full discussion of the methodology see fn. 490. 538 Each group of kharaktēres is counted only once, regardless of length, and clusters of text formations (two or more shapes next to one another) are also counted once. Bracketed numbers indicate rate per hundred words in translation.
Fayum), PDM 61 (III CE). In general, the Theban manuscripts contain fewer illustrations and kharaktēr groups than these others, given their lengths, but PGM 2, a very short text containing both illustrations and kharatkēres, and PDM/PGM 12, the highly illustrated roll, are outliers in this regard.

2.2.4 Contents

The Theban Magical Library is often understood as being representative of Roman magical practice more broadly. In a large part this is no doubt due to the way in which its texts dominate the modern collections, the Papyri Graecae Magicae, not only in the original Preisendanz editions, but also the later incarnations edited and translated by Heinrichs, Betz, Calvo Martínez and Martin. Thus Roman-era magic in Egypt is characterised as being dominated by aggressive practices, in particular love magic and curses, as well as by divination. This is understood as differentiating it both from earlier Pharaonic practices, in which healing and protective rituals were more common, and later Coptic practice, in which divination disappears.539 Thus the Roman age is understood as one characterised by peculiar social stresses and mystical interests. This section will explore the contents of the Theban Magical Library, arguing that over-reliance on it as a source for magical practice of its time and place both distorts our picture of contemporary practice, and hides the particular interests of the Library's collectors, which can emerge clearly only against a larger, more carefully delineated background.

2.2.4.1 Types of Rituals

In order to set out the background of magic as practiced in the Roman period, defined here as the first to sixth centuries CE, it was necessary to create a statistical representation of these practices. This was drawn from all the available handbooks, weighting each piece of evidence so that neither the large handbooks, nor the still larger archives, dominated the picture. The full methodology is set out in Appendix 5, but results are given in table 10. This analysis shows the tendencies of each of the Theban

handbooks individually, by text group, by century, and as an archive. Also represented is a synthetic picture of Roman magical practice from this period, meant to represent an overall appraisal of the interests represented in formularies.

It is striking that the most common single type of text in the Theban Magical Library is the alchemical recipe, accounting for 38% of the Library’s approximately 420 recipes; these will be discussed below at 2.2.4:3.3, but should be borne in mind as a particular feature of this archive, differentiating it from almost all comparable collections of magical texts.\textsuperscript{540} Subtracting the alchemical texts, most of the remaining recipes (27%) are for the purpose of divination or gaining superhuman knowledge. This category is, after healing, the most common in magical texts from the first to sixth centuries generally, although the Theban Library seems to display a particular interest in it. Within the wider category of divination, sortition and dream oracles seem to be the most common in this period, with a significant number of dream oracles falling into the category of binary oracles, in which answers to questions are given by the appearance in dreams of one of two images, rather than by direct communication with a deity. The Theban Library contains no sortition or binary oracles, and while dream oracles are still extremely common, the most frequent divinatory practice is the direct vision, in which the deity appears directly to the waking ritualist or boy seer.\textsuperscript{541} Vessel, lamp, mediated, and celestial divination, all very rare in the other texts, are all well represented in the Theban Library. All of these practices fall under the broader category of rituals of apparition, and will be discussed in the following chapters.

\textsuperscript{540} With the notable exception of the Berlin Library; see 2.3.2.11.

\textsuperscript{541} I use “boy seer” rather than the usual “boy medium” to avoid confusion with what I refer to as the “medium of apparition”, the vessels, lamps, and celestial bodies in which the deities appeared in rituals of apparition. The situation is simpler in German, where was able to refer to one as “Immanenzmittel” and the other as the “Medium”. The use of “seer” in this sense, while somewhat archaic, is not without precedent; see OED, s.v., sense 3.

In regards to gender, Johnston (“Charming Children: The Use of the Child in Ancient Divination,” Arthusa 34(2001), p.98 n.2) has pointed out that while male pronouns are used for the seers in Greek, the words used (παῖς and παιδίον) are neuter and could refer to either boys or girls. Egyptian, lacking a neutral, also uses male pronouns, and expresses the idea of the child’s virginity by referring to the youth “not having gone with a woman” (šm ırm ᱯmt.t, e.g. in PDM 14.769, 819). For these reasons I will follow the papyri in assuming that a boy is used, while recognising that girls may, and probably were, also used in reality.
11: Rituals in Roman Period Manuscripts by type
The next most common type are rituals of erotic compulsion, more often known as “love spells”, whose purpose is gaining access to new sexual partners, or ensuring that current ones remain faithful. Its prevalence in the Theban Library (16%) is essentially the same as in the broader field, and in this case, as with most of the following ritual types, it is likely that this practice was most often used on behalf not of the ritualists themselves, but on behalf of their clients.

Next are healing rituals, the most frequently encountered practice in handbooks of the period more broadly (35%), but far less common in the Theban Library (11%); in fact healing recipes appear in only four of the ten papyri: most appear on PDM 14, in particular on the verso, with further rituals in PGM 4, 13 & PDM/PGM 12.

Next most frequent in the Theban Library are curses, defined broadly as recipes intended to harm other individuals, usually by causing illness, blindness or death. These are more common in the Theban Library than in handbooks of the Roman period more general (9.5% compared to 6.2%).
Several of these are part of more elaborate rituals summoning deities, of which the ability to curse an individual is only one of many purposes to which they can be put, while others are part of procedures which might be considered more pharmacological than supernatural in their working – involving the ingestion of substances by the victim – although there is no reason to think that the ritualists involved made this distinction.

Next in frequency (5.7%) is the dream sending ritual, attested outside the Theban Library only in PGM 3 & 7, although literary references suggest that the practice was, either in reality or in perception, in wider use. Rituals with this purpose are found in PGM 4, 5, & 13, and PDM/PGM 12, but are particularly common in PDM Suppl. While the purpose of this practice, sending dreams to another sleeping individual, is often to cause erotic attraction, the ritual procedures involved resemble that of other rituals of apparition, and so will be discussed at greater length later in this work.

Rituals for acquiring “favour”, that is good luck and the general positive regard of others, are attested in PGM 4 & 5, as well as PDM/PGM, 14 & Suppl. These practices are attested with slightly greater frequency outside the Library. The same phenomenon is encountered in regard to rituals for controlling the behaviour of others in various ways, attested in PGM 4, 5, 13 and PDM/PGM 12 & 14; their specific purposes include including restraining anger, causing the separation of couples, and dealing smoothly with social superiors. Several texts in the Theban Library are best described not as rituals, but as reference works; these include a zodiacal calendar in PGM 4.835-849, as well as several texts on the verso of PDM 14 describing various stones, herbs and animals.

Alongside these are various rituals attested less than five times in the whole Library. These include rituals of protection, exorcism and purification, for breaking bonds and opening doors, catching thieves, initiation, countering the magical attacks of others and instructions for gathering plants.

542 For example PGM 4.2145-2240, 2441-2621, 2622-2707; PGM 12.1-13.
543 For example PDM 14.366-375, 741-749; P.Holm ll.94-100.
544 The Ritual of the Cat (PGM 3.1-164) lists dream sending as one of its functions (l.163).
545 In the rituals contained in ll.407-410, 862-918.
546 See for example Justin Martyr, Apologia 18.3; Irenaeus, Adversus haereses 1.20.2; Hippolytus, Refutatio omnium haeresium 7.32; Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica 4.7.9; Alexander Romance (Recensio sive Recensio vetusta) 1.5.1.3, 1.8.1.1 (and parallels).
Notable among these less common rituals is the *anagōgē* ritual contained in the text known as the *Mithras Liturgy* (PGM 4.475-829), in which the ritualist ascends through the heavens to behold the god of the pole star. This type of ritual is otherwise unattested in contemporary handbooks, although it is known from literary descriptions, as well as Jewish texts and traditions, including the *Sefer ha-Razim* and Merkabah mysticism. Rituals for acquiring *paredroi*, or familiar daimōns, are found in PDM 1, 4 & 12, and will be considered in greater detail in this work as rituals of apparition in which the summoned deities are retained for further purposes rather than being dismissed after the process of divination.

The range of practices found in the Theban Magical Library is huge, representing to some extent most of the ritual types displayed in other texts of this genre. Nonetheless, as I have tried to demonstrate here, it is not simply a random sample of ritual practice from its time, but rather a particular collection, displaying particular interests. While Roman-era magic is generally characterised by aggressive practices – curse and erotic compulsion rituals, we have seen that the predominant practice in surviving handbooks is, in fact healing, with curses representing a fairly minor practice, albeit one well attested in the archaeological record. While the Theban Library might be thought of as characteristic in its interest in divination, the degree of this interest still makes it something of an outlier, and the focus on apparition rituals is still more unusual. Though less marked, the Library also has an unusual interest in dream-sending, erotic compulsion, and cursing. Indeed, it looks very much like the predominant characterisation of Roman period magic is a better description of the Theban Library than it is of the period in general, and this is probably a reflection of the fact that its sheer size dominates the *PGM*.

Alongside a consideration of the types of practices found in the Theban Library, it is worth considering what we do not find. Despite some assumed knowledge of astrology, the Library does not include any planetary tables, and despite its pronounced interest in divination, there are no sortition oracles. Several other sortition oracles are included in the *PGM* despite not containing otherwise 'magical' content, including the *Sortes*.

---

547 Neugebauer provides a discussion and list of such texts in Demotic and Greek in O. Neugebauer, *A History of Ancient Mathematical Astronomy*, vol. 2 (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1975), pp. 785-792.
548 Compare the homeromanteion in PGM 7.1-148, and the pseudo-sortition procedure in PGM 62 (III CE), both of which occur with other material more strictly 'magical' material, such as cursing, healing and apparition rituals. Several other sortition oracles are included in the *PGM* despite not containing otherwise 'magical' content, including the *Sortes*.
dream interpretation texts, animal omens, or palmistry manuals. Similarly, despite their attestation in other handbooks, and in literary contexts, they contain no agricultural or subsistence rituals, for example rain-making, rituals for good fishing or safe nautical navigation; in part, this is due no doubt to their origin in Egypt, where fertility was guaranteed by annual Nile flood, and in

Astrampsychi (=PGM 26, III-IV CE, Oxyrhynchus); PGM 24a (III CE, Oxyrhynchus), a sortition oracle attributed to Hermes and Isis; and PGM 50 (VI CE), a fragmentary knucklebone or dice oracle.

The most famous such text is of course Artemidorus’ *Onéirocriticon*, preserved in the manuscript tradition; fragments and attestations of other Greek dream interpretation texts are collected in Darius del Corno, *Græcorum de re onirocritica scriptorum reliquiae* (Milan: Instituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1969).

In terms of Egyptian language texts, the earliest is the hieratic P.Chester Beatty 3r (XIX Dynasty); other hieratic examples include P.Berlin 29009 and 23058 (respectively XXVI and c.XXX Dynasty). Demotic handbooks include P.Carlberg 13 & 14v (II-III CE); P.Jena 1209 + P.Jena 1403 (III BCE) and P.Tebt.Tait 16-17 (c.200 CE). An edition of a Demotic dream handbook consisting of P.Berlin 8769 & 15683 + Vienna D 6644 as well as other fragments is at present being prepared by Luigi Prada. For discussions of this material see Kasia Szpakowska, *Behind Closed Eyes. Dreams and Nightmares in Ancient Egypt* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2003). For discussions of this material see Kasia Szpakowska, *Behind Closed Eyes. Dreams and Nightmares in Ancient Egypt* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2003), pp.61-114; Luigi Prada, "Papyrus Berlin P. 8769: A New Look at the Text and the Reconstruction of a Lost Demotic Dream Book," in *Forschung in der Papyrussammlung. Eine Festgabe für das Neue Museum*, ed. Verena M. Lepper (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2012).

The observation of the flight of birds was one of the oldest forms of Greek divination; see for example Derek Collins, "Reading the Birds: Oionomanteia in Early Epic," *Colby Quarterly* 38, no. 1 (2002). The *Suda* (s.v. Θέων) tells us that the fourth century Neoplatonist Theon wrote books on bird omens; see the comments of Alan Cameron, Jacqueline Long, and Lee Sherry, *Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), p.52.

While animal omens seem to be less common in Egyptian texts, one I CE text (*The Book of the Gecko*, P.Berl. Inv. 15680) seems to describe a divinatory procedure involving the observation of geckos; similarly, other Demotic texts describe mantic procedures involving the observation of shrew-mice (P.Heid. 785), scarab beetles (PBM 10238), as well as various other animals including cattle, owls, ants and beetles; for these see Alexandra von Lieven, "Divination in Ägypten," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 26 (1974), pp.106-107.


In general see Britta K. Ager, "Roman Agricultural Magic" (Diss. University of Michigan, 2010). A specific literary example is the miraculous downpour of rain which provided water to the thirsty soldiers of Marcus Aurelius in 172 CE, attributed by Christians such as Tertullian to the prayers of Christian soldiers, but to Harounphus, an Egyptian magus, by Cassius Dio, Julian the Theurgist by the *Suda*; see the discussion in Garth Fowden, "Pagan Versions of the Rain Miracle of A.D. 172," *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alter Geschichte* 36, no. 1 (1987). As well as the more recent review in Ido Israelowich, "The Rain Miracle of Marcus Aurelius: (Re-) Construction of Consensus," *Greece & Rome* 55, no. 1 (2008).

See the ritual contained in London Oriental 6795.


Rituals to guarantee the fertility of the Nile were, of course, carried out in Egypt; there is evidence for offerings to the Nile from XX BCE, into the Roman Period, with some practices surviving in a Christianised form among Egyptian Copts until the construction of the Aswan High Dam in January 1971 CE put an end to the annual flood; these seem to have been a communal rather than private concern, however. See Ricardo A. Caminos, ‘Nilopfer’ in LdÄ 4.497-500; Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt*, pp.42-46; László Kákosy, "Survivals of Ancient Egyptian Gods in Coptic and Islamic Egypt," in *Acts of the Third International Congress of Coptic Studies*, ed. Włodzimierz Godlewski (PWN-Editions scientifiques de Pologne,
which river navigation was a relatively straightforward proposition. Nonetheless, the lack of interest in matters of basic subsistence in favour of the spheres of social and divine relationships does suggest an urban or semi-urban rather than rural milieu.

2.2.4.2 The Composition of the Texts

The papyri from the Library are clearly the outcome of a complex process in which individual recipes with their own textual histories were compiled and arranged, with the frequent addition of intertextual and extratextual comments and amendments. As discussed above, this collation process was not haphazard, but deliberate, reflecting the interests of the individual(s) responsible for commissioning and copying each of the manuscripts. While often remarked upon, this process has rarely been studied in depth, and indeed it is difficult, given the shortage of parallel materials, to see how a full redactional history of the texts could be written. In general, it is clear that most, if not all, of the papyri are copies of pre-existing working copies to which commentaries had already been added, since parenthetical remarks and alternative instructions are frequently included in the body of recipes.


556 Compare the comments in Smith, *Jesus the Magician*.p.119.


558 These are also found in the “alchemical” recipes; *Les Alchimistes Grecs*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1981), p.53.

559 Andrew T. Wilburn, "Materia Magica: The Archaeology of Magic in Roman Egypt, Cyprus, and Spain" (Diss. University of Michigan, 2005), p.43. Other conspicuous examples of multiple versions of texts contained in the Theban Library include the prayer to Osiris which appears in both PGM 4.11-25 and PDM 14.327-635 (the first version in old Coptic, the second in Demotic), the Hymn to Helios which appears in both PGM 1 (ll.35-325, 41/42) and PGM 4 (ll.436-461, 1957-1989), the Hymns and Slander Spells to the Moon, appearing in PGM 4.2441-2621, 2622-2707, 2785-2890, and the recipes using a shrew-mouse hesy in PDM 14.366-375, 743-749.
646-734), the textual history of which has been the subject of a study by Morton Smith.\footnote{Morton Smith, "The Eighth Book of Moses and How it Grew (P Leid. J 395)," in Studies in the Cult of Yahweh, ed. Shaye J. D. Cohen (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1984 [1996]).} In his view the three versions are the outcome of at least five literary generations, in the process of which the original text was supplemented with instructions, diverged into two textual families, was collected, and then recopied. The stages reconstructed by Smith may not be strictly correct – for instance, given the tendency of Egyptian rituals to consist of both spoken words and acts, it seems unnecessary to conjecture an invocation-only first generation,\footnote{See the discussion in Ritner, The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice, p.101 fn.495.} but his general point about the long textual history behind the papyrus is certainly correct.

Lidonnici’s excellent study of the structure of PGM 4 demonstrates that the codex is a carefully planned compilation of several smaller earlier collections, which appear within the final work as six major blocks, identifiable by use of languages, recurrent or dominant type of rituals, religio-cultural references, and by a distinctive pattern of long texts followed by numerous smaller ones, which she ingeniously identifies as originating in papyrus sheets, the ends of which would be filled out with more-or-less miscellaneous short texts after longer formularies had been copied out. As is the case with PGM 13, she notes the presence of numerous alternate recipes within blocks, and suggests a minimum of 4-5 textual generations for at least three of these sections.\footnote{LiDonnici, "Compositional Patterns in PGM IV."} This fits neatly with the evidence for handbooks from contexts outside the Library, which are generally in the form of short collections rather than long rolls or codices; of 96 handbooks known to me dating from Egypt from the first to sixth centuries CE, a plurality (33) contain only a single recipe, and 80% contain five or less.

The main texts on PDM/PGM 14 and PDM Suppl. are contained on the fronts (→) of the papyri, generally long recipes written more-or-less within frames used on these texts. On the back, however there are a series of shorter texts, some recipes, some reference works, generally taking up only a small part of the upper half of the papyrus, with the columns of greatly varying width, grouped in twos or threes with large spaces between them, and one written in a markedly different hand.\footnote{Griffith and Thompson, Demotic Magical Papyrus. vol. 1 p.4; on the second hand see vol. 1, p.200, note to l1.} The markedly
different character of front and back leads us to believe we are witnessing a phenomenon similar to that suggested by Lidonnici, where the front contains a planned compilation, while the back is composed of notes opportunistically added over the working life of the handbook.

Particularly interesting for reconstructing the history of the texts of the Library prior to their collection in the current compendia, and for the social context of its owners more broadly, are two papyri, one in Greek, and one in Coptic and Greek, dating from the third and fourth centuries CE respectively. The first of these, SM 5 (=P.Oxy.42 3068) is a short note instructing that the text of an amulet (πιττάκιον) be copied and sent to a named recipient. The second, P.Kell.Copt. V.35, is a letter from one scribe to another containing the instructions for a separation ritual, followed by a brief greeting, with a promise to send a further text in the future. Together, these texts are suggestive of an environment in which short, individual texts were copied and circulated separately, before being collated and recopied into progressively larger collections. Additionally, they suggest that there may be some basis in social reality for the frequent epistolary format encountered in the texts of the Library. While the senders and recipients in these introductory sections are generally semi-legendary figures, it is quite possible that the concept for this framing device originated within the practice of contemporary ritualists, who exchanged texts via letters, transposed into the mythic past. In addition to the already mentioned epistolary frame, other recipes may be preceded by brief stories of their use, discovery, efficacy or purpose; these frames appear almost uniquely in Greek texts.

564 The word πιττάκιον appears frequently in the texts from the Library; see PGM 1.11, 237; PGM 4.1893, 2387, 2394, 3149; PGM 12.79.
567 See for example PGM 1.42-54 (Pnouthios to Kerux), PGM 4.154-285 (Nephtotes to King Psammetikhos), ll.2006-2125 (Pitus to King Ostanes); PGM 5.96-172 (letter of Ieou the Painter). For a discussion of this textual genre see Dieleman, Priests, tongues, and rites, pp.269-270.
568 See for example PGM 4.475-829 (written by a ritualist for his daughter), 1716-1870 (the ritual has no equal), 2373-2440 (created by Hermes for Isis); 2441-2621 (used by Pakhrates to impress Hadrian); PGM 12.401-444 (interpretations used by priests, written on the statues of the gods and hidden from the masses).
In terms of content of the recipes themselves, Dieleman has discerned two formats in the Demotic material, one of which serves as a good description of most of the Greek recipes. The first of these, the “compartmentalized recipe”, is used for procedures designated as phr.t (‘prescription’) and ri (“formula”); the former consists of the sequence title-ingredients-directions for use-incantation, while the latter, used also for the ph-nfr (“divine audience”) recipes, consists of the sequence title-incantation-directions for use. In contrast to the “compartmentalized recipe” is the “integrated recipe”, a pattern followed almost without exception in Greek recipes, in which formulae, ingredient lists and instructions for praxis integrated into a sequence following the temporal progression of the procedure itself, with elements multiplied according to their position in the praxis rather than clearly separated, and possessing an almost a narrative quality; it is possible that some of these may have been translated directly from Greek.569

In PGM 42145-2240 & PGM.13.1-343 & 734-1077 we find a third textual format, which I designate by the admittedly infelicitous, but descriptive, title of “polypractical text”.570 This form is characterised by an initial formula, followed in the examples in PGM 4 & 13 by the primary ritual, and then followed by multiple shorter instructions for other procedures for various purposes which make use of the same formula. This ordered structure is found in a fifth to sixth century CE Greek text which may come from Beni Suef (PGM 123; see 2.3.2.6), but is more often attested in later Coptic handbooks.571

The precise relationship between the Greek and Demotic sections remains an unsolved problem; with the exception of non-magical material, absent from the Demotic material, they display a similar range of interests, and although the Demotic material has a slightly less cosmopolitan, and more Egyptian,
cultural content, they can be considered for the most part a single tradition of practice.\textsuperscript{572} Based on the “outsider” view of Egyptian priests presented in the Greek texts, which rely on claims to authority through the attribution of texts to famous figures in Egyptian, Greek, Semitic and Persian history, as well as the apparent disjuncture in tradition between the Demotic texts and older Egyptian practice, Dieleman has suggested that the Demotic texts represent a parallel tradition; according to this view the original Greek magical material would have been composed in the more Hellenised parts of northern Egypt, perhaps by Egyptian priests, for a Greek-speaking audience, with the Demotic texts being a combination of translations of the Greek recipes and original recipes composed after their model. The Demotic handbooks, PDM/PGM 12, 14 & Suppl. would represent a stage at which both sets of material were brought together by a single collector.\textsuperscript{573} While the specifics of this model remain speculative, it is almost certain that at least certain passages of PDM 14 are partial or whole translations from Greek.\textsuperscript{574} These include sections which contain Greek invocations in what was presumably the language in which the compiler found them,\textsuperscript{575} but also a section (ll.93-114) in which more specific, and presumably therefore original, Greek words, in a contextually appropriate case, are used to gloss less specific Egyptian words, as well as sections containing transcriptions of Greek loanwords,\textsuperscript{576} Greek vowels sequences,\textsuperscript{577} Greek words written in the cipher script,\textsuperscript{578} and the appearance in Demotic of palindromes which would only be functional in Greek.\textsuperscript{579} All of these phenomena are indicative at least of Greek linguistic influence, if not full translation; indeed the use of

\textsuperscript{572} See for example the comments of Dieleman in Dieleman,\textit{Priests, tongues, and rites}, p.145.


\textsuperscript{574} See the comments of Griffith and Thompson,\textit{Demotic Magical Papyrus}. volume 1, pp. 11-12; Dieleman,\textit{Priests, tongues, and rites}, pp.67-69, 110-138, 308-312.

\textsuperscript{575} At ll.1-92, ll.93-114, 451-458, 675-694.


\textsuperscript{577} At ll.376-394, 711-715, 716-724, 1049-1055, 1078-1089, 1110-1129, 1130-1140, 1206-1218, 1219-1227.

\textsuperscript{578} At ll.150-231, 395-427, 489-515, 805-40, and perhaps ll.856-75 (where there are only three separate vowels).

\textsuperscript{579} At ll.376-394, 711-715, 716-724, 1049-1055, 1078-1089, 1110-1129.
Greek loanwords in this papyrus is unparalleled, in absolute and relative quantity, in any other Demotic text.\textsuperscript{580}

2.2.4.3 Non-‘Magical’ Contents

The focus of this work is on the ritual apparition, which falls into the broader genre of rituals which can be described as “magical”; as a result many of the other “magical” ritual types will be discussed in passing, since their ritual components are often shared or similar. Nonetheless, as I have tried to stress throughout this discussion, the Theban Library contains material of other genres – broadly classifiable as literary, astrological and alchemical – which provide contextual information crucial to a complete understanding of the individuals who owned it.

2.2.4.3.1 The Myth of the Sun’s Eye

The oldest text in the Theban Library is the Myth of the Sun’s Eye, a literary text written in Demotic on the front of PDM 12.\textsuperscript{581} Dating to around 100 CE, it consists of 21 complete, and 2 partially preserved, columns of text, recounting a mythological cycle in which the deity Thoth, in the form of a cynocephalous baboon, persuades the goddess Tefnut, the sun’s eye, to return from Nubia to her father Ra in Egypt, interspersed with various fables recited by Thoth to the goddess to encourage her in her journey, and persuade her not to harm him; the presence in the text of “stage-directions” suggest that


\textsuperscript{581} The earliest edition of this text was by Revillout, who published a partial hieroglyphic transliteration and French translation between 1880 and 1911 under the title \textit{Koufi}, from \textit{kwfy (“ape”), an epithet of Thoth misunderstood as the name of the protagonist (“Entretiens philosophiques d’une chatte éthiopienne et d’un petit chacal \textit{Koufi}, (Analyse du papyrus 384 de Leyde. Monuments de Leyde de M. Leemans, 11* partie, fol. CCXV et suiv.),” Revue Égyptologique 1(1880); “Entretiens philosophiques d’une chatte éthiopienne et d’un petit chacal \textit{Koufi},” Revue Égyptologique 2(1882); “Un nouvel extrait des entretiens du chacal \textit{Koufi} et le la chatte éthiopienne,” Revue Égyptologique 4(1885); “Le Roman-Thèse d’un Philosophe Nihiliste,” Revue Égyptologique 11(1904); “Le Koufi. Dialogues philosophiques (suite),” Revue Égyptologique 15(1911)).

it was intended to be used in a dramatic reading or full performance.\textsuperscript{582} The \textit{Myth} is known from several other less well-preserved Demotic copies,\textsuperscript{583} as well as one fragmentary Greek translation,\textsuperscript{584} all dating from the second to third centuries CE, and the underlying myth is preserved in Ptolemaic-era temple inscriptions, with some indications of the outlines of its events in texts from the tenth to eighth centuries BCE.\textsuperscript{585}

In the context of the Theban Library, a key question is whether this oldest text, written at least 100 years before the first stage of the magical contents, was of inherent interest to the Library's owners, or whether they simply regarded it as a convenient writing surface. Both Spiegelberg\textsuperscript{586} and Johnson\textsuperscript{587} have suggested that the re-use itself implies that the text was no longer of interest; but since single texts are occasionally written opisthographically, that is, continuing from the front to the back this point cannot be decisive – the use of one side cannot prove the non-use of the other. By contrast, Tait\textsuperscript{588} implies a closer connection between the \textit{Myth} and PDM 12, suggesting that the economy of space elsewhere in the Library would suggest that an unused text would be erased to make space; however PGM 1, 2, 4, 5a and PDM/PGM 14 have extensive blank space, so writing space was not a clear problem for the users of the Library. More persuasive is his observation of the similarities in content of

\textsuperscript{582} Spiegelberg, \textit{Mythus vom Sonnenauge}, pp.1-2, 8-10.
\textsuperscript{585} Hermann Junker, "Der Auszug der Hathor-Tefnut aus Nubien", \textit{Abhandlungen der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Classe} 3(1911). See also Alexandra von Lieven, "Fragments of a Monumental Proto-Myth of the Sun's Eye", in \textit{Actes du Ixe congrès international des etudes demotiques}, ed. Ghislaine Widmer and Didier Devauchelle (Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 2009).
\textsuperscript{586} Spiegelberg, \textit{Mythus vom Sonnenauge}; p.1.
\textsuperscript{587} Janet H. Johnson, \textit{The Demotic Verbal System} (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1976), p.3 fn.10.
\textsuperscript{588} Tait, "Theban magic", pp.171-173.
the two texts, noted by de Cenival in relation to PDM 14;589 these similarities are both of vocabulary590 and content, with the *Myth* containing deities and supernatural beings who recur in the magical texts, and the deities themselves perform magical feats and transformations.591

There are of course many other magical texts written on the backs of other material, whether letters,592 accounts,593 horoscopes594 or philosophical treatises,595 but the relevance of the *Myth* to an individual interested in magic would seem to differentiate it from the first two of these instances. However, as Reuvens has observed,596 and Dieleman has expanded upon,597 six papyrus fragments from the outer edge of the papyrus, containing text from the end of the *Myth* narrative, were later pasted over the text of the *Myth*, to repair wear from reading PDM 12, in such a way as to obscure the literary text. But these fragments contain Demotic writing on both sides, so it appears that the repairs were made after PDM 12 had been written, destroying the fragment which Dieleman designates column III*. This suggests a hypothetical three stage model of the use of the papyrus: a first stage in which the *Myth of the Sun’s Eye* was the only text; a second in which PDM 12 was added, and the *Myth* may have been retained as being of interest to the owner(s); and a third in which neither the *Myth* nor PDM col.III* held sufficient interest for the owner to prevent their being cannibalised to preserve the rest of the roll, perhaps because they could no longer read Demotic.

590 De Cenival points to the words b’wy.t (Myth 2.5)/be.t (PDM 14.429) (“grave”) and mhbr (“scarab beetle”) as words rare outside the two texts (ibid, pp.5-6); it is worth noting that since the time of her article the latter has been found in several other texts (for example BM 10238 2, 12, v.4; P.Insinger 14.8; P. Berlin 13603 2.7; Rhind 1 6.d7; Louvre E 3452 11.16).
591 De Cenival points to the knowledge of Thoth in the text of md.t rnt-ntr (“the writing of divine men”) and hqy (“magic”) preserved in the Lille fragment (P.Lille.Dem. Inv.31 ll.A21, A22, A23) (ibid., p.8).
592 P.Ramesseum C (XIII BCE).
593 PGM 21, 65; SM 83; ACM 83.
594 SM 85.
595 SM 86.
2.2.4.3.2 Astrological Material

PGM 4.835-849 contains a fragment of an astrological work discussing the periodic influence of the planets on the bodies of individuals between the ages of 53 years and 9 months and 64½ years, which may indicate either the age of the individual who commissioned it, or an interest on the compiler's part on the planetary deity Hermes (Mercury), who is the overall ruler of this period. While the text is otherwise unparalleled, it shows similarities with Vettius Valens Anthologiaeum 6.5-6, with the periods drawn from general Hellenistic astrological principles.598

This text is the only explicitly astrological text in the Theban Library; magical handbooks from outside the Library contain calendars listing the optimal zodiac signs or days of the month for the performance of various rituals,599 or horoscopes belonging to particular individuals, presumably connected to the collections containing them.600 Nonetheless, the other texts in the Theban Library suggest a broader interest in astrological matters; PDM 14.93-114 contains a ritual of apparition in which the god Imhotep is called upon to cast a horoscope for the ritualist, and many others contain invocations or prayers addressed the sun, moon and constellation Ursa Major as deities; other asterisms, in particular the Pleiades and the older Egyptian decans are mentioned in the text of these formulae. Additionally, several texts require a basic grasp of astrology to calculate the correct times to carry out various rituals;601 the significance of these instructions will be discussed elsewhere (4.1.1.1), but we should note that they assume the ability to simultaneously predict in advance the phases of the moon and its longitude in relation to the twelve signs of the zodiac.602 While tables for predicting these

598 For a brief discussion of this text, see O. Neugebauer and H. B. Van Hoesen, "Astrological Papyri and Ostraca: Bibliographical Notes," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 108, no. 2 (1964), pp.62, 64; for the periods see O. Neugebauer and H. B. Van Hoesen, Greek Horoscopes (American Philosophical Society, 1959), pp.10-11. For most of the planets the number is equivalent to their approximate synodic period in years, although for the sun it is based on the Metonic cycle (19 solar years), for Mercury it is 20 (63 synodic periods=20 Egyptian years), and for the moon it is 25.
599 PGM 3.275-281 (III CE); PGM 7.155-167, 272-283, 284-299 (III-IV CE, Hermonthis?).
600 PGM 62 52-75 (III CE), SM 85 (III CE, Oxyrhynchus).
601 These are mentioned in in PGM 2.8; PGM 5.47-50, 51-52, 378; PGM 12.307-309; PGM 13.5-6, 13.347-348; PDM Suppl.183-84.
602 The signs of the zodiac were, of course, derived originally from Mesopotamian rather than Egyptian cultural sources, but the integration of Mesopotamian astrology into Egyptian practice and thought seems to have begun under the Persian period (Richard A. Parker, A Vienna Demotic Papyrus on Eclipse- and Lunar-Omina (Providence: Brown Universit Press, 1959), pp.28-30), and the O.Strassburg D 541 suggests the adoption of the zodiac into Egypt by at least 250 BCE (O. Neugebauer, "Demotic Horoscopes," Journal of the American Oriental Society 63, no. 2 (1943), pp.121-122), while their
events existed in Greek and Demotic from the Ptolemaic period onwards,\textsuperscript{603} such reference works are absent from the Library, and would probably have not been required for the relative simple task of calculating events which recurred every lunar month;\textsuperscript{604} indeed, the relative facility of calculating the behaviour of the moon may be one of the reasons why it was adopted as the means of determining ritual times. We can see here an intimate relationship between the performance of “magical” rituals and astrological knowledge and assumptions, and there is some evidence that the relationship was reciprocal; an important Graeco-Egyptian astrological tradition centres on the authors Nekhepsos\textsuperscript{605} and Petosiris, with texts attributed to the pair apparently originating in the second century BCE, and attested in both Greek and Demotic.

Related to astrology, though not strictly relying upon astronomical calculation, is the \textit{Sphere of Demokritos}, a table contained in PGM 12.351-364 for calculating whether a sick individual will live or die based on the day of sickness, the numerical value of their name, and the day of the month, divided by 30, the fictive value of the lunar month; more complex examples are known, attributed to the

appearance into temple decoration at Esna, Dendera, Shanhûr, Akhmîm, Armant and Koptos from c.200 BCE-109 CE (O Neugebauer and R A Parker, \textit{Egyptian astronomical texts, III: Decans, planets, constellations and zodiacs} (Providence: Brown University Press, 1969), pp.203-212) shows that they were quickly indigenised through incorporation into more traditional cosmological schemes. A fragment of Chaeremon preserved by Michael Psellus (Fragment 2.444-445) describes how the astrological knowledge of Egypt was lost due to a Nile flood, requiring its people to draw upon the lore of the Chaldaeans, suggesting an awareness and rationalisation of the Mesopotamian origins of many aspects of Graeco-Egyptian astrology among Egyptians. For more detailed discussions of the Egyptian adoption of Mesopotamian astrology see Briant Bohleke, "In Terms of Fate: A Survey of the Indigenous Egyptian Contribution to Ancient Astrology in Light of Papyrus CyBR inv. 132(B)," \textit{Studien zur Alttägyptischen Kultur} 23(1996); Dieleman, "Stars and the Egyptian Priesthood in the Graeco-Roman Period."; Ian S. Moyer, \textit{Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp.228-248.


\textsuperscript{604} “Lunar month” is here used as a shorthand for two related measures of time. The phases of the moon depend on its position relative to both the sun and the earth, with the full cycle, the \textit{synodic month} being 29.53 days long; the moon’s position relative to the distant stars which make up the zodiacal constellations varies according to the period known as the \textit{sidereal month}, consisting of 27.32 days (David H. Kelley and Eugene F. Milone, \textit{Exploring Ancient Skies. A Survey of Ancient and Cultural Astronomy}, 2 ed. (New York: Springer, 2011),30-35). The difference between the two, 2.21 days, is small, but would mean that each lunation phase (for example, the full or new moon) would occur approximately 29.11° eastwards each synodic month, equivalent to 2.43 zodiac signs; a conscientious ritualist would need to be aware of this discrepancy.

\textsuperscript{605} I follow here the judgement of Ryholt that the orthographic form Νεχεψῶς, transmitted through Julius Africanus’ and Eusebius’ citations of Manetho, is more correct than the more common form Νεχεψω, representing a transliteration of Nyk-w Pî-sî, ’Necho the Wise’ ("New Light on the Legendary King Nechepsos of Egypt," \textit{Journal of Egyptian Archaeology} 97 (2011), pp.65-66).
astrologer-priest Petosiris. Unlike the example in PDM/PGM 12, these are often truly spherical in shape.606

2.2.4.3.3 Alchemical Material

Three of the papyri (PGM 12, P.Holm, P.Leid I 397) contain material generally characterised as “alchemical”.607 In fact, these represent some of the earliest surviving pieces of evidence for the Graeco-Egyptian alchemical tradition,608 although the contents of the earliest texts which survive in

---


607 As discussed by Newman and Principe (“Alchemy vs. Chemistry: The Etymological Origins of a Historiographic Mistake,” *Early Science and Medicine* 3, no. 1 (1998)) the semantic distinction between “alchemy” and “chemistry” was only made in the final decades of seventeenth century CE. Nonetheless, it is still possible, though perhaps misguided, to characterise older material as closer to one or the other modern construct. Lindsay, for example, characterises the Theban Material as not belonging to the “direct tradition” of alchemy since they lack the “always present” “spiritual aspect” (*The Origins of Alchemy in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (London: Frederick Muller Ltd., 1970).p.37). For a more detailed discussion of the opinions of various authors see Halleux, *Les Alchimistes Grecs*, 1,p.27. Dufault prefers to characterise the material as “tinctorial” (*The Sources of Greek Alchemical Inquiry*, pp.2-3). While his suggestion is a good one, the term “alchemical” is too firmly associated with the similar contemporary material to make the substitution of another term entirely helpful. I hope the specific details provided in the following discussion will serve to prevent the less appropriate associations of this word from mischaracterising its content.

608 A few brief fragments of similar or greater age are known; these include P.Oxy 467 (I/II CE), P.Iand. 85 (I/II CE), P.Fior. (undated); for these see Halleux, *Les Alchimistes Grecs*, 1, pp.155-163.
the later manuscript tradition are generally dated to the first century CE. Given that the Theban Library manuscripts come from two different groups from different centuries (see 2.2.2.6.1) their presence has significant implications for the unity of the Library as a whole.

The earliest of the three papyri, PGM 12, contains five alchemical texts. The first four of these, contained in ll.193-201, contain instructions for colouring gold, while the fifth (ll.401-444), consists of a reference table containing euphemistic names for ingredients attributed to the ‘temple scribes’. This latter text, while not strictly alchemical, shows a clear relationship in its naming practices to texts known from alchemical authors such as Ostanes and Zoroaster, and more specifically Dioscorides, with whom the text shares at least one term in common.

The two later texts are devoted almost entirely to alchemical recipes. P.Holm. displays a primary focus on cleaning, colouring, preparing and counterfeiting precious and semi-precious stones (49.4%), with a strong secondary focus on dyeing fabrics (43.8%). A smaller number of recipes (5%) deal with metal-working, the creation and multiplication of silver, and the purification of silver and tin; finally there are a few brief reference texts (1.9%). By contrast, P.Leid. I 397 is almost entirely devoted to metal-working, containing recipes for creating metals and alloys (21%), gold and silver inks (15.2%), gilding (0.5%), as well as colouring (12.5%), multiplying (8.9%), purifying (6.3%), hardening (3.6%), softening (0.9%), testing (5.4%), and cleaning (3.6%) metals. It also contains a few recipes for dyeing

---

609 The most important codices are Marcianus 299 (X-XI CE), Paris gr. 2325 (XIII CE) and Paris gr. 2327 (XV CE), which contain material written between I and IX CE; see F. Sherwood Taylor, “A Survey of Greek Alchemy,” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 50 (1930), pp.111-113.

610 Berthelot, *Collection des Anciens Alchimistes Grecs*, pp.10-12; see also the excellent discussion in Lynn R. LiDonnici, “Beans, Fleawort, and the Blood of a Hamadryas Baboon: Recipe Ingredients in Greco-Roman Magical Materials,” in *Magic and ritual in the ancient world*, ed. Paul Mirecki and Marvin Meyer (Leiden: Brill, 2001). Berthelot compares ἀκεκαλλίδα, named as “blood of the eye” (ἀἷμα ὀφθαλμοῦ) in PGM 12.421 to ἀναγαλλίς, called “blood of the eye” by “the prophets” (προφῆται) according to *Materia Medica* 2.178 (recensiones e codd. Vindob. med. gr. 1 + suppl. gr. 28; Laur. 73, 41 + 73, 16 + Vind. 93). While the two words seem to refer to quite different botanical subjects – ἀκακαλίς the gall of the tamarisk, and ἀναγαλλίς the low-growing, flowering pimpernel (*Anagallis arvensis*) according to the LSJ and LMPG – they are close enough to suspect that a combination of visual and phonetic mistakes could have resulted in a shift from one to the other. More certain is the wild lettuce (άγρια ὀφθικτή; perhaps *Lactuca Scariola* based on the comments of the LSJ s.v. ὀφθικτήν), listed as Titan’s Blood in PGM 12.435 (<αἷμα> ἀπὸ Τιτᾶνος) and *Materia Medica* 2.136 (αἷμα Τιτάνου).

611 The two exceptions are PGM 5a, the ritual of apparition which has been inserted into P.Holm, and P.Holm ll.95-101, a recipe for cleaning pearls which is also capable of causing skin disease (λέπρα).
cloth (9.8%), as well as ten extracts from Book 5 of the *Materia Medica* of Pedanius Dioscorides, discussing the properties of various substances used elsewhere in the papyri.\(^ {612}\)

Despite the somewhat misleading designation as "alchemy" most of these recipes have been described by modern chemists as functional,\(^ {613}\) and there is, within the recipes themselves, an absence of the mystical accoutrements usually associated with the genre. The work which is otherwise closest in content, the *Physica et Mystica* of Democritus, contains a narrative digression (§3) in the middle of its recipes describing the revelatory process by which the author discovered the secrets of alchemy – nothing like this is found in the Theban texts.

In terms of their workings, the papyri rely on relatively simple techniques of alloying or dyeing metals to either "transform" a less valuable metal into a more valuable one, usually gold or silver, or adulterating precious metals to increase their quantities in various multiplication procedures. Later alchemical texts seem to understand such practices in terms of transmutation,\(^ {614}\) but the recipes in the Theban Papyri waver between an acknowledgement that the alloys only "seem" to be the more precious metal,\(^ {615}\) and a suggestion that their "nature" (φύσις) has changed;\(^ {616}\) elsewhere instructions for testing metals suggest the knowledge that these adulterated metals were less valuable, and therefore, perhaps, had not "really" changed into the more precious variety.\(^ {617}\) In any case, these practices mark the papyri as belonging to the school that Taylor describes as the Democritean, in contrast to the Marian school, which made use of more complex processes of distillation and

---

\(^ {612}\) These extracts are mentioned, but not reproduced in Berthelot, *Collection des Anciens Alchimistes Grecs*, vol.1 p.50 and Halleux, *Les Alchimistes Grecs*, t.1 p.109, and therefore are also omitted from the English translation of Caley and Jensen (editor), *The Leiden and Stockholm Papyri: Greco-Egyptian Chemical Documents From the Early 4th Century AD*.

\(^ {613}\) See for example the assessment of Berthelot, who compares the procedures to the contemporaneous *Manuels Roret* (Berthelot, *Collection des Anciens Alchimistes Grecs*, vol.1 p.6.), and the discussion in Caley and Jensen (editor), *The Leiden and Stockholm Papyri: Greco-Egyptian Chemical Documents From the Early 4th Century AD*, pp.41-45, 85-88. Trost (*Gold- und Silbertinten. Technologische Untersuchungen zur abendländischen Chrysographie und Argyrographie von der Spätantike bis zum hohen Mittelalter* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1991), pp.58-102) created silver and gold inks according to each of the recipes in the papyri, and found them to be satisfactory, though variable in quality.

\(^ {614}\) Caley and Jensen (editor), *The Leiden and Stockholm Papyri*, p.129.

\(^ {615}\) Holm 5.216-224, 1017-1027; P. Leid. I 397 ll. 283, 139.

\(^ {616}\) P.Holm. ll.1-12, 193-194, 209-210,782; P. Leid. I 397 ll.364-365, 499-500, 515.

\(^ {617}\) P.Holm. 952-957; P. Leid. I 397 ll.251-253, 316-323, 324-328, 402-404.
sublimation using complex apparatuses, and whose most prominent early representative is Maria “the Jewess”.  

The texts themselves consist of two types, full (Vollrezepte) and abbreviated recipes (Kurzrezepte), the former giving quantities of ingredients required and detailed procedures, while the latter giving only ingredients without quantity, along with procedures which are either abbreviated or completely omitted. The alchemical handbooks contain the same multiplication of text types, repetition of texts and paratextual references (“another [recipe]”) as the magical books; some explanation for the large number of variant recipes with similar purposes may be found in the fact that the substances available to the users of the text in this period would be of variable purity and content, making the already delicate chemical processes still more unpredictable. The multiple recipes would thus be understood as a record of experimentation with different techniques, a possibility which will later be discussed in relation to the magical processes which the rest of the Library contains, perhaps still more unreliable in their effects. Alongside the ten texts taken from Dioscorides, several of the recipes are attributed to named authors; these are Demokritos and Anaxilaos, Phimenas, and Julius Africanus.

The activities implied by the alchemical recipes fall broadly into three categories. The first is the production of dyed fabric, always wool when specified, and usually purple. While wool was ostensibly

---

618 Of the named alchemical authors, Taylor assigns Ostanes to the Democritian school. The Marian school includes Zosimos of Panopolis, as well as the alchemical works attributed to Hermes Trismegistos and Agathodaimon; Taylor, “A Survey of Greek Alchemy”, p.114.
619 Halleux, Les Alchimistes Grecs, t.p.16.
622 P.Leid. I 397 l.447. Berthelot (Berthelot, Collection des Anciens Alchimistes Grecs, p.24) associates Phimenas with Pammēnēs the Saite who Tacitus mentions being expelled from Rome, and is elsewhere said to have been the teacher of Demokritos. Lindsay (The Origins of Alchemy in Graeco-Roman Egypt, p.396 fn.53) and Lagercrantz (Papyrus Graecus Holmiensis (P.Holm.) Recepte für Silber, Steine und Purpur, pp.105-106) think the identification unlikely. For a more extended discussion see Halleux, Les Alchimistes Grecs, vol.1, p.103 fn.2.
623 P.Holm. l.866, 1012. The identification of Africanus with Julius Africanus is resisted by Lagercrantz (Papyrus Graecus Holmiensis (P.Holm.) Recepte für Silber, Steine und Purpur, p.106), but affirmed by Halleux (Les Alchimistes Grecs, vol.1, p.70).
forbidden to the Egyptian priests who are the presumed owners of the Library; it was the most common fabric in Roman Egypt, and the colour purple was a signifier of luxury; the recipes in the papyri here provide cheaper alternatives to the expensive murex dye which would have been imported from the Levant. The second is the production and working of precious metals and stones; where the intended final products are given, these are statuettes (ζῴδια, εἰκόνες, ἀσπίδια), and it does not seem to far-fetched to imagine these as sacred images. The third and final category is the creation of gold and silver inks for writing and drawing on papyrus, parchment and marble. Taken together, they imply that the owner of the Library at this stage was involved in a workshop of some description producing luxury objects.

The practical functionality of the alchemical texts may seem incongruous next to the magical material, but, as with the astrological content of the Library, I would suggest that they should be understood as part of a larger unity, in which the different categories of practice belong to a single concern with

---

624 Gnomon of the Idios Logos §71 (BGU 5.1210 ll.181-182).
627 P.Leid. I 397 l.229.
628 P.Leid. I 397 l.410.
629 P.Leid. I 397 l.410. The LSJ defines this word as meaning a ‘small shield’, as a diminutive of ἀσπίς. Discussing the II CE P.Oxy. 3.473, Adam Lukasiewicz (“ἀσπιδεῖον,” Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 67 (1987)) suggests that the erection and crowning of three ἀσπίδεια refers to painted portraits resembling shields. Similar portraits, but apparently entirely metal, are mentioned by Pliny, and depicted in the ‘Tomb of the three brothers’ at Palmyra (Jane Fejer, Roman Portraits in Context (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), pp.156-157). Another possibility is suggested by the Memphis Decree (196 BCE), in which ἀσπίς and ἀσπιδοεῖδος refers to statuettes in the form of serpents (OGIS 90, A II.43-44, B l.11). It seems unlikely that either surfaces for painting or functional shields would have been made from precious metal, and so the word here probably refers either to small, decorative shields or serpent figurines.
630 Compare the activities of the contemporary of the Library, Zosimos of Panopolis, who mentions manufacturing talismans, male and female statues, a "Phrygian figure", and statuettes of animals, birds, trees, as well as deities, specifically naming Agathodaimon, Good Fortune, Destiny, the Earth and the Nile; CMA 2.6.2, 2.6.8, 2.6.31, 2.12.5; see the discussion in Shannon L. Grimes, "Zosimus of Panopolis: Alchemy, Nature and Religion in Late Antiquity" (Diss. School of Syracuse University, 2006), pp.35-36, who suggests that Zosimos was a temple craftsman.
631 P.Leid. I 397 l.395 specifies that the ink is to be used in writing on "scrolls and parchment" (βίβλια καὶ διφθέρας), while l.403 adds that the ink may also be used upon "polished marble" (μαρμάρου ἐστιλβωμ). The oldest datable papyrus with gilding is P. BM 10472, a XXth Dynasty Book of the Dead (Shirley Alexander, "Notes on the Use of Gold-Leaf in Egyptian Papyrus," The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 51 (1965), pp.48-49), but these and other examples are of gold leaf being used in images, rather than of gold ink being used to write. The earliest mention of gold writing seems to be in the Letter of Aristea§176, in which the Jewish Law is said to written in "letters of gold". It seems that no examples of gold writing on papyrus have survived, but parchment manuscripts with gold and silver writing survive from IV-V CE onwards (Trost, Gold- und Silbertinten, pp.6-8).
hidden knowledge pertaining to the understanding and manipulation of the fundamental forces of the cosmos. On a physical level, the alchemical and magical material are contained in the same manuscripts (PGM 12; P.Holm. + PGM 5a), or written in the same hand (P.Holm. + PGM 5a; P.Leid I 397; PGM 13; possible PGM 4), and use the same range of lexical signs (see 2.2.4.2). On a textual level they are extremely similar in presentation, both sets of recipes consisting of brief titles, followed by longer instructions characterised by imperatives and participles; additionally, authors associated with alchemical texts are named as authors in several magical recipes. The materia used in the two sets of material is extremely similar; to give only the most salient examples, several magical recipes calls for the use of soot (α ἰθάλη) from a gold- (χρυσοχοϊκή/χρυσοχόου) or coppersmith’s furnace (α ἰθάλη χαλκέως), and two alchemical recipes call for the urine of an “uncorrupted boy” (παῖς ἄφθορος), the same term used elsewhere to designate a helper in rituals of apparition.

While the alchemical recipes themselves are, as has been noted, largely absent of the more mystico-magical practices that characterise other such material, this does not necessarily mean that their users did not connect them to the magical, and in particular revelatory, material they sit alongside. There are slight, but suggestive hints of a significant relationship between revelatory practices and alchemy, with much of the important evidence coming from Zosimos of Panopolis, who was both one of the most important figures of Graeco-Roman alchemy, and, like the final owners of the Library, a resident of the Thebaid of the fourth century CE. Zosimos mentions another school of alchemical practitioners who deal with daimōns, priests who gain knowledge of tinctures through the worship of these beings.

---

632 Ostanes is mentioned in PGM 4.2006-2125, PGM 12.121-143. He was said to have been a Persian magos who accompanied either Xerxes or Alexander, and was associated with the magi who taught Demokritos; see Lindsay, *The Origins of Alchemy in Graeco-Roman Egypt*.131-158

Pibekhis appears in in PGM 4.3007-3086, and Apollobex in PGM 12.107-121; both figures may refer to the same individual, whose Egyptian name is either (“The Falcon” or “He of the Falcon (God)’); see Berthelot, *Les Origines de l’Alchimie*, p.168, as well as Biskup, *Pibechis*, BNP, and Dieleman, *Priests, tongues, and rites*, pp.263-264 fn.195, 267 fn.213.

Demokritos is mentioned in PGM 12:351-364; his pseudonymous alchemical works were among the most famous and plentiful in antiquity; see Lindsay, *The Origins of Alchemy in Graeco-Roman Egypt*.p.90-110.

633 P.Leid. I 397 ll.374, 413-414; the recipes are for gilding. The mentions in magical texts are in PGM 1.86-87, 5.374-375. As Berthelot (*Collection des Anciens Alchimistes Grecs*, volume 1 p.46-47 fn.3) notes urine had a chemical function as a source of alkaline phosphates and ammonia, but the specification “uncorrupted” locates these particular recipes within the same larger worldview as the magical texts.
who he styles as malevolent rulers (ἐφόροι), as well as other individuals who use the power of μαγεία to avert the hostile powers of fate. Given the interest of the Theban Library in revelatory divination and the manipulation of the forces of destiny, it seems quite possible that Zosimos is referring to individuals like its owners, if not the owners themselves.

2.3 Context

As we have seen, the form and contents of the Theban Library tell us a great deal about the linguistic background of its owner(s), as well as their interests, and even the rough outlines of its own development as a collection. The following section will try to fill out this picture by reference to external materials. I will first examine understandings of its nature as a collection, focusing in particular on the reasons for its final deposition. Next, I will situate it within the context of other Egyptian archives containing magical material, and then examine the assertion that it may represent a portion of a temple library by looking at what is known about such libraries. The following discussion will highlight the relationship between the Library and other material, magical and non-magical, and the final two parts will turn at last to the contents of the Library's texts, drawing out the ways in which they can be used to situate its owners and composers both culturally and socially.

2.3.1 The nature of the Theban Library

As discussed above (2.1.2), little is known about the discovery of the Theban Magical Library, and suggestions that they were found in a box, jar, or sarcophagus in a tomb are at best probabilistic.

636 On the Letter Omega 7. Zosimos specifically names two of his rivals, although he does not mention whether they belong to the party or parties which I highlight here. They are Neilos, a priest, and Paphnutia (Treatise on the Body of Magnesia 7, 8).
637 Further suggestions of such revelatory alchemical practices are found in the tract Isis the Prophetess to her son Horus, where Isis is visited and taught alchemy by a stellar angel, and an anonymous Christian alchemist (Constitution of Gold 4, V-VI CE) who asks why there are so many invocations to daimons (δημονοκλησίαι) in the Democritean school of alchemy, when Zosimos could explain the work be explained so simply. There are also various references in alchemical treatises to oracles from Apollo (Zosimos, The Four Bodies 3; Olympiodoros, On the Sacred Art 42; Anonymous, Fabrication 1, 2) and daimons (χρησμοί δαιμόνων; Olympiodoros, On the Sacred Art 17, 37). While the idea that knowledge, especially of the hidden forces of the cosmos, as a gift of deities was common in this period, the specific references to alchemical revelations from a solar daimon are suggestive in light of the appearance in PGM 5a of a ritual of apparition calling upon Helios.
speculations. Similarly speculative, though perhaps more fruitful, are attempts to define the nature of the Library. The two main positions are presented by Betz, who suggests it may either be the collection of a lone scholar, “probably philosophically inclined, as well as a bibliophile and archivist”, and “more than a magician”, or else the product of a temple library, put together by Theban priests.638

A slightly more complex suggestion is put forward by Dufault, who suggests that the Library’s owner belonged to a category he defines as a “dependent scholar”, one of a group of educated individuals who sold their specialised knowledge to local aristocrats. Several of his lines of argument rest on questionable assumptions – his mistaken inclusion of PGM 7 as part of the Anastasi group (see 2.1.3) leads him to depend on the evidence of the *paignia*, or symposium-tricks described in PGM 7.167-186,639 and in his discussion of the alchemical recipes he assumes that they may have been used to debase currency,640 whereas the few concrete suggestions of the actual purposes of the recipes suggests the production of figurines (see 2.2.4.3.3). Nonetheless, he locates the envisaged client of the Library’s owners within the provincial elites, a conclusion that may be too narrow, but which agrees with the focus on social and “spiritual” rather than subsistence problems in the ritual recipes of the Theban Library (see 2.2.4.1).

A related question concerns whether the Library was intended for practical use, or simply as an academic curiosity, although this dichotomy may be an anachronistic one. Fowden suggests that it may have been primarily intended to be studied,641 noting both the size of the texts, and the apparent lack of the physical damage – spots of discoloration and physical wear, for example – that we might expect in a functioning workshop on the alchemical texts. Nock points out that a much later (seventeenth century) “magical” treatise written on paper is spotted with droplets of wax, probably

---

from candles used in the associated rituals, but this codex is generally in poor condition; Delatte, its editor, notes that many of the pages are dirty or have been cut, and it may be that the owner(s) of the Library simply took better care of their possessions. Fowden's assessment is not irrefutable – all of the papyri I have examined do display some damage and discoloration; PGM 12 & 14, in particular, show heavy signs of use and repair, so we must ask how much damage should be expected. Nonetheless, it is worth mentioning in this context a fragment of what seem to be ritual instructions found on a damaged ostracon (O. Mich. inv. 9883) found in the ruins of House 403 in Karanis and dating approximately to the second century CE. Wilburn suggests the attractive theory that it was a “small, working text copied out of a spell book”, which could serve as a portable “spell template”, avoiding the inconvenience of carrying a larger roll or codex to a customer's house, and the necessity, once the ritualist had arrived, of locating the desired ritual within it. While this hypothesis rests on relatively slender evidence, it makes a great deal of sense, and may go some way towards explaining any lack of “wear and tear” on documents within the Library. As parallel evidence for such “working texts” written on ostraca, we might note O.Strassburg D 1338, a Demotic text containing a single medical ritual, and the invocation ostraca from the Archive of Hor, discussed in more detail in 2.3.2.2 and 3.3.3.

While we are limited in what we can know about the Library's owner(s), and about its use during their lives, several suggestions have been put forward concerning the reasons for its final internment, in

643 Anecdota Atheniensia I, p.2
644 On PDM/PGM 12 see Reuven, Lettres à M. Lepron, i° Lettre, p.5; Dieleman, Priests, tongues, and rites, pp.29-33. On PDM 14 see Leemans, Monuments Égyptiens du Musée d'Antiquités des Pays-Bas à Leide, vol. 1 p.4; Dieleman, Priests, tongues, and rites, p.36.
645 Wilburn, Materia Magica", pp. 79-83.
646 O.Hor 18, 65. O.Hor 13 also contains an invocation, but ll.1-2 contain a description of Hor's supplications, and ll.8-13 contain a dream account, so that it is more likely that the ostracon constitutes a record of a successful ritual, of which the invocation is one part.
whatever cache it was later discovered. These suggestions can be reduced to three main lines of argument.⁶⁴⁷

1. **Persecution Model**

The most common suggestion is that the Theban Magical Library was abandoned to protect its owner(s) from the legal penalties to which those accused of magic were subject. The first to put forward this argument this seems to have been Wessely, who specifically pointed to the persecutions under Diocletian in the early fourth century CE, and the later events of 371.⁶⁴⁸

There is no evidence of the prosecution of magical, alchemical or astrological procedures in the Pharaonic or Ptolemaic periods,⁶⁴⁹ but the beginning of Roman rule marked a changed attitude to these phenomena, an orientation which seems to have become even more severe under Diocletian and his successors.⁶⁵⁰ Several sources of Roman law contain provisions which

---

⁶⁴⁷ See also the discussions in Brashear, "An Introduction and Survey", p.3405; Wilburn, "Materia Magica", p.36.
⁶⁵⁰ The initial Roman objection to magical rituals seems to have focused on their private character (since private cultic acts in general were regarded with suspicion) and on rituals intended to harm the bodies, minds and livelihoods of others. One early indication of the shift in attitude comes in an edict of 302 CE, issued under the *augusti* Diocletian and Maximian, which prescribes the death penalty for *malefici* ("sorcerors") and Manichaeans (*Mosaicarum et Romanarum Legum Collatio* 15-3).

can be broadly characterised as banning certain aspects of these activities; these include the XII Tables (451/450 BCE), the Lex Cornelia de sicariis et veneficis (82/81 BCE), SB 14.12144 (198/199 CE), the Pauli Sententiae (compiled c.300 CE), the Codex Theodosianus (material dating from 312-438 CE). Additionally there are references to the destruction or confiscation of books of magic (χημεία) and magicians (magi) during the Roman Empire. For further discussion, see Rives, "Magic in Roman Law: The Reconstruction of a Crime," Classical Antiquity 22, no. 2 (2003).

The Roman laws against astrology, and the several instances of expulsion, are discussed in Cramer, Astrology in Roman Law and Politics, pp.233-283. These laws were based on the Augustan ban of 11 CE, and punished both astrologers and their clients, in specifically for astrological inquiries regarding the political futures and deaths of individuals, and any matter regarding the imperial household (Dio Cassius, Roman History 56.25.5); the term used (μάντις) refers to diviners generally, though the subsequent reference to Augustus' horoscope implies astrological divination to be the specific, or most significant, referent. Between eight and 13 expulsions of astrologers from Rome and/or Italy are recorded between the years of 139 BCE and 180 CE (ibid., p.234); in the records of these banishments astrologers are frequently lumped together with diviners and magi. IV CE brought a total, empire-wide ban on astrology, recorded in the edicts contained in Codex Theodosianus 9.16; as with the hardening of the legal attitude towards magic and alchemy this shift seem to have originated with Diocletian; see Codex Iustinianus 9.18.2, which dates to his reign, perhaps to 296 CE (ibid., p.233, fn.2). See also Tamsyn Barton, Ancient Astrology (London: Routledge, 1994), pp.49-52.

In particular VIIIa, which seems to forbid the harming of another's reputation through carmina ('songs, incantations'), and VIII a & b, which concerns charming (excantare) the crops of others, apparently damaging or appropriating them; as Phillips points out, however, the law seems to view the attack, rather than the means, as the significant component of the crime. See Phillips, "Nullum Crimen sine Lege", pp.263-264; Kippenberg, "Magic in Roman Civil Discourse", pp.144-147.

The terms veneficia and venenum refer to killing both through the medium of administration of toxic compounds ("poisoning") and through the use of ritual means ("cursing"). See Pharr, "The Interdiction of Magic in Roman Law", pp.286-289; Kippenberg, "Magic in Roman Civil Discourse", pp.147-149; Rives, "Magic in Roman Law: The Reconstruction of a Crime."

First published as P. Coll. Youtie 1.30; this is a circular from the prefect of Aegyptus, perhaps Q. Aemilius Saturninus, prescribing the death penalty for those participate in ticket (χρησμοὶ ἐγγράφοι, l.5); processional (κωμασία ἀκαλμάτων, l.7) or "magical" (μαγικοί, l.2) oracles.

For discussions of this text see John Rea, "A New Version of P. Yale Inv. 299," Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 27 (1977); Ritner, "The Religious, Social, and Legal Parameters of Traditional Egyptian Magic", pp.56-60.

Relevant here is 5.23.17-18, which stipulates that "accessories to magic" (magicae artis conscios; presumably those who employ ritualists) should suffer "extreme punishment" (summo suplicio, that is, the death penalty), "magicians" (magi) should be burned alive, books of magic (libros magicae artis) should be publicly burned, and their owners banished or put to death depending upon their status; see Kippenberg, "Magic in Roman Civil Discourse", p.149.

The most important of these are contained in 9.6.3, dating to 317-319 CE in the joint reign of Constantine and Licinius; these forbid the use of 'magical arts' to damage the health (salus) or chastity (pudicus) of individuals. The interpretatio specifies that this involves the invocation of daimons (invocationem daemonorum). Rituals to heal or to control the weather are specifically excepted. See ibid. p.149.
of books of magical and occult knowledge during the reign of Septimius Severus. While the terms used in these laws do not correlate neatly with our understanding of the term “magic”, it seems that they were intended, and indeed used, to prosecute many of the activities contained in the texts of the Library: the creation of substances intended to kill, including inscribed metal curse-tablets, the use of rituals to inflame lust, divination through the invocation of daimōns, dreams or astrology, the performance of private rituals, and even healing procedures.

The fact that the collection history the Theban Library seems to end in the fourth century CE, the period when legal persecution of the practices it contains reached its height, provides circumstantial evidence that the hostile attitude of the administration may have played some role...
in its deposition; perhaps it was hidden out of fear of the death penalty which was attached not only to performing magical and alchemical practices, but to possessing books describing them. However, without clear evidence for this we should be cautious of definitive conclusions; while we do see a decline in Greek and Demotic handbooks in the fourth century (see figure 9), our corpus is too small and haphazard to be sure that this is not an artefact of accidents of excavation and survival rather than persecution, and there is a contradictory increase in Coptic manuscripts in the same period. Additionally, as Frankfurter has argued, we should not assume, based on fragmentary literary and documentary evidence, that laws against occult practices were enforced systematically, especially in the provinces.664

2. Secrecy Model

An alternative suggestion is that the papyri were hidden to prevent them from being seen by “curious and profane eyes”, in the words of Brashear.665 There are indeed several references to the importance of secrecy in the Theban Library, and the first recension of the Eighth Book of Moses (PGM 13.1-343) contains the instructions to “dispose of the book so that it will not be found” once the user has been filled with the “divine wisdom”.666 The idea that the book would be disposed of once its techniques had been thoroughly absorbed may, however, belong more to the framing narrative of the text than to the lived reality of its users; the larger section to which it belongs describes the original addressee swearing the oath to conceal the text in the temple of Jerusalem. This frame would serve to enhance the significance of the text in the eyes of its users – it was never meant to be seen or used by them, and its power would thus be all the greater for its forbidden character. This is not to say that the idea is impossible, although the stipulation of the Eighth Book, that the ritualist would have absorbed all the potential knowledge and power available in all ten of the manuscripts, seems unlikely. Nonetheless, the

664 David Frankfurter, "Native Egyptian Religion in Its Roman Guise", Numen 43, no. 3 (1996), p.11. Compare the comments of Tacitus, who characterises the astrologers as “ever-forbidden and ever-present” (vetabitur semper et retinebitur; Histories 1.22) and the attempts to expel them from Italy as ‘impotent’ (inritum; Annales 12.52).
666 ...πλησθεὶς τῆς θεοσοφίας ἀνεύρετον ποίησον τὴν βιβλίου (l.234); Brashear ("An Introduction and Survey", p.3405 fn.82) incorrectly cites this as l.233. Compare the Hidden Tenth Book of Moses (PGM 13.734-1077): ἐπιγνοὺς γὰρ τῆς βιβλίου τὴν δύναμιν; κρύψεις (ll.741-742).
idea of hiding powerful texts which were no longer required makes some sense; perhaps their original owners were dead, or were no longer interested in its texts, and destroying them might seem sacrilegious.

3. Funerary Offering Model

A third suggestion is that the manuscripts may have served as a funeral assemblage or grave offering, presumably for their owner, or an individual close to them. This use of texts has a long history in both Egyptian and Greek culture, and although the most obvious examples are funerary texts such as the Book of the Dead and the “Orphic” golden tablets, literary and theological texts are also attested. Such an understanding might find a parallel to the Theban Magical Library in the Book of Thoth buried with Prince Naneferkaptaḥ in Setna I, containing revelatory practices; the book is described as providing light for the tomb (4.34). This model is in my opinion the most attractive, in that it relies on known practices, and requires no special social conditions; ultimately, of course, the lack of recorded context for the Theban Library prevents us from reaching a firm conclusion.

The lack of evidence for the reasons for the Library’s deposition means that there is very little that can be said with certainty, but this itself should be a caution against the overly bold characterisations of past authors. The following sections will examine two particular aspects of the Library by reference to external information – firstly by comparing it to other known magical archives from Egypt, and secondly by looking at the evidence that it may be, as some have suggested, the remains of a temple library.

---

667 The contexts of 41 of the “Orphic” tablets are listed in R.G. Edmonds, The ‘Orphic’ Gold Tablets and Greek Religion: Further Along the Path (Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp.41-48; in every case where the context is known it is part of a funerary assemblage, either inhumation or cremation.

668 In general see Preisendanz, Papyrusfunde und Papyrusforschung, pp.130-132, who primarily discusses literary texts.

669 There are two formulae (hp (n šḥ)) one to bind (phḥ; on this term see CDD 6.156-157 s.v.; Ritner, The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice, pp. 57-67; Richard Jasnow, “The Greek Alexander Romance and Demotic Egyptian Literature,” Journal of Near Eastern Studies 56, no. 2 (1997), pp. 99-100;) the heaven, earth and otherworld, understand the birds and animals, and see fish in the water with a divine daimon ((nḥt n nṯr) resting on the water above them (this result alters its position; in 3.12-14 and 3.34-37 it is a product of the first formula, while in 4.1-3 it is a product of the second); the second to allow the speaker to see the sun rising in heaven with his retinue, and the moon rising with the stars, even if they are in the otherworld.
2.3.2 Egyptian Magical Archives, XVII BCE - XI CE

The Theban Magical Library is among the largest of several magical archives originating in ancient Egypt, but by no means the only one. This section contextualises it by briefly examining other known archives from the Middle Kingdom through to the Coptic period.

2.3.2.1 The Ramesseum Papyri

The earliest known “magical” archive is that of the “Ramesseum Papyri”, dating from the middle of the 13th Dynasty during the late Middle Kingdom. The archive consists of 26 papyri, written variously in hieratic and linear hieroglyphs, which were found at the bottom of a shaft with three chambers in what is now the funerary temple of Ramesses II on the Theban west bank. A number of objects are associated with the papyri; a white box, with a jackal painted on the lid, inside which they were found, along with a bundle of reeds, a number of female figurines, including one wearing a Bes-Aha mask and carrying snake wands, small faience food and drink offerings, a pair of clappers, three ivory wands and one copper-alloy cobra wand, along with assorted smaller animal and other figures. Although there is nothing conclusively linking the papyri to the objects other than the reeds and the box, Bourriau has suggested that the nature of the ensemble, and the lack of evidence of disturbance other than their initial displacement, may suggest a homogenous group. Aside from the masked woman and the cobra wand, which may be suggestive of the interests of the tomb occupant, the objects are fairly typical of late Middle Kingdom burials. As is the case with the Theban Magical Library, the Ramesseum Collection may have been the work of multiple generations of collectors, although I am not aware of

---


671 For the details of its find see J.E. Quibbel, "The Ramesseum," in Egyptian Research Account, 1896. The Ramesseum and the Tomb of Ptah-hetep (London: 1898), pp.3-4, where it is called "the tomb of ivory boy", referring to the figurine of a dwarf carrying a calf (University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology E1340 5) found inside it.

672 Bourriau, "Patterns of change in burial customs during the Middle Kingdom", p.20.

673 Ibid., p.20.

any studies to date which have focused on the question of its collection. The majority (15) of the papyri are formularies,\textsuperscript{675} containing instructions for rituals of healing,\textsuperscript{676} protection,\textsuperscript{677} favour\textsuperscript{678} and erotic attraction\textsuperscript{679}; some of the contents of these is duplicated,\textsuperscript{680} and several of these have documentary texts on their opposite side, either accounts\textsuperscript{681} or letters.\textsuperscript{682} Alongside these are texts outlining the procedures for communal rituals\textsuperscript{683} as well as literary compositions,\textsuperscript{684} a hymn,\textsuperscript{685} an onomasticon,\textsuperscript{686} what appear to be an architectural drawing,\textsuperscript{687} and an embalment diary.\textsuperscript{688} Given the range of interests expressed in this archive, it is often assumed that their owner was a lector priest (ḥry-ḥḥ.t) or “magician” (ḥkȝ).\textsuperscript{689}

2.3.2.2 The Archive of Hor

The Archive of Hor dates from c.174–c.159 BCE,\textsuperscript{690} and was found in a small building next to the entrance to the ibis catacombs in the Serapeum complex at Saqqara. The Archive contains a large number of ostraca, predominantly in Demotic, with a few in Greek, belonging to a priest attached to

\textsuperscript{675} Uncategorised in the following list is P.Ram. 19, so far unpublished but described on the British Museum website as magical/religious.
\textsuperscript{676} P.Ram. 3, 4, 5, 8, 12, 14.
\textsuperscript{677} P.Ram. C + 18, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17.
\textsuperscript{678} P.Ram. 7.
\textsuperscript{679} P.Ram. 11.
\textsuperscript{680} For example P.Ram 10, 1.1ff & 16 p.8; Gardiner, \textit{The Ramesseum Papyri. Plates.p.13}.
\textsuperscript{681} P.Ram. C + 18, P.Ram. 4.
\textsuperscript{682} P.Ram. C + 18.
\textsuperscript{683} P.Ram. B; P.Ram. E.
\textsuperscript{684} P.Ram. A; P.Ram. 1; P.Ram. 2; the “Ramesside Wisdom Fragment” (Mounted as part of P.Ram. 1).
\textsuperscript{685} P.Ram. 6.
\textsuperscript{686} P.Ram. D.
\textsuperscript{687} P.Ram. B.
\textsuperscript{688} P.Ram. 13, written on the verso of a set of accounts.
\textsuperscript{689} Ritner, \textit{The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice}, pp.231-232.
the ibis cult. The contents and nature of this Archive will be discussed at greater length later in this essay; at this point we may note that it consists of four types of texts: i) records of Hor's prophetic dreams, often including the circumstances surrounding them; ii) the invocations used to provoke those dreams; iii) records of the administration of the ibis cult; iv) drafts of letters and petitions written by Hor. The inclusion of Hor's collection as a “magical archive” may seem surprising, but both Ray and Ritner recognise their important similarities to the Demotic texts of the Theban Library. The ostraca containing invocations are essentially formularies for provoking rituals of apparition comparable to the later handbooks, and so this collection meets the basic criterion of a magical archive, despite the religion/magic division prevalent in much modern Western discourse.

2.3.2.3 The Fayum Temple Libraries

Slightly later than the Archive of Hor are the texts of the Fayum Temple Libraries, a series of papyri dating from the first century BCE to the second century CE, which Reymond argues derive from temple libraries in the Fayum, largely due to their content and format. Devauchelle, far more cautious, points out that the circumstances of their excavation prevents any real conclusions being drawn.

---

691 Hor seems to have been a pastophoros (w*n) of Isis in the Sebennytic nome, but only used the title scribe (p*i s*h) in the texts written after he took up residence at Memphis. There is no evidence that he was a katokhos, like his contemporary Ptolemaios. On this question see Ray, The Archive of Hor, pp.161-163.

692 Ibid.p.131.

693 Ritner, "Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire", p.3346.


695 Reymond, From Ancient Egyptian Hermetic Writings, 2, pp. 33-41.
drawn about the nature of temple libraries. While their fragmentary state, and the inadequacy of their publication makes any conclusions extremely tentative, the texts are variously concerned with healing (P.Vienna D 6257), temple architecture (P. Vienna D 6319), temple management (P. Vienna D 6330) and astrology (P.Vienna D 6614); additionally, two fragments appear to be part of the proto-Hermetic composition which Jasnow and Zauzich call the Book of Thoth (P.Vienna 6336 & 6343).

The one text which appears to contain magical material (P.Vienna D 6231) is dated by Reymond to the second century CE, but she is uncertain of its origin, attributing it to a “temple library in Crocodilopolis”; the other texts are attributed by her to the Temple of Suchos in Crocodilopolis, or the scriptorium of the temple at Soknopaiou Nesos. Thus this group of texts is not a collection in the same sense as the others discussed here, but it is rather suggestive in regards to the contents of a temple library in the early Roman period, a topic which will be explored at greater length below (2.3.3).

2.3.2.4 The Fayum Magical Archive

PGM 36, 37 and 38 were all acquired for the University of Oslo by Samson Eitrem in 1920, and PGM 39 by H.I. Bell in 1923, and Gee implies they may form a single archive. All of the papyri are dated palaeographically to the fourth century CE, and seem to originate from ancient Theadelphia in the Fayum. However, since PGM 39, an applied text of erotic compulsion, was purchased separately

---

697 Devauchelle (ibid, pp.128-129) is uncertain that the fragments grouped under this sigla belong together.
698 Devauchelle (ibid.p.132) is unconvinced that these fragments belong together. It is Ritner (Ritner, The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice.p.3343) who describes it as astrological.
700 Ritner (The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice.p.3343), Johnson (“From the Contents of the Libraries of the Suchos Temples in the Fayyum (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer). Pt. 1. A Medical Book from Crocodilopolis: P. Vindob. D. 6257. Pt. 2. From Ancient Egyptian Hermetic Writings by E. A. E. Reymond (Review).”) and Devauchelle (“E. A. E. Reymond, From Ancient Egyptian Hermetic Writings (From the Contents of the Libraries of the Suchos Temples in the Fayyum, Part II) (Review)”) hold it to be magical; Reymond (From Ancient Egyptian Hermetic Writings, 2.p.34) says it has “magical implications” while being “different from the standard form of Egyptian magical texts in general”; she considers it to be concerned with the establishment of protection. Kłakowicz (Kłakowicz, “E. A. E. Reymond, From the Contents of the Libraries of the Suchos Temples in the Fayyum. Part II. From Ancient Egyptian Hermetic Writings (Review).”) believes it to be a commentary on BD 162-164.
701 Gee, “Abracadabra, Isaac and Jacob”, p.37 fn.76.
702 This is only explicitly stated by Eitrem for PGM 36, purchased in 1920 (=P.Oslo 1; Samson Eitrem, Papyri Osloenses I: Magical Papyri (Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi I Oslo, 1925).p.31). The online acquisition history of the Oslo
from the others, it should probably be excluded from the putative archive. Of the remaining papyri, PGM 36 and 38 are both magical handbooks, the former one of the longest surviving rolls, illustrated on almost every one of its ten columns, and dominated by rituals of erotic compulsion, with smaller numbers of miscellaneous rituals. PGM 38 consists of a single fragment, the text on the front (ll.1-12) apparently another ritual of erotic compulsion, and the verso (ll.13-26) paralleling a ritual in PGM 4 (ll.1596-1715) for creating an amulet. While these two display similar writing, the third text, PGM 37, is quite different, displaying a greater regularity in letter-height and width, and it contains a Greek translation of the Egyptian text known as the Book of the Temple, whose oldest copies were written in Middle Egyptian in hieratic, with other examples surviving in Demotic. If this text can be connected to the magical papyri PGM 36 & 38, this might indicate a priestly connection for this archive, given not only its contents, but the fact that 3 copies of the Demotic version can be linked with some certainty to temple libraries. However, while the dates of the three papyri are close, the lack of internal or palaeographic connection between them, and the fact that they were bought as part of a purchase of 483 pieces, demands caution in accepting this conclusion.

---

703 O'Neil (Betz, Greek Magical Papyri, p.279) notes that “this text is so fragmentary that the text owes more to Eitrem’s ingenuity than to the copyist”, but enough remains to make the restoration plausible.

704 On this text see Joachim Friedrich Quack, “Das Buch vom Tempel und verwandte Texte,” Archive für Religionsgeschichte 2(2000). The Trismegistos entry for this text (LDAB 63716) suggests that Quack has connected the Oslo fragment with P.Wash. Uni 2.72, another Greek translation of the Book of the Temple, but his discussion of the texts seems to indicate he regards them as merely “the same composition” (derselben Komposition; “Ein ägyptisches Handbuch des Tempels und seine griechische Übersetzung,” Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 119 (1997), p.397), and he refers to the discussion of Totti, who, following the consensus of previous publications, dates the Washington fragment to II CE, roughly two centuries earlier than the Oslo version (Ausgewählte Texte der Isis- und Sarapis-Religion (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1985), texts 9 & 10).


706 See the online acquisition history of the Oslo Papyrus Collection (http://ub-fmserver.uio.no/Acquisition.html; accessed 08/11/2013).
2.3.2.5 The Hermonthis Magical Archive

PGM 7, 8 & 11a were purchased by W. Budge on behalf of the British Library from a native Egyptian in 1888, along with three older texts. Zago, believing PGM 7 was part of the Theban Magical Library, suggested that PGM 8 & 11a might also belong, since they were purchased in the same year. While it is not clear that any of them derive from the Theban Library (see 2.1.3), the fact that they were purchased in a single sale, belong to the same genre, and have similar hands and dates (PGM 7: III-IV CE; PGM 8: IV/V CE; PGM 11a: IV-V CE) makes it quite possible that they were once part of a single collection. Particularly interesting is the fact that PGM 11a is written on the back of an account for an estate dated to July 336 CE (P.Lond.125 front), which may relate to the same property as that discussed in P.Lips inv. 39 + P.Bonn inv.147, dated to the first third of 338 CE, and containing a lengthy text of the Psalms (Septuagint numbers 30-55) on the back. The estate discussed in these texts centres on Hermonthis, and consisting of approximately 1500-2000 artabas, would represent one of the largest properties of its time and place. For this reason, Mitteis, the original editor of P.Lips 97 suggested that it was not a private landholding, but a state or temple domain, favouring the second option; Bagnall dismissed the possibility of a temple owning such a large estate in the fourth century CE, preferring to think of it as a “great house”. If we can accept all four texts as belonging to a single archive, it is reasonable to think it may have originated, like the Theban Library, in the Thebaid, perhaps in Hermonthis; the fact

---

707 British Library Manuscripts Department, *Minutes: Purchases 1879-1888*, pp.279-296. The other texts were a Book of the Dead on papyrus, a hieratic text containing a “religious work” and a hieroglyphic copy of the Book of the Dead written on leather, said to be from Thebes.


709 Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, pp.126-127.


that one of the other texts purchased by the British Library from the sale was said to have a Theban origin makes this suggestion even more plausible.\textsuperscript{712}

PGM 7, is one of the longest surviving Greek formularies, a scroll comparable in length to the longer papyri from the Theban Library. It is a comparatively high-quality text, containing extensive use of lexical signs, including elaborate paragraphos, as well as the extensive use of illustrations and *khataktēres*. In terms of content, its greatest concern is with divination, both through dream oracles and mediated divination, but also through sortition, with the first four columns being almost entirely devoted to a *homeromanteion*. Slightly less common are rituals of erotic compulsion and healing, with other miscellaneous recipes including rituals for cursing, protection and favour. The verso contains a text in a different and later hand (ll.1017-1026), invoking powers including the sun and Michael.

PGM 8 is a shorter text containing three recipes, one erotic compulsion ritual, and two dream oracles, one of which ll.64-110) includes an illustration of the god Bes, and duplicates a text found in both PGM 7.222-249 and PGM 102.1-17 (Oxyrhynchus, IV CE). In an interesting example of the complexity of the relationships between recensions of the same text, the version of this recipe in PGM 7 would seem to be closer to the fragmentary Oxyrhynchite version, than that in PGM 8, apparently from the same archive. PGM 11a, written on the back (↓) of one of the accounts, contains a single ritual for acquiring an assistant *daimōn*, or *paredros*.

The Hermonthis Archive presents a smaller group of texts displaying a similar range of interests to the Theban Library, with a focus on divination alongside an array of related practices. The geographical and temporal closeness of the two groups is remarkable, although we should not assume that there could only have been a single group or individual with an interest in magic in the Thebaid; additionally, despite some temporal overlap, the Hermonthis Archive seems to have both begun and to have continued somewhat later than the Theban Library. The re-use of accounts from a large estate might suggest that the owner(s) were involved in the administration or functioning of the landholdings, but this must be considered uncertain, since there are other ways that the scrap papyrus

\textsuperscript{712} It is described as a “fragment of a painted leather hieroglyphic copy of Book of the Dead from Thebes”. British Library Manuscripts Department, \textit{Minutes: Purchases 1879-1888}, pp.295.
could have been acquired. The presence of the Psalms is similarly interesting, providing the most
crude, and earliest, link yet between an interest in the texts of Judaean/Christian religion and late
antique magical practice.  

2.3.2.6 Kellis Magical Archive

The Kellis Magical Archive refers to a body of texts found in a single house in a residential area south
of ancient Kellis in Ismant el-Kharab. This building has yielded more than 100 papyri in Coptic,
Greek and Syriac, dating from the fourth century CE, consisting of documentary texts – principally
letters and accounts relating to a number of individuals, some certainly related – as well as two Coptic
codices containing Manichaean texts. Here, however, we are concerned with a smaller group of eight
texts, whose content can be characterised roughly as magical; the relationship of these texts to each
other, and to the larger body of texts from the same findspot, is unclear, but it seems likely that they
constitute one or more archives, and de Haro Sanchez has concluded that they probably represent the
activity of a centre of literary education and copying.

The magical texts consist of P.Kell.Copt V.35, a Coptic letter on re-used papyrus from an individual
called Ouales to another called Psais, consisting of a recipe for separation, partially written in Greek, a
request for texts in return, and a promise for further texts. P.Kell. I.82 & 83 are list of good and bad
days in Greek, the former written on a wooden board, and containing the beginning of what seems to
be an invocation at the end of the preserved text (ll.36-38). P.Kell. I 84 is a horoscope for the year 373
CE, written on the back of a wooden tablet from a notebook containing a series of accounts in Coptic
(P.Kell.Copt. V. 48); inaccuracies in most of the calculations suggests that the astrologer was not

---

73 Bagnall (*Egypt in Late Antiquity*, p.126 fn.79) implies that the owner of the group may have been a Christian, a suggestion
Gee thinks "dubious" ("Abracadabra, Isaac and Jacob", p.45 fn.135).


76 Magali de Haro Sanchez, "Les Papyrus Iatromagiques Grecs de Kellis," *Lucida Intervalla* 37 (2008), pp.91-93. Compare the
particularly competent. 717 There are a series of small drawings, perhaps kharaktēres, at the bottom of the tablet.

Coming to the magical material proper, two items can be described as magical formulaires; these are P. Kell. I 85 a + b, two fragments of a Greek codex preserving five recipes, three of which are concerned with healing, and P.Kell. I 88, a wooden tablet, probably once part of a larger document, containing a prayer to the Christian god for good health. 718 Two small amulets, both against fever (P. Kell. I 86 & 87), intended for named individuals, may represent commissions which were never delivered to their recipients. The second of these, P. Kell. I 87, appears to have been copied from the text preserved on P. Kell. I 85 b ll.16-17.

Of particular interest in this body of texts is the religious context they provide; while the text in P. Kell. I 85 a & b (and its copy in P. Kell. I 87) contains the pagan inflected onomata typical of the genre, with Ptah and Thermouthis and recognisable names, and P. Kell. I 86 contains a list of angel names, P. Kell. I 88 is clearly Christian in content, as is the letter (P.Kell.Copt. V.35), whose author swears by the Paraclete (that is, Mani; l.27). While the pagan temple to Tutu in Kellis seems to have functioned as late as 335 CE, 719 it seems more likely that the owner(s) of the texts discussed here were, like the rest of the inhabitants of the immediate area, Manichaeans, who thought of themselves as the true Christians. 720


718 The text was originally classified as an amulet, but re-identified, with the help of a parallel in P.Barcl. 155 (19-26), as a liturgical prayer; see Klaas Anthony Worp, Robert Walter Daniel, and Cornelia Eva Römer, "Das Gebet zur Handauflegung bei Kranken in P.Barcl. 155,9 - 156,5 und P.Kellis I 88," in Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 119(1997).


2.3.2.7 The Multilingual Magical Workshop

The “Multilingual Magical Workshop” dates from fifth to sixth centuries CE, and consists of two Greek rolls (PGM 123, 124), one miniature Coptic codex (P.Mil.Vogl.Copt. 16) along with fragments in Greek, Coptic and Aramaic.\(^{721}\) The presence of multiple hands, and the fact that several of the texts on the Greek fragments (PGM 123.b-f) are copies of texts in the formularies, imply that this archive is the product of a workshop which specialised in producing amulets for healing or favour. While the find spot of this collection is unknown, the dialect of the Coptic texts led Pernigotti to suggest a location near Beni Suef as a likely location.\(^{722}\) The contents of this archive are quite diverse: PGM 123, following the format of many later Coptic texts, consists of a generic ritual and invocation followed by a list of its uses, mainly for purposes of healing, but also for granting victory; by contrast PGM 124 is a curse. Finally, P.Mil.Vogl.Copt.16 contains a number of invocations and an erotic spell. All of these are highly illustrated, and while there is a clear link to earlier practice, Christian content is quite prominent.

2.3.2.8 The Coptic Wizard’s Horde

Moving on to predominantly Coptic collections, the “Coptic Wizard’s Hoard”\(^{723}\) consists of 12 manuscripts containing three texts, A,\(^{724}\) B (600 + 601 + 602; 597 + 598; 1294) and C (595; this possibly part of text B), dated to the fifth to seventh centuries CE; only text A is published. The group contains five hands, one of which (5) is extremely poor. Texts A and B both appear in duplicate, once in a “book hand”, and once in the less practiced hand. Part of text B is copied onto an amulet (1294) in hand 5, which indicates, as with the case of the Multilingual Workshop, that we are dealing with the remains of a workshop which included amulets in its output. The primary interest of text A is in healing and


\(^{722}\) “Nuovi papiri magici in copto, greco e aramaico”, pp.45-46.


\(^{724}\) 593, a codex: 599 + 594 + 603 + 596.
protective rituals, but there are, in addition, rituals intended to curse, induce erotic desire and cause
dream revelations.

2.3.2.9 The British Museum Portfolio

The next archive, the “British Museum Portfolio”\(^{725}\) dates from c.600 CE, and consists of four texts on
seven sheets of papyrus,\(^ {726}\) apparently written by an individual named Severus son of Ioanna. Again,
the contents are quite diverse, an invocation for a good singing voice,\(^ {727}\) another for good fishing,\(^ {728}\) an
invocation and instructions for amulet making,\(^ {729}\) and another for exorcism.\(^ {730}\) From this point on, we
may note that while the praxis and iconography of Coptic magical texts retain clear links to older
practice, the mytho-/theological background has become almost entirely Christianised, with
references to both orthodox and gnostic figures largely replacing Egyptian and Greek deities.

2.3.2.10 The London Hay Collection

Somewhat later (VI-VII CE) is the London Hay Collection, consisting of 5 sheets\(^ {731}\) written on paper,
papyrus and leather. Two of these\(^ {732}\) are written in the same hand. The longest text, the ‘London Hay
Cookbook’, consists of a series of invocations followed by brief rituals to accompany these for various
purposes, including healing, favour, separation, erotic compulsion and various other curses and ways
of controlling others; the remaining texts are concerned with erotic compulsion, good business, and
healing rituals.


\(^ {726}\) London Oriental Manuscript 6794: 6795; 6796 [2], [3], [1]; 6796 [4].

\(^ {727}\) London Oriental 6794.

\(^ {728}\) London Oriental 6795.

\(^ {729}\) London Oriental 6796 [2], [3], [1].

\(^ {730}\) London Oriental 6796 [4].

\(^ {731}\) London Hay 10122, 10376, 10391, 10414, 10434.

\(^ {732}\) London Hay 10376 and 10414.
2.3.2.11 The Berlin Library

One of the most interesting Coptic collections is the Berlin Library, a group purchased by Dr. Reinhardt for the Berlin Museum, and identified as an archive by Erman. They are dated to the seventh or eighth centuries CE, and their probable origin in the Fayum is indicated by the dialectal influences on the generally Sahidic texts. Their contents attest a diverse practice – alongside historiolaë mentioning Christian figures can be found texts mentioning Horus and Isis, and even a ritual of erotic compulsion invoking the Christian devil.

The archive consists of 21 manuscripts, most written on papyrus, but a few on parchment. With one exception each manuscript contain only one recipe, and alongside the formularies, seven of the shorter documents seem to be applied texts, perhaps amulets. These contain images and kharaktēres alongside recognisable Coptic words.

In terms of interests, the majority of the texts are concerned with healing, with smaller numbers consisting of rituals of erotic compulsion and curses. One text gives an invocation for a good singing voice, and a further two contain formulae of unclear function. Alongside these magical texts, there are two lists of martyrs, as well as an alchemical text, giving a list of recipes for producing

---

734 P.Berlin 8313.
735 P.Berlin 8320.
739 P.Berlin 8313.
740 Berlin 8322, P.Berlin 8326.
744 P.Berlin 8321, P.Berlin 8327.
745 P. Berlin 8318.
746 P.Berlin 8322, P.Berlin 8326.
747 P.Berlin 8317, P.Berlin 8332.
dyes. This interest in alchemy aligns it with the Theban Library, the only other archive to contain such tinctorial recipes.

2.3.2.12 The Heidelberg Library

The last archive to be mentioned, the “Heidelberg Library”, probably dates from late tenth to early eleventh century CE, with the texts varying in date within this period. It consists of nine texts, three codices and six sheets, written on parchment, paper and rag paper; dialectal features may suggest a Fayumic origin for these texts. All three of the codices contain relatively long narrative invocations; the first (P.Heid.Kopt.684) is a ritual of erotic compulsion, told through the story of St. Cyprian; the

---

747 P.Berlin 826. An edition of this text is being prepared by Tonio Sebastien Richter of Leipzig University.

748 The first to identify these texts as a group was Friedrich Bilabel, who noted that they were almost all purchased together by Schmidt in 1930; those which were not part of this initial group, P.Heid.Kopt. 685 & 686, were identified by him as being written in the same hand as P.Heid.Kopt.682; Friedrich Bilabel, Adolf Grohmann, and Goerg Graf, Griechische, koptische und arabische Texte zur Religion und religiösen Literatur in Ägyptens Spätzeit, Veröffentlichungen aus den badischen Papyrus-Sammlungen (Heidelberg: Verlag der Universitätsbibliothek, 1934), p.392. See also Marvin Meyer, The magical book of Mary and the angels (P. Heid. Inv. Kopt. 685); text, translation, and commentary (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter Heidelberg GmbH, 1996), pp.1-3.

749 These are:
- P.Heid.Kopt.685, the Magical Book of Mary and the Angels, published in Meyer, The magical book of Mary and the angels. This text is written as a palimpsest over an older Coptic lectionary, for which see Hans Quecke, "Palimpsestfragmente eines koptischen Lektionars (P. Heid. Kopt. 685)," Le Muséon 85, no. 1-2 (1972).
- P.Heid.Kopt.686, the Praise of Michael the Archangel, published in Angelicus M. Kropp, Der Lobpreis des Erzengels Michael (vormals P. Heidelberg Inv. Nr. 1686) (Brussels: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1966); Meyer and Smith, Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power. no.135 pp.332-341. This text is a palimpsest, written over a lectionary.

750 These are:
second *Book of Mary and the Angels* (P.Heid.Kopt.685) is generally concerned with healing, exorcism and protection, while the third, the *Praise of Michael the Archangel*, contains an eclectic group of rituals, several involving healing, the others for a wide range of purposes, including regulating relationships between couples, removing curses from cattle, protection from bandits, and so on. Of the sheets, three (P.Heid. Kopt 678, 679, 680, 681, 682 & 683) contain curses of various kinds, while one (P.Heid.Kopt.683) contains a ritual of erotic compulsion. All are decorated with elaborate geometric and figurative designs intended to be copied onto the applied texts modelled on them. Like the British Museum Portfolio, one of the texts (P.Heid.Kopt.682) contains the name of its scribe, Iohannes the deacon, and even more interestingly, the date of its writing.

2.3.2.13 Summary of Magical Archives

While we have seen that the Theban Magical Library is outstanding in the length of its texts, it is not so unusual in terms of their number. At ten papyri, it is smaller than the Berlin Library (21), the Ramesseum Papyri (26), and the Archive of Hor (c.48), but roughly the same size as the Coptic Wizard’s Horde (12) and the Heidelberg Library (9). Similarly, its diversity in script and language (hieratic, Demotic, Coptic, Greek) is paralleled in the Ramesseum (hieroglyphic, hieratic), Hor (Greek, Demotic), Kellis (Greek, Coptic) and Multilingual (Greek, Coptic, Aramaic) collections. Unlike the Heidelberg and British Museum archives, the Theban Magical Library does not contain the names of any of its owners or scribes. Each of the collections display diversity of interest, and sometimes include literary, documentary, or applied magical texts alongside their formularies; although the particular interests of the Theban Library, chemical recipes and rituals of apparition, are not matched exactly by any other archive, this is hardly surprising if we understand an archive not as a haphazard sample of the text types available in its time, but a reflection of the interests and specialist practices of its collector(s). Having said this, four (The Archive of Hor, the Hermonthis Archive, the Fayum Archive and the London Hay Collection) do contain rituals of apparition comparable to those in the Theban

---

751 L48. Bilabel read the author’s name as ΠΔΙ ΙΩ ‘Pdi Io’, which Iain Gardner has recently recognised as the abbreviated form of ΠΔΙ(ΔΧΟΡΟΣ) ΙΩ(ΩΑΜΗΗΙΟΣ); see the forthcoming publication “Relations of Image, Text and Design Elements in Selected Amulets and Spells of the Heidelberg Papyri Collection,” in *Methodological Reflexions on the Relationship between Magical Texts and Images*, ed. Sarah Kiyanrad (Berlin: De Gruyther, Forthcoming).

752 Paope 21, 684 (=October 18, 967 CE); Meyer and Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*, p.179.
Library, and the Berlin Library contains a fascinating parallel instance of concurrent interests in magic and alchemy. In conclusion, it is worth noting that the Ramesseum Papyri, the belongings of a lector priest found in a box in a tomb in Thebes, are an attested instance of the exact model postulated by most scholars for the Library, and its story has doubtless influenced, consciously or unconsciously, this reconstruction of its creation and discovery.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archive Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of papyri</th>
<th>No. of formularies</th>
<th>Other text types</th>
<th>Scripts/Languages</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ramesseum Papyri</td>
<td>c.XVII BCE</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Accounts (2), letters (1), cultic ritual (2), literary (4), hymnic (1), onomasticon (1), architectural drawing (1), embalment diary (1)</td>
<td>hieratic, linear hieroglyphs</td>
<td>Possibly part of assemblage including figurines, reeds, wands, offering objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theban Magical Library</td>
<td>III-IV CE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Literary (1), Alchemical (2)</td>
<td>Greek, Demotic with hieratic, Old Coptic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayum Magical Archive</td>
<td>IV CE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Literary (1)</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Literary text (The Book of the Temple) may be unconnected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermonthis Magical Archive</td>
<td>III-V CE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Psalms (1), Accounts (2)</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellis Magical Archive</td>
<td>IV CE</td>
<td>7+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Letter containing formulary (1); Amulets (2); Horoscope (1); Calendar of good and bad days</td>
<td>Greek, Coptic</td>
<td>Numerous associated documentary and theological texts in Coptic, Greek and Syriac; most prominent is a Greek liturgical prayer for health; some texts written on wooden tablets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual Magical Workshop</td>
<td>V-VI CE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amulets (1, 4 fragments)</td>
<td>Greek, Coptic, Aramaic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coptic Wizard’s Horde</td>
<td>IV-VII CE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Amulet (1)</td>
<td>Coptic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Museum Portfolio</td>
<td>c.600 CE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coptic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Hay Collection</td>
<td>VI-VII CE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coptic</td>
<td>Texts written on paper, papyrus and leather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin Library</td>
<td>VII-VIII CE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Applied texts (7), lists of martyrs (2), alchemical recipes (1)</td>
<td>Coptic</td>
<td>Texts written on papyrus and parchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg Library</td>
<td>X-XI CE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coptic</td>
<td>Texts written on parchment, paper and rag paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14: Egyptian Magical Archives XVII BCE-XI CE

753 The Archive of Hor is excluded since magical (revelational) texts represent a minority of the total material (see 2.3.2.2), and the Fayum Temple Library texts are excluded as they do not form a true archive (see 2.3.2.3).
2.3.3 Temple Libraries

Several authors have suggested that the Theban Magical Library represented part of the collection of the library of a traditional Egyptian temple,\(^{754}\) since magical texts – specifically those concerned with execration, healing and protective rituals – are believed to have been the sole preserve of such libraries.\(^{755}\) In order to fully explore this idea it is worth summarising what is known of temple libraries.\(^{756}\) Temples are believed to have possessed attached scriptoria within their known as ‘Houses of Life’ (\(pr\) ‘\(nh\)),\(^{757}\) manned by staff known in Greek either as pterophorai or hierogrammateis (\(s\$ md\$t\-)\(^{758}\) additionally there appear to have been smaller “Houses of Books” (\(pr\) md\$t\-) within the temples themselves.\(^{759}\) In the following discussion I will refer to both of these as “libraries”.

The House of Books in the temple of Horus at Edfu (built 140-124 BCE) contains a catalogue of the books (the “Souls of Ra”, \(b\$w\ Ro\)) contained within it inscribed on the wall; these include a temple-inventory, texts concerning apotropaic, protective and other rituals, temple architecture, temple decoration, astrology. A second list of the 42 Books of Hermes studied by the priests, preserved by Clement of Alexandria,\(^{760}\) shows some correspondence with the Edfu catalogue, listing texts concerned with hymns, the life of the king, astrology, cosmography, geography, construction and provisioning of temples, education and sacrifice, laws, the gods, priestly training, and medicine; Fowden suggests the contents of this section may have been drawn from Chaeremon.\(^{761}\)

\(^{754}\) Ritner, “Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire”, pp. 3345-3346, 3361-3363; The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice.p.206 fn 952); Frankfurter, Religion in Roman Egypt, pp. 214-221, 224-233; following them Wilburn, "Materia Magica", p.40.


\(^{756}\) In general on this question see Alan H. Gardiner, "The House of Life," The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 24, no. 2 (1938).


\(^{758}\) Diodorus (Bibliotheca historica, 1.49.3), quoting Hecataeus, glosses this as the “Healing Place of the Soul” (\(ψυχῆς ἰατρεῖον\)).


\(^{760}\) Stromata 6.4.35-7.

\(^{761}\) Fowden, The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind, p. 58, fn.43.
Two more recent studies of texts from the Tebtunis temple library estimated that the total number of manuscripts excavated from this collection will be around 400, once all the fragments are collated, with 315 separate texts dating from the first century BCE to the third century CE; this would imply the deliberate inclusion of duplicates, some variant, perhaps so that they could be compared and collated. Most of the texts (c.63%) are in Demotic; smaller numbers are in hieratic (c.32%), hieroglyphic (c.4%), and Greek (c.1%). The Greek texts include documentary, literary, medical and astrological material; some of these, however, including the astrological text, show signs of re-use, and thus may not have been kept for their own interest.

Ryholt divides the literary material into cultic (c.50%), non-cultic (c.25%) and narrative texts (c.25%). The ~110 cultic works consist of manuals of priestly knowledge, including The Book of the Temple, a detailed manual describing the running of the ideal temple; the proto-Hermetic Book of Thoth, mentioned above; the cult-topographical Book of the Fayum, the astrological Nut Book, the Manual of the Priesthood of Sekhmet, describing the correct method of choosing sacrificial animals; the Mythological and Priestly Manuals, containing theo-/mythological and cosmo-/geographical encyclopedic accounts respectively. Also included under this heading are ritual works, including not only the daily ritual performed before the main god of the temple, but also more occasional rituals, such as the Opening of the Mouth and a healing ritual; and religious poetry, onomastica. There is some material described as “magical”, containing rituals of protection and purification for the pharaoh,
and in one case for a private person, written in hieratic and hieroglyphs.\textsuperscript{771} The non-cultic material includes 45 divinatory texts, predominantly astrological, with the remainder being dream-books; literary texts, such as the \textit{Insinger Wisdom Text}; alongside medical, mathematical and legal manuals.\textsuperscript{772} Finally, the narrative texts consist of legendary cycles, including the stories of Setna Khaemwase; mythological narratives, and prophecies.\textsuperscript{773} Some of the texts appear to have been common to several temples (at least within the Fayum), while others (such as the \textit{Nut Book} found in Tebtunis) are unique to one library.\textsuperscript{774}

In fictional setting, \textit{Setna II} 5.11-13 describes the “book of magical power” (\textit{mدل n hîk}) being found in the temple library (\textit{pr-mdî}) of Thoth in Hermopolis, which the lector priest Horus Paneshe uses to create amulets to protect the king from the attacks of Kushite sorcerers, and create wax servitors to kidnap and beat the Nubian ruler (5.15-24).

Finally, there is a recollection of the temple library in the Coptic \textit{ⲥⲫⲣⲁⲛϣ}, probably derived from “scribe of the house of life” (\textit{sh.w-pr-\textasciitilde{nh}}), which appears in the Bohairic version of Genesis 41.8, 24 for the Greek \textit{εξηγητής} (“interpreter (of dreams)”);\textsuperscript{775} this would suggest a memory of the scribes of the temple libraries as experts in divination carried into the Christian period.

In conclusion, although there are no accounts of temple libraries which exactly parallel the contents of the Theban Magical Library, there are suggestions that they would not have been entirely alien to such a setting. In its interests in healing, protection and divination, the Library mirrors the texts from known scriptoria, and although there is no direct parallel to its focus on revelatory divination, the basic knowledge of astrology implied in the Theban Library is a further parallel, as is the presence of the \textit{Myth of the Sun’s Eye}, a text whose other copies probably derive from temple libraries. More problematic is the absence of texts relating directly to temple ritual, which would seem to be the core texts of the scriptoria.

\textsuperscript{771} Ibid., p.151.
\textsuperscript{772} Ibid., pp.152-154.
\textsuperscript{773} Ibid., pp.155-157.
\textsuperscript{774} von Lieven, “Religiöse Texte aus der Tempelbibliothek von Tebtynis”, pp. 66-68.
\textsuperscript{775} Battiscombe Gunn, "Interpreters of Dreams in Ancient Egypt", \textit{The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology} 4, no. 4 (1917).
2.3.4 Relationship to other Roman Period texts & artefacts

2.3.4.1 Artefacts of Mediterranean Magic

For good reason, many scholars have observed that the category “magic” is a problematic one to apply to the ancient world, given the nuances it has acquired in a post-Christian, post-Enlightenment Europe. Nonetheless, the Theban Library shows a clear family resemblance to certain other artefacts from its time and place. I will here use the term “magic” to refer to this complex of related artefacts and practices, although it must be understood that this is an etic term, adopted for want of a better label, and that those using these texts may not have understood them as filling the social or conceptual positions that “magic” describes in modern-day and recent Western societies.

The closest artefacts to the Theban Library are the many handbooks already mentioned, which show striking similarities not only in the types of recipes they prescribe – principally intended for healing, divination, cursing, erotic compulsion and so on – but also in their form, with recipes containing similarities not only of grammatical structure, but also of vocabulary, worldview (deities mentioned and so on) and trappings (onomata, vowel-strings and so on). To these theoretical works can be added the numerous applied texts, written, inscribed and drawn on papyrus, metal lamellae and gemstones, which are clearly the outcome of rituals similar to those in the handbooks, intended for healing, protection, cursing, and so on. Alongside these are other artefacts produced in the course of rituals, less common, but with clear connections to the written material. Outside these “core artefacts” are a gradated succession of other items – ancient astrological, alchemical, lapidary, medical, botanical, philosophical and religious texts, among others – which derive from similar milieus, displaying varying degrees of similarity in worldview, content and form. The following sections will not provide a full survey of this material – the bounds of which could not in any case be adequately delineated – but instead note the most striking similarities, differences, and shared content with the magical texts of the Theban Library.
2.3.4.1.1 Other Formularies

There are approximately 95 Greek, and 10 Demotic, magical handbooks which originated in Roman Egypt (I-VI CE) and have survived, been discovered and published. These have already been discussed at various points in this section, but it is worth briefly summarising the ways in which the Theban Library is like and unlike, them. Firstly, most of the handbooks are short, with roughly a third (38.8%) containing only a single recipe, and the majority (72.9%) containing less than 5. By contrast, the shortest of the Theban texts, PGM 2,\(^7\) which contains only two rituals, is damaged, and probably contained more originally; PGM 1, similar in format, contains six. With the exception of these, and PGM 13, which contains only four, very long recipes, all of the remaining five texts contain at least 10 recipes, with PGM 5a containing exactly this number, PDM Suppl. being slightly longer (15), PDM/PGM 12 longer still (29) and PGM 4 (48) and PDM/PGM 14 (98) far longer than all but a few contemporaneous handbooks. Alongside their length, their content is markedly different, with a greater focus on revelatory divination, curses, and dream sending, and proportionally fewer healing rituals (see 2.2.4).

The few papyri which approach the longer handbooks of the Theban Library in length – PGM 3, 7, 36 & 94, PDM/PGM 61, P.Berl 11734 – have, almost without exception, been suggested at various times to belong to the Library. Of these, PGM 3, 7 and PDM/PGM 61 show a similar range of interests to the Theban Library texts, which a marked interest in divination. It was probably these similarities which led Preisendanz, quite sensibly, to propose a connection between these papyri and the Library, but as we have seen (2.1.3) the evidence for this is not strong. Nonetheless, the similarity is notable, and we might ask if the connection between the length of the handbooks and a shift in focus in rituals is purely an artefact of survival, or if, for example, those ritualists who made use of more elaborate written material would have been interested in a different range of practices; as will later be discussed, the use of divination in tandem with other rituals, as a means of gaining access to additional ritual knowledge and authority, may have been of greater importance or interest to more ‘advanced’ ritual practitioners.

\(^7\)PGM 5a, containing only a single ritual, is not counted here, since it forms part of the much larger P.Holm.
Apart from the shared purposes of their prescriptions, the handbooks display important similarities in the forms of the recipes they describe, but these are only very occasionally exact. There is a great deal of similarity in the form of the practices, with shared ritual components found in multiple recipes; those that pertain to the rituals of apparition will be discussed at greater length in section 4. Here we will focus on shared recipes, words, phrases and passages.

Among the most striking aspects of the material I categorise here as “magical” is the shared use of the onomata (see 2.2.2.3.2 and 4.2.2.3). While many of these are found in only a few, or even a single, recipe, others occur in multiple texts. One of the most striking of these is the Μασκέλλι Μασκέλλω formula attested in both Greek and Demotic versions within the Theban Library, as well as in numerous formularies and applied texts in Greek, Greek-transcribed traditional Egyptian, and Coptic texts on papyrus and lead, dating from the second to the eighth CE and originating from Egypt, Palestine and modern Tunisia; its most prominent element, Maskelli, also appears as the name of an aeon in the Pistis Sophia.

Leaving aside the onomata, the most striking parallels between papyri within and outside the Theban Magical Library are the hymns reconstructed by Heitsch and Preisendanz. Those relevant here are Hymn to Helios II – found in the Theban papyri PGM 1 & 4, and in the non-Theban PGM 8 – and the Hymn to Hermes – found in the Theban papyrus PGM 5 as well as the non-Theban PGM 7 & 17b. There are also a few other, non-metrical, invocations which appear in several Theban and non-Theban papyri.

---

780 P BM 10808 col.2 ll.6-8.
781 P. Berlin 8320 l.8.
782 365-3-4.
783 Preisendanz and Henrichs, Papyri Graecae Magicae. volume 2 pp.237-266.
784 PGM 4.436-461, 1957-1989 (Theban Library, IV CE); PGM 1.74-81 (Theban Library, III CE); PGM 8.315-23; 41/42 (Hermontthis, IV-V CE).
785 PGM 5.400-420 (Theban Library, IV CE); PGM 7.658-680 (Hermontthis, III CE); PGM 17b (Hermopolis, III CE).
sources: notably an invocation to the Agathos Daimon (PGM 12 and PGM 21) and an invocation to
the sun-god (PGM 4 and PGM 36).

With these exceptions, there are no examples of substantial duplicated content between the Theban
and non-Theban handbooks, despite the fact that their contents shows clear evidence of long textual
histories (see 2.2.5.2). This should be a reminder to us that a great deal, and almost certainly the
majority, of evidence of ancient magical practice has been lost, either because it was never written
down, or because its written form was subsequently lost or destroyed. What we have is a fragmentary
record of a field of practice which displays some recurrent features, but a still greater degree of
diversity.

2.3.4.1.2 Evidence for Applied Rituals

Alongside the theoretical handbooks which provide evidence for the study and dissemination of
practices, there are several pieces of evidence for applied rituals, the various amulets, curse and erotic
compulsion texts, and so on preserved on papyrus, metal leaves and inscribed gems.

As with the formularies, there are many general similarities between these and the texts of the Theban
Library - a tendency to mention the same deities, to use the same or similar onomata, kharaktēres and
imagery. There are, however, few direct parallels between the two bodies of evidence. Here I will
summarise the few which have been noted by previous authors.

PGM 4.296-434 is a ritual of erotic compulsion described as “a wonderful erotic binding”
(Φιλτροκατάδεσμος θαυμαστός); it consists of a ritual involving forming two wax or clay figures, one
male, one female, with the male in the form of Ares holding a sword over the right side of the woman's
neck, while the female is bound, and has several onomata written across her body. In the course of the

---

786 PGM 12.239-244, 252-257, 765-799 (Thebes III CE); PGM 21.1-29 (Ptolemais Euergetis, II-III CE).
787 PGM 4.1642-1679 (Theban Library, IV CE); PGM 36.1-26 (Fayum, IV CE).
788 This similarity was perhaps first noticed by Reuven, Lettres à M. Letronne. 1st Letter, pp.23-24; for similarities to the
magical gems see also Campbell Bonner, Studies in magical amulets: chiefly Graeco-Egyptian (University of Michigan Press,
1950).p.8; Smith, "Relations between magical papyri and magical gems", pp.132, 134-35; Simon Michel, "(Re)Interpreting
789 See the comments in Gordon, "Shaping the text: Innovation and authority in Graeco-Egyptian Malign Magic", pp.70-71.
ritual, the female body is then pierced with thirteen copper needles, before being bound to an inscribed lead tablet with thread, and deposited with flowers by the grave of someone who has died violently (βίαιος) or before their time (ἀωρος) at sunset. At each stage an elaborate formula is to be recited.

There are a number of finds matching this description to varying degrees. The first is a deposition held in the Louvre (Louvre E 27145), found by looters in Antinoopolis, consisting of a bound female figure inside a clay jar pierced with thirteen nails and accompanied by a piece of inscribed lead foil. There are clear differences: the lack of an Ares figure, absence of onomata on the figure’s body, and the variant text on the lamella; finally there is no clay jar mentioned in the version from the Library. Somewhat closer are two statuettes of Ares and a kneeling woman, one of terracotta and one of wax; the wax one at least is pierced by needles, apparently matching the placement in the Louvre example. In addition, there are several texts which reproduce the contents of the lamella, albeit with some degree of variation in each instance. Despite their differences, these finds are suggestive of the environment within which they existed, in which rituals might be widely reproduced, while varying in their details on the level of performance.

790 Brashear (Brashear, "An Introduction and Survey", p.3417) notes that the nails are placed slightly differently; although Daniel and Maltomini (Daniel and Maltomini, Supplementum Magicum vol.1 p.179) mention 13 nails, there only appear to be 12 on images of the figurine. 8 of these conform closely to the plan in PGM 4. While the formulary prescribes two in the area below the breastbone (ὑποχόνδριον, l.325), the figurine has only one, and where it prescribes one in the hands the figurine has one between the two hands, in the lower back. Finally, the formulary prescribes two in τὰς φύσεις (l.326). While O’Neil (Betz, Greek Magical Papyri, p. 44) translates this as “pudenda”, the figurine has one in its vagina and one in its anus. However, the plural, as well as the later references to both vaginal (ll.351-352) and anal (l.352) intercourse, imply to me that the figurine agrees with the intention of the formulary; the word usually appears in the singular when referring to the female genitalia (for example in Artemidorus, Oneirocriticon 5.63, PGM 36.82, 324; Horapollo, Hieroglyphica 1.11).

791 T.Cairo Mus. JdE 48217 (=SM 46; Hawara, II-III CE); SB 7452; T.Köln 1, 2, 3 (=SM 49-51; Oxyrhynchus, II-IV CE); T.Mich.inv.6925 (=SM 48; II-III CE). For discussions of these parallels see Dierk Wortmann, "Neue magische Texte," Bonner Jahrbücher des Rheinischen Landesmuseums in Bonn 168(1968); Daniel and Maltomini, Supplementum Magicum, vol.1 pp.174-213.

Of the approximately 5000 amuletic gems which exist in modern collections; with estimated dates tending to between the first and sixth centuries CE, they tend to overlap both in date and geographic range with the magical papyri. Despite the fact that several texts in the Theban Library and other formularies describe the production of such gems, there are relatively few surviving gems which directly parallel descriptions found in handbooks. The few which do display some close similarity will be discussed below.

The *Paredric Rite of Pnouthios* (PGM 1.143-148) describes a lion-faced Helioros holding a whip and celestial globe, surrounded by an ouroboros, with onomata on the hidden exergue. While the iconographic elements are well known from published gems, none seem to match the description exactly. One good-business ritual PGM 4 (ll.3125-3171) describes the creation of a wax statue of a mummiform figure holding a sceptre, with three heads, one of a falcon, the second of a baboon and the third of an ibis. Michel points out that this perfectly describes a gem in the British Museum (OA.9680), down to the onomata on the back; nonetheless this is still not an exact match, since the media used – a wax statue three hands high in one case, and a 22mm-tall haematite gem – are quite different.

The most striking parallel is between a lost gem from Syria and the *Sword of Dardanos* (PGM 4.1716-1870). The recipe is for a ritual of attraction, in which a gem is inscribed with an image of Aphrodite riding Psyche, with Eros below standing on the vault of heaven and burning Psyche with a burning torch. This image is found nearly exactly replicated on CB-d 1555, down to the onoma next to Aphrodite; the reverse, as prescribed, has an image of Eros and Psyche embracing. There is a very

793 Smith, "Relations between magical papyri and magical gems", p. 131.
796 For example PGM 22a.11-14; PGM 62.40-43.
797 See the comments in Bonner, *Studies in magical amulets: chiefly Graeco-Egyptian*, pp.20-22; Smith, "Relations between magical papyri and magical gems", pp. 132-133.
799 Michel, "(Re)Interpreting Magical Gems", p. 144.
800 CBd-1555, known from a seal impression.
minor deviation in the lack of letters written on the reverse, but this does little to reduce the impressive correspondence displayed by the gem.\textsuperscript{801}

With these significant exceptions, the evidence for specific connections between surviving applied magical artefacts and the texts of the Theban Library is as slim as that for handbooks. This paucity of parallels led Smith to suggest that the gems represented Palestinian, Syrian, and Anatolian practice, whereas the papyri represented Egyptian,\textsuperscript{802} but given the patchiness of our evidence this seems premature; as we have seen, the Sword of Dardanos from PGM 4 corresponds most closely to a Syrian gem. Once again then, we must remember that the recipes chosen for inclusion in the Theban Library are not an exhaustive or even representative sample, but a particularistic selection from a much broader range of practices, transmitted in both oral and written form.

2.3.4.2 Other textual affinities

Once we move beyond the core evidence for ancient Mediterranean magical practice – the formularies and applied artefacts, we move into a nebulous series of texts with clear but less easily defined affinities. Even the most generous definition of “magic” would be strained beyond usefulness to include all of this material; here I will simply introduce the most important evidence, which will recur in the later discussions of the rituals of the Theban Library.

As with the case with the alchemical and astrological material (see 2.2.5.3), the magical texts of the Theban Library have parallels in the medieval manuscript tradition. Most relevant here is the Cyranides (c.III CE),\textsuperscript{803} a series of six surviving books describing the qualities of stones, plants and animals, and how these may be manipulated for healing, erotic, curse, divinatory purposes. This work is only one of a much larger body of works, which probably originated in Egypt in the later Ptolemaic period, attributed to authors from Democritus to Hermes Trismegistos,\textsuperscript{804} these include the works on

\textsuperscript{801} For a discussion of this gem see P. René Mouterde, Le Glaive de Dardanos. Objets et inscriptions magiques de Syrie (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1930), pp.53-64.
\textsuperscript{802} Smith, “Relations between magical papyri and magical gems”, p.133.
\textsuperscript{803} Festugière, La Révélation d’Hermès Trismégiste, vol. 1, pp.201-216.
\textsuperscript{804} For a brief discussion of this tradition, see Robert Halleux and Jacques Schamp, Les Lapidaires Grecs (Paris, 1985), pp.xxii-xxviii
natural powers, animals and plants attributed to Bolos of Mendes, and the Pseudo-Plutarchian *De Fluviis*. While these reveal a more limited scope – almost without exception the production of amulets – than the elaborate rituals of the magical papyri, there are clear linguistic, cosmological and intellectual similarities between the two bodies of material.

From roughly the same period as the Theban Library, but different milieus, are the bodies of texts associated with Chaldaean Theurgy and Neoplatonism. In the former category are the *Chaldaean Oracles*, a text concerned with both the theoretical and practical sides of rituals of apparition, anagogic and purification, attributed to Julian the Chaldaean and his son, Julian the Theurgist, the latter of whom may have received the *Oracles* through inspired mediumship under the supervision of his father.\(^{805}\) This work survives only in fragments preserved in the writings of later philosophers of the school now known as "Neoplatonic",\(^{806}\) many of whom regarded it as an authoritative text. Among these writers the most important is Iamblichus, whose work *De Mysteriis*, which provides an apologetic and theoretical framework for theurgy, was recognised as early as Reuvens as important for the study of the Theban texts.\(^{807}\) The exact nature of the relationship, however, is controversial; Ritner, based on the comments of Iamblichus and his teacher Porphyry, assumes that Neoplatonic Theurgy relied to some extent on texts similar to those of the Theban Library,\(^{808}\) while Pachoumi, in view of the relative dates of the papyri and Neo-Platonists, as well as certain verbal parallels with the magical papyri, takes "a hypothetical Neoplatonist influence" as a "working hypothesis."\(^{809}\) There are certainly

---


806 The philosophers now classed as part of this movement would, of course, have seen themselves simply as Platonists; see Michael Frede, "Numenius," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, ed. W. Haase (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987), pp.1040-1041, who would like to disregard the distinctions between the different phases of Platonism as a "rather unfortunate trend in the historiography of ancient Platonism" (*etwas unglücklichen Verlauf der Historiographie des antiken Platonismus*; p.1040); compare Pierluigi Donini, "Medioplatonismo e filosofi medioplatonici. Una raccolta di studi," in *Commentary and Tradition. Aristotelianism, Platonism, and Post-Hellenistic Philosophy*, ed. Mauro Bonazzi (De Gruyter: 2010), pp.286-287; who accepts the divisions as a "hitoriographical constructions" (*costruzioni storiografiche*) but reaffirms their value for historians.


808 Ritner, "Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire." p.3371.

notable differences between the two bodies of material: the Theurgic-Neoplatonic texts tend to contain more information about the worldview within which the practices were understood, but this should probably be understood more as a function of different genres (philosophical/theological treatises versus working texts) than necessarily representing a radical difference on the part of their users; we may also observe that the *Chaldaean Oracles* contain a different range of deities, with an absence of the Egyptian influences present in the papyri, and a more clearly-defined, Platonic hierarchy of divine being.

In a slightly different sphere, several texts from the first few centuries CE describe the activities of individuals – who we can broadly characterise as “magicians” – which seem to overlap considerably with the interests implied in the Theban Library. These texts include historical, liturgical, hagiographical and theological works in Greek, Coptic and Latin, and are often associated with Christian writers, in particular the group now known as the “Church Fathers”. One text of particular interest here is Book 4 of the *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* by Hippolytus of Rome (see 3.2.3.2), which describes how μάγοι perform various rituals of apparition, read sealed letters, cause thunder and so on by the use of the natural properties of objects rather than the intervention of superhuman beings; these tricks, he says, are in turn imitated by heresiarchs. While it is very difficult to think that he is not describing individuals carrying out rituals very similar to those of the Theban Library, we must note a crucial distinction between these two bodies of evidence, which we may characterise as “insider” (the magical papyri, theurgic texts and so on) and “outsider” (the writings of non-practitioners). An analogy from the highly influential study of the Azande of the Nilotic-Sudan of the 1920s by Evans-Pritchard may be useful here.

Evans-Pritchard uses the English terms “magic” and “witchcraft” to translate the emic Zande terms ngua and mangu respectively. The former refers to ritual-technical knowledge practiced by “magicians” (boro/ira ngua) in socially-sanctioned fraternities, while the latter refers to a “psychic emanation” which witches (boro/ira mangu) can, consciously or unconsciously, produce to harm

---

810 In particular chapters 28-42.
Witchcraft was usually diagnosed through oracles, which would result simply in a request that the witch undo their curse, rather than the sort of lethal trials associated with analogous accusations in medieval Europe; nonetheless, Evans-Pritchard's research led him to believe that witchcraft was a phenomenon which seemed to exist entirely in accusations than in actual practice: accused individuals would go through the motions of lifting curses, all the while denying, and apparently innocent of, their status of witches, and believing the oracle had made a false diagnosis.\textsuperscript{813} The ritual-technical practices of magic were sometimes used to cause harm, but this was conceptually a completely different phenomenon, socially sanctioned as a means to take violent vengeance on witches or users of bad-magic (\textit{gbgbere/gbigbita/kitikiti ngua}),\textsuperscript{814} although the legitimacy of particular instances of these techniques may be contested.\textsuperscript{815}

I describe these practices not because they provide a precise analogy to the situation in Roman Egypt, or because they represent something closer to a primordial pattern from which “more advanced” practices emerge, but simply because they illustrate the division between what individuals in a particular society believe others do, and what other individuals in that society actually do. There is no reason to assume either that non-practitioners writing about rituals resembling those in the magical papyri are describing them either impartially or accurately, nor that accusations of magic are always grounded in objective facts. To take two examples, the philosopher Plotinus suffered from spasms,\textsuperscript{816} and the rhetor Libanius from headaches,\textsuperscript{817} which they each interpreted as the effects of curses; but very little evidence is offered in the accounts that any curse-ritual took place. The curse of Olympius against Plotinus, a rival philosopher, is recounted by Plotinus' own student, Porphyry, and could be understood as easily as the gossip arising between rival schools as from any confession by the accused sorcerer. The curse against Libanius was confirmed by the discovery of a chameleon in his classroom, dead many months and twisted into an unnatural position. Libanius and his students associated it

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{812} Ibid.p.9.
  \item \textsuperscript{813} Ibid, pp.94-96, 118-133.
  \item \textsuperscript{814} Ibid, pp.388-389.
  \item \textsuperscript{815} Ibid, pp.406-409.
  \item \textsuperscript{816} Porphyry, \textit{Vita Plotini} 10.1-15.
  \item \textsuperscript{817} Libanius, \textit{Orationes} 1.243-50.
\end{itemize}
with a hostile ritual, but in the absence of other paraphenalia we might easily wonder if the creature had not simply died of its own accord and shrivelled over time.

This distinction between *magic-as-socially-described-idea*, the sense in which outsiders use the various terms translated as “magic,” and *magic-as-genre-of-text/praxis*, the way in which ‘magic’ is used here to refer to the practices of the magical papyri, is an important one, and they should not be confused. The understanding outsiders have of magical rituals would derive not solely from first-hand experience, but also from the general socially prescribed ideas about how magic and its users operate.

---


In Coptic the loanwords *ⲙⲁⲅⲉⲓⲁ* and *ⲫⲁⲣⲙⲁⲕⲉⲓⲁ* are used alongside the native term *ⲧⲓⲕ*; for the equivalence of these terms see Walter E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Clarendon Press, 1939).p.661a; Ritner, *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*, pp.14-15. "The Religious, Social, and Legal Parameters of Traditional Egyptian Magic", pp.48-50. The latter term had far less negative associations in the Pharaonic period (ME Hk# / D Hq) referring to the divine power animating the cosmos and drawn upon by gods and men alike, as well as the deity who was the embodiment of this force; for a discussion see Herman te Velde, "The God Heka in Egyptian Theology," *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Gezelschap 'Ex Oriente Lux' 21* (1970).

The disjuncture between in-group and out-group terms is noticeable when we look for these terms in magical artefacts; *γοητεία* and its cognates do not seem to appear in any of the texts of the Theban Library, or the PGM and SM corpora. I have only been able to find *μαγεία* and its cognates in nine instances in the Theban Library, but only in five recipes in two papyri (PGM 1 & 4), of which four recipes can be characterised as more self-consciously 'literary' than most other texts, while the final recipe contains them in a metrical hymn. Three other texts in the corpora contain some reference to *μαγεία*: two handbooks (PGM 63 & 126), and one healing amulet (PGM 90). *Φαρμακεία*, the most neutral of the three cognate sets, is similarly frequent, but somewhat more widespread, appearing once each in three Theban texts (PGM 4, 5, 13) and nine times in the rest of the corpora (PGM 7, 8, 24b, 34, & 36). However, these terms are less common than the cognates of *μυστήριον* (18 times in the Theban Library; 3 more in the PGM) or the single word *τελετή* (21 times in the Theban Library; 2 more in PGM 7). It is therefore unclear that the group of Greek terms translated as ‘magic’ are the best way of describing the self-understanding of the owner(s) of magical texts, rather than, say, ‘ritual’ or ‘mystery-religion’.

The problem is even more acute in Coptic magical texts, where *ϩⲓⲕ*, *ⲣⲙⲱⲣⲕⲟⲓⲉ* and *ⲧⲓⲕ* designate (without apparent exception) negative forces which their rituals are intended to counteract; see for example P. Heid. Inv. Kopt.685 4.3 & 4.4; Heid. Inv. Kopt.686 Il.137, 140, 141, 270; P.Macq.1.1 II.14.18-24; compare the comments of Meyer, *The magical book of Mary and the angels*, p.62.

The Demotic term *ⲧⲓⲕ* appears three times in the Theban Library, twice as part of the epiteths of deities (PDM 14.257 & Suppl.166), once as part of an invocation (PDM 14.1026).
Thus these texts have to be used with care; correspondences between outsider and insider magic may derive not only from immediate observation, but also from the fact that insider texts would draw upon the same mass of socially-given knowledge about superhuman forces and beings as the outsiders.

But the relationship between insider and outsider documents may be still more complex than this; Frankfurter argues that the magical papyri “lie between the world of insider and that of the outsider”, that their texts draw upon outsider, and specifically Greek, ideas about Egyptian practices to enhance their value in the eyes of ritualists and clients in a process he describes as “stereotype appropriation”. The extent to which this is applicable must vary between recipes, but some, such as Pnouthios’ Paredric (PGM 1.42-195), do seem to partake of outsider views of magic to a greater extent than others.

---

820 Religion in Roman Egypt, pp.224-237; “The Consequences of Hellenism in Late Antique Egypt”, pp.175-183. Dieleman would limit this phenomenon to the Greek texts; Dieleman, Priests, tongues, and rites, pp.280-284.
Alongside texts which ostensibly describe real magicians are “fictional” texts dealing with magic, which draw once again on the same cultural wellsprings without making serious claims to truthfulness.821 In Greek these include Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, with Zatchlas, an Egyptian priest who carries out a necromantic ritual;822 Lucian's *Philopseudes*, which tells the story of the Egyptian priest-magician Pancrates,823 whose name is reminiscent of the Pakhrates of PGM 4; and Heliodorus *Aethiopica*, with its Kalasiris, the Egyptian priest who foretells the future using the stars, and knows that his kind are often mistaken for vendors of love-potions.824 Demotic too contains a rich body of literature concerned with priest-magicians; best known are *Setna I & II*,825 but to this can be added the story of *Petese son of Petetum*826 and the *Life of Imhotep*,827 as well as several more fragmentary works.

As with the “non-fictional” literary representations of magic, these works must be used with some caution; to take one motif as an example, Egyptian tales from the Middle Kingdom through to the Roman period often describe a magician bringing to life a being made from wax, which is capable of moving of its own accord, with the *Petese* story describing a waxen cat and falcon chasing one another through the streets of Heliopolis.828 Yet whenever wax images appear in applied magical texts, they are used to create static images which are empowered through ensoulment to affect the world in a more

---


822 Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 2.28.

823 Lucian, *Philopseudes* 33-34.


827 P.Carlsberg 85, described in "The Life of Imhotep (P. Carlsberg 85)," in *Actes du IXe congrès international des etudes demotiques*, ed. Ghislaine Widmer and Didier Devauchelle (Cairo: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 2009).

828 Examples include *King Cheops and the Magicians* 2.21-3.14, 5.8-10; *Petese A+B* 3.14-30; *P.Petese Saqq*. 1-3; *Setna I* 3.27-29; *Setna II* 4.16; *Alexander Romance* 1, 10. Animated magical images also appear in the *Life of Imhotep* (ibid.p.309).
indirect manner. Thus the fictional texts draw upon similar mechanisms, but describe outcomes which even the practitioners of the rituals would consider fantastical, for their own narrative purposes.

Moving away from texts describing magical practices, we will finally note some of the most important textual relationships between the texts of the Theban Library and literary and religious works from various cultural traditions. The range of cultural influences which has been claimed for the magical papyri on the whole is vast: Brashear, for example, notes claims of Mithraic, Persian, Babylonian, Latin/Roman and Buddhist elements. Here we will focus on Pharaonic Egyptian, Homeric, and Judaeo-Christian.

Whether or not we hypothesise a direct line of development from Pharaonic cultic practices to Roman magical practices, it is clear that older Egyptian ritual texts offer a fertile source of information about the cultural background which produced the texts of the Theban Magical Library. The most prolific genre of ritual texts from pre-Roman Egypt is that of the funerary text, the most well-known examples of which are the corpora known to modern scholars as the Pyramid Texts (attested from c. 2350 BCE onwards), the Coffin Texts (from c.XXII BCE) and the Book of the Dead (from c.XVI CE). These contain texts consisting of formulae, and occasionally associated praxis, for use by deceased individuals, to allow them to overcome the dangers of the afterlife through revivification, transfiguration, apotropaic rites, secret passwords, and so on, as well as hymnic and informational texts, including theological, topographical and cosmological content. While these texts, largely intended to be used by the dead, clearly originate in a different sphere than the Theban Library, there is some evidence that some of them may have been derived from rituals carried out by the living, and several authors, most

---

829 For example (in the Theban Library) in PGM 4.296-466, where wax images of Ares and Aphrodite are part of a ritual of erotic compulsion; PGM 4.1872-1927, where a dog is created which attracts a woman and hisses if she is not coming; PGM 4.2373-2440, where a wax image of Thoth-Hermes attracts wealth; PGM 4.2943-2966, where a dog figurine is part of a ritual of erotic compulsion; PGM 4.3125-3171, where a figurine of the agathodaimon brings good business; PGM 13.308-318, in which a wax hippopotamus is used to send a dream; PDM 14.309-334, in which a wax ape is used in a favour-ritual. In older rituals red wax is often used to make apotropaic figures of hostile gods and humans which are then destroyed; see Ritner, The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice, pp.140-163.


prominently Gee and Ritner, have pointed to similarities between the structure, praxis and content of the funerary texts and magical papyri. In addition to the funerary texts, less well known documents of Egyptian cult and cosmology have been compared to texts from the Theban Library; these include the *Tebtunis Cosmology*, a text from second century CE Tebtunis, details of which are echoed in PGM 12 & 13; the *Neith Cosmogony* from the temple of Esna, which contains echoes of the cosmopoia of *Eighth Book of Moses*; and the Invocation to the All-Lord in PGM 13, whose structure Dieleman compares to several Egyptian hymns, in particular the Augustan P.Rhind I.

While the Theban Library contains nothing like the Homeric sortition oracle, the Homeromanteion, of PGM 7.1-148, several lines from the *Iliad* appear in PGM 4, where they are to be written on objects to create empowered amulets. The idea that Homeric texts contained some kind of inherent power should not surprise us; the attribution of theological authority to these works was an enduring (though not the only) characteristic of engagement with Homer from as early as the sixth century BCE, and most individuals literate in Greek would have been familiar with these works as a key part of the

---


833 The text describes the god Shai emerging as the sun god from an egg fertilised by the Ogdoad in the form of four winds; this is echoed in PGM 12.238 & PGM 13.761 where Agathodaimon, the *interpretatio graeca* of Shai, is said to have come forth from four winds. Mark Smith suggests a second parallel to Shai's earlier creative work in the primaeval ocean in PGM 4.1642-1643, where Agathodaimon is said to procreate in the ocean; Mark Smith, "A New Egyptian Cosmology," in *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Egyptologists*, ed. C. Eyre (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1998), p.1079.

834 The Esna cosmogony describes seven words coming forth from the mouth of the goddess Neith, which become seven divine beings; Sauneron compares this to the seven deities created by the seven laughs of the creator god in PGM 13.161-206, 471-564; Serge Sauneron, "La légende des sept propos de Méthyer au temple d’Esna," *Bulletin de la Société française d’Egyptologie* 32 (1961).

835 Dieleman, *Priests, tongues, and rites*, pp.149-170.

836 Other magical and divinatory papyri containing portions of Homer include PGM 22a.1-17 (Hermopolis, IV-V CE), containing healing rituals; SM 7 (II-III CE), containing a homeromanteion; P.Oxy.LVI.3831 (III-IV CE), another homeromanteion. For a discussion of the homeric sortition oracles see Franco Maltomini, "P.Lond. 121 (= PGM VII), 1-221: Homeromanteion," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 106 (1995).

837 PGM 4.469-470=Iliad 10.193; 471=Iliad 10.564; 472=Iliad 10.531; 473=Iliad 10.572; 474=Iliad 5.385; 822=Iliad 10.564; 823=Iliad 10.521; 824=Iliad 10.572; 825=Iliad 8.424; 830=Iliad 5.385; 832=Iliad 6.424; 833=Iliad 10.193; 2146=Iliad 10.564; 2147=Iliad 10.521; 2148=Iliad 10.572.

curriculum at all levels. It is perhaps worth remarking that all of the fragments are drawn from the most heavily used portion – the first ten books – of the more popular of the two epics, the *Iliad.*

The last category of related material to be considered here are those which are part of the continuum of Judaeo-Christian texts. Like many of the other texts of the magical papyri, the Theban Library contains numerous allusions to Biblical verses. These references are more often to Jewish texts (not only canonical, but deuterocanonical and apocryphal) – the plagues of Egypt and the journeys of Israel in the desert, for example – than to the New Testament, although there are occasional references to Jesus, and Leonas suggests that the language at times diverges from that of the Septuagint in a manner that is more suggestive of Patristic authors. One of the most prominently Jewish/Christian coloured passages, the *Exorcism of Pibekhis,* has been described by as the product of a “heathen compiler”, who nonetheless drew upon a pre-existing Jewish liturgical exorcism, in the process adding a mention of Jesus and an instance of the divine name which would be alien to a Jewish setting. Alongside these more obvious references, Calvo Martínez has identified some items of vocabulary which are characteristic of the language of the Alexandrian Judaens represented by the Septuagint and Philo.

Alongside these are the works generally characterised as “Gnostic”, which were composed and used by groups which have not survived to the present day. Both in the time of the Church Fathers, and in the

---

841 In PGM 4.3009-3085.
842 For example in PGM 4.3020, PGM 12.192; in the former instance he is identified as the “god of the Hebrews” (τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν Ἑβραίων) leading Deissmann to see the use as that of a pagan (einem Heiden) (Adolf Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1908).p.186 fn.14).
844 PGM 4.3007-3085.
846 ibid, pp.193-194, 201.
847 José Luis Calvo Martínez, “El tratamiento del material hímnico en los Papiros Mágicos. El himno ἡεὐρό μοι,” *MHNI: revista internacional de investigación sobre magia y astrología antiguas* 2(2002).p.85; He points to παντοκράτωρ as one such word.
nineteenth-century, artefacts of ancient Mediterranean magic were often considered “gnostic” (see 2.4.1.1), and the discovery of manuscripts apparently containing Sethian and Valentinian material – principally the *Pistis Sophia* of the Askew Codex, the *Books of Ieou* and unnamed text of the Bruce Codex, and the Nag Hammadi codices – reveals striking similarities: the appearance of common divine names such as Abrasax, Aberamentho and Maskelli (as well, of course, as the more common Jesus and Iao), a comparable use of vowels strings, as well as a broadly similar worldview – a hierarchical divine world, governed by fate mediated through the stars, and susceptible to manipulation through efficacious rituals. Nevertheless, the Theban Library provides no evidence of an adherence to Christian or Jewish gnosticism, and the Gnostic texts are characterised by a different range of interests and practices. With this in mind, we should understand their similarities as springing from the fact that they both emerge from the same background of popular and occult beliefs in the Egypt, and broader Mediterranean world, of the second to fourth centuries CE.

2.3.5 Cultural Setting

Having sketched out the range of documents with which the Theban Library can usefully be compared, we will now turn to look at a more difficult question, that of the cultural background of the texts. Throughout this discussion we have returned to the idea that the authors and copyists of many of the texts may have belonged to the traditional Egyptian priesthood, but we have already seen suggestions that this is not an uncontroversial, or entirely satisfactory, summary of the cultural influences of the recipes. In this section I will first lay out the terms of the discussion – the range of opinions currently held by scholars – before moving on to more specific discussions of Egyptian and Greek cultural interaction, the cultural origins of particular ritual practices, and finally the religious landscape of the Thebaid in the third and fourth centuries CE.

---

848 For example in *Gospel of The Egyptians* (Nag Hammadi III 2.52.26, 2.53.9, 2.65.1); *Apocalypse of Adam* (Nag Hammadi V.5.75.22); *Zostrianos* (Nag Hammadi VIII.1.47.13).
849 *Pistis Sophia* 354, 360, 367.
850 *Pistis Sophia* 365.
In his discussion of the linguistic origins of onomata, Bohak describes three schools of interpretation: the pan-Iranian, typified by Dieterich, who saw Iranian influences as dominant in the magical papyri; the pan-Egyptian, of which Ritner is the example given, which would assign the papyri an almost exclusively culturally Egyptian orientation; and the pan-Judaic, a school which exaggerates the importance of Jewish elements, and which Bohak saw as a dominant one as of 2003.

To these three we can add the pan-Hellenic, described by Graf, which sees the papyri as straightforwardly Greek cultural products. These four stereotyped positions can be seen as arising not only from the undeniably culturally diverse contents of the magical papyri, but also from the tendency of scholars to identify more readily features which relate to their own particular area of study, whether the identifications are accurate or merely illusory. These four “schools” are something of a fiction, however: with the exception of Iranian/Mesopotamian influences, which are now seen as relatively minor, most scholars accept that Egyptian and Greek, and to a lesser extent Semitic, elements are inextricably intertwined in the papyri, with the disagreement arising over whether the Hellenic elements are structural, that is, they are the primary element of a ritual, or

852 The text cited by Bohak is Dieterich, Eine Mithrasliturgie. This is not an entirely fair characterisation of Dieterich, who accepts Egyptian and Greek influence on the text he is discussing (for example at pp.78-82), but Bohak seems to be discussing “late antique religiosity” in general at this point, as shown by his mention of Scholem’s discussion of Gnosticism (Gershom G. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1960 [1965]), pp.1-2).
853 Ritner’s strongest presentation of his argument is contained in Ritner, "Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire", pp.3352-3358.
855 Compare the more specific comments of Bohak: “because we know so much more about Hebrew and Aramaic than about, say, Nubian or Carian, scholars tend to indulge a natural tendency to look for solutions in the languages we happen to know best” ("Hebrew, Hebrew everywhere? Notes on the interpretation of Voces Magicae", p.69).
857 Thus, for example Ritner ("Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire: the Demotic Spells and their Religious Context," in ibid.p.3367) accepts “obviously foreign” elements (citing the Homeric passages as an example), and admits that they may reflect “Greek, Hebrew etc.” ritual or oral elements, although he points out that they may have been reworked to fit an Egyptian procedure. Graf (Graf, Magic in the Ancient World, pp.5-6) accepts that the magical papyri, and the Theban Library in particular, show "details of ideology and ritual that can be understood only in light of the Egyptian context", but that the wide distribution of similar practices (the magic-as-genre identified in 2.3.4) and the diversity of cultural elements requires them to be seen as documents of “late pagan syncretism.” Betz accepts that the bilingual Demotic-Greek texts are largely or wholly Egyptian in character, but believes the others often display Greek and Jewish characteristics which are not in every case simply secondary impositions on an Egyptian core ("Magic and Mystery in the Greek Magical Papyri", pp.248-249).
incidental, accretions around an Egyptian core. A related argument concerns whether they represent linguistic and idiomatic translations of Egyptian practices into Hellenistic forms, or whether they can be traced back to older Greek rituals.

2.3.5.1 The cultural origins of particular ritual types

When we turn to specific ritual practices in the Theban Library, we can begin to make more productive comments. In general, several authors have commented that the magical practices of the Roman period demonstrate a shift in practice from the apotropaic and medical concerns of the Pharaonic material towards a praxis more concerned with erotic, divinitory and curse rituals. While this judgement is in part a reflection of the predominance in the material of large, somewhat unrepresentative handbooks and archives (see 2.2.5.1), and healing rituals do seem to remain the predominant concern of the Roman period, there does seem to be a significant shift in the range and type of practices that demands explanation. With the majority of pre-Roman Egyptian magical texts dating to the Middle or New Kingdoms, there is considerable space to argue either that the introduction of these newer practices is lost in what is a clear gap in our evidence, or that they were present in earlier periods, but in spheres generally excluded from consideration as magic – thus we might see incubation as the fore-runner of magical divination, and execration rituals as prefiguring magical cursing. By contrast, others have suggested that this shift is the consequence of the influx of foreign, usually Greek, cultural elements.

The third and fourth chapters of this work (in particular 3.2.3.1) will discuss older Egyptian ritual practices that may serve as the immediate predecessors to the ritual of apparition, the most common type of ritual found in the Theban Magical Library. Here we should note that Porphyry, whose *Epistula ad Anebonem* is one of the earliest Neoplatonic texts to show an awareness of rituals of apparition,

858 Ritner, "Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire", pp.3363-3367.
859 Ibid.
861 This view is widely held; some examples can be found in Borghouts, *Ancient Egyptian Magical Texts*.p.vii; Pinch, *Magic in Ancient Egypt*, p.163; Tait, "Theban magic", p.176; Assmann, "Magic and Theology in Ancient Egypt", p.17; Dieleman, "Coping with a difficult life: Magic, Healing, and Sacred Knowledge", p.342.
used Chaeremon, the Egyptian priest and Stoic philosopher, as one of his major sources for the practice, and similarly, Iamblichus' reply, *De Mysteriis*, shows an awareness, and probably a reliance, on both Chaeremon (1 CE), and probably more significantly, Manetho (IV BCE). The relevant works of these authors are known only from citations, but from Porphyry's citation of Chaeremon we can see that the Egyptian author provided information on rituals involving purity requirements, sacrifice and compulsive formulae, for erotic and divinatory purposes; that is, rituals which are strikingly similar to many of those described in the Theban Magical Library. On the one hand, this is good evidence for the theory that these practices were in use by Egyptian priests from an early period; on the other, it would prove that a Greek-language text discussing them was available, and fairly widely read by the beginning of our era.

We are in a different position when we turn to the phenomenon of ritual cursing, specifically the practice attested by the curse tablets known as defixiones or katadesmoi, artefacts produced in the context of rituals in which formulae, including the names of the intended victims, were written on media, most prominently metal, before being deposited in temples, burial sites or springs, with the medium often being pierced by nails or physically bound in the course of the praxis. Several recipes in the Theban Library, most prominently PGM 4.296-434 (discussed at 2.3.4.2) include examples of this type of ritual, which, broadly considered, must include not only examples intended explicitly as curses, but also those intended to bind the anger and compel the erotic attraction of others, since they operate according to similar principles and produce similar artefacts. While all the handbooks prescribing these rituals date from the Roman period, applied artefacts are found from the sixth century BCE in Sicily, before appearing in the fifth century BCE Attica and Macedonia, and ultimately across the entire Mediterranean world, from “Northern Britain to Nubia; from Spain to Luristan” in the

---

863 Chaeremon, Fragment 4.
864 Compare the comments of Ritner, “Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire”, p.3371.
865 See the discussion in Faraone, *Ancient Greek Love Magic*, pp.43-55 for “love spells” as curses.
words of Kotansky.\textsuperscript{866} Despite this range, however, the vast majority of the \textasciitilde{1500} known examples\textsuperscript{867} come from Greece – 266 of the 600 discussed by Faraone in 1991.\textsuperscript{868} While these artefacts are attested in Egypt – somewhat fewer than 40 including texts on papyrus,\textsuperscript{869} the preferred medium in this province – the fact that these are both significantly later than the Greek examples (I-V CE), fewer in number, and clearly part of the same tradition, strongly suggests that they are a borrowing from Hellenic cultural models. Despite this evidence, Ritner has argued that specific features of these binding rituals, specifically the writing of the name of the dead agent, the use of bound figurines, and the deposition of the figures in jars or coffin-like boxes, are evidence that not only the examples from the Theban Library and the PGM, but perhaps the entire Greek tradition derives from Egyptian models, specifically the practices of writing letters to the dead and producing execration texts.\textsuperscript{870}

Egyptian letters to the dead are attested from the VI to XXI Dynasties, and consist of requests to dead family members to intercede on their behalf against other dead, and sometimes perhaps living, individuals, or to provide more general healing or fertility.\textsuperscript{871} As Johnston points out, however, the youngest letters to the dead (c.IX-X BCE) would predate the earliest Sicilian curse tablets by around


\textsuperscript{867} This is the estimate in John G. Gager, \textit{Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), p.3.

\textsuperscript{868} Faraone, "The Agonistic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells." These are the 220 from DTA, as well as the 46 examples from Achaia in DT.

\textsuperscript{869} Brashear notes that there are 19 lamellae from Egypt, of which I do not count the Aramaic exorcism, the 2 Greek amulets or the Greek invocation (Brashear, "An Introduction and Survey", p.3444). To these I add 16 texts on papyrus from the PGM (PGM 15, 16, 17a, 19a, 28a, 32, 32a, 39, 40, 51, 64, 84, 101, 107, 108, 109), the examples on wood and papyrus from SM not published in the PGM (SM 51, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62), and Tablet Qaw, a Demotic curse text of Roman date (Spiegelberg, \textit{Demotica II}, pp.39-41; William F. Edgerton, "A Wooden Tablet from Qâw," \textit{Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache} 72(1936)).

\textsuperscript{870} Ritner, \textit{The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice}, pp.113-183.

400 years, and the earliest Egyptian examples by still more. Furthermore, their mechanism, appealing to the pre-existing and ongoing relationship between the deceased and their living family members, is quite different from the divinely-effected compulsion of the restless dead upon which the curse rituals rely.

While Egyptian execration texts are attested up to the Ptolemaic period, they generally consist simply of lists of personal and place-names rather than the elaborate curses of the later rituals; while there is some evidence for the deposition of these artefacts, the main mechanism of the execration rituals seems to have been the destruction of the clay or wax supports on which the texts were written rather than reliance on the agency of dead agents acting from the deposition site.

While Ritner's argument thus seems insufficient to overturn the hypothesis placing the origins of the curse tablet in the Hellenic tradition, Graf has shown that the specific elements of the erotic ritual noted by Ritner in PGM 4, and in applied artefacts, probably represent the integration of culturally Egyptian elements, perhaps taken from the older letter to the dead and execration practices – the naming of the dead agent, the deposition of the objects in a box, the names of Egyptian deities – into a text whose origins are Greek or Graeco-Semitic. The increasing prominence of “Egyptian” elements in curse tablets from the first century CE onwards is often remarked upon, and may represent the adoption of the form into Egypt and the subsequent dissemination of Egyptian elements outside the land of the Nile; another prominent feature of magical practice which originated in Egypt but quickly spread beyond was the use of the matronymic in identifying individuals in magical texts.

---

873 Ibid, pp.90-93.
874 See the discussion of burial in Ritner, *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*, pp.172-180. The strongest evidence for Ritner's argument, in my opinion, is that of CT 37, a ritual for the destruction of enemies to be spoken over a wax figurine of the enemy to be buried in the "place of Osiris" (s.t Ws|r), interpreted by Ritner as "graveyard".
876 Gager, *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*, pp.6-7.
As the example of these curse tablets shows, each type of ritual may have an origin in a different cultural tradition, and may be further supplemented by ritual components from other practices. Thus, as Quack points out, attempting to assign a Greek or Egyptian ethnic identity to particular rituals is meaningless from a synchronic perspective; although we may be able to distinguish some diachronic threads, the texts as we have them are products of their time and place, as rational and whole in their synthesis of multiple cultural forms as the Roman-era funerary assemblages or clay statuettes whose blend of Egyptian and Greek elements is often jarring to those used to exempla from the "classical" periods of those traditions, but entirely logical to those who produced them. Aside from the linguistic evidence already cited, the only way to understand the cultural allegiances of the Theban Library texts is to look at the self-presentations and reference points provided in the texts themselves, and here we find, alongside an extensive reliance on a Graeco-Egyptian synthetic discourse, an identification with the Egyptian priesthood, as well as a wider sense of belonging to a broader Mediterranean fraternity of Hellenic and Persian wise-men.

---


879 Ibid.p.72.

880 For an excellent discussion of these see Christina Riggs, The Beautiful Burial in Roman Egypt: Art, Identity, and Funerary Religion (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); in particular her comments on pp.5: “But what is discordant to our eyes—the portrait head on a real or represented mummy, for instance—was a choice made by the artists involved, at the instigation of their patrons and within the bounds of what the culture deemed useful or desirable. No one sets out to produce ‘crude’ or ‘degenerate’ art. The choice to employ conventions and elements not traditionally included in the Egyptian artistic repertoire was a meaningful one, whether consciously or not, and the art created as a result of that choice is all the more significant because of it.”


882 Compare Dieleman’s discussion of the attribution of texts in the PGM to famous Egyptian, Persian and Greek wise-men (Dieleman, Priests, tongues, and rites, pp.263-270).
2.3.5.2 Roman Thebes

The association of the Theban Library with Thebes itself is often repeated, but it has rarely been considered in the context of that city’s own history. To situate the Theban Library within the Thebes of its day, it is first necessary to describe its physical and religious landscape.

The traditional view in scholarship has been of Roman Thebes as a *ville musée*, a city whose greatness lay in its past. According to this model, the regular rebellions during Ptolemaic and early Roman rule resulted in its virtual destruction under Ptolemy IX and Cornelius Gallus. While Thebes certainly lost some of its political and economic importance in the Roman period, evidence of continuous dedications to its temples, and textual finds unparalleled elsewhere in Upper Egypt confirm its continuing importance. In particular, Klotz has persuasively argued that Strabo’s description of Thebes in 27-26 BCE as κωμῆ ὧν συνοικεῖται should be understood not as describing a “collection of [small] villages”, but rather a collection of “smaller communities”, a picture of Thebes as it had existed since the New Kingdom, a dispersed collection of residential areas clustered around multiple religious complexes rather than a single centre, as was the case with most Hellenistic cities.

The core of this dispersed Thebes was formed by the temple complex of Karnak (Διὸς πόλις η Μεγάλη, $n(|)w.t$, $nθ$) on the east bank, with its associated settlement. The largest religious complex in Egypt, Karnak’s largest temples were dedicated to Amun-Zeus, Mut-Hera, and Khonsu-Herakles, with important smaller temples to Opet-Demeter, Ptah-Hephaistos, Montu-Apollo, Thoth-Hermes, Maat, Harpre, and Imhotep-Asklepios. Three kilometres south was the smaller temple of Luxor.
(Ἄπις/Ὠφιῆον, ἱπ, τυλικα πάνε), also dedicated to Amun, with a Roman-era Serapis and Isis shrine outside. Fifteen kilometres south of Luxor was Armant (Ἐρμώνθις, ἱвшис, ἱπτῖς), dedicated to Montu, and also the site of the Bucheum, the burial site of that god’s avatar, the Buchis bull. In life this bull seems to have had a rotating residency at Armant and Karnak, as well as the nearby Tod (Τοῦφιον), 20km south of Luxor, and Medamud (Τὰ Κεραμεῖα, ἱ Wrest, ἱπτῖς), 8km northeast of Luxor. On the west bank opposite Luxor were a series of settlements collectively referred to as the Memneion (Τὰ Μεμνονεία, ἱπτῖς, ἱπ), apparently after the Colossus of Amenhotep III which stood in the ruins of his funerary temple, known to the Greeks as Memnon, the Ethiopian prince of Homeric epic. Most prominent here was Medinet Habu, consisting of the town Djeme built within its walls, along with temples to Amun-Kematef and the Ogdoad, Min, Arensnohiphis, and a shrine to Montu. Further into the desert were Deir el-Medina, with its temples to Hathor-Aphrodite, and Deir el-Bahri, with another shrine to Hathor, and a second jointly to Amenhotep, son of Hapu, and Imhotep. Other, smaller, temples in the region included Deir el-Roumi, dedicated to Montu, Qasr el-Aguz, dedicated to Thoth-the-Ibis, and Deir el-Shelwit, dedicated to Isis. While the largest concentrations of population seem to have been at Karnak and Medinet Habu, it appears that most of the temples had associated settlements, and that in addition to these known temple-towns were numerous smaller villages whose precise locations remain undetermined. The population of the region seems to have been something less than 50,000, but in addition to the living residents we must also count the dead, whose influence over Thebes extended into the afterlife: the tombs of the Valley of the Kings were the sites of touristic and cultic activity during this period, as was the Colossus of Amenhotep III/Memnon. Similarly, the tomb-sites on the Western Desert directly overlooking the Nile Valley continued to be used, both for

the burial of sacred animals\(^{890}\) – ibises, falcons and shrew-mice, to name only the most common mummies – and of humans, the latter often re-using tombs from the New Kingdom.\(^{892}\)

Thebes, and its surrounding area, was the site of several traumatic events over the course of the third and fourth centuries of our era; the Thebaid was subject to regular incursions from the Blemmyes of Lower Nubia between c.249 and 298 CE,\(^{893}\) while a revolt in nearby Busiris and Coptos in 293/294 CE resulted in the destruction of those two cities\(^{894}\). There had probably been a Roman garrison at Thebes for the entirety of the period of the Roman Empire,\(^{895}\) but 298 CE saw the establishment by Diocletian of a fortress at Luxor temple, resulting in the permanent presence of perhaps 10,000 soldiers in the region.\(^{896}\)

The most significant change, as we attempt to trace the religious history of Thebes, would have come with the ascension of Constantine, the first Christian emperor. Although legislation against pagan temples did not come until the fifth century, it seems that certain Christians, such as Shenoute, the archimandrite of the White Monastery at Achmim, understood earlier, more specific, edicts forbidding aspects of pagan cult as sanctioning the destruction of temples.\(^{897}\) The literary sources for such destructions by Christians are often suspect, due to both their relatively late dates and their narrative purpose, namely the demonstration of the power of the new religion over the old,\(^{898}\) but there is some

\(^{890}\) See Dieter Kessler, *Die Hieligen Tiere und der König*, vol. 1(Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1989), pp.159-193. I am not aware of any attempts to date the latest animal burials, although given the evidence from the Bucchum (see below) we might expect the last of them to have occurred in III or early IV CE. Most of the animal mummies which survived the 19th century are dated very generally as “Late Period”, “Ptolemaic” or “Roman”.

\(^{891}\) Riggs, *The Beautiful Burial in Roman Egypt*, pp.177-178.


\(^{894}\) Vandorpe, ”City of Many a Gate, Harbour for Many a Rebel”, p.236.


\(^{897}\) See for example the discussion in Mark Smith, ”Aspects of the Preservation and Transmission of Indigenous Religious Traditions in Akhmim and its Environs during the Graeco-Roman Period,” in *Perspectives on Panopolis: An Egyptian town from Alexander the Great to the Arab conquest. Acts of an international symposium held in Leiden on 16, 17 and 18 December 1998*, ed. A. Egberts, B.P. Muhs, and J. van der Vliet(Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp.244-247. For a list of and discussion of accounts of
evidence that traditional Egyptian temples were under physical threat by the end of the fourth century CE, with both Shenoute’s destruction of Atribis, slightly north of Thebes, and the razing of the Serapeum at Alexandria both relatively well attested.

While temple activity seems to have continued at Philae into the middle of the fifth century CE, there is evidence that Egyptian temples in general began a slow decline over the Roman period as imperial patronage shrank; while there is certainly evidence for continuous building work on the Theban temples from Augustus to Antoninus Pius, with the last attestation apparently under Valerian, there is an undoubted decline in the scale of this sponsorship, and this, alongside the synchronic decline in documents mentioning priests and cultic activity, has led Bagnall to argue that the Christianisation of Egypt took place in the void created by the decline of the traditional temples; Frankfurter, with a more optimistic view of the continuing vitality of the traditional religion, suggests that the lack of imperial patronage forced the priesthood to rely on charismatic authority of the sort embodied by magical texts such as those of the Theban Library. This charisma could equally be drawn upon by Christians, who could also offer the reassuring “totalitarian certainty” of monotheism against the background of the crises of the third and fourth centuries; according to this model early Christians nonetheless faced stiff resistance from both priests and their followers, despite the decline of the official temple cults. Whichever model we accept, “combat or void”, we must both acknowledge the

---


901 Procopius, *De Bellis* 1.1934-37 refers to Justinian ordering the shrines in Philae to be torn down c.535-537 CE, but the last inscriptions date from the middle of the previous century, so that any temple activity at the time of its closure would have been fairly limited; see the discussion in Jitse H. F. Dijkstra, *Philae and the end of Ancient Egyptian Religion: A Regional Study of Religious Transformation (298-642 CE)* (Leuven, : Uitgeverij Peeters, 2008), especially pp.11-41.


903 David Klotz, “Kneph: The Religion of Roman Thebes” (Diss. Yale University, 2008), pp.538-539.

904 Bagnall, “Combat ou vide.”

905 Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt*, see particularly pp.179-184, 224-237, 265.
growing absence of evidence for traditional cultic activity, and avoid overexaggerating the Christianisation of Egypt or the Thebaid. Again, to give only a very impressionistic sense of numbers, Bagnall suggests that Christians constituted less than 0.5% of the general Egyptian population at the beginning of the third century, growing to something over 2% by the middle of the century,906 a majority by c.325 CE, and the overwhelming majority by the end of fourth century.907

As we might expect, this religious shift is not immediately apparent at Thebes; although literary texts place Christians in the region from at least fourth century, documentary sources supporting a Christian presence do not appear until the fifth, and the first archaeological evidence begins to appear around 600 CE.908

If we might expect most, if not all, cultic activity to have ceased by the end of the fourth century CE, it is much harder to trace the exact period in which each ceased to function. As Bagnall points out, the conversion of Luxor temple into a fortress complete with imperial chapel, coupled with the lack of inscriptions from the third century, suggests cultic activity had ceased at this site,909 and the removal of obelisks from Karnak by Constantine, demolishing walls to make a pathway for them to the Nile, would have been a major trauma for the temple if it was still functioning.910 Of the major sites, the latest clear sign of cultic activity comes from the Buheum, where a stela commemorating the burial of

---

909 Bagnall, “Combat ou vide”, p.287. Klotz argues that there is no conclusive evidence that cultic activity had ceased by this time, but since there is neither evidence that it continued, it seems most reasonable to agree with Bagnall in seeing the construction of the fortress marks latest date for the functional end of the temple’s cultic activity (David Klotz, “Kneph: The Religion of Roman Thebes” (Diss. Yale University, 2008), pp.546-551).
910 David Klotz, "Kneph: The Religion of Roman Thebes" (Yale University, 2008), pp.551-554.
the sacred bull can be dated to 340 CE. The latest private dedication in Greek, also from Medamud, seems to be SB V 8199, dedicated to “the greatest god” by the an eirearch in 291 CE.

The shrine to Amenhotep and Imhotep at Deir el-Bahri generated large amounts of Greek and Demotic graffiti from visitors, but this seems to have ceased by c.170 CE; nonetheless, if this signals the end of one phase of the site’s use, a new phase seems to have begun c.280 CE, lasting until c.334 CE, when a corporation of iron-workers from Hermomithis began making annual pilgrimages to the site, apparently as part of the Sokar festival at the end of Khoiak, which would culminate with a visit to the necropolis, and a ritual banquet and donkey-sacrifice at Deir el-Bahri. While it is unclear to whom the iron-workers were making the sacrifice, the mention of Imhotep and Amenhotep in a graffito of 283 CE suggests an awareness of the site’s history remained well into the third century.

The last dated Greek graffito from the Valley of the Kings dates to 567 CE, but the latest dated proskunēma inscriptions, the clearest evidence of cultic activity, date from late II CE. Nevertheless, the fact that there continued to be visitors throughout the period of the Theban Library may be important for arguments which rely on the Libery’s owner’s knowledge of the underworld texts contained in the

---

911 Jean-Claude Grenier, “La stèle funéraire du dernier taureau Bouchis (Caire JE 31901 = Stèle Bucheum 20),” Ermant - 4 novembre 340,” Bulletin de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale 83 (1983). Grenier sees the dating of the stela by the reign of Diocletian, rather than the reigning Christian ruler, as an act of defiance, but the existence of larger numbers of texts, including later Christian ones, which use this same system, makes the question more complicated; see Roger S. Bagnall and K.K.A. Worp, Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt: Second Edition (Brill, 2004), pp.63-68.

912 See the discussion in Bagnall, “Combat ou vide”, p.288. The title θέος μεγίστος was a common one, attested in several other texts from Thebes. In most cases it seems to refer to Amun (UPZ 2.218 (218 BCE); UPZ 2.198 (133 BCE); UPZ 2.199 (131 BCE); UPZ 2.219 (130 BCE); P.Worp 17 (I-II CE); O.Bodl. 2 1480 (171 CE); O.Bodl. 2 1820 (III CE); SB 1 4340 (255 CE)), less often to Herakles (=Khonsu; O.Petr. 190 (I CE), or Apollo and Asklepios (=Montu and Imhotep; O.Strash. 2.902 (205 CE)).


914 Łajtar, Deir El-Bahari in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, text 161.
tombs. Burials whose funerary assemblages imply continued adherence to the traditional religion continue throughout the period of the Theban Library, with numerous mummy masks dating from the third century CE from the graves around Deir el-Bahri, and mummy labels from the cemetery northwest of Medinet Habu dating to the third and fourth centuries CE.

Priests are still mentioned in documents from the Theban region into the fourth century CE, showing that even if the cults were no longer functioning on their previous scale, individuals continued to use the associated titles. As we have already seen, one of the key aspects of priestly competence, literacy in the traditional scripts, is attested in the case of hieroglyphs at Hermonthis up to 340 CE, but with the exception of the Demotic texts of the Theban Library, the latest Demotic texts from the region are O.Medinet Habu 4038, a documentary text from c.271 CE, and a series of hymns to Rattawy, the consort of Montu, and other deities (P. Ashm. 1984.76), from around the same time; the editors of both have commented on their linguistic and orthographic similarity to PDM 14.

In the sphere of less traditional religiosity, Zosimos provides evidence for alchemical activity in Upper Egypt in third to fourth centuries CE, and the interest of this author, and the owners of the Nag

---

917 See, for example, the arguments of John Coleman Darnell, "The Enigmatic Netherworld Books of the Solar-Osirian Unity: Cryptographic compositions in the tombs of Tutankhamun, Ramesses VI, and Ramesses IX" (Diss. University of Chicago, 1995), pp.xviii, 165, 571-573. Two of the three tombs discussed by Darnell, those of Ramesses VI (KV 9) and Ramesses IX (KV 6), contain Graeco-Roman graffiti, with that of Ramesses VI being particularly popular, both for the quality of its wall-decoration, and its status as the supposed tomb of Memnon (Victoria Ann Foertmeyer, "Tourism in Graeco-Roman Egypt" (Diss. Princeton University, 1989), p.28).

918 Christina Riggs, "Roman Period Mummy Masks from Deir el-Bahri," The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 86(2000); The Beautiful Burial in Roman Egypt, pp.232-244.


920 O.Bodl. 2.1821 (III CE), SB 1.4340 (11 February 255 CE), O.Bodl. 2.2142 (late III-early IV CE), O.Bodl. 2.2062 (19 December 303 CE), P.Lips. 97 (338 CE). While two of the titles used in these documents, ἱερεύς, προφήτης, can appear in Christian contexts, as Choat (Belief and Cult in Fourth-Century Papyri (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), pp.58-59) notes, this only seems to become a possibility in the fifth century CE. The third title, παστοφόρος, never seems to have been held by a Christian.


Hammadi Library, in both Hermetica and what can be loosely be described as “gnosticism”, provides a context for the affinities of the Theban Library texts with this material.\footnote{923 See the discussions in Fowden, The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind, pp.120-126, 168-176; Michèle Mertens, “Alchemy, Hermetism and Gnosticism at Panopolis c. 300 A.D.: The Evidence of Zosimus,” in Perspectives on Panopolis: An Egyptian town from Alexander the Great to the Arab conquest. Acts of an international symposium held in Leiden on 16, 17 and 18 December 1998, ed. A. Egberts, B.P. Muhs, and J. van der Vliet (Leiden: Brill, 2002).\footnote{924 Preisendanz, Papyrusfunde und Papyrusforschung, p.94.\footnote{925 Tait, “Theban magic”, pp.176-179.\footnote{926 Thebes is mentioned in PDM 14.313, but this is followed by a long list of other cultic sites, so that this cannot be taken as indicative of a local origin.\footnote{927 PDM 14.621.\footnote{928 PDM 14.1028.\footnote{929 PDM 14.167-168. Tait, "Theban magic", p.180 mistakenly has Neith.\footnote{930 PDM 14.239. Khonsu-in-Thebes-Neferhotep was the chief god worshipped at the Khonsu temple in Karnak; see Klotz, "Kneph", pp.106-119.\footnote{931 PDM 14.258, 299, 809.\footnote{932 See also ιαβουχ (PGM 4.2198), ιαβωκ (PGM 12.263), cf. ιαβωκ (SM 87). Although the element ια-, common in onomata, is usually understood as a variant of Ιαω (see for example Brashear, "An Introduction and Survey", p.3587-3589), it seems likely to me that in many cases it represents the Egyptian interjection written in Demotic as ỉ, and in Coptic as ḫ, perhaps derived from ME i/y ‘to glorify’ (Rodolphe Kasser, Compléments au Dictionnaire Copte de Crum (Cairo: Imprimerie de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1964), p.13; W. Vycichl, Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte (Peeters, 1983),p.60). Compare also the Greek exclamation ἱ. The second element, βουχ or βωκ, is then easily recognisable as the name of the Buchis bull, whose Greek form is usually βουχ.\footnote{933 Bataille, Les Memnonia., p.290, fn.1.}\footnote{934 Kematef-}

To what extent is the Theban Library a product of the specific religious landscape of Thebes? Both Preisendanz\footnote{924 Preisendanz, Papyrusfunde und Papyrusforschung, p.94.\footnote{925 Tait, “Theban magic”, pp.176-179.\footnote{926 Thebes is mentioned in PDM 14.313, but this is followed by a long list of other cultic sites, so that this cannot be taken as indicative of a local origin.\footnote{927 PDM 14.621.\footnote{928 PDM 14.1028.\footnote{929 PDM 14.167-168. Tait, "Theban magic", p.180 mistakenly has Neith.\footnote{930 PDM 14.239. Khonsu-in-Thebes-Neferhotep was the chief god worshipped at the Khonsu temple in Karnak; see Klotz, "Kneph", pp.106-119.\footnote{931 PDM 14.258, 299, 809.\footnote{932 See also ιαβουχ (PGM 4.2198), ιαβωκ (PGM 12.263), cf. ιαβωκ (SM 87). Although the element ια-, common in onomata, is usually understood as a variant of Ιαω (see for example Brashear, "An Introduction and Survey", p.3587-3589), it seems likely to me that in many cases it represents the Egyptian interjection written in Demotic as ỉ, and in Coptic as ḫ, perhaps derived from ME i/y ‘to glorify’ (Rodolphe Kasser, Compléments au Dictionnaire Copte de Crum (Cairo: Imprimerie de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1964), p.13; W. Vycichl, Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte (Peeters, 1983),p.60). Compare also the Greek exclamation ἱ. The second element, βουχ or βωκ, is then easily recognisable as the name of the Buchis bull, whose Greek form is usually βουχ.\footnote{933 Bataille, Les Memnonia., p.290, fn.1.}}}} and Tait\footnote{925 Tait, “Theban magic”, pp.176-179.} have noted that there is little in the way of “local colour” which might tie the contents of the rituals to Thebes; the more nationally-popular deities, Amun, Ra-Helios, Thoth-Hermes, Imhotep-Asklepios, Osiris, and Isis appear, of course, but where geographic associations are present, these are often with their cult centres outside Thebes: Imhotep with Memphis, Thoth with Hermopolis, and so on. Similarly, certain Theban deities, for example Amenhotep and Amenophis, seem to be absent, and deities not apparently part of the official cults, Bes, Seth-Typhon, Iaō, Hekate, and so on, do appear. There are, however, a few references to specific Theban cults and locations;\footnote{926 PDM 14 contains mentions of Pi-Djeme,\footnote{927 PDM 14.621.\footnote{928 PDM 14.1028.\footnote{929 PDM 14.167-168. Tait, "Theban magic", p.180 mistakenly has Neith.\footnote{930 PDM 14.239. Khonsu-in-Thebes-Neferhotep was the chief god worshipped at the Khonsu temple in Karnak; see Klotz, "Kneph", pp.106-119.\footnote{931 PDM 14.258, 299, 809.\footnote{932 See also ιαβουχ (PGM 4.2198), ιαβωκ (PGM 12.263), cf. ιαβωκ (SM 87). Although the element ια-, common in onomata, is usually understood as a variant of Ιαω (see for example Brashear, "An Introduction and Survey", p.3587-3589), it seems likely to me that in many cases it represents the Egyptian interjection written in Demotic as ỉ, and in Coptic as ḫ, perhaps derived from ME i/y ‘to glorify’ (Rodolphe Kasser, Compléments au Dictionnaire Copte de Crum (Cairo: Imprimerie de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1964), p.13; W. Vycichl, Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte (Peeters, 1983),p.60). Compare also the Greek exclamation ἱ. The second element, βουχ or βωκ, is then easily recognisable as the name of the Buchis bull, whose Greek form is usually βουχ.\footnote{933 Bataille, Les Memnonia., p.290, fn.1.}}}}
Kmeph\textsuperscript{935} and Harsiese\textsuperscript{936} appear elsewhere in the Library, but their frequent appearance in other, non-Theban magical texts implies that they should be perhaps understood as elements of the broader Mediterranean magical genre rather than specifically a Theban religious culture. That most of the more certain references to local religion appear in the early, Egyptian-language PDM 14 may suggest that, as the local cults declined, so too did the Theban Library’s adherence to their local traditional cults. By contrast, the relatively high awareness of Judaeo-Christian religious content, even in the third century texts, should be seen as significant given the low Christian, and likely non-existent Judaean, population of Thebes.

2.3.6. The World of the Theban Library

The fragmentary information offered by the papyri themselves makes it tempting to look to outsider accounts to reconstruct the identities of the owners of the Theban Library. While I will use this evidence more extensively later (3.2.3.2), it is worth drawing together the testimony that the manuscripts offer, however incomplete, and examining the picture which emerges.

2.3.6.1 Summary of Previous Discussions

Linguistically, we have seen that the Theban Library can be characterised as a bilingual collection, with the relative proportions of the two languages shifting over time; Egyptian dominates in the third century, but Greek in the fourth. The Egyptian language texts from the third century are written in the Demotic script, in an older stage of the language, while the fourth century Egyptian texts, fewer in number, are written in old Coptic script, and display fewer archaisms. In the final stage of the Theban Library, repairs to PDM/PGM 12 which damaged the Demotic material suggest that the owner was no longer literate in Demotic.

\textsuperscript{934} PGM 13.788-789.
\textsuperscript{935} Both the demiurge Kematef worshipped at Medinet Habu and the decan Kenmet are transcribed into Greek variously as χ/κ-ν/μ-η/υ/ω/μ-β/φ/μ(-κ). Both deities were associated iconographically with serpents, which may have encouraged confusion between the two. In the Theban Library the name appears in PGM 1.27, 238; PGM 2.157; PGM 4.1576, 1704, 2087; PGM 13.1576. In most of these cases, the deity appears to have solar, Osirian or agathodaimonic characteristics which suggest that an identification with Kematef is primary, although in other cases the name appears as part of a formula, and may have been bleached of some of its specific associations.
\textsuperscript{936} PDM Suppl. 206.
The texts themselves are the product of a long process of composition, with each manuscript representing planned collections, containing material from older, shorter and more haphazard collections copied into larger reference works. Most of these texts belong to a recognizable genre, which I refer to, in this specific sense, as “magic”, whose characteristic features include the presence of certain deities and particular iconographical tendencies in depicting them, as well as the use of vowel-strings, onomata, kharaktēres, and text formations. This genre is attested throughout the Hellenistic Mediterranean and Middle East, albeit with specific local variations tied to the exigencies and religious practices associated with particular regions. There is evidence that some of the Theban Library texts, in particular, as Dieleman has argued, the early Greek ones, were written north of Thebes, and that the Demotic recipes may have been original compositions inspired by these. While some of them, especially the early Demotic texts, reflect local Theban cults, the majority of the recipes represent a more national, and even international, religious horizon.

Against the background of the general practice attested in Egyptian handbooks, the Theban Library displays a broad, and arguably characteristic, range of recipe-types; the divergence of its focus from the background practices of its time, however, reveals some particular interests: a greater than average number of texts concerned with divination, in particular revelatory divination, as well as rituals of erotic compulsion, and curses. Healing, the predominant interest of other texts, is attested in several rituals, but to a lesser degree than is characteristic of other texts from the period. This range of interests in not quite unique – it is similar to the range of of the longer non-Theban texts, PGM 3 & PGM 7, and to a lesser extent, PDM 61 – which may imply that divination was specifically an interest of more “advanced’ practitioners”.937 Alongside magical practices, a clear concern with alchemy, used to dye fabrics and create small, precious objects, is apparent from the Library’s earliest stages, in PDM/PGM 12, but becomes predominant in the the fourth century stage of its development with the addition of the two large alchemical codices.

937 This appealing idea requires more refinement; from an analysis of the formularies in my corpus the correlation between size of papyrus (number of recipes) and number of divination recipes (as a percentage of the total number of recipes) is very slight, 2.8%.
2.3.6.2 The Social Context of the Owners from the Texts

While the highly practical nature of most of the texts of the Library leaves room for relatively few clues as to the identity of the individuals who owned or used them, there are nonetheless a few tantalising hints. In several cases these details are common to magical handbooks from outside the collection, so may describe an “ideal” rather than particular practitioner.

As already noted (2.2.4.2), several texts in the Theban Library use an epistolary frame, in which the writing of letters between ritual experts serves as a model of textual transmission.938 While most of these, ascribed to famous individuals associated with occult knowledge, can be dismissed, in three cases the mention of a specific, non-famous individual suggests the attribution is genuine. Two bowl divination rituals in PDM 14 (ll.1-92 & 528-53) are attributed to a physician (swnw) from Oxyrhynchus,939 while a dream divination ritual in PGM 5 (ll.370-446) contains two in-text digressions (ll.372-375, 382) giving the alternative opinions “of a certain Herakleopolitan” (Ἡρακλεοπολιτικοῦ τινος, l.372). The direct influence of these individuals – the complete recipes transmitted by the Oxyrhynchite physician, and the alternate procedures of the Herakleopolitan – would have lain in earlier stages of the texts’ histories, since their additions are fully integrated into the text of the handbooks rather than existing as marginal insertions, but they do imply that the owners of the Library were, at least at one time, part of a larger community with links to Middle Egypt.940

The texts also suggest a concept of legitimate succession within this community; Pnouthios’ Paredric (PGM 1.42-195) instructs its readers to pass on the ritual only “to the son of [their] own loins” (ἰσχινῷ

938 PGM 1.42-54 (Pnouthios to Kerux); PGM 4.154-285 (Nephotes to King Psammetikhos), 2006-2125 (Pitus to King Ostanes); PGM 5.96-172 (letter of Ieou the Painter).

939 Wolja Erichsen, *Demotisches Glossar* (Copenhagen 1954). p.415 gives the basic meaning as “Arzt” (“medical doctor, physician”), and the Coptic equivalent, ṣⲧⲡⲕⲧⲧ, is used to translate the Greek ἰατρός (“healer, physician, surgeon”) (CDD 342B). In the bilingual Demotic/Greek P.Berlin 5507 (l.7), P.Berlin 3998 (l.7) & P.Leid 413 (l.23) the word is translated as ταρῑχευτής (“embalmer”), displaying a slightly broader range of meaning (Rachel Mairs and Cary J. Martin, "A Bilingual „Sale” of Liturgies from the Archive of the Theban Chouachytes: P. Berlin 5507, P. Berlin 3998 and P. Leiden 413,” *Enchoria* 31(2008/9), p.52; it seems that Erichsen was already aware of this equivalence). Nunn traces this broadening to the XXVII Dynasty (J.F. Nunn, *Ancient Egyptian Medicine* (University of Oklahoma Press, 2002), p.115).

940 See also the comments of Dieleman, *Priests, tongues, and rites*, pp.265-266.
While the frame of the Mithras Liturgy (PGM 475-829) states that it is intended for an “only child” (μόνον τέκνον; l.476), specifically a “daughter” (θύγατερ; l.478). Finally, in several texts the reader is addressed as “son” or “child” in the course of instructions (PGM 4.748, 2518; 13.214, 343, 719, 755). O’Neil suggests that these terms should be understood as indicating the practitioner’s “apprentice”, rather than, perhaps, taking them literally, although the phrases “son of [their] own loins” and “only child” would seem to express an ideal of a literal parent-child relationship.

While they could be referring to the younger children of the ritualists, references in the papyri to young boys, used as either seers or servants, should probably be understood as referring to slaves. Slave ownership was common, but not universal in Roman Egypt; Bagnall and Frier’s survey of 233 Egyptian census returns from the first to third centuries CE found that 21% of households in the metropoleis registered slave-ownership. The owners of the papyri would probably have fallen into the category Harper refers to as “bourgeois slave owners”, largely urban, sub-elite households, consisting of artisanal and petty mercantile families who owned less than half a dozen slaves. This would place them, economically, if not in the top 1.2-1.7% of elites, within the 6-12% of individuals of middling status, roughly where we would expect to find individuals who were literate in Greek, and possessed relatively large book collections.

---

941 For this reading see Parthey, “Zwei griechische Zauberpapyri”, p.143 and O’Neil in Betz, Greek Magical Papyri, p.8 fn.8.
942 Danker, “The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, including the Demotic Spells by Hans Dieter Betz (review)”, p.84 fn 317.
944 See Apuleius, Apologia 46, where it is assumed that seers will be slaves.
946 Slavery in the Late Roman World, pp.49-55, Bagnall (Egypt in Late Antiquity, pp.208-209) has a slightly different description of slave owners, characterising them as “the upper stratum of society: members of military, and the imperial civil service”, but he seems to be discussing the evidence for slavery in general, which becomes more plentiful with the larger households who owned more slaves; elsewhere, speaking of rural slaves, he notes that “ownership of a small number of slaves – one to four – was not remarkable” (ibid., p.125).
947 Harper, Slavery in the Late Roman World, pp.75-76.
There are several other references in the papyri to social phenomena indicative of an urban milieu. Most prominent is the assumption in PGM 2 (l.49, 51) and PGM 4 (l.735-736) that the practitioner has access to a bath (βαλανεῖον). Such baths were found in numerous locations in Roman Egypt, both urban and rural, and are attested at Thebes in both papyrological and archaeological sources. More problematic are references in PGM 4 to rituals intended to affect gladiators (μονομάχοι; l.2163), chariot-drivers (ηνίοχοι; l.2161), and athletes (ἄθληται; l.2519). The games (ἀγῶνες) in which these individuals would compete are known to have taken place throughout Egypt during Roman rule, although they chiefly seem to have been associated with Greek Hellenic civic institutions (in the case of chariot and athletic games) and Roman military camps (in the case of gladiatorial games). Thebes possessed both a gymnasium (at Karnak) and a military camp (at Luxor), but I am aware of no evidence for games of any of these types in Thebes in third to fourth century CE; these references may therefore reflect the earlier, non-Theban concerns of the original composer of these particular texts rather than the owners of the Library themselves.

949 Among the latest of these are O.Wilk.1485 (III CE) and O.Strasb. 1.143 (183 or 215 CE).
950 The earliest bath excavated seems to be that built north-west of the first pylon of Karnak c.III BCE, which was probably functional until II BCE (Mansour Boraik, “Ptolemaic Baths in front of the Temple of Karnak A Brief Preliminary Report - November 2007,” in Le bain collectif en Egypte, ed. Marie-Françoise Boussac, Thibaud Fournet, and Berangere Redon (Institut Français d’Archéologie Oriental: 2009); Mansour Boraik et al., “Ptolemaic Baths in Front of Karnak Temples. Recent Discoveries (Season 2009-2010),” Cahiers de Karnak 14 (2013)). A second set of baths is attested at Karnak from I CE, while yet another “Late Roman” bath operated at Medinet Habu (Hölscher, The Excavation of Medinet Habu Vol. 5, p.55). See also Redon, “Établissements balnéaires et présences grecque et romaine en Egypte”, who lists three bath sites at Karnak and two at Medinet Habu.
952 See the discussion of Clarysse, “Greeks in Ptolemaic Thebes”, p.7, as well as P.Dryton 39 L.7. The latest of these attestations is from 117 BCE, but the title ἀγώνας possessed by Apollonides (early II CE) and Soter (late II CE) suggests the continuation of Greek metropolitan institutions into the Roman period; for the former see Lajtar, Deir El-Bahari in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, no.123, and for the latter K. van Landuyt, “The Soter Family: Genealogy and Onomastics,” in Hundred-gated Thebes: acts of a Colloquium on Thebes and the Theban area in the Graeco-Roman Period, ed. Sven P. Vleeming(Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995). Interestingly, Soter’s tomb was originally opened under the supervision of Anton Lebolo, the same individual who first acquired the Book of Breathings which would later provide the inspiration for the Book of Abraham (see 2.1.4.8) (László Kákosy, “The Soter Tomb in Thebes,” ibid.).
In PGM 12 (l.l.96-106) and PGM 4 (l.l.2359-2372, 2373-2440, 3125-3171) we find four recipes for good business; these are the only Greek examples known to me, although there are several examples of Coptic texts intended for this purpose, and in view of their rarity it is tempting to see them as being intended for the use of the Library’s owners, unlike the more common erotic, healing or curse rituals. The site where the ritual is to work is generally described in vague terms as a “place” (τόπος; PGM 4.2366,3127), “house” (οἰκία; PGM 4.2374) or “place of business/workshop” (ἐργαστήριον), but in one case the most likely place of business is apparently a temple (ἱερόν; PGM 4.3125, 3126). Again, there are several layers of interpretation here: are the rituals intended for the papyrus’ owners, or for their clients? Would the rituals have been used by the owners of the Theban Library, or were they simply copied from their exemplars without any intention of being used? Nevertheless, the picture they imply would fit well with what we know or might imagine of the practitioners’ activities – offering luxury metalworks, fabrics and more occult ritual services, based in a workshop, private house or temple.

It may seem obvious that the ritualists would receive payment for their services, but there is only a single clear reference to this, in the framing story of the invocation to Selene contained in PGM 4.2441-2621, in which the prophet Pakhrates so impresses Hadrian with a display of his divine magical power that he receives a “double payment” (διπλὰ ὀψώνια, l.2455). The sense here is not entirely clear;

---

953 Profit (πόρος), mentioned as one of the outcomes in the business recipes, is one of the gifts of the ring described in PGM 12.270-350 (at l.304), although this is only briefly mentioned as one of its many uses.


955 This encounter seems almost certainly fictional, but there is some evidence that a grain of truth may lie behind it. Hadrian did visit Egypt in 130-131 CE, apparently displaying a particular interest in Egypt’s religious offerings (Foertmeyer, “Tourism in Graeco-Roman Egypt”, pp.107-108), and a Demotic ostracron from Narmouthis (OMM 298) describes Hadrian questioning five priests about hieroglyphs.

More relevant here is a reference in Athenaios’ Deipnosophistai (Athenaios 15.21 p.677D-F) to Pankrates, a native Egyptian poet who met Hadrian in Alexandria, and flattered him with a poem about his recent lion hunt, suggesting that the colour of the red lotus derived from the lion’s blood, and that it should be named Ἀντινό εἰος after the Emperor’s favourite, Antinous. Pankrates was rewarded with a maintenance at the Museum. The same poet may also have been the author of a multiple-book narrative poem in elegiac distichs called the Bokkhoreis (Athenaios 11.55 p. 478A), telling the story of the Egyptian king Bokkhoris; this king was famous in Egyptian memory as the recipient of an oracle from a prophetic lamb (Manetho fr.64; The Prophecy of the Lamb; Aelian, De natura animalium 12.3; Pseudo-Plutarch, De proverbiis Alexandrinorum no.21). On Pankrates the poet see Stanley Burstein, Brill’s New Pauly, s.v. ‘Pankrates the Egyptian (625)’.
ὀψώνιον can refer either to a one-off fee for a particular service, or to an ongoing salary for retained workers, so that this “double payment” could be understood either as the doubling of Pakhrates’ ongoing salary as a prophet, or of the fee he charged for displaying his powers. Whichever is the case, this text makes it clear that ritualists could expect financial gain for their services, and that their rituals could be performed as spectacles, as well as for the more immediate goals of divination, healing, and so on.

Taken together, these hints, as well as others to be explored at greater depth in later chapters, provide a suggestion of the social milieu of the practitioner envisaged by the texts of the Theban Library. Individually, any feature of a text could be understood as a conceit of a framing device, but the fact that most of them occur in multiple texts within multiple papyri, suggests that they are significant elements of the self-understanding of the owners of the Theban Magical Library.

A second Pankrates appears in Lucian’s *Philopseudes* 34-36, where he is describes as one of the sacred scribes (τῶν ἱερῶν γραμματέων) of Memphis, capable of riding on and swimming with crocodiles, as well as animating brooms and pestles in the prototype of the story of The Magician’s Apprentice.

A memory of a real Pakhrates/Pankrates, a hellenised priest-poet who met Hadrian may lie behind all these stories; Foertmeyer (ibid., p.108) suggests it may have been Pakhrates who suggested to Hadrian the idea of ritually killing Antinous alleged by Dio Chrysostom (62.11.2-3), but both the event and the connection to the priest are problematic at best.

956 The LSJ understands this particular usage to refer to “a magician’s fee”. Spicq comments that ὀψώνιον was, in Koine, identical with μισθός (“wage, salary, fee” and so on), and that the “commonest meaning is that of remuneration for a given task”, but that it could also refer to a recurring payment (Ceslas Spicq, *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*, trans. James D. Ernest, 3 vols. (Hendrickson Publishers, 1993), pp.600-602). In BGU 2.362 (215-216 CE) it is used to refer to the monthly salary of non-priestly staff; references to the upkeep of priests, at least in the Ptolemaic era, use the term τροφή (“provisions, livelihood”; see for example OGIS 56 (A) ll.70, 72=The Canopus Decree of Ptolemy III Euergetes, 238 BCE). For a discussion of this problem see Otto, *Priester und Tempel*. vol.2 pp.26-27.

3. Rituals of Apparition

In the first part of this thesis my goal was to use the Theban Magical Library as a lens through which Roman Egyptian magical practice could be explored and defined within a specific corpus of evidence. The second part of this thesis focuses on the most common practice found in this archive, the “ritual of apparition”. This will consist of two parts: the first will focus on an overview of the practice, exploring its definition, the broad outlines of its procedure, its relationship to other practices, and its position within the larger cognitive schema of its practitioners. The second part will focus on particular components of the rituals, focusing on the ways in which the magical technology represented in Roman-period texts reflects both a particular understanding of the mechanics of the natural-divine world, and the synthesis of cultural elements which can be discerned in the existing texts. While the focus here will be on texts from the Theban Library, the following chapters will go significantly beyond these to include other relevant material, principally similar texts from the larger corpus of Greek, Demotic, and Coptic magical papyri, but also the adjacent evidence discussed previously in 2.3.4.

3.1 Defining Rituals of Apparition

3.1.1 Defining Ritual

A ritual of apparition must, of course, be a type of ritual, but while it is a common in modern scholarly discussions of magic and related fields to use “ritual” as term of description and analysis, its meaning is not uncontested. As we have seen, many of the common items of vocabulary used in such studies may unwittingly serve as vehicles for the unexamined assumptions of particular scholars; “magic” and “religion” are two terms which have already been discussed. And yet ritual often escapes the type of reflective analysis to which these terms have been subjected, perhaps because on its apparently neutral, descriptive nature. Given its conceptual prominence in the field of ancient magic studies it is worth briefly surveying the history and implications of its usage. Here I will rely for the most part on
recent discussions within the fields of anthropology and sociology,\textsuperscript{957} and while I will attempt to excavate the assumptions underlying its use, I will also explain why I choose to use it, albeit with a minimal, and somewhat limited, meaning.

“Ritual” originated in English as a borrowing from Middle French, derived ultimately from the Latin \textit{ritus}, and more specifically its adjectival form \textit{ritualis}. The earliest attestations, as an adjective, are found in the sixteenth century, but it does not seem to have been used as a noun in English until the following century.\textsuperscript{958} Michael Stausberg traces the rise of “ritual” as a technical term in the humanities to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when it gradually came to be preferred as a more neutral replacement for concepts such as “ceremony”, “ceremonial”, “observance”, “custom”, “service”, and “tradition”.\textsuperscript{959} The term, as used by rationalist, Western scholars, was used primarily to describe practices from other cultures, from other places and times, and specifically to describe practices with explicit or suspected “religious” content. A sense of its key referents can be gained by looking at three important works which drew extensively upon the term, or a modern European-language cognate: Arnold van Gennep’s \textit{Rites de passage} (1909), in which he discussed initiation, birth, marriage and death rituals in the usual early anthropological buffet of ancient Western and contemporary non-Western cultures; Émile Durkheim’s \textit{Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse} (1912), which looked primarily to Indigenous Australian cultures as containing the purest instances of “totemism” (\textit{totémisme}); and Victor Turner’s \textit{The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure} (1969), most of whose content focused on the Ndembu people of northwestern Zambia. In their choices of subject, we see clearly the use of the term “ritual” as a way to define the practices of groups conceptualised as radically

“other”. Despite numerous, and generally contradictory, efforts to define ‘ritual’ in absolute terms, the term is best understood, within the context of modern scholarship, as a fuzzy set, referring primarily to the kinds of exotic rituals described by these early theorists, and secondarily to those practices from other cultures which resemble them, to varying degrees.960

An important theoretical development was prompted by the work of Erving Goffman in his 1956 essay The Nature of Deference and Demeanor,961 in which he demonstrated that everyday interactions between individuals in modern Western societies displayed many of the features attributed by earlier theorists to ritual – the examples he uses are social obligations, such as the rules of etiquette governing behaviour in polite society. Goffman extended this line of argument in later works,962 and it was subsequently taken up by Randall Collins and his students, exploring the ways in which the category of ritual could be used fruitfully to examine the day-to-day workings of social interaction.963 This development is not without critics; Jack Goody has argued that "we hardly need the concept ‘ritual’ to deal with table manners, or courting behaviour, or personal idiosyncrasies".964 Yet, as I will later argue, many of components of more “exotic” rituals can best be understood when viewed precisely as extensions of more quotidian behaviours. The concept of ritual can be extended still further, and several theorists have begun to explore how ritual behaviour might be exhibited among non-human animals. There are, of course, many conceptual issues involved in comparing what are apparently instinctual behaviours with those which are ostensibly cultural, but the similarity is nonetheless

960 See the comments of Jan A.M. Snoek, "Defining 'Rituals", in Theorizing Rituals.
961 Erving Goffman, "The Nature of Deference and Demeanor," in Interaction Ritual. Essays in face-to-face behavior (New York: Pantheon Books, 1956 [1967]). As Summers-Effler points out, this work was, to some extent, already anticipated by Durkheim (Summers-Effler, "Ritual Theory.").
striking, and its consideration holds some promise.\textsuperscript{965}

Given the range of behaviours that “ritual” can cover, and the range of definitions created to support these, it should be clear that, as Sax puts it, “ritual” is an analytic category created by scholars, rather than a natural one whose existence is, in some sense, prior to analysis.\textsuperscript{966} But this does not mean that it cannot be useful as a tool; the question to ask is whether it “carves social practice at any joint”, to borrow Bulbulia’s evocative phrase.\textsuperscript{967} It is here that the consideration of the magical rituals of the sort common in Graeco-Egyptian magic is useful; few scholars would deny that they deserve to be defined as ritual, and yet they problematise several formal definitions. Thus some scholars take it as axiomatic that rituals must be enacted by groups,\textsuperscript{968} and yet the magical rituals we encounter are almost without exception to be carried out by a single practitioner.\textsuperscript{969} Again, there is a common view in recent writing that rituals represent actions whose meaning or purpose are opaque, non-existent, or contested; meaning/purpose is secondary to action.\textsuperscript{970} This may well be true for some rituals – Frits Staal used the Vedic Agnicayana as an example\textsuperscript{971} – but we might equally think of New Year or birthday celebrations in the modern English-speaking world. And yet, again, magical rituals tend to have very clearly defined

\textsuperscript{965} The simple dichotomy between “instinct” and “culture” sketched here is, of course, too crude, but is merely intended to present what might be considered an instinctive [sic] reaction to the proposition. For examples of this work see the essays in E.G. D’Aquili, C.D. Laughlin, and J. McManus, 


\textsuperscript{966} Sax, "Ritual and the Problem of Efficacy", pp.3-4.

\textsuperscript{967} Bulbulia, "Ritual Studies and Ritual Theories", p.463.

\textsuperscript{968} Goody, "Against "Ritual": Loosely structured thoughts on a loosely defined topic", especially pp.26-27; Don Handelman, "Conceptual Alternatives to 'Ritual,'" in \textit{Theorizing Rituals: Issues, Topics, Approaches, Concepts}, ed. Jens Kreinath, Jan Snoek, and Michael Stausberg (Leiden: Brill, 2006); a fuller exposition of this model can be found in \textit{Models and Mirrors: Towards an Anthropology of Public Events} (Berghahn Books, 1998).

\textsuperscript{969} This is assumed rather than stated in most cases, and we may reconstruct instances where the ritualist was accompanied by a boy seer, and even perhaps a larger audience (see 3.2.4.3), but there are several instances in the Demotic texts where the ritual is explicitly stated to be carried out alone (\textit{cf.} PDM 14, 169, 175, 293, 295, 424, 528, 695, 805, 821, 841, 111).


\textsuperscript{971} Staal, "The Meaninglessness of Ritual".
goals. Finally, and most crucially, there is the distinction between what we might term “functional” and “cultural” practices, in which ritual is understood implicitly as action whose form is determined by social convention, in contrast to practical activities – starting a fire, building a house – whose processes are defined by culturally-independent considerations determined by the laws of physics or chemistry. Stanley J. Tambiah has gone some way towards deconstructing this binary, pointing out that in addition to the “constitutive rituals” that we might think of as purely culturally-determined, there exist “regulative rituals”, the sorts of socially-prescribed rules and procedures governing otherwise “functional” tasks, for example, with which implements, and in what manner, to eat a meal.

And yet this exposes the most serious theoretical problem associated with ritual, that it inherently creates a divide between the functional and the ritual. As Sax tells us, in the final analysis what we choose to define as rituals are essentially acts in which the causative link between a behaviour and its intended outcome seem to us inappropriate; thus, when we go through complex and highly standardised medical procedures, this is an instance of technology, whose components can be analysed in terms of function, but when an individual in another culture undergoes a traditional healing procedure this is ritual, whose components are analysed according to meaning. There is, of course, something honest about this: it exposes the fact that when we call something a ritual we are implicitly making judgements about its effectiveness in regards to its stated purpose, and yet, at least in the case of the magical rituals under discussion here, they were understood within their own contexts as technologies for achieving particular ends, whose components were defined by function rather than meaning – to the extent that such a distinction is valid. Indeed, rituals of apparition would be understood within their culture not as constitutive rituals, that is, activities which had no existence

---

972 For reasons that will soon become apparent, I ignore here the question of meaning, to focus instead on the question of purpose; the distinction is to some extent elided in Staal's work.
974 Sax, "Ritual and the Problem of Efficacy", pp.5-6.
outside of ritualised patterns of behaviour, but rather as regulative rituals: encountering deities, while rarer and more exotic than the activity of sitting down to a meal, was no less of a real phenomenon to most of the inhabitants of the Roman world, and one which was often believed to occur spontaneously. The function of rituals of apparition was not to create a new class of phenomenon, but rather to provide a formalised process within which such encounters could be sought. But if these rituals were merely ineffective technology – “bad science”, to use Tambiah’s characterisation of one view of magic – this might objectively justify their categorisation as ritual rather than technology. And yet there is considerable evidence that they were often experienced as effective – though, like any technology, they could be unreliable (see 3.3.1).

The purpose of this discussion has been to highlight the fact that “ritual” is a category which, while seemingly more neutral than “religion” or “magic”, has similar conceptual baggage. For this reason, I must reject Meyer and Smith’s call to replace “magic” with “ritual”.976 to do so is to conceal the assumptions underlying the label, with very little conceptual gain. Ritual, as we have seen, does not, and cannot have, any unitary definition, and thus we cannot assume that two practices designated as “ritual” have anything in common without demonstration.977 Again, for this reason, Meyer and Smith’s attempt to avoid the question of the purpose or function of magic by reference to the multi-valency or meaninglessness of “ritual” does not truly advance our understanding of rituals whose purposes are, as we have said, often very explicit.978

Nonetheless, “ritual”, like “magic”, can be a useful shorthand, if employed carefully. It is worth remembering that, emically, the practices I am discussing would have been understood as technology, and for this reason I will occasionally use the somewhat jarring term “magical technology”, and assume that this technology must be understood in terms of its function. But on the other hand, it is

977 According to Snoek’s analysis, “ritual” is best understood as a polythetic class, a type of “fuzzy set” which has multiple criteria, each of which may or may not be present in any particular member of the set (Snoek, “Defining ‘Rituals’”, pp.4-7). 978 “Beyond agreement on how rituals are done (correctly, with a focus on rules), theorists are not agreed on why they are done. Whether ritual is in some way symbolic behavior, or communicative behavior, or a focusing of the individual’s emotions or perceptions, or a form of social control and cohesion, is a topic of debate. Maybe, according to the latest proposal by Frits Staal, it does not mean much of anything” (Meyer and Smith, Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power, pp.4-5).
only intellectually honest to admit that in using the term “ritual” I am acknowledging that the actions they describe cannot be understood within the modern materialist assumptions which must, to a minimal extent, be used by historians. Again, for this reason, I will sometimes slip into discussing the components in terms of their “meanings”, here assuming that the intended function can, to some extent, be understood by reference to the semiotic systems available to the practitioners.

It remains to provide my own definition of ritual, and here I avoid the perhaps impossible problem of a universal definition, instead defining it as it is used within, and for the purposes of, this work. By ritual I mean human activity carried out according to a social script, which is to some extent fluid, but will tend to follow certain typical paths, and will draw its components (understood either as functional or signifying acts) from the larger worldview of the society within which it develops. It will, in addition, generally be marked out by specific features that differentiate it from more mundane activity; within the context of magical rituals this “marking” is achieved through the use of (for example): conditions of purity; linking the ritual to cosmic time; by the use of items which are either exotic or luxury goods, or linked to particular deities or cults, or which are intrinsically powerful (for example, blood, with its inherent link to life, or magnets, whose “supernatural” powers are inherent); and the use of formalised language and imagery drawn from both traditional cults and the ‘genre’ of Roman-era magic.\footnote{This definition owes a great deal to that offered by Tambiah, who defines ritual according to criteria of formality, conventionality, stereotypy, and rigidity (Tambiah, “A Performative Approach to Ritual”, pp.122-130). Tambiah’s definition, while not without its critics, is nonetheless influential, and some have found it to be a useful one; see for example Sax, “Ritual and the Problem of Efficacy”, pp.7-8.}

3.1.2 The Ritual of Apparition

In contrast to the difficult problem of defining “ritual”, defining the “ritual of apparition” presents a far simpler task. The term is taken from the work of Michael D. Swartz,\footnote{Michael D. Swartz, “Understanding Ritual in Jewish Magic: Perspectives from the Genizah and Related Sources,” in Officina magica: essays on the practice of magic in antiquity, ed. Shaul Shaked (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp.242-243.} who uses it to describe a ritual contained in a text from the Cairo Genizah\footnote{MS. JTSA ENA 6643.4 ll. 4–13.} which offers a clear parallel to many of those in the Roman-era magical papyri. This is a type of ritual in which deities are summoned in order to appear to
the practitioner, to answer questions, bestow favours, or to establish an ongoing relationship. While this type of practice is extremely common in the magical papyri – to the extent that it is often, wrongly, seen as the predominant practice in Roman-era magic (see 2.2.4.1) – the term is not one which has found broader use within scholarship. In part, this is because such practices are often subsumed under the term “divination”, but this ignores the important distinction between, for example, rituals of apparition and the quite different sortition oracles, or other forms of technical divination. Another solution often adopted by scholars is to use a term from Greek or Egyptian, most often autoptos, sustasis, or ph-ntr, but as I will demonstrate below (3.2.3) no emic term adequately covers the full range of practices which we can understand of rituals of apparition; instead they refer more narrowly to particular types of apparition rituals, or else more broadly to divination practices in general. In German, of course, we have the term “Offenbarungzauber” – ”revelation magic” – and the similar English term “revelation spell” is used by a few authors, notably Frankfurter and Ritner. However, the term “revelation” is one I do not find entirely satisfactory, since it implies that the only purpose is the revelation of knowledge, whereas, as we will see (3.2.3.1), the apparition of a deity could be the prelude to other acts. For these reasons, I will use Swartz’s somewhat novel term.

I have already given a minimal definition – “a ritual in which deities are summoned in order to appear to the practitioner” – but it is worth giving a slightly more detailed description of these rituals as they occur within the Theban Library, and in Roman-era magical texts more generally. The rituals are generally preceded by preparatory processes, prominent among which is that of entering into a state of purity, in which the ritualist may avoid sex or particular types of food. The ritual will often be linked to cosmic time by carrying it out on days or nights where specific astrological conjunctions take place, and the invocation ritual itself will generally consist, minimally, of both a burnt offering – although this is often of incense alone – and a spoken formula. The deity may appear through a variety of means, which I will refer to as “media of apparition” – they may appear directly before the waking ritualist, or else in the flame of a lamp or in the liquid of a vessel, or else in dreams, and they may appear to the ritualists themselves, or instead to boys used by them as seers.
3.1.3 Previous studies

To date the only comprehensive work dedicated to rituals of apparition is Hopfner's influential *Griechische-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszaubers* (1921-1924). Hopfner exhaustively contextualised the rituals within the broader framework of Greek philosophy and popular belief, devoting half of the first volume (§§1–377) to the act of tracing ideas about the gods and subordinate deities, and the remainder (§§378–881) to a theoretical and practical exposition of the methods used for communicating with these deities. The second volume looked at the cultural background to the rituals (§§1–69), before examining them in detail according to his threefold model of categorisation, giving detailed expositions and translations of a number of rituals from the Greek and Demotic magical papyri, as well as from relevant literary texts.

It would be misleading to say that there has been no work on rituals of apparition since Hopfner's time, but there has been no similarly ambitious or specialised treatment in the last ninety years; by contrast with the attention that curses\(^{982}\) and erotic rituals\(^{983}\) have received since the 1960s, “divination magic” has been relatively neglected. Johnston suggests that this may be due to divination’s status as a *tertium quid*, neither as respectable as “religion” nor as controversial as “magic”, so that it has received

---

\(^{982}\) Among the works which devote significant space to curses are Faraone, "The Agonistic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells"; H.S. Versnel, "Beyond Cursing: The Appeal to Justice in Judicial Prayers," in *Magika hiera: Ancient Greek magic and religion*, ed. Christopher A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Gager, *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*; Gordon, "Shaping the text: Innovation and authority in Graeco-Egyptian Malign Magic". This list includes only general works, and excludes the numerous publications of particular texts which may include more general discussions of curse rituals.

attention neither from traditional nor revisionist historians.\textsuperscript{984} We may also note, however, that applied curse and erotic artefacts serve as documents of real rituals, and are readily amenable to interpretations as materialisations of the sorts of social conflicts and stresses which interest social historians; by contrast, divination rituals tend to be known only from the more abstract formulaaries, and, especially in the case of rituals of apparition, are less easily related to concrete social conditions. They remain, for many, an oddity of late antique religiosity.

Despite this caveat, there have been several works which have dealt with rituals of apparition,\textsuperscript{985} at shorter length than Hopfner's work. More common, however, than works dealing with rituals of apparition, are studies of particular sub-types, including mediated,\textsuperscript{986} dream,\textsuperscript{987} and lamp divination;\textsuperscript{988} the summoning of \textit{paredroi};\textsuperscript{989} and the practice of necromancy.\textsuperscript{990} Alongside these are works which deal with apparition rituals in the context of discussions of theurgy,\textsuperscript{991} hermeticism,\textsuperscript{992} ancient concepts of dreaming,\textsuperscript{993} or ancient magic more generally.\textsuperscript{994} Rituals of apparition within the Jewish

\begin{thebibliography}{999}
\bibitem{987} Eitrem, "Dreams and Divination in Magical Ritual".
\bibitem{988} Gee, "The Structure of Lamp Divination".
\bibitem{992} Festugière, \textit{La Révélation d’Hermès Trismégiste.}, vol.1, pp. 283-354.
\end{thebibliography}
tradition – the Sefer ha-Razim, the Hekhalot texts, and so on – have received an extensive and sympathetic treatment over the last twenty years, with much of the work produced by Rebecca Lesses, a scholar who draws extensively upon notions of Austinean performativity.995

This brief survey cannot discuss each of these works in the detail they deserve, but in order to contextualise the work which will follow it is worth making explicit some of the limitations of work to date. Firstly, with the exception of Hopfner’s treatment, most discussions focus on individual rituals, or on sub-categories, underplaying or even entirely losing the important continuities of practice within the genre of rituals of apparition. Hopfner’s approach, while preferable, is not without its flaws: among them a reliance on the Preisendanz editions of the Greek texts, and a focus on literary texts, leading to unsatisfying attempts to systematize the more heterogenous papyrological sources. But there is a larger problem at work across much of the work produced on rituals of apparition, and magical material more generally; many discussions simply provide narrative retellings of particular ritual texts, and append brief comments or notes of parallels. This trap is a difficult one to avoid when dealing with this sort of complex material, and yet, when the ritual texts themselves can be adequately accessed either in their original languages or in translation, such expositions provide little additional information, aside from untangling the occasionally confusing sequences of acts.

A preferable approach in my opinion, and one which I will attempt here, is to look at all the available material synoptically, so that patterns and anomalies in ritual components and sequences can be made explicit; additionally, such an approach provides a ready reference against which new texts can be compared. The next section will discuss in more detail how this analysis will be carried out.

3.1.4 Methodology

Emilio Suárez de la Torre begins his discussion of the Little Beggar (PGM 4.2373-2440) by reminding us that “each of the recipes [...] is a world”; that is, each text has its own unique structure and history, a fact which resists attempts at generalisations or the construction of overly ambitious unifying theories. Nonetheless, the discussion which follows his observation makes clear the limitations of this ground-level approach; even his attempt to discuss a single text relies extensively on parallels with the broader corpus of Roman-Egyptian magical material.

The method taken here, then, will be one which casts its net wide to study many ritual texts in a synoptic fashion, yet it cannot be denied that such an approach risks erasing the unique world of each ritual. While the peculiarities of individual texts will be stressed wherever possible, this is a problem which cannot be entirely avoided, and it must be noted that this approach, that of the broad survey, is only one of a number of possible methodologies.

The focus here will be on rituals from the corpus of ritual apparition texts from Egypt; the core of this corpus will be those belonging to the Theban Library, but earlier and later texts in Late Egyptian, Demotic, Greek, Latin, Coptic, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic will be considered where relevant. Wherever possible the text used will be based on my own readings of papyri, either from high-quality digital images or autopsy of the relevant documents. The focus will be on the “insider” evidence produced by practitioners of these rituals, but, again, outsider evidence will be used where appropriate to fill this out, paying close attention in each instance to the ways in which the agendas or sources of particular authors may have coloured their perceptions and accounts of the rituals under discussion. It is important to note that what we are analysing here is not rituals per se, but rather accounts of rituals; descriptions either of hypothetical rituals, in the cases of both the recipes from formularies and the more fictive literary sources, or remembered, and hence unreliable, accounts of rituals in the few cases where we can suspect descriptions of real events. This situation is, of course, to a large extent the norm in studies of the ancient world, but contrasts with the situation of anthropologists or sociologists who

---

study contemporary societies first hand. Some of the practical implications of this situation will be investigated in 3.3.2-3.

The minimalist definition of ritual sketched out above (3.1.1) has certain consequences for the analysis used here. The notion of a ritual as an activity consisting of a number of components, following some sort of “script”, implies that there is an overarching structure giving these components a particular coherence, both in terms of the way in which it would have been enacted and experienced, and can now be analysed. This structure will be described in greater detail in the next section, but we can note here a few features that make this structure similar to language:

1. **Syntagmatic variation**
   Just as lexemes may vary in meaning according to their syntactic employment, ritual components may change their function as their position within the structure is altered: a burnt offering may be part of an invocation, a compulsive rite, or a release procedure.

2. **Paradigmatic variation**
   Ritual components, like lexemes, may be varied on a paradigmatic level – thus, within a single ritual, particular acts may change in subtle ways to change the overall meaning-function: thus the deity being summoned by a particular ritual may change according to the particular formula spoken, or materia burned as an offering.

3. **Recursion**
   While the basic structure of particular magical rituals is relatively fixed, individual instantiations can be extended by the repetition of sequences. Thus an amulet-making or initiation ritual, consisting of the sequence (purification)-(invocation+act)-(exit act) may be prefixed to an apparition ritual consisting of the same sequence, which may further be extended by compulsive rituals appended to the end of an unsuccessful performance.

Nonetheless, while ritual structure may be “language-like”, it cannot be taken straightforwardly as a
semiotic system which can be read in terms of its meaning (see 3.1.1); rather be must understand the rituals and their components as functional within the phenomenological horizons of the practitioners; that is, each ritual was, at least potentially, efficacious in terms of its stated purpose; this point must be assumed here, but will be discussed at more detail at 3.3.1. Nonetheless, we can still to some extent “read” rituals, as telling us something about the worldviews of those who produced them, consisting of components which were meaningful within their context. To highlight this conceptual division between the rituals as they were understood emically and as they can be understood etically, I will sometimes speak of the “meaning-function” of particular ritual components.

These ritual components themselves may be either physical objects (precious stones, for example), or acts (invocations, the act of going to sleep), and they may be combined with one another to produce complexes – the speaking of an invocation while inscribing a stone. The boundary between a component, a complex, and a ritual is somewhat fluid, but can be broadly understood conceptually as a hierarchy, with a component as the smallest unit, complexes as combinations of two or more components, and a ritual composed of one or more complexes.

The function of many of these components, though more often the larger complexes, can be understood in terms of their “source domain”, a context from outside the ritual within which the complex or its components would have occurred, and from which its meaning-function would be derived. Thus the act of preparing a chair or throne for the deity in a ritual of apparition derives its meaning-function from the source domain of hospitality practices, with the function of the chair set up to welcome a guest, or to welcome a deity, forming a straightforward analogy. Other ritual complexes may draw upon the domains of the daily cult rituals enacted for deities, social rituals of deference to superiors, and so on. In some cases documentary or literary evidence can provide us with the references to the source domains necessary to make these judgements; in other cases, the source

997 Compare the comments of Houseman: “rituals do not tell stories; they enact particular realities. They do not so much say things (‘God, who is like a father, is in heaven’, ‘This young person has attained manhood’, ‘Your neighbour’s witchcraft has been neutralized’) as do them. For this reason, linguistic communication is a poor model for understanding what is going on in ritual.’ (M. Houseman, “Relationality,” in Theorizing Rituals: Issues, Topics, Approaches, Concepts, ed. Jens Kreinath, Jan Snoek, and Michael Stausberg (Leiden: Brill, 2006), p.441.)
domain, or “meaning-function” of rituals may be less clear.

A further way of analysing ritual components and complexes is in terms of “marking”. This terminology draws from linguistic analysis, whereby lexemes and morphemes can be said to be marked in terms of various features – tense, aspect, gender, formality, and so on. Within rituals of apparition the materia used within ritual complexes can be marked in three main ways. The first way is marking in terms of the *invoked deity*; thus, for example, rituals invoking solar deities may use materia drawn from the laurel plant, linked in Hellenic belief to the sun god Apollo, or they may be oriented towards the east, the direction of the sun’s rising. Secondly, materia may be marked as *magico-cultic*; in this case there is no specific link to a deity, but the object is considered to have a connection to magical or other cultic ritual practice. The final type of marking common in magical rituals is marking in terms of *prestige*; in this case objects may not have any link to a deity or particular cultic function, but will be unusual or expensive instances of common objects. Thus, for example, the relatively expensive hieratic papyrus is often specified as the type of papyrus to be used within rituals.998 Again, these three forms of marking should be considered as relative rather than absolute: items to be used in magica rituals are often specified to be new, and this can be understood as marking either according to prestige (they are both unusual and purchased especially for the occasion) or magico-cultic function (the association between new items and magical rituals may be strong enough that they acquire a cultic meaning).

I have already introduced several key pieces of terminology, but it is worth making explicit the sense in which a few others are used. The individual carrying out a ritual is referred to indifferently as either a ritualist or a (ritual) practitioner. This should be understood in a relative rather than absolute sense; “ritualist” or “ritual expert” should not be mistaken as a more palatable synonym for “magician”. While those carrying out, and interested in, rituals of apparition would have been “ritual experts” by virtue of the knowledge they displayed, Roman Egypt would have been home to many other “ritual experts” –

---

the functionaries of the Roman state, the civic cults, Christian groups – who would not necessarily have been involved in “magical” practice as defined here. Where other individuals are involved, as in curses, healing, or erotic rituals, they will be referred to as victim (the object of an aggressive ritual), patient (the object of a healing ritual), or client (the individual for whom a ritual is being carried out).

A final, but crucial, point of terminology concerns the term “deity”. Here it is used to describe beings covered by a wide range of Greek and Egyptian terms, but which can be operationally defined here as “the immaterial beings summoned to appear in rituals of apparition”. This includes the great cultic figures – Apollo, Osiris, the Christian and Jewish god – usually considered as deities, but also beings whose titles may imply a lesser status, including angels, *daimōns*, and the spirits of the dead. This usage may seem too broad to some, but it is justified by the apparent lack of differentiation found in the papyri and related documents themselves.999 Deity thus serves a convenient shorthand with which most readers will have familiarity, in contrast to the more precise, but less transparent, coinages used

999 This elision is clearest in rituals where the deity is referred to by multiple, apparently contradictory titles; thus in PGM 1.42-195 the deity is variously described as δύναλς (l.176), δεός (l.97), πνεύμα (l.197); likewise, in PGM 5.459-489 the deity is both a δαίμων (L.465) and a δεός (L.465); again, in PGM 13.345-646 the deity is referred to both as a δεός (L.564) and an ἄγγελος (L.649). This apparent lack of distinction can to some extent be explained by certain readings of the evidence; thus Pachoumi (“Divine Epiphanies of Paredroi”) argues that the ‘god’ and ‘angel’ in rituals such as PGM 1.42-195 are represent separate beings linked in a hypostatic hierarchy, while Smith (Smith, “The Eighth Book of Moses and How it Grew”, p.220) believes that the “angel” and “god” in PGM 13.345-646 are different deities, with the angel being mentioned in a later addition to the text. In fact it seems to me that the “angel” serves the same function as the god in the recension as the god does in the third recension of the same ritual (PGM 13.345-646), namely revealing and ameliorating the ritualist’s fate. As I argue later (3.2.3.6) the phrase σύστησόν με should be translated not “intruduce me [to the god]”, but rather “conjoin me [to you]”; conjunction referring to the special relationship between practitioner and deity brought about by the ritual of σύστασις. This lack of clear discrimination between gods and angels is also noted in the case of the Hekhalot literature by Lesses, *Ritual Practices to Gain Power*, p.247.

Similarly, a lack of clear distinction between “gods” and the spirits of the dead is strongly implied by rituals such as PGM 4.154-285, where the same ritual can be used to summon either a god or a dead spirit depending on the choice of liquid used in the vessel divination; and PDM 14.1-92, where the choice of materia burned as an offering has the same effect. This is equally apparent in literary texts; thus, for example, in Thessalos’ *De Virtutis Herbarum* 22, where Thessalos is given the choice of summoning a god or dead spirit. Compare P.BM EA 10672 (I CE), a sign-list in which the hieroglyph for “god” (@Table:229) is glossed as “(one) who is buried” (ἰὼν κρός, w, 15.2). Petrie and Griffith (*Two hieroglyphic papyri from Tuna*, London: Tübner & Co., 1889), p.16) understood this as referring primarily to the deified dead, while Newberry (Percy E. Newberry, “The Cult of the [God]-Pole,” *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 33(1947), p.91) took it as a reference to the swaddling of the fetish represented by the hieroglyph, but texts from the Graeco-Roman period regularly use the word krs, with the same determinative as the papyrus, to refer to the burial of Osiris; see Penelope Wilson, *A Ptolemaic Lexicon. A Lexicographical Study of the Texts in the Temple of Edfu* (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1997), pp.1067-1068.
by writers in other disciplines.\textsuperscript{1000}

3.2 Understanding Rituals of Apparition

This loose definition has sketched the outlines of the ritual of apparition, but the following sections will refine it and begin to fill in the gaps. The first discussion sets out the etic framework within which I will analyse the different sub-categories of this ritual type. The second supplements this with an emic perspective, using a lexicographical study of the terms used within formularies. The third section steps back to looks at the social context of rituals of apparition, using both internal and external, literary sources, to reconstruct the rationale for, and processes involved in, ritual performances.

3.2.1 Forms

Within the literature which deals with ancient magic there are loose terminological conventions which serve to discriminate between the different sub-types of apparition rituals, but the only attempt to establish a clear system was developed (unsurprisingly) by Hopfner. This model was an extension of a broader schema which divided magic (“Zauber”) into three classes, \( \theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \gamma \epsilon \iota \alpha \), \( \mu \alpha \gamma \iota \alpha \), and \( \gamma \omega \eta \tau \epsilon \iota \alpha \), based on the aims and methods used by practitioners.\textsuperscript{1001} While he admitted that these categories were more of an ideal, dependent on the models of philosophers, and in particular Iamblichus,\textsuperscript{1002} he nonetheless used them to subdivide the categories of “revelation magic” (“Offenbarungszauber”). His model had three overarching types, with further subtypes:\textsuperscript{1003}


\textsuperscript{1001} Hopfner, Griechische-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber, vol. 2. §§41-46. According to this model \( \gamma \omega \eta \tau \epsilon \iota \alpha \), the lowest form of magic, was concerned with harmful magic (“Angriffs- und Schadenzauber”), and primarily used sympathetic materia to coerce the lowest daimōns; \( \mu \gamma \epsilon \iota \alpha \) was concerned with love, power, and protective magic (“Liebes-, Macht-, Schutz- und Abwehrzauber”), and called upon higher daimons, and sometimes gods using magical prayers; while \( \theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \gamma \epsilon \iota \alpha \) was concerned with knowledge and revelation magic, and made use of the highest angels, archangels and gods (“Erkenntnis- und Offenbarungszauber”); the ideal theurgist would use no material implements.

\textsuperscript{1002} Ibid. vol 2. §§46, 70.

\textsuperscript{1003} Ibid. vol 2. §§72-75.
1. **Theurgic divination (“theurgische Divination”)**

   In theurgic divination the deity appeared directly, without the mediation of a human seer or an intervening medium of apparition (“Immanenzmittel”). In a true theurgic divination the soul of the ritualist would rise up out of its body to meet the deity in an ecstatic rapture, but Hopfner acknowledged that the type found in the magical papyri more often showed a god being brought down to earth. For Hopfner, appearances of the deity in dreams were also instances of theurgic divination, since the deity appeared to the ritualist directly.

2. **Magical divination (“magische Divination”)**

   In magical divination a deity still appeared, but not directly to the ritualist; instead they made themselves known to a human seer, or else via a medium of apparition – appearing in the water of a vessel, the flame of a lamp, the reflection of a mirror, and so on. A second type of magical divination involved the deity making itself known through indirect means; rather than appearing they might speak through an inspired human medium, or an animal.

3. **Goetic divination (“goetische Divination”)**

   The final category did not involve direct communication with a deity; instead the movements or changes in property of inanimate objects were observed as signs by which the desired information could be divined.

In addition to these three categories, Hopfner noted the phenomenon of necromancy (“Nekromantie”), that is, communicating with the spirits of the dead rather than a god or angel, which could be practiced according to any of the three methods.\(^{1004}\) Having set out this system, Hopfner attempted to classify the practices of the Greek and Demotic magical papyri according to its outlines,\(^{1005}\) but despite references to his model by Festugière\(^{1006}\) and Martin,\(^{1007}\) it has generally remained unused.

\(^{1004}\) Ibid. vol 2. §74.

\(^{1005}\) Ibid. vol 2. §75. In broad terms, Hopfner’s assessments of the types of rituals in the papyri agree with mine, although there are certain texts which he considered to be apparition rituals that I do not. Additionally, the line references given by Hopfner are often inaccurate, perhaps due to his reliance on Preisendanz, whose line numbering is at times difficult to follow.

\(^{1006}\) Festugière, *La Récvélation d’Hermès Trismégiste*, vol. 1 pp.283-284.
A second, less rigid, model is that of Gordon, concerned primarily with relationship between the different forms of apparition rituals, arguing that there is an implicit “hierarchy of authority” between them. Thus he argues that dreams – "purely mental... phenomen[a]" – represent the lowest form, followed by lamp and vessel divination (with or without boy seer), in which the medium of apparition comes between the ritualist and the deity; the highest form is the “direct vision”, which he associates implicitly with the term ἄυτοπτος (see 3.2.3.3).

These models make a great deal of sense to us as modern readers, and, as Hopfner ably demonstrates, there is strong evidence that those philosophers associated with the theurgic tradition viewed the assemblage of Romen-era magical practices in hierarchical, not to mention moralistic, terms. But this must not be our starting point for investigating the practices of the papyri. Instead we need to ask whether the philosophical models were representative of, or reacting against, popular or alternative understandings of ritual practice.

One way to approach this question, and indeed the related question of whether the ritual of apparition does in fact represent a coherent category, is to look at those surviving recipes which contain instructions for multiple alternative ritual types. This data is contained in table 16. Immediately it should be obvious that these 11 recipes are not evenly distributed – nine belong to PDM 14; the remaining two are found in PGM 2 & 8. The first, and most important observation to be made is that there is no implied valuation apparent to me in the descriptions of the two or more rituals for which each recipe contains instructions, with one possible exception; in PDM 2.1-64 the main ritual is a dream oracle, and a mediated lamp ritual is only suggested as an option if the main ritual and the compulsive practices fail. This may imply that an unmediated ritual is preferable to a mediated one, but note that this clearly undermines Gordon’s model, whereby lamp divination is always preferable to a dream oracle. Yet when we compare the other spells, we can see that recipes provide similar procedures for rituals with (mediated) and without boy seers (unmediated), as well as rituals where the medium of apparition is a lamp and a constellation (Ursa Major). While there are no clear

---

1007 Martin, Magie et magiciens dans le monde gréco-romain., p.261. Martin appears to rely solely on Festugière.
1008 Gordon, "Reporting the Marvellous: Private Divination in the Greek Magical Papyri", pp.82-83.
instances of direct visions – rituals of apparition where no medium of apparition is used – overlapping with non-direct visions, the lack of a clear term for this type in the vocabulary of the magical papyri should strongly imply that the distinction was not a particularly important one for the ritual's practitioners (see 3.2.3.3).

Thus, I would argue that the models of both Hopfner and Gordon are overly reliant on literary, and particularly Neoplatonic, conceptions of a hierarchy of ritual practice, and on modern conceptions of the relative values of waking and sleeping experience. The first of these risks mistaking factional polemic for meaningful differences, while the latter may encode valuations alien to the society being studied. An instructive case in point is P.Oxy.XI 1381, an encomium of Asklepios-Imhotep, in which the same apparition of the god is witnessed by both the sleeping author and his wide awake mother, implying that the two modalities could be equally reliable.1009

1009 P.Oxy.XI 1381.102-140. The author is clear that, for his mother, it was 'no dream or sleep' (οὔτ'ὄναρ οὔθ’ ὕπνος, ll.108-109), while he saw the same vision in dreams (δι’ ὄνειράτων, l.139-140). See also Thessalos apparent indifference as to whether he received an answer to his question either "by a dream or by a divine spirit" (δι’ ὀνείρου φαντασίας ἢ διὰ πνεύματος θείου, De Virtutibus Herborum 11).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Ritual</th>
<th>Unmediated</th>
<th>Mediated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursa Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Direct         |            |          |
| Dream          |            |          |
| Lamp           |            |          |
| Vessel         |            |          |
| Sun            |            |          |
| Moon           |            |          |
| Ursa Major     |            |          |

16: Apparition ritual types and alternative.
Instead, I will use a model that is purely descriptive, with the different forms of the ritual represented merely as a range of options rather than arranged hierarchically according to their truth or moral value; this would seem to agree with the methods of the ritualists who used the Theban Library and similar collections. The clearest way to divide apparition rituals is according to two axes: the first, mediated or unmediated, describes whether or not the ritualist makes use of a boy seer as an intermediary. The second axis, medium of apparition, describes the manner by which the deity appears. If the deity appears directly to either the waking ritualist or boy seer, it is direct, otherwise it may appear in the liquid of a vessel, the flame of a lamp, the light of the sun, moon, or a constellation (usually Ursa Major), or else in dreams. Theoretically there could be further media of apparition; PGM 13.752 mentions εἰσοπτρομαντεία (“mirror divination”), although it is not attested elsewhere in the extant magical papyri. Additionally, it should be noted this model does not fully accommodate either ἀναγωγή (ascent rituals), or inspired divination, that is rituals where the deity speaks through the boy medium, rather than merely appearing to him. But each of these practices is represented only once in the extant handbooks, and so can be merely noted as important anomalies.\footnote{These are the Mithras Liturgy (PGM 4.475-824), the anagōgē ritual, and Solomon’s collapse (PGM 4.850-929), the inspired mediumistic divination ritual.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of boy seer</th>
<th>Medium of apparition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (Direct)</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Mediated)</td>
<td>Lamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (Unmediated)</td>
<td>Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ursa Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dream</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As I hope the discussion of overlap between types of rituals has demonstrated, the diversity of the ritual of apparition should not obscure the fact that there seems to be a single overarching phenomenon. This is further demonstrated by the similarity in structure between the hundred or so surviving Roman-era rituals. This will become more clear in the next chapter, where ritual components and complexes are explored, but for now I will sketch out the essential outlines of the procedures.

The most minimal recipes for apparition rituals contain only invocation formulae intended to summon the deities to appear, and this speech act seems to have been the most essential act of such practices. The ideal response of the deity was of course to arrive in an encounter, although the texts are clear that this did not always occur. Thus the simplest ritual of apparition consists of only a single act:

\[ \text{INVOCATION} \]

Alongside the spoken formula, the invocation is often described as including bodily acts, most often the burning of an offering, usually incense, but often of some combination of incense, plant, animal, and mineral materia. Thus we could describe a simple, ideal, ritual of apparition, thus:

\[ \text{INVOCATION} \quad + \quad \text{offering} \]

\[ \text{INVOCATION} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{ENCOUNTER} \]
Missing, of course, from this sequence, is the “machinery” of the ritual, the physical objects whose presence often seems to have been a necessary feature. Most crucial among these is the medium of apparition, in rituals where it was called for. The media of apparition encountered in the papyri are lamps, vessels, and celestial bodies (the sun, moon, and stars). These, alongside the physical objects which could serve as bodies for deities – primarily statues and animal mummies – seem to have served as *divine icons*; their meaning-function was to act as a physical indicator of the god's presence prior to their experienced presence in the encounter. Thus they tend to serve a central role in the invocations: the ritualist and other materia are physically oriented towards and around them, and formulae are spoken to them. Alongside the media of apparition are the frequently encountered boy seers; again, these boys are regularly encountered.

Before the main ritual could take place, the physical space and objects to be used in it would have to be prepared. The recipes regularly instruct that the rituals are to take place at certain times, measured either according to the zodiacal position of the moon, the lunar month, the hour of the day or night, or all three. They also at times specify where the ritual is to take place, and how the space is to be purified or marked with, for example, *kharaktēres* or images. Alongside these larger tasks, smaller acts of preparation included the creation of phylacteries, eyepaints, and other aides; the production of these artefacts could themselves be the subject of smaller rituals.

In addition to the main ritual, there are what we could term “affixed rituals”, similar in their outline to the main invocation ritual, but taking place before or after. The preliminary rituals, including the one referred to in the Greek papyri as a *συστασις*, seem to have served to establish a relationship between the deity and the ritualist and/or their materia, so that the success of the main ritual could be guaranteed. Like the main invocation rituals, the place and time of these preliminary rituals is often specified, and
they generally consist of invocations, and acts including burnt offerings, as well as, in some cases, apparitions.

The most common affixed rituals are compulsive and release rituals. Compulsive rituals generally take place after an unsuccessful invocation, and are intended to force the deity to appear; release procedures, by contrast, take place after a successful invocation, and are intended to ensure that the deity leaves in peace without harming the ritualist. Both of these activities, like invocations, generally consist of spoken formulae and burnt offerings, and this serves as an excellent example of what I earlier referred to as syntagmatic variation; the position of the formula and offering within the ritual as a whole is the most unambiguous indicator of its function.

If we construct a hypothetical sequence of a ritual of apparition, we can see how the other two features I have identified can be realised:

![Sequence Diagram](image)

Here we can see the recursive nature of rituals of apparition, as sequences of similar acts are strung together to create longer ritual complexes. While paradigmatic variation is not apparent at this level of analysis, we might notice it when we examine the content of formulae; thus the meaning of an offering may change depending on the materia burnt: preliminary and invocation offerings often consist of incense, whereas those for release procedures may use the brains or feet of animals.

These stages will be examined in greater detail in the next chapter. Having outlined the
types and procedures of the ritual of apparition, it is time to turn to the Greek and Egyptian words used to describe them.

3.2.2 Terms for Rituals of Apparition in the Papyri

As already noted, no single term in either Egyptian or Greek is used consistently to designate the category of practice referred to in this thesis as the ritual of apparition. Authors such as Ritner, Dieleman, and Gordon often use \( ph-ntr \) (for Egyptian), and \( αὔτοπτος \) or \( σύστασις \) (Greek) as generic terms, but to date no systematic survey of the usages of these terms in the corpus of Greek and Demotic magical papyri has been carried out. The following section aims to correct this oversight, examining the major terms encountered in the texts, and attempting to provide statements on not only their usage – the range of rituals to which they can be applied – but also their origins, whether they represent appropriations of everyday language, or are borrowings from contemporary philosophical or religious discourse. For this purpose, I will draw as necessary upon sources from outside the papyri, principally those discussed in 2.3.4.2.

In the following discussion I will use the term “cognate” to refer to words which share both lexical roots and semantic range, with the principal lexeme highlighted in the title of each discussion. This will include not only forms which fulfil a different grammatical role – as verbs or adjectives rather than as nouns, for example – but also compounds including the core lexeme. Of course, shared roots do not guarantee shared meanings – consider the common problem of “false friends” encountered by speakers of different European languages – and so in each case I will endeavour to ensure that each instance cited is relevant to the definitional task at hand.

These investigations will limit themselves, for the most part, to the immediate predecessors of the usage of the key terms, rather than full etymological discussions. While such investigations would doubtless be rewarding, they are not necessary in a study of this scope, which seeks to define each term with reference to a specific, fairly narrow,
domain of usage. Each discussion will be accompanied by a table listing instances of the
term in magical papyri; I do not include here manuscripts later than the sixth century CE,
and although the Theban Library will remain the core group under consideration, the
following discussion will give instances of each term from other known formularies of the
Roman period. Each text (that is, recipe) discussed will be accompanied by a brief
description of the medium of apparition—whether it used a boy seer or not
("(un)mediated"), and whether the deity makes its appearance in sleep ("dream"), the
flame of a lamp ("lamp"), or directly to the ritualist ("direct"). In some cases the type of
ritual will not be strictly relevant for consideration of the range of the word—generally in
those texts where the ritual of apparition is not the primary purpose, or a list of uses is
simply being given—and in these cases the information in the "medium of Apparition"
column in the table will be bracketed.

3.2.2.1 Pḥ-nṯr

The first term to be discussed here is also the most lexicographically complex. The term
$pḥ-nṯr$ appears 15 times in eight recipes (see table 20) in two of the Demotic papyri (PDM
14 & Suppl.), and in each instance the term refers to a ritual of apparition without a
medium; in every case where the form of the ritual is clear, it refers to a dream oracle, and
in one instances (PDM 14.805-840) it may also refer to lamp divination. In one instance
(PDM 14.232-238) the ritual is a binary oracle rather than a ritual of apparition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Medium of apparition</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.93-114</td>
<td>Unmediated: Dream</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ritual as a whole is titled a ‘horoscope-casting for an inquiry (sš-mšt) performed by Imhotep’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.150-231</td>
<td>Unmediated: Dream</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ritual also includes instructions for a mediated lamp divination ritual (wš n pỉ hbs (150), šn n pỉ šw n (176)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.232-238</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream (binary oracle)</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specified as r-hrw pỉ-sḥ pỉ wšb n ks ‘according to Pisash the wab-priest of Kes’. The ritual has characteristics of a binary oracle, but there is some indications it also functioned as a ritual of apparition. Despite the lack of detail, it seems most likely to be a dream oracle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21: Instances of ph-ntr in magical texts</td>
<td></td>
<td>828</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ritual describes alternative procedures for a lamp divination (šn-hne n pỉ hbs) using a medium, a direct lamp divination, and a dream oracle. The term ph-ntr seems to refer to the dream oracle, and possibly one instance of unmediated lamp divination. In l.836, 837 the ph-ntr is specified as n mnebi (“of Manebai”) and n mwribi (“of Muriba”) respectively, referring to the formula to be used in each instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.805-840</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream or lamp</td>
<td>833</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specified as n wsIr (“of Osiris”) written as a rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM Suppl.130-138</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specified as n dhwty (“of Thoth”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM Suppl.149-162</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specified as n iy-m-htp (“of Imhotep”). The reference to awakening (tnw) in l.182 suggests it may be a dream oracle. The instance in l.183 is part of a rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The earliest reading of the term was by Maspero, who read it as *sš* ("formula, writing")\(^{1019}\) without offering a discussion. Subsequently, Griffith and Thompson tentatively suggested *whj-ntr*, literally "god’s letter", translated as "inquiry"; they noted that the "meaning always seems to be direct divination without medium". This reading was followed by Bresciani, who suggested that the term should be understood as equivalent to the ἐπιταγή τοῦ θεοῦ ("commandment of the god"),\(^{1020}\) but while this Greek term does appear in several magical papyri both within and outside the Theban Library, it never occurs as the title of a category of ritual, as it does in the Demotic texts, so his suggestion cannot be accepted. Revillout, closer to the mark, translated it as "a divine coming".\(^{1021}\)

The reading I accept here was proposed by Johnson in her reading of PDM Suppl., where the term, in its initial two instances, is written partially in hieratic. In the second two instances, and throughout the probably later papyrus PDM 14, it is written in a fully Demotic form. The term *ph-ntr* is known from older texts in hieroglyphic, hieratic and Demotic writing, and while the individual elements are clear, their syntactic relationship is less obvious. The first, *ph*, is a nominalised form of the verb meaning "to arrive, to reach, to attain", and rarely "to attack", while the second, *ntr*, is the word for "god". The difficulty arises in deciding whether *ntr* is to be understood as the subject of the verb, or its object, and we may further ask whether the compound had undergone lexicalisation, so that the meaning could no longer be understood simply in terms of its elements, but rather in

\(^{1019}\) Maspero uses the transliteration *seχα* in l.828, *sχαυ* for l.833, *sχα* in l.836 and *sχάι* in l.837, translating it as "formule", "conjuration" and "forme" (twice) respectively, presumably understanding them as various nominalised forms of the verb surviving in Sahidic as *ⲥⲧⲧⲁⲡ* (Maspero, "Papyrus Magiques" pp.30-34 & n.50). Compare *Mémoire sur quelques papyrus du Louvre*, p.119, where he translates it as "incantation" (PDM Suppl.130).


\(^{1021}\) "Une divine venue". He provides the hieroglyphic transcription  transliterated as *ear neter i*. The transcription is of PDM 14.95 (Revillout, "Papyrus Magique de Londres et de Leide", p.33).
terms of a derived meaning. The following translations are offered by scholars who accept the reading \( ph-nTr \):

1. divine visitation\(^{1022} \)
2. god’s arrival\(^{1023} \)
3. divine audience\(^{1024} \)
4. petitioning (lit. “reaching”) god\(^{1025} \)
5. divine oracle\(^{1026} \)

The first two options understand \( nTr \) as the subject, the fourth as the object, and the third through fifth assume some degree of lexicalisation. The lack of translations which understand \( nTr \) simply as the object is sensible, since all movement in the texts themselves is understood as from the deity to the ritualist, making a straightforward reading of “reaching god” untenable. Before concluding which reading is most acceptable, it is worth surveying the few other contexts in which the phrase, or echoes of it, occur.

1. **CT 401**

Gee suggests\(^{1027} \) that the earliest instance of a mention of a \( ph-nTr \) may be found in this utterance, spoken to the seven ferrymen (\( mhntyw \)) of the west, which requests that they provide the speaker with a barge in order to descend through


\(^{1023}\) Johnson, "Louvre E3229", pp.90-91. She had earlier made the same translation without comment in *The Demotic Verbal System*, p.292, and would use it throughout her English versions of PDM 14 & Suppl. in Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*.


\(^{1025}\) Ritner, "Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire", p.3346.


\(^{1027}\) John Gee, "The earliest example of the \( ph-nTr \)?," *Göttinger Miszellen* 194(2003), p.27.
the door of the west and reach \((ph)\) the god.\(^\text{1028}\) The meaning of the text can be understood in terms of Egyptian astrological lore: the ferrymen represent asterisms who travel in the path of the sun god, who are petitioned here to bear the deceased safely to the otherworld.\(^\text{1029}\) Despite the presence of both lexemes, there seems no obvious connection to the later divinatory practice, but rather a more straightforward meaning of reaching the sun-god’s location.

2. **The Shipwrecked Sailor**

This Middle Kingdom narrative text describes the story of a sailor who survives a shipwreck and is washed onto an island where he discovers abundant food. Making a burnt offering, an enormous divine serpent appears before him; he prostrates himself before it, and the serpent demands that he tell it how he arrived on the island. After hearing his story, the serpent reassures the sailor that he is safe, telling him not to be afraid, as he has reached \((ph, l.113)\) the serpent. Gee suggests this to be the earliest clear example of a \(ph\)-\(n\(\text{tr}\), relating the actions of the sailor – a burnt offering which precipitates the appearance of the deity – to the Demotic examples\(^\text{1030}\). This argument does not seem entirely satisfactory, however; the burnt offerings in the Roman-era rituals of apparition are accompaniments to spoken invocations (see 4.3), of which there is no example in the *Shipwrecked Sailor* – indeed, while we would expect some degree of fear as a reasonable a reaction to a divine apparition, the serpent’s appearance before the sailor seems entirely unexpected. Within the narrative, too, a more plausible explanation can be found: the sailor has been describing his journey and shipwreck, to which the serpent replies by telling him that the god has saved him by bringing him to an abundantly provisioned island. In this context, it makes more sense to understand

\(^{1028}\) *h\(\text{iy}=\text{i m r} \text{\text{\text{\textsl{imm.t ph=\text{i ntr}}}}[\ldots]}*.* De Buck suggests the following traces may be read \(\text{\text{Tmy.w}}\); Adriaan De Buck, *The Egyptian Coffin Texts* (The University of Chicago Press, 1935-1961), vol.5 p.174.


\(^{1030}\) Gee, "The earliest example of the \(\text{\text{\textsl{ph-n\(\text{tr}\)}}}\)."
the serpent's statement as an initial reassurance, that despite his hardships he is now safe, having reached the safety of the serpent and its island.

3. P.Rollin + P.Lee

One of the most complex contexts in which the term $ph\text{-}ntr$ appears is in P.Lee l.3, a document relating to the trial of individuals implicated in the “Harem Conspiracy”, a plot to assassinate Ramsess III. This particular section describes how Pairi, one of the conspirators being tried, gave a document for “respect and fear” ($nrw \ Ʒf(\mathcal{t})$) to Penhoubin, the overseer of cattle, in the name of the pharaoh. A literal translation of the following would read: *He began to perform a $ph\text{-}ntr$. Life Peace Health. He reached the harem on the side of that other very high place. The people were deceived (?)*. He began to make inscribed men of wax.* Broadly speaking, there are three ways to understand this passage. According to the first, that of Goedicke and Redford,* the $ph\text{-}ntr$ was a festival or ritual taking place during the attempted assassination, and the document Penhoubin receives is understood as a passport allowing him to move freely within Medinet Habu on the pretext of taking part in the $ph\text{-}ntr$. By contrast, Kruchten understands the $ph\text{-}ntr$ to refer to a divinatory procedure in which Penhoubin asked illicit questions relating to the royal household, perhaps in a manner analogous to the accusations against the Roman-era visitors to the oracle of Bes (see 2.3.1).* Finally, Ritner understands the document to be a ritual text from a temple, which contained the instructions for both the $ph\text{-}ntr$ and the creation of wax images, both of which were magical procedures intended to control people to allow the assassination to take place; he suggests that it may have been a “hostile oracle”.*

---

* $iw=f \ hpr \ hr \ ph\text{-}ntr \ s\tilde{y}w \ n\text{;} \ rm\text{t}w \ iw=f \ ph \ t\ i \ r\it^{\ell} \ pr \ hpr \ t\ i \ k\ t \ st. \ c\tilde{t} \ m\text{d}t. \ iw=f \ hpr \ hr \ ir \ rm\text{t}w \ n \ mn\tilde{y} \ ss\tilde{w}$.


A definitive answer to which of these interpretations is correct will not be ventured here, although the understanding of the \( ph-ntr \) as a festival is strengthened to some extent by the attestation of a festival of the same name at a later period (no.5 below); it is clear, however, that the term here refers to some sort of oracular procedure.

4. **P.Turin Cat. 2072**

This papyrus, a journal describing events concerning the team of workers in the necropolis. There is a mention in it of "a lamp \([\text{c.9 sign groups}]\)-wa and Qenna, to \( ph\ p[3\ ntr] \)" (v1.6). Kruchten and Ritner understand here that the two individuals \([\text{-wa and Qenna have been provided with lamps to "approach the god"}, \text{understood as carrying out the \( ph-ntr \) ritual, most likely some kind of lamp divination. Helck translates "...[x-number of] lamps went to (?) Amunwa and Qenna for the god's arrival."}^{1035} \) The nine intervening sign groups make any definitive understanding of the connection between the lamp and the two workers problematic, and we can see that there are essentially two understandings here. The first understands the workers as using the lamps to carry out their own private oracular rituals, the second understands the workers to be using the lamps to participate in a larger oracular event. There is little in the immediate context to suggest which is correct, but in the absence of contemporary evidence for lamp divination, the idea of two necropolis workers carrying out in private a ritual whose attestations are restricted to members of the royal family and the priesthood seems anachronistic; by contrast there is considerable evidence for the use of lamps as votive offerings in Egyptian temple religion, and some evidence (below, no.5) for the existence of a \( ph-ntr \) festival at a later date.

---

1035 "...Fackeln x. [Es gingen ?] \([jmr\text{-}]\-\text{\( w^\prime \) und} \text{Qnn}\) zur An\[-\]kunft des Gottes." W. Helck and A. Schlott-Schwab, *Die datierten und datierbaren Ostraka, Papyri und Graffiti von Deir el-Medineh* (Harrassowitz, 2002), p.499.
5. Karnak Temple

The clearest mention of the *ph-ntr* occurs in two texts from the Temple of Amun at Karnak, the first on the east wall of the court of the 10th Pylon (the *Oracular Text of Djehutymose*),\(^\text{1036}\) the second (now lost) on the north face of the 10th Pylon itself (*Oracle regarding the property of Henutawy*),\(^\text{1037}\) both from the rule of Pinedjem II as high priest of Amun (990-969 BCE). The first text describes a “beautiful festival of the *ph-ntr*”, possibly abbreviated in one instance simply as *ph-ntr*, in which the barques of Amun, Mut and Khons were brought out over a period of 13 (?) days to be presented with pairs of oracle tickets concerning the malfeasance of certain priests, including Djehutymose, who had the inscription carved to record the verdict of the god, that he was innocent of the charges of misconduct. The second text records an oracular verdict by Amun concerning the property of a woman called Henutawy, identified by Maspero as the sister of Pinedjem.\(^\text{1038}\) In both cases the agent of the *ph-ntr* is identified, using the particle *în*, as Pinedjem himself, suggesting that an appropriate translation in these instances may be something along the lines of “going to the god (performed by Pinedjem)”.

The basic procedure of the *ph-ntr* in these cases appears to be the same as a standard processional oracle, where the divine barque indicated the correct option by moving in the direction of the ticket with the correct verdict written on it, selecting it from amongst two or more others placed before it; as in the case of other such oracles, the god’s decision held legal force. Kruchten suggests that the *ph-ntr* may be distinguished by taking place over several days, but that in particular it referred in this instance to a novel festival instituted by the theocratic

\(^{1036}\) Published in Kruchten, *Le grand texte oraculaire du Djéhoutymose*. See also the earlier discussion in Kruchten, "Un Instrument Politique Original".

\(^{1037}\) The text, now destroyed, was copied by Champollion. The transcription can be found in Gaston Maspero, "Les Momies Royales de Déir el-Bahari," *Mission Archéologique Française au Caire* 1(1889), pp.704-706, while a translation and discussion can be found in Alan Gardiner, "The Gods of Thebes as Guarantors of Personal Property," *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 48 (1962).

priestly rulers of whom Pinedjem was one. As she points out, the “beautiful festival of the ph-ntr” is not attested in earlier or later sources. This cannot be decisive however; the evidence for Egyptian festivals is very sparse, and it would be quite possible for the festival to have existed for some time before and after its X BCE attestations.

6. **BM 10587**

This text is an oracular amuletic decree, a text produced as a result of an oracular consultation of the god Khonsu-in-Thebes-Neferhotep, for Nesankhef(en)maat, son of Tabiyabaty and Padimatit; it would have been rolled up and worn as an amulet around his neck. The text probably dates to the XXI-XXII Dynasty (XI-VIII BCE). In the text of the amulet the deity promises to protect the boy from several dangers, including the undertaking to “nullify (wṣf) every bad ph-n-nTr”. It might be possible to understand this instance as referring to visitations from hostile deities, since several passages in this and other such decrees refer to averting the dangers posed by hostile gods, but as Kruchten suggests, a better explanation may be found in understanding ph-n-nTr in this case to mean “oracular verdict.” There are several other examples in the corpus of such amulets of the deity promising to avert the outcome of bad oracles, and the term wṣf is used elsewhere to refer to nullifying speech or dreams, the latter probably referring to prophetic dreams, both of which might be understood as equivalent to oracles. Worth noting here is that the term appears to refer not to the process of consultation, but rather the outcome, the oracular declaration.

7. **The Teachings of Onchsheshonqy**

In one of the many aphorisms contained in this Demotic wisdom text, we find a statement whose exact meaning is difficult to ascertain, but which seems to

---

1040 Ibid., p.64.
mention the $ph\cdot ntr$. Among the translations offered are 1) “if you ask three wise men about a single thing, it is certainly the (god's) arrival of the great god”, and 2) “you should inquire of three wise men about an individual matter if it is important enough for an oracular petition of the great god”. The translation depends on two points, firstly, whether the two clauses beginning with $iw=$ are understood as future injunctives, circumstantials, or conditionals, and secondly, the function of the adverb $m\cdot sh$. The second of the two translations here, while perhaps more natural, raises problems of interpretation: if the matter is important enough for an “oracular petition”, why would someone go to “wise men” for advice, rather than the god? While I will not suggest a definitive solution here, the interpretation offered in the previous case, where $ph\cdot ntr$ refers to the god's oracular declaration rather than the oracular process itself, seems promising. Expanding upon the first translation offered, the sense might be “if you ask three wise men about a single matter, it (that is, their answer) is certainly the pronouncement of the great god.”

8. P.Petese II. D + E

Two instances of $ph\cdot ntr$ are found in P.Petese II, a narrative text containing a series of short stories, dating to around 100 CE, and belonging to the Tebtunis temple library. The first occurs in a fragment too brief to be certain of its context, but the second is found in a story apparently concerning a woman

---

1042 $iw=k\ s\ n\ m\ d\ t\ iw=s\ m\ s\ n\ ph\cdot ntr\ ntr\ c\ s$, 8.6.
from the king’s harem. According to Ryholt’s very plausible reconstruction, the principal characters of the fragment are two women (A and B), and a king. The king asks woman A if woman B has committed adultery, and woman A performs a *ph-ntr* that night. After a lacuna, it seems that woman A gives her answer, that woman B has slept with another man, and so the king has her thrown out of the harem. It seems likely that woman A discovers the information she gives to the king through the *ph-ntr*. While there is very little information given about the process envisaged in this text, the fact that it takes place at night may be significant, implying a dream oracle.

Of the instances which seem to represent genuine parallels in usage with the usage of *ph - ntr* in the Theban Library (3-5, 8) only one (5) offers a clear context; here it refers to a festival in which a processional oracle is consulted over several days, and seems to refer to an action carried out by the high priest as officiant. With the exception of 8, the other examples, while more vague, would seem to fit most neatly with this understanding. Although 3 & 4 could be understood as instances of private divination, such a reading is not necessary. Likewise, with the exception of 8, none of the examples point clearly to a ritual of apparition. 6 suggests that the term was extended to the pronouncements of the oracle, and this may be reflected in PDM Suppl.155, where the deity is requested to “give a true answer in a *ph - ntr*.” I would therefore trace the following development for the term: its original usage, perhaps in the Ramesside period, referred to a ritual which took place during a festival, or the larger festival itself, and could be translated as “going before the god (to make an oracular request)”; this follows the argument of Kruchten and Ritner that *ph* here has an analogous range to *spr*, which likewise means both “to approach” and ‘to

---

\(1046\) D2 col.2 ll.2-3: 2 [\…] m-si n iy ir=s ph-ntr/ n piy krh.
\(1048\) Ryholt notes (p.110) that women who committed adultery were more often killed, so woman B may instead be an accomplice.
petition.\textsuperscript{1049} This usage would then have taken on the more general meanings of “oracle” and “oracular pronouncement”, and its usage in Theban Library and 8 would be understood as using it in the first of these senses. Despite the arguments of Ritner, Kruchten, and Gee, the evidence for the term \textit{ph -ntr} referring to the practice of rituals of apparition in general is not strong; all of the instances before the Roman period can be reasonably understood as referring to a processional oracle.\textsuperscript{1050} Even in Roman period texts, the fact that the \textit{ph-ntr} in 8 takes place at night suggests a dream oracle, and in almost every instance this is the form which we find it referring to in the Theban Library.

In the Theban Library the \textit{ph -ntr} ritual is contrasted with lamp,\textsuperscript{1051} vessel,\textsuperscript{1052} and mediated divination.\textsuperscript{1053} In PDM Suppl. rituals are specified as pertaining to specific deities: Osiris\textsuperscript{1054} and Thoth;\textsuperscript{1055} a similar phenomenon may be found in PDM 14.805-840 where the rituals are specified to be those of \textit{mênebi} and \textit{mwribi}, to be understood as either the names of deities, or else as the incipits of formulae. In PDM 14.232-238 the ritual is specified to be 'at the request of Pisash, the \textit{wab}-priest of Cusae; since this individual is otherwise unknown, it may be that this is another instance of an attribution to a real individual known to the owner or compiler of the text at some point (see 2.3.6.2), but the incorporation of his name into the ritual’s title may, rather, indicate that he was an individual famous to the text’s users, if not to modern scholars.

\textbf{3.2.2.2 Šn}

The term Šn appears as the name of a type of ritual in 15 texts, all in PDM 14; while they are all rituals of apparition, they include both mediated and direct rituals, with lamps, vessels or the sun as the medium of apparition. Šn has a range of meanings; the verb means “to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
  \item Kruchten, \textit{Le grand texte oraculaire du Djéhoutymose}. p.64 fn.5; Ritner, \textit{The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice.}, p.214.
  \item Compare the comments of Dieleman, "The Production of Magic Handbooks in Egypt", p.108 fn.64.
  \item PDM 14.150.
  \item PDM 14.805-840.
  \item PDM 14.176, PDM 14.805-840.
  \item PDM Suppl.130-138.
  \item PDM Suppl.149.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
seek, to inquire, to ask, to inspect”, and by extension, “to report, to greet”. The derived noun has a basic meaning of “inquiry”, and by a similar extension “report, news”; both the verb and noun were common throughout the history of the Egyptian language, but in addition to their everyday sense of “ask” or “question”, the use of the morphemes as items of specific terminology in oracular consultation is attested from the Ptolemaic era.

The verb appears in PDM 14 regularly, most often with the meaning of “to inquire (in an oracular procedure)”, but also, when the subject is deity, with the meaning “to reply to an inquiry”, or by expansion “to prophesy”. In a few cases, a more mundane sense of “ask” is clearly intended, although in others – where a boy seer is asked to respond during a divination – the best translation is unclear, although the meaning is readily understandable. The noun form is used several times to refer not only to the procedure as a whole, but also to the question being asked, and the response from the deity.

Where ṣn appears as the name of a type of ritual it is always modified by one or more other nouns: ṣn n (p) ḥbs (“inquiry of the lamp”), ṣn n p ḥl (“inquiry of the boy(-seer)”), ṣn n p ṭ (“inquiry of the sun”), and most often ṣn-hn(e) “vessel-inquiry”; the fact that this last is a direct genitive suggests that it had become lexicalised to a greater extent than the other variations, and indeed this is reflected in the further modifications of ṣn-hn(e): ṣn-hn(e) n p ḥbs, ṣn-hn(e) n p ṭ, ṣn-hn(e) n p ṭ, literally “vessel divination of the lamp”, “vessel divination of the sun”. In the instances where these terms appear, it seems from the instructions that a vessel is not actually used, and although
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1056 For a discussion see Ritner, *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*, pp.43-44.  
1057 For example at PDM 14.61, 462, 496, 506, 525, 544, 551, 552, 827, 850, 1168.  
1058 For example PDM 14.52, 987.  
1059 PDM 14.410, 150.  
1060 PDM 14.176; cf. PDM 14.750 md wt n p ḥbs r ṣn n p ḥl (“words of the lamp to question the youth”).  
1061 PDM 14.856.  
1062 PDM 14.9, 239, 295, 395, 425, 528 (twice), 537, 539, 627, 695, 805, 841, 851.  
1064 PDM 14.880.
there is some evidence that vessels with floating wicks were used as lamps in Egypt,\textsuperscript{1065} this would not explain the usage in rituals where the medium or practitioner looks directly at the sun. This evidence, as well as that of the Coptic texts discussed below, suggests that $\hat{s}n$-$hn(e)$ had in some contexts taken on the neutral meaning of “divinatory inquiry”, and it seems to be used in this sense in PDM 14 in several instances even where it is not otherwise qualified. In three instances the $\hat{s}n$-$hn(e)$ is specified as being of (n) a deity – Isis,\textsuperscript{1066} Khonsu,\textsuperscript{1067} or Osiris,\textsuperscript{1068} while the use of the term “alone” (\textit{wae.} $f$) in several instances\textsuperscript{1069} implies that mediated divinations, if not the norm, may have been assumed to have been the unmarked form. Alongside these uses of $\hat{s}n$ in the names of rituals, we find several related terms in PDM 14 attesting to the technical use of the verb and noun, including $hn$ $n$ $\hat{s}n$ (“vessel of divination”),\textsuperscript{1070} to refer to a vessel used in divination, and $\hat{s}n$ $wbe$ $\hat{i}$ $\hat{h}$ (“to inquire before the moon”).\textsuperscript{1071}

$\hat{s}n$ appears in several texts of Ptolemaic and early Roman date in the context of traditional Egyptian oracles,\textsuperscript{1072} with the same range of uses – to inquire, to answer, inquiry, response – with the most explicit instances in the \textit{Contest for the Benefice of Amun},\textsuperscript{1073} where it is clear that a processional oracle is being used, and Vienna D 12006r (I BCE-I CE), a sortition oracle using a stone.

\textsuperscript{1066} PDM 14.9.
\textsuperscript{1067} PDM 14.239.
\textsuperscript{1068} PDM 14.627.
\textsuperscript{1069} PDM 14.295, 425, 695, 805.
\textsuperscript{1070} PDM 14.112.
\textsuperscript{1071} PDM 14.695.
\textsuperscript{1072} For example P.Berl. inv 15637 + 15803 l.l.x+0, x+12 (IV-III), P.Berl. inv. 15607 l.x+1 (Ptolemaic), Cairo JE 95206 l.l.11, 12, 17, 18, 31 (Ptolemaic), Ostracon PSBA 35 l.2 (Ptolemaic), \textit{Teachings of Onchsheshonqy} 16.14.
\textsuperscript{1073} l.2, 2.13, 10.7-8, 6.1, 10.8, 11.8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Medium of apparition</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Term(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.117-149</td>
<td>Unmediated: lamp</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>šn...n hbs</td>
<td>This main ritual is for a dream oracle; the lamp inquiry here is an alternate ritual contained in the recipe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.150-231</td>
<td>Mediated: lamp</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>šn n pī hbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>šn n pī šlw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.239-295</td>
<td>Mediated: vessel</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>šn-hn</td>
<td>Specified as n ḫnsw (“of Khonsu”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.295-308</td>
<td>Unmediated: sun (?)</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>[šn-hn]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.395-427</td>
<td>Mediated or mediated: vessel</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>[šn-hn]</td>
<td>Surviving traces suggest word in 395 is a rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>425</td>
<td>šn-hne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.489-515</td>
<td>Mediated: lamp</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>šn-hne n pī hbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.528-553</td>
<td>Mediated or unmediated: vessel</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>šn-hne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>528</td>
<td>šn-hne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>537</td>
<td>šn-hne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>539</td>
<td>šn-hne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.627-635</td>
<td>Mediated: vessel</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>šn-hn</td>
<td>Specified as n ḡsir (“of Osiris”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.695-700</td>
<td>Mediated/unmediated: moon</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>šn-hn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.805-840</td>
<td>Mediated or unmediated: lamp</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>šn-hne</td>
<td>The ritual describes alternative procedures for a lamp divination using a medium, a direct lamp divination, and a dream oracle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>817</td>
<td>šn-hne n pī hbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>837</td>
<td>šn n pī hbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>838</td>
<td>šn-hn n pī hbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.841-850</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>šn-hne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.851-855</td>
<td>Unmediated: Vessel</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>šn-hne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.856-875</td>
<td>Mediated: sun</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>šn n pī ṟc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.875-885</td>
<td>Mediated or unmediated: sun</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>šn-hne... n pī ṟc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22: Instances of šn in magical texts
As noted above, the technical usage of ʿsn to refer to revelational divinatory procedures continued into the Coptic period. The Coptic form ρⲉⲛⲉ appears in two formularies, but it is most commonly encountered in outsider works. In the Coptic editions of the Bible it occurs several times, usually in the forms ρⲉⲛⲉⲧⲓ (from ʿsn-hn) and ρⲉⲛⲉⲧⲓ (“one who inquires”), most often to translate μαντεία (“divination”) and related terms, less often ἐπαοίδος (“enchanter by spells”), ἐγγαστρίμυθος (“diviner by familiar spirits”), and πύθων (“oracular spirit”). None of the Greek terms specifically refer to vessel divination, further suggesting that ʿsn-hn/phiai had acquired the general meaning of “divination” in some contexts. The fullest description of the figure of the ρⲉⲛⲉ appears in Pistis Sophia (30.26–31.4), where they are linked to the astrologers (ⲣⲉⲣⲟⲩⲧⲓⲟϣ) as figures affected by Jesus’ upheaval of the celestial spheres; but while the astrologers foretell the future through the use of calculations, the ρⲉⲛⲉ prophesy by invoking and questioning archons and decans, astral deities. This seems to be an outsider description of the sort of apparition rituals described in the Theban Library. The ρⲉⲛⲉ are associated with astrologers (ⲣⲉⲟⲩⲧⲓⲟϣ, ἀστρολογὸς) in several other texts, and also with ρⲉⲟⲩⲟⲩ (“speakers of spells”), and ρⲉⲣⲟⲩⲧⲓ (“magicians”).

ʿSn was a common Egyptian word which had taken on, by the Ptolemaic period, a specialised meaning of “oracular consultation”, referring not only to processional oracles, but other procedures, including sortition oracles. In PDM 14 we see the term being applied to revelational divination mediated through vessels, lamps, and celestial bodies, often
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1074 London Hay 10391 ll.44-55 (VI-VII CE); P.Berl.inv.5744 l.11 (XII CE).
1075 Numbers 23.23, Deuteronomy 18.10, Joshua 13.22, Isaiah 44.25, Micah 3.6, 7, 11.
1076 Leviticus 19.31, 20.27.
1077 Leviticus 20.27, 1 Samuel 28.21.
1078 Acts 16.16.
1080 Ibid.
1081 Ibid.
1082 Ibid.
using mediums. The term for vessel-inquiry, \( sn-hn(e) \), gradually became a synonym for oracular inquiry in general. This specialised terminology was known to literate Egyptians outside the circle of magical practitioners, among whom were certain Christian writers who associated the divinatory practices it referred to with magicians and astrologers.

3.2.2.3 Ἀγωγή

Ἀγωγή and its related terms derive from the verb ἄγω ("I lead, carry, bring"). This cluster of terms is an unusual example of a technical term with two quite distinct meanings in Greek magical texts, the first referring to a ritual of apparition (in which a deity is "brought" or "led in"), and the second, and more common, referring to rituals of erotic compulsion (in which the victim is "brought" to the ritualist or client).

Ἀγωγή and its related terms appear in 12 texts in three papyri from the Theban Library (PGM 4, PGM 13, PDM/PGM 14), and 14 times in non-Theban manuscripts, with the large scrolls PGM 7 and PGM 36 making up the bulk of these, with five attestations each.

In the vast majority of instances, 22 of the total 26, it is fairly certain that ἄγωγη refers to an erotic ritual, and in these contexts the basic term ἄγωγη is usually used, occasionally replaced by the derived ἄγωγημον, sometimes supplemented by an adjective describing the ritual's efficacy or mode of operation. In this context, ἄγωγη seems to first appear in papyri around the third century CE, and Faraone suggests that it may have originally been borrowed from the vocabulary of marriage or initiation.  

contrasted to the φίλτρον and χαριτήσιον, which are used by those in a weaker position to mollify or a repair a relationship with male authority figures.\footnote{Faraone, \textit{Ancient Greek Love Magic}, pp.25-26, 28, 175. Compare the comments of Eitrem, \textit{Papyri Odoenses I: Magical Papyri}, pp.49-50; Georg Luck, \textit{Arcana mundi: magic and the occult in the Greek and Roman worlds} (Baltimore: Baltimore, 1985 [2006]), p.494; and Pachoumi, "The Greek Magical Papyri", p.107.} This seems to accord with the usage in the magical papyri, where the effects of the rituals are described in intense, often violent imagery. Slightly earlier than the papyri (II CE), Galen lists the ἀγωγή alongside the φίλτρον, dream-sending (which often had an erotic end in mind), and the μίσηθρον ("praxis for making hatred"),\footnote{The term μίσηθρον (or μίσητρον) appears only once in the corpus of magical papyri, at PGM 3.164.} although this may simply indicate that he understands them as belonging to the same general category, rather than as directly comparable terms.

The use of ἀγωγή in relationship to rituals of apparition is more complex, and is found only in the Theban Library. The bare form appears twice, in the titles of two related texts attributed to Pitus.\footnote{PGM 4.1928-2005, PGM 4.2006-2125.} Both describe necromantic processes in which the invoked spirit is questioned in a process described as an ἀνάκρισις (see 3.2.2.4 below); one of these rituals describes a dream oracle, while the medium of apparition in the second instance is unclear. The other instances modify ἀγωγή to result in a series of compounds – φωταγογία ("light-bringing"),\footnote{PGM 4.955, 975, 1103-1104.} θεαγωγία ("god-bringing"),\footnote{PGM 4.976, 985.} ψυχαγωγία ("soul-bringing"),\footnote{PDM 14.110.} and derived terms. In the older instance, a Greek language invocation within a dream oracle procedure from PDM 14, one of three deities is described as ψυχαγωγα ἔως Φοξ ("soul-bringing Phox", l.110). The large number and variability of epithets makes it dangerous to attribute specific meanings, but Phox is the highest of the three deities: he is called upon to compel the second deity, Helios, to send (ἀναπέμπειν; ll.103, 105, 110) the third.\footnote{The third deity seems to be either the goddess Neboutosoualēth (l.3), or the archangel Zebourthaunēn (ll.4-5); the confusion may be due either to the redactional history of the text, or more interestingly, may reflect that there are in fact four deities, and Neboutosoualēth prepares the way for Zebourthaunēn. This}
role as a “soul-bringer” may then refer either to his role within the ritual (accomplishing the ἀγωγὴ) or else to a cosmic role as a conductor of the dead, taking on the attributes of the classical ψυχαγωγός, Hermes.

The text where the terms are employed most fully is found in PGM 4, in reference to an instance of unmediated lamp divination. The purpose of the overall ritual seems to be ἀυτοπτός, while a part of it is described as a σύστασις; both of these terms have clear theurgic resonances (see 3.2.2.3 and 3.2.2.6). Within this ritual the terms φωταγωγία and θεαγωγός appear to have quite specific meanings, referring to particular sections of the ritual, and by extension the associated formulae, concerned with summoning the deity, and the appearance of light which precedes it. The different terms here thus demarcate different steps in a process – the initial σύστασις creates the relationship between deity and ritualist necessary for the invocation, the φωταγωγία creates the light into which the deity will manifest, and then the θεαγωγός λόγος calls the god to appear, resulting in the αὐτοπτός in which the ritualist sees and interacts with the deity.

The earliest attestation of a term related to ἀγωγὴ in the context of summoning deities or spirits seems to come in the fifth century BCE, with the works of the tragedian Aeschylus: in the Persians the cries of the elders summoning the ghost of Darius are described as ψυχαγωγοί γόοι (“soul-bringing wails”), while Ψυχαγωγοί was the title of another of his fragmentary plays. By this period, then, ψυχαγωγία referred to the process of necromancy, and by at least the time of Plato was sufficiently well known to develop an extended sense whereby rhetorical persuasion, poetry and even amusement could be

possibility is strengthened by the fact that the goddess is described as φαεσφόρος (‘light-bringing’) – see the following discussion of φωταγωγία.

PGM 4.930-1114.

...καὶ ψυχαγωγοῖς ὀρθιάζοντες γόοι..., Persae 687.

described as “soul-bringing”\textsuperscript{1094} \(\Theta\varepsilon\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\ι\alpha\) seems to be considerably later, with the earliest attestation in citations of Porphyry’s \textit{Letter to Anebo}, where he uses it to describe the rituals of apparition practiced by the Egyptian priest.\textsuperscript{1095} He does not, apparently, feel the need to explain the term, making it likely that it was a familiar one within the philosophical/theurgic circles to which both the philosopher and the priest belonged. In his response to the \textit{Letter}, Iamblichus uses the term himself,\textsuperscript{1096} and it recurs again in later authors, most notably in Michael Psellus’ discussions of theurgy, where he links it with \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\).\textsuperscript{1097}

\(\Phi\omega\tau\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\ι\alpha\) has a longer history, referring originally to the simple act of bringing illumination,\textsuperscript{1098} but its application to rituals of apparition, by analogy perhaps with \(\psi\upsilon\chi\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\iota\alpha\) and \(\theta\varepsilon\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\iota\alpha\) seems to be first attested in Iamblichus, who mentions τῆς τοῦ φωτὸς ἀγωγῆς ("the bringing of the light").\textsuperscript{1099} This format, using the bare noun ἀγωγή with a modifying genitive, is repeated elsewhere in \textit{De Mysteriis}, where he mentions τὰς ἀγωγὰς τῶν πνευμάτων ("the bringing of spirits"),\textsuperscript{1100} providing a precedent for the use of the unmodified ἀγωγή in reference to rituals of apparition in the two Pitus texts.

\textsuperscript{1094} For discussions see Daniel Ogden, "The Ancient Greek Oracles [sic] of the Dead," \textit{Acta Classica} 44 (2001); Elizabeth Asmis, "Psychagogia' in Plato’s ‘Phaedrus’," \textit{Illinois Classical Studies} 11, no. 1/2 (1986); Johnston, \textit{Restless Dead}, p.103; "Delphi and the Dead," in \textit{Mantikê: Studies in Ancient Divination}, ed. Sarah Iles Johnston and Peter T. Struck (Leiden: Brill, 2005), p.290; and the LSJ, s.v. An interesting, and ironic, extended sense, is found in the use of \(\psi\omega\chi\gamma\omega\gamma\iota\alpha\) to refer to the act of persuading a slave or captive to flee; see David M. Ratzan, "Contract Norms and Contract Enforcement in Graeco-Roman Egypt" (Diss. Columbia University, 2011),p.475.

\textsuperscript{1095} Cited in Iamblichus, \textit{De Mysteriis} 6.1.4-5: ...\(\varepsilon\deltaι\alpha\) δὲ νεκρῶν ζῶων τὰ πολλὰ αἱ \(\theta\varepsilon\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\iota\alpha\) ἐπιτελοῦνται.

\textsuperscript{1096} \textit{De Mysteriis} 2.10.40.

\textsuperscript{1097} \textit{Theologia} (Gautier), \textit{Opusculum} 27 1.188-189: Ἐξευλόμην οὖν πρὸς ύμᾶς διαλαβεῖν τὶς τὶς αὐτοψία ἐστὶ καὶ τὶς ἡ \(\theta\varepsilon\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\iota\alpha\)...; \textit{Orationes Forenses et Acta, Oration} 1.323, 328. See also Gregory of Nazianzus, \textit{Adversus Eunomianos} (orat. 27). 10.12; as well as Eusebius, \textit{Praeparatio evangelica} 5.10.3.1 and Theodoretus, \textit{Graecarum affectionum curatio} 3.66.13-67.1, both quoting Porphyry, \textit{Epistula ad Anebonem}.

\textsuperscript{1098} See LSJ, s.v. \(\phi\omega\tau\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\iota\alpha\).

\textsuperscript{1099} \textit{De Mysteriis} 3.14.45-46.

\textsuperscript{1100} 3.6.11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Medium of Apparition</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.930-1114</td>
<td>Unmediated:</td>
<td>φωταγωγία</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>The texts also includes the terms αὐτόπτος, referring to the apparition ritual, and σύστασις, referring to the conjunction ritual. The φωταγωγία is the initial act of bringing the light, which is followed by the κάτοχος τοῦ φωτὸς to keep the light, and finally by the θεαγωγὸς, which brings the god into the light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lamp or direct (?)</td>
<td>φωταγωγία</td>
<td>975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τὸν δεσπωγόν λόγον</td>
<td>976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θεαγωγὸς</td>
<td>985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τὸ εἰπεῖν τὴν φωτα/γωγίαν</td>
<td>1103-1104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.1390-1495</td>
<td>(Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἀγωγὴ ἐπὶ ἥρωων ἢ μοσμάχων</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τῆς ἁγωγῆς ταύτης</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.1496-1595</td>
<td>(Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἀγωγὴ ἐπὶ ζύρνης ἐπίθυομένης</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.1928-2005</td>
<td>Unmediated:</td>
<td>ἀγωγὴ Πίτυος βασιλέως/ ἐπὶ παντὸς σκύρου</td>
<td>1928-1929</td>
<td>The process of questioning the invoked daimón is referred to as an ἀνάκρισις.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Πίτυος ἁγωγῆ</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>The process of questioning the invoked daimón is referred to as an ἀνάκρισις.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.2006-2125</td>
<td>Unmediated:</td>
<td>ἐπὶ δὲ ἁγωγίμων</td>
<td>2231</td>
<td>The instance of ἁγώγιμον here refers to the use of the paredros created in the larger ritual for erotic compulsion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Πίτυος ἁγωγῆ</td>
<td>2231</td>
<td>The instance of ἁγώγιμον here refers to the use of the paredros created in the larger ritual for erotic compulsion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.2145-2240</td>
<td>(Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἐπὶ δὲ ἁγωγίμων</td>
<td>2231</td>
<td>The instance of ἁγώγιμον here refers to the use of the paredros created in the larger ritual for erotic compulsion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἁγωγὴ</td>
<td>2231</td>
<td>The instance of ἁγώγιμον here refers to the use of the paredros created in the larger ritual for erotic compulsion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.2441-2621</td>
<td>(Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἁγωγὴ</td>
<td>2441</td>
<td>The sense of the second instance is unclear whether the deity asked to come in an ἁγωγὴ (‘invocation’), or for the purposes of carrying out an ἁγωγὴ (‘love spell’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἐπὶ ἁγωγῆς</td>
<td>2543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.2708-2884</td>
<td>(Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἀλλή ἁγωγὴ</td>
<td>2708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.2891-2942</td>
<td>(Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἁγωγὴ</td>
<td>2891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.2943-2966</td>
<td>(Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἁγωγὴ ἁγρυπνητική(ή)</td>
<td>2943</td>
<td>Both instances refer to a use to which the onoma from the larger ritual can be put to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 13.1-343</td>
<td>(Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἐπὶ δὲ ἁγωγῆς πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Both instances refer to a use to which the onoma from the larger ritual can be put to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἁγωγᾶς</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>Both instances refer to a use to which the onoma from the larger ritual can be put to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 3.275-281</td>
<td>(Astrological calendar)</td>
<td>ἁγώγ[ιμον]</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Papyrus provenance unknown. The context gives few clues as to the ritual intended here, but it is most likely a ritual of erotic compulsion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.284-299</td>
<td>(Astrological calendar)</td>
<td>ἁγώγ[ιμον]</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive. The context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.300a-310 (Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἀγώγημον αὐδώρων 300a</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.593-619 (Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἀγωγή ἁσχέτου 593</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.973-980 (Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἀγώγημον παράψιμον 973</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.981-983 (Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἀγώ[γιμον] 981</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive. The first letter is unclear (perhaps due to correction), and the end of the word is lost due to papyrus damage, but the reconstruction seems secure given its position as title, and the text’s contents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 19b.4-18 (Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἀγωγή ἐπὶ κυνός 4</td>
<td>Papyrus provenance unknown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 36.68-101 (Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἀγωγή θεαμαστή 134</td>
<td>Fayum Archive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 36.295-311 (Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἀγωγή 295</td>
<td>Fayum Archive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 36.333-360 (Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἀγωγή 333</td>
<td>Fayum Archive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 36.361-371 (Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἀγωγή 361</td>
<td>Fayum Archive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 61.197-216 (Erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>ἀγω[γή] 39</td>
<td>Fayum Archive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM 82 (Erotic compulsion?)</td>
<td>ἀγώγ(ψον) fr.a 1.4</td>
<td>Papyrus provenance unknown. The text is too fragmentary to be sure of its contents, but it seems likely that it, too, is a ritual of erotic compulsion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23: Instances of ἀγωγή in magical texts

The original context of the ἀγωγή terms is not entirely clear; ψυχαγωγία has a long history in Greek, and the variants θεαγωγία and φωταγωγία may have been used by analogy with this older term. Their use by Iamblichus and Psellus, as well as the connection to terms such as αὐτοψία, suggest that they may originally have been used within the context of

---

*Eitrem, Papyri Osloenses I: Magical Papyri, p.11.*
Chaldaean theurgy,\textsuperscript{1102} but there are no instances of their use in the surviving Oracles, and the first attestation, in Porphyry’s Letter to Anebo, seems to be discussing Egyptian, rather than Chaldaean, practices. If a more precise statement of the significance of the terms eludes us in this case, these very difficulties highlight the complex cultural origins of the rituals of apparition, drawing both on the more formalised practices of Chaldaean or Neoplatonic theurgy, and on the popular practices of the Egyptian and Hellenic traditions.

3.2.2.4 Ἀνάκρισις

The term ἀνάκρισις is used in three related recipes contained within PGM 4,\textsuperscript{1103} necromantic rituals intended for questioning skulls (σκύφοι),\textsuperscript{1104} attributed to the Thessalian king Pitus. Two of these texts are titled as ἀγωγή, with the ἀνάκρισις referring to a specific function or portion of the ritual, in which the spirit of the dead person was interrogated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Medium of Apparition</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.2140-2144</td>
<td>Unmediated: Unclear</td>
<td>ἀνάκρισις/σκήνους</td>
<td>2140-2141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24: Instances of ἀνάκρισις in magical texts

\textsuperscript{1102} The related term ἀναγωγή does appear, in reference to rituals of ascent; see fr.190, and Majercik, The Chaldean Oracles, pp.38-40. Interestingly, the whole process of theurgy could at times be referred to as the theurgic or hieratic ἀγωγή, although here the term is used in the sense of “way of life”; see Iamblichus, De Mysteriis 5.26.57; Proclus, In rem publicam commentarii 2.66.13-14; Marinus, Vita Procli ll.682-683.
\textsuperscript{1103} This is the block referred to by LiDonnici (LiDonnici, “Compositional Patterns in PGM IV”, pp.170-171) as Block 4.
\textsuperscript{1104} On this euphemistic term see Faraone, "Necromancy Goes Underground", pp.257-258, 263.
Ἀνάκρισις originally referred to a preliminary interrogation of litigants before a court case in certain jurisdictions of Greek law, but by the Roman period it seems that there were three dominant senses: 1) any interrogation, inquiry, or examination, particularly as part of a legal procedure; 2) the examination of slaves before their sale; and 3) examinations or tests in in certain technical fields, such as medicine and mathematics. The sense in which it appears in PGM 4 clearly derive from sense (1), referring to the interrogation of spirits in a manner analogous to the questioning by a magistrate or other social superior; as such there seems to be a suggestion of a power imbalance in favour of the questioner. It seems sensible to link this term closely with the textual tradition which produced these three related recipes, but we might also suppose the term appropriate in this instance, where the “deity” was a dead human, but would be less so in other texts, where a higher divinity who was invoked. While compulsive procedures to compel the deity are a feature of many magical rituals, the instance in another text in this particular block of PGM 4 (ll.2125-2139) of a ritual to seal skulls so that they cannot speak is unparalleled, and further evidence of the particular power relationship between the ritualist and this class of deity.

1106 See for example in P.Mich 1.55 l.20 (240CE); literary instances are found in 3 Maccabbees 7.5; Acts of the Apostles 25.26; Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae 17.121.5; Plutarch, Romulus 8.2.3. Compare the Coptic examples of the verb form ⲁⲱⲁⲣⲓⲛⲉ in P.Ryl.Copt. 31 l.7 (IV CE); P. KRU 50 l.25 (724 CE).
1107 See for example in SPP XX.71 l.10 (269-270 CE), P.Oxy IV.3784 L.2 (III CE), BGU II.460 back l.1 (III CE), PSI XII.1254 L.24 (237 CE), P.Oxy. XLIX.3477 back l.1 (270 CE).
1108 For a list of instances in Galen see Richard J. Durling, A Dictionary of Medical Terms in Galen (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), p.42.
1109 This is also the predominant sense in Byzantine lexicons; see the Suda, Etymologicum Gudianum, Lexicon of Pseudo-Zonaras, s.v.
3.2.2.4 Ἀρκτικὴ

The term Ἀρκτικὴ appears in two adjacent texts in PGM 4, identified by LiDonnici as the bulk of Block 2 Section D. Ἀρκτικὴ itself is a feminine adjective derived from Ἄρκτος ("bear"), and thus means something like "of the Bear", where the Bear is the constellation Ursa Major, associated within the Hellenic tradition with Artemis, and within the Egyptian tradition with Seth. A more specific understanding of the term's meaning is given by the title of PGM 4.1331-1389, ἀρκτικὴ δύναμις, "(act of) power of the Bear".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Medium of Apparition</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.1275-1322</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>ἀρκτικὴ πάντα ποιούσα</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>Unclear if this is for a ritual of apparition, or a general petitionary invocation. The Bear seems to be conceived as a female deity in the formula, although a male lord of the Bear (ὁ τῆς ἄρκτου... κύριος, l.1294) is mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.1323-1330</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>ἄλλο</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>Although the term ἀρκτικὴ is not explicit, it can be inferred from its position between the preceding and following procedures. The Bear is invoked as male.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.1331-1389</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>ἀρκτικὴ δύναμις πάντα ποιούσα</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>Power (δύναμις) here should probably be understood as something like &quot;deed of power, miracle&quot; (see BDAG s.v.). Again, it is unclear if this is for a ritual of apparition, or a general petitionary invocation. The Bear seems to be invoked as a male deity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.686-702</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>ἀρκτικὴ</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive. Unclear if this is for a ritual of apparition, or a general petitionary invocation. The Bear is invoked as a female deity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 72.1-32</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>[ἀρκτικὴ πράξις]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown provenance. Although the formula is addressed to a female Bear, the title is restored, so is not necessarily accurate. Again, the procedure is unclear, and the ritual may be a petitionary invocation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25: Instances of ἀρκτικὴ in magical texts

---

iii LiDonnici, "Compositional Patterns in PGM IV"; Ogden, "Ancient Greek Oracles of the Dead", pp.166-167.
The term also appears once in one of the Hermonthis papyri, PGM 7, and has been restored in a third, PGM 72 (III CE). In none of the texts where the term appears is its position as a ritual of apparition explicit, although a recipe placed between the two PGM 4 texts, titled ἄλλο (“another (arktikē”) is clearly a dream oracle.\textsuperscript{1112} In the two PGM 4 examples the title promises that it “does everything” (πάντα ποιοῦσα),\textsuperscript{1113} and so we may understand that the recipes describe rituals which can be put to multiple uses, and cannot be sure whether an apparition was expected or experienced.

3.2.2.3 Αὔτοπτος

Αὔτοπτος and related terms appear in 11 magical texts in seven papyri, four of them fourth-century manuscripts from the Theban Library (PGM 4, 5, 5a & 13), two from the Hermonthis Archive (PGM 7 & 8), and one un-provenanced (PGM 3). Along with σύστασις and $ph$-$ntr$, αὔτοπτος is one of the terms most often cited by scholars of ancient magic as a generic term for rituals of apparition, usually with the translation “direct vision”. Its literal meaning is “to see for yourself”, σὲ αὐτὸν τὸν [ἰ]δεῖν, as it is explained in PGM 7.335. A closely related term is αὔτόπτης, “witness”. These have both a technical and an administrative meaning in other texts of the period. In proto-scientific medical and astrological works they refer to knowledge acquired through personal experience or observation;\textsuperscript{1114} in petitions αὐτώψια often refers to the ‘personal inspections or investigations’ carried out by officials or other individuals in positions of power.\textsuperscript{1115}

While authors such as Graf imply that the inherent meaning of αὐτοπτος refers to a true direct vision – that is one where the deity appears directly to the ritualist without the assistance of a boy seer or medium of apparition – this is not borne out in the magical

\textsuperscript{1112} PGM 4.1323-1330.
\textsuperscript{1113} PGM 4.1275-1322, PGM 4.1331-1389.
\textsuperscript{1114} See for example in Galen, De naturalibus facultatibus 2.12.14, 2.55.13; Vettius Valens, Anthologiurum 4.11.30, 7.40.70.
\textsuperscript{1115} For example in P.Oxy. X.1272 ll.18-20 (144 CE), P.Wisc. II.86 ll.25-27 (245-247 CE), P.Cair.Isid. 66 ll.6-7, 9-11 (298 CE).
There are only two instances (PGM 7.336-347, 727-739) where it seems that such an encounter is clearly expected, both in the Hermonthis Archive; other instances in this archive seem to refer either to lamp (PGM 8.64-110) or vessel divination (PGM 7.319-334).

In the Theban Library, two of the three of the instances where the means of apparition is clearly described refer to instances of vessel divination, while the last refers, again, to lamp divination. In a further four instances the medium of apparition is unclear. Two instances give suggestions of the limits of the term: PGM 8.64-110 seems to describe the αὐτοπτος as an alternative to an ὀνειραιτητόν ("request for a dream (oracle)"), and the fragmentary text PGM 3.633-731 provides some evidence that it was also distinguished from a divination using a child medium.

Αὐτοπτος occurs in reference to rituals of apparition in several literary texts outside the corpus of magical papyri. The earliest instances of this seem to occur in the Chaldaean Oracles; although these are generally too fragmentary to recover context, later references can provide something of its meaning. These are generally found in the writings of Neoplatonists who had some experience of Chaldaean theurgy. Porphyry uses the term twice, once in a retelling of the summoning of a daimōn by an Egyptian priest, and once in his criticism of such rituals in a letter written to another Egyptian priest, the Letter to Anebo. Iamblichus uses the term frequently in his reply to this letter, although he does not offer a clear definition, he seems to use it in reference to apparitions of deities whose characteristics are visible to the practitioner. By contrasting the αὐτοψία

1116 Graf, Magic in the Ancient World, p.294 n.41.
1117 See notes in the table below.
1118 Chaldaean Oracles 101, 142. For the latter instance the LSJ suggests the translation “self-revealed”, but this seems to be a mistake; Hesychius (s.v. ἐπ’ αὐτοφώρῳ) glosses as ἐπ’ ὄψι, and the Suida likewise as ἐπ’ ὄψι, ἐπ’ αὐτοφώρῳ. The term ἐπ’ αὐτοφανέσι (s.v. ἐπ’ αὐτοφώρῳ) does appear in connection to ἐπ’ αὐτοφώρῳ, connected by both Hesychius and the Suida to ἐπ’ αὐτόπτῳ, but the two terms seem to refer to different senses of ἐπ’ αὐτοφώρῳ. Likewise, the example cited from Julian's Πρὸς Ἡράκλειον κυνικὸν (16.9): ἐξ Ἰνδῶν ὁ Διόνυσος αὐτοπτος ἐφαίνετο δαίμων is probably best translated as "from India Dionysios appeared as a visible deity" rather than "... as a self-revealed deity".
1119 Κληθέντα δὲ εἰς/αὐτοψίαν τὸν δαίμον θεὸν ἐλθεῖν (Vita Plotini 10.21-22).
1120 ὧτω γάρ φασιν αὐτοπτεῖσθαι (Epistula ad Anebonem 2.98.3-5).
1121 De Mysteriis 2.3.63, 2.4.44, 2.6.27, 2.7.2, 2.10.23, 2.10.49-50, 2.10.90, 2.10.90, 7.3.24.
of the Egyptians to their θυσίαι εὐχαί ("more common prayers") he implies that αὐτοπτος may have referred in some instances to rituals of apparition in general.\textsuperscript{122}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Medium of Apparition</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Term(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.154-195</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>σκέψις διὰ λεκάνης αὐτόπτου</td>
<td>Αὐτοπτος is preceded by σύστασις.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>ἐπιτελευμένης αὐτοπτικῆς λεκανομαντείας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.930-1114</td>
<td>Unmediated: lamp (?)</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>αὔτοπτος</td>
<td>Αὐτοπτος is preceded by σύστασις.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
<td>αὔτοψίας</td>
<td>The light from which the god emerges comes from the lamp, but the description is ambiguous as to whether the vision uses the lamp as a medium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>952</td>
<td>αὔτόπτου λυχνομαντίας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 5.53-69</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>αὔτοπτος λόγος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 5a.1-3</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>αὔτοπτήσεις</td>
<td>In body rather than title of ritual; the purpose of the ritual seems to be a σύστασις (see 3.2.2.6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 13.734-1077</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>734-735</td>
<td>αὔτο/τοψίας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 3.282-499</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>αὔτοπτον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 3.633-731</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>λόγον αὔτοπτον</td>
<td>Provenance unknown. Αὐτοπτος is preceded by σύστασις. A child (παῖς) is mentioned in l.710, but this seems to refer to an alternate procedure, perhaps introduced by ἐὰν δὲ (‘and if...’) in l.706.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.319-334</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>αὔτοπτος</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.335-347</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (?)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>αὐτοπτική</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.727-739</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (?)</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>Ἀπόλλωνος αὔτοπτος</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 8.64-110</td>
<td>Unmediated: lamp (?)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>αὔτοπτον</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive. Seems to indicate alternate ritual to main dream oracle procedure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{122} De Mysteriis 7.3.24.
Proclus uses the term frequently in his commentaries on Plato, in particular using it in reference to the *Myth of Er* from the *Republic*,\textsuperscript{1123} a story in which the eponymous hero dies and witnesses the gods of Hades overseeing the reincarnation of souls;\textsuperscript{1124} in another passage he refers to the moon as the autoptic image of nature.\textsuperscript{1125} That αὐτόπτος could be applied to these phenomena suggests that the defining feature, for Proclus, was a personal vision of god(s), rather than a particular ritual. Relying on Proclus, the later Michael Psellus distinguished between the αὐτοψία and the ἐποπτεία (perhaps “observation”),\textsuperscript{1126} where the former described a ritual in which the ritualist (τελετής) observed the appearance of the deity, while the latter referred to one in which it was only the seer (τελούμενος) who saw the apparition.

This differentiation from mediated divination procedures seems to be maintained in the magical papyri, although the term ἐποπτεία is not used.\textsuperscript{1127} While some authors have suggested that the *autoptos* necessarily refers to a waking vision, this is not so clear; again, this differentiation is implicitly upheld in the magical papyri, but Neoplatonist authors do not agree. Both Damascius\textsuperscript{1128} and Synesius\textsuperscript{1129} seem to understand dreams as, at least potentially αὐτόπτοι, and the only clear differentiation between the two occurs in the *Alexander Romance*.\textsuperscript{1130} The general impression we get from the magical papyri that the αὐτόπτος was often associated with vessel divination, recurs in the prologue to Thessalos’ *De virtutibus herbarum*, where a Theban priest is described as possessing “the power of

\textsuperscript{1123} In Platonis rem publicam commentarii 2.155.18, 2.242.15, 2.248.14, 2.280.22.
\textsuperscript{1124} Plato, *Respublica* 613e-614d.
\textsuperscript{1125} In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria 3.69.16: τὸ αὐτόπτον ἄγαλμα.
\textsuperscript{1126} Michael Psellus, Τοῦ Ψελλοῦ ἐξήγησις τῶν Χαλδαίων ῥητῶν in *Daemonologica* 136.5-13.
\textsuperscript{1127} The related term ἐπόπτης is used to describe a boy seer in PGM 7.572, while the deity himself is referred to as ἐπόπτης (‘overseer’) in PGM 7.237. The verb ἐποπτεύω appears in PGM 4.504, where it is used to refer to the initiate gazing upon the sacred mysteries.
\textsuperscript{1128} Vita Isidori Frag 14: ὅτι βιττον ἔλεγεν ἐκ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον τῶν ἑλειῶν αὐτοψιῶν, τὴν μὲν αἰσθητικὸν τῶν ἐγγηγορῶν, φαντασιώδη δὲ τῶν καθευδόντων, ἀληθῆ δὲ ἐκεῖναν. 
\textsuperscript{1129} De insomniis 5.15, 14-16: οὲ δὲ τὸ αὐτοπτῆσαι θεῶν [i.e. through divination] χρήμα εὐδαιμον, τὸ διὰ φαντασίαν ἔλειν [i.e. in dreams] πρεσβύτερας αὐτοψίας ἐστίν.
\textsuperscript{1130} Pseudo-Callisthenes, *Historia Alexandri Magni* 1.6.2.3: ἄλλο δὲ θεῖος, ἄλλο αὐτοψία.
The use of αὐτοπτος and related terms in the magical papyri may reflect a borrowing from the technical vocabulary of theurgy; this hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that it regularly appears alongside σύστασις. In Chaldaean and Neoplatonic theurgy, αὐτοπτος seems to refer to visions of deities seen by practitioners in the course of rituals, but by extension to other visions of deities, including those in dreams. In less technical literature, including the magical papyri, the term seems to have been used in more idiosyncratic ways. In the magical papyri it seems to generally refer to rituals of apparition in which the ritualist was awake, and viewed the deity directly rather than through a medium. Usually, however, these were apparitions seen in vessels, or less often lamps, rather than being completely unmediated.

3.2.2.4 Μαντεία

Μαντεία is the common Greek term for any form of divination, and some idea of its range of meaning can be gained from two texts separated by roughly five centuries. In *Prometheus Bound*, Aeschylus has Prometheus speak of the “many forms of divination” (τρόπους... πολλούς μαντικής; 484) he devised, including dream interpretation, cledonomancy, bird omina, the reading of entrails and fire divination. Writing in II CE, Artemidorus lists the types of μάντεις (“diviners”) as Pythagoreans (Πυθαγορισταί), physiognomists (φυσιογνωμονικοί), observers-of-forms (μορφοσκόποι), palm-readers (χειροσκόποι), vessel-diviners (λεκανομάντεις), necromancers (νεκυομάντεις), bird-watchers (οἰωνισταί), star-gazers (ἄστερατοσκοποί), dream-interpreters (ὄνειροκρίται), liver-readers (ἡπατοσκοποί), astrologers (μαθηματικοί), as well as diviners by knuckle-bones (ἄστραγαλομάντεις), cheese (τυρομάντεις), and sieves (κοσκινομάντεις). The relatively few references found in Egyptian papyri are often from a temple context, and probably...
represent ticket oracles in most cases.\textsuperscript{134}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Medium of Apparition</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGM 1.262-347</td>
<td>(Unmediated: unclear (direct or lamp?))</td>
<td>περὶ μαντείας</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>The text is listing the subjects about which the ritualist may ask the invoked deity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 2.1-64</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>μαντεύεις/ νυκτὸς ἐν ὀρᾳ</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>The phrase appears as part of the formula used to call the deity. The ritual contains an alternative mediated lamp divination ritual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.154-285</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel</td>
<td>ἐπιτελουμένης αὐτοτπικῆς λεκανομαντείας</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>The ritual is also described as being an αὐτοτπη and νεκυαγωγή.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.930-1114</td>
<td>Unmediated: lamp</td>
<td>δεν μαν/τεύη</td>
<td>932-933</td>
<td>The ritual is also described as an αὐτοτπης.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.3086-3244</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td>μαντία Κρονικὴ</td>
<td>3086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.3209-3254</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel</td>
<td>Αφροδίτης φιακλαμαντείν</td>
<td>3209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 5.1-52</td>
<td>Mediated: unclear (direct or vessel?)</td>
<td>μαντ(εῖον) Σαραπιακὸν/ [ἐπὶ] παιδός</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 12.153-160</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (?)</td>
<td>δεσμαντείον</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 13.734-1077</td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td>ἡλιομαντιών</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>Refers to uses to procedures for which a boy seer can be used after using the specified formula on him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.675-695 [PGM 14c.16-27]</td>
<td>(Ritual for evil sleep (in-ky. k hyn))</td>
<td>τὰς σὰς μαντείας ἐπίτε&lt;λ&gt;λω</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>Μαντείας here seems to refer to something like “prophetic powers”, as translated by Hock.\textsuperscript{135}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 3.1-164</td>
<td>(Multipurpose ritual)</td>
<td>φ[ι.]μαντόσυνος</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Papyrus provenance unknown. This is an otherwise unattested epithet applied to the sun god in a spoken formula.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{134} For example SB 24.15920 (87/103 CE; Hermopolis Magna); P.Aberd.62 (1 CE; Soknopaiou Nesos), a temple account, P.Sarap.83a (90-133 CE; Hermopolite); SB 14.12144 (198/199 CE).

\textsuperscript{135} Betz, Greek Magical Papyri. p.232.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>πάν[των] τῶν</td>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τοιούτων μαντικῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 3.275-281</td>
<td>(Lunar zodiacal calendar for rituals)</td>
<td>[π]σὶει</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>λεκαν[ν] ομαντεία[ν]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀερομαντεία[ν]</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ν]εσκυμαντ[είαν]</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 6.1-47</td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td>[π]έψιεν</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>From Memphis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>μάντευμ[έ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>μαντεύσει νυκτός</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἐν ν ἡμήρῃ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ιδιά. [μ.]μαντικῆς ὀνειράτων</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.1-148</td>
<td>(Homerīc sortition oracle)</td>
<td>τέλος ἔχει τῶν ἐπῶν Ὅμηρομαντείου</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.155-167</td>
<td>(Calendar of days and times to perform divination)</td>
<td>ἡμερομαντίας</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.284-299</td>
<td>(Lunar zodiacal calendar for rituals)</td>
<td>νεκυομαντεία</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.319-334</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel</td>
<td>τὴν μαντείαν μου ταύτην</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.348-358</td>
<td>Mediated: direct</td>
<td>μαντείαν ἐπὶ παιδός</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.540-578</td>
<td>Mediated: lamp</td>
<td>λυχνομαντείαν</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τὴν μαντείαν</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τὴν λυχνομαντείαν ταύτην</td>
<td>560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.795-845</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>Δημοκρίτου</td>
<td>794-975</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὀνειρο/μαντις μαθηματικὸς</td>
<td></td>
<td>as an ὀνειραιτῆτος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 8.64-110</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>πέψιον μάντιν ἐξ ἀδύτων τῶν ἀληθείας</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27: Instances of μαντεία in magical texts

Μαντεία and its cognates appear in ten texts from seven of the Theban papyri, as well as in an additional two texts from the Hermonthis Archive (PGM 7 & 8) and two singular papyri (PGM 3 & 6). In a few cases it refers not to the main procedure described in the recipe, but rather to a subject about which the invoked deity may be asked (PGM 1262-347), or additional uses to which formulae may be put (PGM 13734-1077). In some cases
there is overlap with other important terms, notably αὐτοπτὸς (PGM 4.154-285; PGM 4.930-1114), νεκυοαγωγή (PGM 4.154-285), and ὀνειραιτητόν (PGM 7.795-845).

The range of referents to which μαντεία and its cognates are applied are very large, and it seems in fact to be the term with the broadest semantic range of all of those considered here, referring to direct, dream, lamp, and vessel divination, both mediated and unmediated. Often, greater specificity of referent is achieved by forming a compound of which μαντεία is the second element; specific terms exist for vessel divination (λεκανομαντεία, ὑγρομαντεία, φιαλομαντεία), lamp divination (λυχνομαντεία), divine divination (Θεομαντεία), solar divination (Ἠλιομαντεία), mirror divination (εἰσοπτρομαντεία), air divination (ἀερομαντεία), necromancy (νεκυομαντεία), and dream divination (ὀνειρομαντεία). These terms are not necessarily distinct, and there are instances of overlap; one passage in the Cyranides mentions the practice of “necromancy using bowls”.

3.2.2.5 Ὀνειραιτητόν

The term ὀνειραιτητόν is derived from ὄνειρος (“dream”) and αἰτέω (“I ask, request”); this word, and related terms, appear in six texts from the Theban Library, as well as 10 texts in non-Theban magical papyri, of which seven instances are found in the Hermonthis Archive. In every instance where it describes the main ritual it refers to a request for a dream oracle, although in three, non-Theban, examples, these are binary oracles, with two possible outcomes indicated by dream imagery, rather than true rituals of apparition in which a deity gives a verbal response. Of the examples in the Hermonthis archive, two are described as being “of (the god) Bes”, and a third is ascribed to Pythagoras and

---

[99x746] 1136 This rare term lends its name to the pseudo-Solomonic treatise on divination, the Hygromantia. See P. A. Torijano, Solomon, the Esoteric King: From King to Magus, Development of a Tradition (Brill, 2002), pp.151-157.
[99x75] 1139 PGM 7.222-249, PGM 8.64-110; compare PGM 102.1-17 [frag.E, D, C] (Oxyrhynchus, IV CE), a third version of the same ritual which is lacking its title.
Demokritos, and described as not only as an ὀνειραιτητόν but also an ὀνειρόμαντις (“dream oracle”). In four texts the term refers not to the ritual itself, but to a use the larger ritual or invoked deity can be put; in this context it is often paired with ὀνειροπομπία, the act of sending dreams to others.

While the practice of requesting dreams from deities was common throughout the ancient Mediterranean, ὀνειραιτητόν and its relatives are noticeably absent not only from Neoplatonic and Theurgic texts, but also from non-magical texts in general – literary, documentary, and epigraphic. The closest parallel in usage is that of Artemidorus in his *Oneirocriticon*, the only surviving complete Greek handbook of dream interpretation, who refers twice to αἰτηματικός (“petitionary, requested”) dreams, in which an individual requests a dream from a deity; in his fullest discussion of these he describes the process of requesting a binary oracle, although he clearly disapproves of the practice. Artemidorus’ research seems to have consisted of reading other treatises, as well as dealing with professional dream-interpreters in place in Greece, Asia, and Italy, so that it seems possible that in this case terminology of asking (ἀρτεῖν) for a dream derives from the popular dream interpretation tradition of the Hellenophone Mediterranean.

---

1140 PGM 7.795-845.
1142 “…περὶ ὀνειροπομπείας, περὶ ὀνειραιτησίας…” (PGM 1.329); “όνειροπομπεὶ καλλίστως,/ ὀνειραιτητεῖ θαυμαστῶς” (PGM 4.2439-2444); “ἐπὶ δὲ ὀνειροπομπῶν ἔλεγο…/ ἐπὶ δὲ ὀνειραιτήτου λέγε…” (PGM 4.2496-2497); “όνειροπομπεὶ καὶ κατέχει καὶ ὀνε/ραιτητεῖ ἄμα” (PGM 4.2077-2078).
1143 1.6.1-9 & 4.2.85-102.
1144 4.2.86-90; 94-99: …μέμνησο δέ, ὅταν μὲν αἰτῇς ὀνείρους, μήτε ἐπιθυμιᾶν λιβανωτὸν μήτε ὀνόματα ἀρρήτα λέγειν, καί, τὸ κεφάλαιον εἰπεῖν, περιεχόμενον τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπερώτα μηδέν…Ἐτὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν νομοθέτων τοῖς θεοῖς καταγέλα, λέγω δὲ τῶν τοιούτων πλάνη γίνεται πολλή.
1145 *Onirocriticon 1 prologue passim.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Medium of Apparition</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Term(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGM 1.262-347</td>
<td>(Unmediated: direct)</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>περὶ ὀνειραιτησίας</td>
<td>Refers to one of the subjects about which the recipe suggests the ritualist asks the deity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.2006-2125</td>
<td>(Unmediated: dream)</td>
<td>2077-2078</td>
<td>ὄνει/ραιτητεί</td>
<td>Refers to one of the abilities of the dead spirit acquired as a paredros in the course of the ritual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.2441-2621</td>
<td>(Ritual of erotic compulsion)</td>
<td>2440</td>
<td>ὀνειραιτητεί</td>
<td>In both instances ὀνειραιτητόν refers to a secondary use to which the main ritual could be used after the deity is invoked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 12.153-160</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>ὄνειρου αἰτησις</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 12.190-192</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>ὀνειραιτητόν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 13.1-343</td>
<td>(Unmediated: direct)</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>ὀνειραιτητά</td>
<td>Describes one function of a practice to be carried out after completion of main ritual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.222-249</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>ὀνειραιτητόν Βησσάς</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.250-254</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>ὀνειραιτητόν</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.664-685</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>ὀνειραιτητόν</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.703-726</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>ὀνειραιτητόν</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7.740</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>ὀνειραιτητόν</td>
<td>Hermonthis Archive. The title has</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2.2.6 Σύστασις

One of the more complex concepts in the corpus of the Greek magical papyri is that of the σύστασις, a noun derived from the verb συνέστημι (σύν + ἔστημι), literally “to set together”. The range of meanings of these two lexemes, and their several cognates, is very wide: from the basic sense of “setting together” they can refer to the act of introducing one party to another, and by extension a letter of introduction or recommendation. It can refer to the manner in which something is composed, and by extension the composite object itself. Similarly, it can refer both to alliances, friendships or associations, and to conflicts, each of which can be considered as a meeting of multiple separate agents.\(^{146}\)

---


Non-technical uses of the verb in the magical papyri include PGM 4.1766-1767: ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα/συνέστηκεν; PGM 13.76 (reproduced in l.586): διὰ τὲ συνέστηκεν ὁ πόλος καὶ ἡ γῆ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Medium of Apparition</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Term(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGM 1.42-195</td>
<td>(Unmediated: direct)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>τὴν πρώτην σύστασιν</td>
<td>The act of σύστασις here seems to refer to a preliminary ritual before the main ritual of apparition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 2.1-64</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>συσταθῆς αὐτῷ</td>
<td>The ritual includes instructions for an alternative mediated lamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 2.64-184</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>συνίστα δὲ σεσυτὸν τῷ θεῷ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.154-285</td>
<td>(Unmediated: vessel)</td>
<td>168-169</td>
<td>συστα/θεὶς πρὸς τὸν Ἡλιον</td>
<td>The σύστασις here acts as a preliminary procedure before the αὐτοπτικὴ λεκανομαντεία.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>σημεῖον ἐσται τῆς συστάσεως</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>214-215</td>
<td>συνεστά/θην σοῦ τῷ ἱερῷ μορφῇ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>219-220</td>
<td>ταύτης τῆς συστά/σεως</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td>σύστασις τῆς πράξεως</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.475-829</td>
<td>(Unmediated: direct (anagoge))</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>ἡ δὲ τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ σύστασις</td>
<td>Part of the larger ἀναγωγή ritual known as the Mithras Liturgy. Σύστασις here may refer to a preliminary procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.930-1114</td>
<td>(Unmediated: lamp)</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>σύστασις</td>
<td>Σύστασις here refers to the formula, and probably associated ritual, which proceeds the main αὐτοπτος λυχνομαντεία.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 5α.1-3</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ἐχε συνιστάμενον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 13.1-343</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>συνιστάνου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 13.343-646</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>σύστασιν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>379</td>
<td>ἐνα ἐξ αὐτῶν συσταθῆς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.734-1077</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>σύστησον με</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>σύστησον με</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.187-262</td>
<td>Direct: direct</td>
<td>ἡ σύστασις τῆς πράξεως</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>ἡ σύστασις τῆς πράξεως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.494-611</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>[Σύστασις πρὸς] Ηλιον</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>[Σύστασις πρὸς] Ηλιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.633-731</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>αὐτῶν σύστασιν τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>αὐτῶν σύστασιν τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1-47</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>[σ]ύστασις αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ηλιον</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[σ]ύστασις αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ηλιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.505-528</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Σύστασις ἰδίου δαίμονος</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>Σύστασις ἰδίου δαίμονος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29: Instances of σύστασις in magical papyri

Σύστασις and its related terms appear in ten recipes from the Theban Magical Library, and in a further five recipes in three non-Theban papyri (PGM 3, 6 & 7). In every instance, the σύστασις refers either to a relationship between the deity and ritualist, or to a practice or formula intended to bring about such a relationship. In several cases this ritual is clearly

---

[147] The edition of Preisendanz (Preisendanz and Henrichs, *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri (vol. I)*) marks the initial letters of the line with pointed brackets (<>), but an examination of images of the original papyrus shows that the text is to be understood as filling a lacuna rather than suppleting an omission.
to be carried out before the main divinatory ritual of apparition is to be performed, and in several of these cases the main ritual is referred to as an αὐτόπτος. The deities most often invoked in this relationship are the sun and moon, but in two recensions of the Ogdoad of Moses the ritualist enters into a σύστασις with the gods of the hours and day. In other instances the σύστασις is with the personal daimōn (ἴδιος δαίμων), or with deities with less clear attributes. While the details of these practices will be discussed elsewhere (see 4.1.2), we know from one of the texts that the process of σύστασις resulted in the practitioner becoming “initiated, empowered, consecrated”) to the deity concerned, as well as empowered (ἐδυναμώθην). One outcome of the practice was that the ritualist was able to command deities, although there were additional advantages: PGM 1.42-195 promises that the ritualist in σύστασις with a mighty paredros will not go into hades, but be mummified and taken into the heavens by the attendant deity. The ritual is elsewhere conceived as bringing the practitioner into σύστασις with the deity’s form (μορφή), name (ὄνομα), and emanations (ἀπόρροιαι), while the ritualists gains the presence of the deity in their hearts, a godlike nature (ἰσόθεος φύσις), or is armed with a “magical soul” (μαγικὴ ψυχή) so that they are fortified against a potentially fearful divine apparition. While the σύστασις is often a prelude or prerequisite for the ritual of

---

\[1148\] In PGM 4.154-195, 930-1144; PGM 3.633-731.
\[1149\] PGM 2.1-64, PGM 2.64-184, PGM 4.154-285, PGM 5a.1-3, PGM 6.1-47
\[1150\] PGM 6.1-47
\[1152\] PGM 4.216.
\[1153\] Most explicit in PGM 4.197-200: ‘Give me this favour that, whenever I tell one of the gods to come, he is seen coming swiftly to me in answer to my chants’ (δός δε μοι ταύτην τὴν χάριν, ἵν’, ὅταν τινὰ αὐτῶν / τῶν θε(ῶν) φράσω μολεῖν, ἵνα ὁ λόγος τῆς φράσας μοι μολδέτω/ ὁ δὲ τὸ σῶμα προσέλθῃ σὺν αὐτῷ τῇ μορφῇ τοῦ θεοῦ.
\[1154\] PGM 1.177-180: τελευτήσαντός σου / τὸ σῶμα [περισ]τελεῖ, ὡς πρέπον θεῷ, σοῦ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα βαστά/ξος εἰς ἀέρα ἄγετο, ἵνα εἴη ἵνα μοι τὴν καρδίαν τῆς ψυχῆς μου ἐπανεύρισκον.
\[1155\] PGM 4.215.
\[1156\] PGM 4.215-216.
\[1157\] PGM 4.216.
\[1158\] PGM 13.932: ἔχω σε ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου.
\[1159\] PGM 4.219.
apparition itself, some texts clearly envisage an apparition taking place.\textsuperscript{116}

Translations and interpretations of σύστασις and its related terms fall into three interpretive strategies: σύστασις as union with a deity, σύστασις as encounter with a deity, and σύστασις as introduction to the deity; in some translations, as in the Betz-edited PGM, the translation used varies between texts. The most detailed discussion to date, that of Eitrem,\textsuperscript{116}\textsuperscript{2} emphatically rejects the idea of union (“Vereinigung”, ‘ἔνωσις’, uniri cum deo), arguing instead that “encounter” (“Begegnung”, “rencontre”) is the correct understanding; the discussion is not extensive, but it partly depends on two of the appearances of the term σύστασις in the Cyranides, where it appears to refer simply to “associations”\textsuperscript{116}\textsuperscript{3} In view of the foregoing discussion however, this seems insufficient; “encounter” suggests a passing meeting, whereas the relationship between the deity and ritualist described in the texts themselves is that of a transformative empowerment. For this reason, I would suggest a translation along the lines of “conjunction”, capturing to some extent the sense of a relationship, and the jargonistic character of the usage, while avoiding the full “union” which Eitrem rightly rejects.\textsuperscript{116}\textsuperscript{4}

As with αὐτοπτος, σύστασις seems to have originated as a term of art within Chaldaean theurgy, so it should not surprise us that they occur together in several texts from this tradition. While none of the surviving fragments of the Chaldaean Oracles mentions the σύστασις, Michael Psellus recounts the story that Julian the Chaldaean conjoined (συνέστησε) the soul of his son, Julian the Theurgist, to the souls of all the gods and Plato at his birth,\textsuperscript{116}\textsuperscript{5} while Marinus describes Proclus as having performed ταί τών Χαλδαίων

\textsuperscript{116}\textsuperscript{2} Most obviously in PGM 54.2-3: ἔχε με συνιστάμενον. / ...καὶ αὐτοπτήσεις.

\textsuperscript{116}\textsuperscript{3} Eitrem, “Zu philostrats heroikos”, pp.49-50.

\textsuperscript{116}\textsuperscript{4} 1.19.11-12: οὗτο ἐστιν μέγα καὶ δαυμαστόν φορού/μενον ἐπὶ τε νίκῃς καὶ φιλίας καὶ συστάσεως πρὸς πάντας καὶ πάσας: 34-35: ἔχε μέγιστον/ φυλακτήριον πρὸς πᾶσαν φιλίαν καὶ σύστασιν καὶ νίκην.

\textsuperscript{116}\textsuperscript{5} Thanks to the work of Lewy (Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy. Mysticism and Platonism in the Later Roman Empire) discussed below, this is already the standard translation in works on theurgy and Neoplatonism.

\textsuperscript{116}\textsuperscript{6} Περὶ τῆς χρυσῆς ἁλύσεως τῆς παρ’ Ὁμήρῳ ἀρχαγγελική/ ἔμελλεν, ἀρχαγγελικὴν ἑτίσε ψυχὴν τὸν συνοχέα τοῦ παντὸς πρὸς τήν/ τῷ Ἑρμῇ…
συστάσεις the as part of his theurgic practice. Porphyry, in his *Letter to Anebo*, lists συστάσεις along with ingested liquids (καταπόσεις), incantation (ἐπῳδαί) and various media of apparition as different means of acquiring oracles, and in his reply Iamblichus summarises all of these as different types of φωτὸς ἀγογή. Damascius, probably anachronistically, describes the σύστασις as a stage in the earlier mystery cults, preceding the divine vision (ἐποπτεία), and Maximus of Tyre understands Socrates' *daimonion* as one of a number of deities conjoined (συνισταμένας) to fortunate mortals. As summarised by Lewy, these at times contradictory discussions suggest that the σύστασις may have functioned in theurgy, as in the magical papyri, as a ritual to create an initial relationship between deity and practitioner, although it is interesting that the magical papyri appear, for once, to be more consistent in their usage than the later literary texts.

While the source domain of this usage of σύστασις is unclear, it may have some relationship to the concept of sympathy (συμπάθεια), by which deities are connected to other objects throughout the cosmos through invisible connections by which causal force can be transferred up and down the hierarchy of being. By entering into this conjunctive relationship with the deity, the ritualist would become, in a sense, an extension of the divinity itself.

---

1166 *Vita Procli* 677-679. In this instance the συστάσεις seem to have been performed after Proclus had experienced the ‘fiery apparitions of Hekate seen with his own eyes’ (φάσμασι μὲν Ἐκατικοῖς φωτοειδέσιν ἑαυτοπτομένοις ὁμιλήσει). While it is possible that Marinus misunderstood the sequence of rituals, it is equally possibly that the σύστασις, perhaps with different deities each time, was a ritual performed throughout theurgic practice, or else that its precise function was not the same as that in the magical papyri.


1170 *Dissertationes* 8.6.24-27: ἀλλ' εἰ τῷ ὄντι ἡγεῖ ταυτὶ τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ τὰ σώματα αἰνίττεσθαί τινας δαιμονίους δυνάμεις καὶ συνισταμένας τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῖς εὐμοιροτάτοις καὶ ὄναρ.

1171 Lewy and Tardieu, *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy. Mysticism and Platonism in the Later Roman Empire*, pp.228-238.

1172 See for example the use of συνίστημι in Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis* 3.9.28-30: τὴν τυχοῦσαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁμοιότητα, κατοχή/τε συνίσταται εὐθὺς τελεία καὶ πλήρωσις τῆς κρείττονος/ σύστασι καὶ δυνάμεις.
3.2.2.8 Summary of terms for rituals of apparition

This brief survey of the terms used for rituals of apparition in the Greek and Demotic magical papyri has highlighted not only the diversity of terminology, but also the several different domains from which they seem to derive. These can be summarised as follows:

1. **General terms for divination**
   
   Most prominent among these is μαντεία, but this category would also include ūn, and ph-ntr, with the latter perhaps representing an oracle originally associated with a specific temple and festival, but later generalised.

2. **Terms deriving from popular belief**
   
   The term “popular belief” is not unproblematic, but here I understand terms with particular referents in the beliefs and practices of individuals within the Greek and Egyptian cultural traditions, which were neither part of large-scale cults, nor prominent in literary or philosophical texts. This includes ἀγωγή, in the sense in which it seems to have been derived from ψυχαγωγή, and ὀνειραιτητόν, whose origins seem to lie in the Hellenic tradition of oneiromancy.

3. **Terms deriving from Chaldaean Theurgy**
   
   The tradition of Chaldaean Theurgy, first expressed in the *Chaldaean Oracles*, and adopted by Neoplatonist Theurgists from Iamblichus onwards, used several terms in technical senses to describe their own rituals of apparition and inspired divination. The clearest instances preserved in the magical papyri are aὐτοπτος and σύστασις, referring to the divine encounter and divine conjunction respectively, but terms such as θεαγωγία and φωταγογία may also originate from a theurgic context.

4. **Others**
   
   Within most of the word-clusters we have examined have been certain terms
which appear to be neologisms, formed by analogy with older terms, but with distinct technical meanings. The most prominent example we have looked at here is the term ἀρκτική, a substantivised adjective. It does not seem to be used in this specific sense outside the magical papyri, leading us to suspect that it represents a neologism.

It is important to remember that the range of terms used by any text does not absolutely determine its cultural origin: a term adopted into magical discourse from another field may then be used in unconnected contexts. But where multiple terms from, for example, the vocabulary of Chaldaean Theurgy are found in a single text, we may suspect a more direct influence from this tradition on that particular text.

A second important aspect of this study has been to examine the range captured by each term. It has become common, for example, to state that the term $ph-ntr$ corresponds to the Greek σύστασις or αὐτόπτος,\footnote{See for example Ritner, "Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire", p.3346; Betz, Greek Magical Papyri, p.56 n.126; Dieleman, "Coping with a difficult life: Magic, Healing, and Sacred Knowledge", p.355.} and that all three of these terms refer to unmediated direct visions.\footnote{Hopfner, Griechische-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszauben. vol.2/1 pp.116, 193; Johnston, Ancient Greek Divination, pp.152, 155, 159-160.} Table 29 summarises the information from the preceding discussions, demonstrating the range of referents for each term. Contrary to the general consensus of scholarship, the direct evidence of the magical papyri shows that $ph-ntr$ almost always refers to dream oracles, a sense never demonstrated for αὐτόπτος. Instead, αὐτόπτοι are always unmediated, but in fact may refer not only to direct visions, but also to visions which use lamps or vessels as the media of apparition. Finally, the σύστασις, as has been argued, should be understood as a preliminary conjunction rather than a ritual of apparition in and of itself. Each of these terms has a unique, but overlapping sphere of reference.
Table 30 shows the overlap between terminology, with bracketing used to indicate instances where the terms are used together within a single ritual, but not to refer to the same practice. Immediately obvious is the relationship between the three "theurgic terms" already identified: αὐτόπτος, σύστασις, and θεαγωγός, but it is also worth noting that αὐτόπτος also co-occurs with ἀγωγή, φωταγωγία, and θεαγωγεία.
Finally, table 31 summarises the terms used for rituals of apparition in each of the papyri where they appear with titles. It is worth noting that several terms – including $p\text{h-}n\text{Tr}$ – appear in only one or two manuscripts. As we might expect, the terms with the widest distribution are those general terms which seem to have been common in the Greek-speaking population at large—most notably ὀ νειραιτητόν and μαντεία— but αὔτοπτος also has a surprisingly wide range, with related terms appearing in seven papyri. Of particular interest here is the distribution of attestations between papyri – the manuscript displaying the most extensive vocabulary being PGM 4, and each of the other papyri displaying a different range of terms. While none of the non-Theban papyri match any of the Theban texts in the specific profile of terminology they use, it is clear that the most extensive similarities are found in PGM 3, 7 & 8, those papyri often suggested to belong to the Library. Notable also is the absence of PDM/PGM 61, another papyrus often associated with the Library, although we should note also that the predominantly Demotic papyri tend to display a smaller range of terms more generally.
32: Terms used for rituals of apparition in handbooks
*Ἀγογή here refers only to its use as a term for rituals of apparition, not for other procedures (for instance rituals of erotic compulsion).

### 3.2.3 Social context

The recipes of the Roman magical papyri are, in general, very sparing about information regarding the context in which they took place. The few framing narratives which we do find in the texts tend to be situated in the ideal past in which wise priests and kings corresponded about divine matters; their value for reconstructing the social, rather than
ideological, situation of the practitioners of magic is therefore limited. Instead, we must use passing references, and inference from the assemblage of practices themselves, to draw conclusions. This inference can be supplemented, to some extent, by contemporary literary mentions of people carrying out similar rituals. These must be used with caution, however, since it is rare for them to even purport to describe real events; generally their information is hypothetical, fictional, or at best at several removes from the original witnesses. If we spread our net wider, we can take in later collections, such as the Picatrix. Yet with these, as with the much later discussions of anthropologists in Egypt, we must be cautious about assuming unbroken continuity, where changes, however difficult to detect, may provide important insights into Egyptian social history.

This section will focus narrowly on three aspects of rituals of apparition about which it is possible to make some suggestions without going too far beyond the available evidence. Firstly, the purposes of these rituals – why they were performed, and what outcomes were expected, how they fitted into the broader range of practices attested in the magical papyri in general, and the Theban Library in particular. The second discussion, and the more speculative, will look at evidence for their public performance, and the role that they may have played in the social and religious lives of their participants.

3.2.3.1 The Purpose and Position of Rituals of Apparition

Rituals of apparition are generally subsumed into the category of divination, a sphere which, as we have seen, included a great number of other practices in the Roman Mediterranean. The purpose of this section is to go beyond this general characterisation, and to try to suggest the types of questions to which ritualists might have been seeking answers. In the course of investigating this question I will also discuss clues within the papyri, and related material, which suggest the social context of these rituals, and their relationship to the broader spectrum of practice within the magical collections.

In most cases, unfortunately, the recipes are frustratingly vague; the ritualist is to “inquire”
or “ask” (ἐπ)ἐρωτᾶν, πυνθάνειν, about a ‘matter’ (πράγμα, ἀποκρίνειν, ἀπολύσεις) to which they wish (θέλειν, νυνυείν, ἀποκρίνειν, ἀπολύσεις) to have an answer, which the god then responds to (χρηματίζειν, μηνύειν, ἀποκρίνειν). This vagueness is revealing in its own way: the word for “matter” is often modified in such a way as to stress its broad applicability. In the Greek texts this is indicated by specifying that the question concerns a “certain” matter, inviting the ritualists to substitute any concerns of their own, and in the Demotic texts this is even more explicit: they may ask about “any” matter. This suggests that the authors of the recipes did indeed envisage that the ritualists using them might have a potentially infinite number of questions to ask.

---

1175 For example in PGM 4.231: ἐπερώτα περὶ οὗ θέλεις; PGM 4.250: κριθήσεται περὶ οὗ ἐπερωτάς ἀντων. PGM 7.577: ἔρωτα...

1176 For example in PGM 4.912: πυθοῦ περὶ οὗ θέλεις; PGM 4.736: καὶ πυνθάνου, ὃθέλεις.


1178 For example in PGM 4.223: σκέψασθαι περὶ πραγμάτων; PGM 4.1033: ἀκούσω δηλαυγῶς καὶ ἀψεύστως περὶ τοῦ δεῖς πράγματος; PGM 4.5106: περὶ τοῦ δεί(νος) πρ(άγματος).

1179 For example PDM 14.112-113: ἀριστώσημι κυρία/ ἄνθρωπον θεοῦ καὶ ἀποκρίθησαι σοι. PDM Suppl.157-158: ἄνθρωπον κυρία/ ἄνθρωπον θεοῦ καὶ ἀποκρίθησαι σοι.

1180 For example PGM 4.24-25: ημ. τ. ἐπέχ. ἐπερώτητα... PDM 14.61: ημ. τ. θεός καὶ ἀποκρίθησαι σοι.

1181 For example PGM 4.1-42: πάντα μηνύσει σοι.

1182 For example PGM 4.231: ἀποκρίθησαι σοι; PGM 7.577: ἀποκρίθησαι σοι.

1183 See the discussion above, 3.2.2.2.


In many cases we can assume that the request or question would have been inserted into the spoken invocation formula if there was an appropriate point, to replace the generic “matter”, but there are indications that, in at least some cases, the question or request was written down. This is most often the case in instances of dream oracles, where the matter might be written down, either on linen or papyrus, and placed either by the head of the ritualist, or under the lamp being used in the ritual.\textsuperscript{1191} In another instance, where Imhotep is asked to perform an astrological consultation, the matter is instead placed on the astrological table,\textsuperscript{1192} while in an invocation of Ursa Major the written matter is shown to the constellation as the invocation is being spoken.\textsuperscript{1193} In these instances, the request is sometimes written alongside a formula containing onomata,\textsuperscript{1194} implying perhaps that the act of writing may have been accompanied by the act of speaking. A literary parallel to these practices is provided by Hippolytus in his Refutatio Omnium Haeresium, in which the ritualist is carrying out a mediated consultation for a group of observers. The questioner writes their request on a piece of papyrus, which is then burned so that the smoke may reach the deity being consulted, while separate pieces of the papyrus have onomata written upon them, and are placed beside the boy-medium’s head.\textsuperscript{1195}

Alongside the writing of the questions, other texts imply that the answers may also have been written by the ritualist in the course of, or after, the consultation. Thus, for example, in the dream oracle of PGM 8.64-110 the ritualists are instructed to have a small tablet nearby, to write down what is spoken to them in order that they do not forget it.\textsuperscript{1196}

\textsuperscript{1191} PGM 7.664-685: The matter is written on a piece of linen (βύσσι[νον ῥάκος], 664), which is wrapped around an olive branch and placed below the right part of the ritualist’s head. PGM 7.703-726: The matter is written on a piece of pure papyrus (χάρτ[ῃ καθαρῷ, 703] along with the formula, and placed under the lamp. PDM Suppl.149-162: The matter is written on new papyrus (dma n mıy, 157) and placed under the lamp.

\textsuperscript{1192} PDM 14.93-114: The matter is written down on new papyrus (dma n mıy, 113) and placed on the astrological table (pynʾks, that is πίναξ, l.114).

\textsuperscript{1193} PGM 72.1-36: The matter is written alongside the onoma νεξحركة (Συνομοσυσμαλέπ, ll.9-10). Preisendanz reconstructs the damaged word for the material used for writing as papyrus (χάρτ, l.6).

\textsuperscript{1194} In PGM 7.703-726; PGM 72.1-36.

\textsuperscript{1195} Refutatio Omnium Haeresium 4.28.1-3, 7-8. The onomata are described as writings ‘in Hebrew’ (Ἐβραίκως, 4.28.2.2, 4.28.7.5).

\textsuperscript{1196} PGM 8.89-91...έχε εἴγγιστά σου/ πινακίδα, ἵνα δοσα λέγει γράψις, ἵνα μὴ κοιμη[θ]εὶς/ ληθαργήσης.
Likewise, in PGM 13.1-343, a direct vision, the ritualist is to write down the things spoken by the deity, along with the name it gives for itself.\textsuperscript{1197} In instances where writing is not prescribed, the ritual may imply a need for enhanced memory to recall the message from the deity, as in PGM 7.727-739, a direct vision where the ritualist may request to be given memory (μνήμη) by the god. A similar rationale may lie behind the few independent rituals for memory preserved in two of the magical papyri, which without exception involve ingesting empowered materia.\textsuperscript{1198} An exception, which nonetheless stresses the general concern with memory, is found in the \textit{Mithras Liturgy}, in which the recipe promises that the oracle will be remembered infallibly, even if it consists of myriads of verses.\textsuperscript{1199}

Although, as we have noted, most of the descriptions of the questions asked by ritualists are left intentionally unspecific, a few examples suggest the types of questions which might have concerned ritualists. As we might expect from divination rituals, most of the questions suggest an interest in uncovering hidden information.\textsuperscript{1200} Thus, for example, PGM 1.42-195 and PGM 3.282-409\textsuperscript{1201} tell us that the invoked deity will be able to let the ritualist know what another person is thinking; the context of the former implies that this is in response to a question from the other individual, and thus a demonstration of the ritualist’s abilities.\textsuperscript{1202} In this text, and another (PGM 3.187-262)\textsuperscript{1203} it is also implied that the

\begin{itemize}
  \item PGM 13.210-211: ....ἐπάν εἰσέλθῃ ὁ θεὸς, κάτω βλέπε καὶ γράφε τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ ἴνα διδώσῃ σοι αὑτοῦ ὄνομασίαν.
  \item PGM 1.232-247; PGM 3.410-423; PGM 3.424-466; PGM 3.467-478.
  \item PGM 4.729-732: τότε/ μνημονεύσεις ἀπαραβάτως τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ/ μεγάλου θεοῦ βρέθεντα, κἀν ἦν μυρίων στίχων ὁ χρησμός.
  \item We should note that this was not always the primary concern of Greek and Egyptian divination – surviving evidence recording real oracular consultations indicates that questions were not always about hidden information – the identity of a thief, for example – but instead often asked whether the questioner should carry out a particular act – a planned journey or purchase, for example. For a brief survey of some Egyptian oracle questions see Černý in Richard A. Parker, \textit{A Saite Oracle Papyrus from Thebes in the Brooklyn Museum} [\textit{Papyrus Brooklyn 47.218.3}] (Providence: Brown University Press, 1962), pp.45-48; a more general discussion of the Greek case is given in M.A. Flower, \textit{The Seer in Ancient Greece} (University of California Press, 2008), pp.74-76.
  \item PGM 1.174-176: ...ἐὰν/ δὲ τις <><> σε ἐρωτήσῃ τί κατὰ ψυχὴν ἔχω... ἐπερώτα τὸν ἄγγελον.
\end{itemize}
question may concern the future, with the example from PGM 1 being one in which the ritualist asks what will happen in the future, and what will become of the questioner.\footnote{PGM 1.174-176: ...ἐὰν/ δέ τί<ς> σε ἐρωτήσῃ... τι μοι ἐγένετο ἢ γένετο μέλ\[\ldots]ει: γενέσθαι ἐπερώτα τὸν ἄγγελον.} This possibility is reflected in other evidence; thus the Dream of Nectanebo Graeco-Roman literary text the eponymous king asks the gods to reveal what has been determined (τὰ ἐνεστηκότα, l.5).\footnote{Compare Pseudo-Callisthenes, Historia Alexandri Magni 1.3.1-2, where Nectanebo uses bowl divination to watch the gods of Egypt piloting the boats of his enemies against him.} Similarly, the archive of Ḥor records the priest carrying out consultations in the form of dream oracles to determine the future for both himself and other individuals.\footnote{For example texts 1 and 2 predict the retreat of Antiochus from Egypt (1.14-17, 2.4-6), and the Greek texts A-E seem to predict the victory of the Ptolemies over unrest in the Thebaid; texts 8 (ll.21-24), 9 (v ll. 7-10) and 10 (ll.14-16) record guarantees that Isis will grant Ḥor a long life and a good burial in death. Text 12 records him carrying out a consultation on behalf of an invididual named Pi-hm-ntr-|mn.} Closely related to this interest in the future is a concern with the concept of fate, most explicit in the three recensions of the Ogdoad of Moses in PGM 13.\footnote{These are PGM 13.1-343, 343-646, 646-734.} In the second of these the deity is asked to reveal the fate (γένεσις, l.612) of the ritualist; if this is negative the ritualist may ask the deity to remove the evil fate.\footnote{PGM 13. 613-614: ἀπάλειψόν μου τὰ τῆς εἱμαρ/μένης κακά.} Again, in the third recension, the deity is asked what is allotted to the ritualist,\footnote{PGM 13.709: δέσποτα, τί μοι εἴμαι.} and will reveal the star, the daimôn, and the horoscope belonging to the ritualist, along with where the ritualist will live\footnote{For this specific concern compare PDM Suppl.162-168, a recipe to determine the ritualist’s ‘house of life’ (ὥσπερ τὸ ὡροσκόπος), probably to be understood as ‘dwelling place’.} and die;\footnote{PGM 13.710-711: ἐρεῖ σοι καὶ περὶ ἄστρου καὶ ποῖός ἐστιν ὁ σὸς δαίμων καὶ ὁ ὡροσκόπος, καὶ ποῦ ζήσῃ καὶ ποῦ ἀποθανεῖται.} again the ritualist may ask the deity to remove or avert this fate.\footnote{PGM 13.713: ...ἐρώτα, ἢν αὐτὸς ἀπαλείψῃ ἢ μεθεδείσῃ.} These instances demonstrate the close relationship between fate and astrology in the conceptual schema of the Roman period; γένεσις,\footnote{Γένεσις refers to the “nativity”, the fortune determined by the position of the celestial bodies at the time of an individual’s birth.} ἀστήρ,\footnote{Ἀστήρ refers, of course, to stars in general, but here it probably means “planet”, and more particularly “ruling planet”; see for example the discussion of the planets in Vettius Valens’ Anthologarium libri ix (1.1),} δαίμων,\footnote{Δαίμων refers to the personal or household god, who is usually also a guardian spirit.} and ὡροσκόπος\footnote{ἀστήρ, δαίμων, ὡροσκόπος, and γένεσις are all technical} are all technical
terms used when casting a horoscope. This aspect is even more pronounced in PDM 14.93-114, in which the ritualist sets up an astrological chart which the deity apparently arranges during the dream oracle to indicate the configuration favourable to the matter. Yet another instance of the god being asked to alter the ritualist’s fate occurs in an invocation of Helios contained within the larger, polypractical first Ogdoad of Moses; in this instance the negative fate in store for the practitioner is apparently indicated by the appearance of the deity: he appears “with a dark countenance”, and in response the ritualist may ask for a greater lifespan. This idea that the countenance or appearance of the deity reflects the fate in store for the ritualist recurs in the second recension, where the god is asked to show the ritualist his “good form”. Again, there is an mention in PGM 1 of the ritualist inquiring into the fate of another individual, specifically one who has taken ill, to discover whether they will live, and if they will die, the day and time of their death. From this same text we also have the most extreme instance of the deity’s

1215 Δαίμων could be understood as referring to the ἴδιος δαίμων, the deity assigned to the individual at birth, but given the context it probably refers more specifically to the “lot of the daimón” (κλῆρος δαιμόνος), a point on the ecliptic determined from the longitude of the sun and the moon.

1216 Ὠροσκόπος, or “horoscope”, refers to the ascendant, the sign or degree rising at the time of birth.

1217 Something similar may be envisaged in PDM 14.117-149, another dream oracle in which the ritualist is first told to “set up your …” (di.t ἄστρον [p=y=k ..], l.117). The final word has a star determinative ( */, leading Griffiths and Thompson to suggest it might be a planisphere (Griffith and Thompson, Demotic Magical Papyrus., vol. 1 p.45). The same determinative appears in the last word of substantive πυνγος n aś wnm.t (‘astrological table’, l.113) in PDM 93-114, although there does not appear to be sufficient space in l.117 for this exact term. Yet another possible instance occurs in PGM 10.1-12, a fragmentary text which describes the use of a πίνακς (ll.2-3). While damage makes its purpose unclear, the statement that “a voice comes to you” (φωνὴ σοὶ ἔρχεται, l.1) seems to imply some sort of revelation; compare PGM 4.164-165 (φωνὴν λαμβάνων ἐν στίχοις; from a description of vessel divination) and SM 66 l.22 where a daimōn is asked to appear to the ritualist διὰ φωνῆς in an instance of mediumistic divination.

1218 PGM 13.254-261. See also the references in spoken formulae to the deity as a protector from fate: PGM 1.215-216: ὑπεράσπισθον μου πρός πάσαν ὑπεροχὴν ἐξουσίαν δαίμονος ἀείρου [καὶ εἱμαρμένης; PGM 13.612-613: ἡ ἀγαθὴ σου μορφὴ.


1221 PGM 13.616-617: …φανήτω μοι ἡ ἁγαθὴ σου/ μορφὴ;

1222 PGM 1.188-189: ἐρεῖ δὲ σοι περὶ κατακλίσεως ἀνθρώπου, εἶ ὃστε/τοι ἢ τελ[ευτής] εἰ καὶ ποίη ἡμέρα καὶ ποίη ὥρα νυκτὸς. Again, there is an astrological flavour to this description, not only in the reference to foretelling the
intervention in the ritualist’s destiny: once conjoined (συσταθέν, l.180) with the ritualist as a paredros the deity will wrap (περιστέλλω, l.179) the ritualist’s body after death, and carry their soul it into the air with him, so that they will not go into Hades.\footnote{PGM 1.177-180. Ritner (Betz, Greek Magical Papyri, p.7 n.36) compares this promise to the Oracular Amuletic Decrees, documents written in hieratic and worn as amulets which mainly date to the 21\textsuperscript{st} to 22\textsuperscript{nd} dynasties, issued by deities promising protection to the recipients, who were apparently young children for the most part (Edwards, Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum: Oracular amuletic decrees of the late New Kingdom, pp.xxiii-xlv). One of the closest comparisons is the Decree for Neskhons (Cairo Museum 5832; c.995 BCE), in which Amorasonther promises to “deify (\textit{nfr}) her soul and her body in the Necropolis, and I will not allow her soul ever to be destroyed in the Necropolis. I will deify her in the Necropolis like any god and any goddess who is divine, like any being and any thing which is divine in the Necropolis” (ll.42-56/§11; published in Battiscombe Gunn, "The Decree of Amonrasonthrë for Neskhons," The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 41 (1955) and M W Golénischeff, Catalogue Général des Antiquités du Musée du Caire: Papyrus Hiératiques (1927), pp.196-197). A parallel closer in date than these relatively unusual documents occurs in the Book of Thoth, where six spirits called “rowers” (\textit{hn}) regenerate (\textit{snfr}) corpses who have no papyrus roll (that is, funerary text, presumably as a synecdoche for funerary rites) (B04, 8/8-8/15), and there are similar concepts expressed in other Ptolemaic and Roman funerary texts (see for example the discussion in Martin Andreas Stadler, “The Funerary Texts of Papyrus Turin N. 766: A Demotic Book of Breathing (Part II),” Enchoria 26 (2000), in particular the text of L.224/3002.5, on pp.116-117). More generally, the concept that those especially blessed by gods would be attended by deities at their deaths, and be salved from ‘hades’ was a common one in the Roman period; thus, for example, in the Gospel of Truth it is said that those who possess something “of the immeasurable greatness” do not go down into Amente (42.17-18); in Philo’s \textit{De vita Mosis} Moses is told how he will be buried “not by mortal hands but by immortal powers” (χερσί ν οὐ θνηταῖς ἀλλ’ / ἀθανάτοις δυνάμεσιν; 2.291); in the Testament of Abraham the patriarch’s body is anointed, perfumed and buried by angels (Recension A, 54.19-25); Augustine claims that Porphyry advised the cultivation of friendship with a daimôn, who might elevate the soul above the earth after death (De Civitate Dei t10.9: “…et admoneat utendum alicuius daemonis amicitia, quo subiectante vel paululum terra possit elevari quise post mortem…”).}

The concept of fate (ἀνάγκη, εἱμαρμένη, μοῖρα, and so on) as an oppressive force tied to the stars, which could be averted through ritual means, was an old one in both the Egyptian and Hellenic traditions.\footnote{For Egyptian concepts of fate see Jan Quaegebeur, \textit{Le dieu égyptien Shai dans la religion et l’onomastique} (Leuven University Press, 1975), in particular pp.126-129, and John Baines, “Contexts of Fate: Literature and Practical Religion,” in The Unbroken Reed: Studies in the Culture and Heritage of Ancient Egypt in Honour of A. F. Shore, ed. C. J. Eyre, A. Leahy, and Lisa Montagno Leahy (London: The Egypt Exploration Society, 1994). Particularly vivid descriptions of the late antique understanding of the power of fate, and the possibilities for escaping its influence can be found in the Gnostic texts; see for example the discussions in Horace Jeffery Hodges, "Gnostic Liberation from Astrological Determinism: Hipparchan "Trepidation" and the Breaking of Fate," \textit{Vigiliae Christianae} 51, no. 4 (1997); van der Vliet, "Fate, Magic and Astrology in Pistis Sophia.”; Zlatko Pleše, "Fate, Providence and Astrology in Gnosticism (1): The Apocryphon of John," \textit{MNH} 7(2007).} One of the literary examples closest to the picture presented in the magical papyri occurs in \textit{The Story of Petese} (2.3-25), in which the titular
priest apparently summons a spirit (ἰvised) at its tomb, demands to know his life-span, and is
told he has 40 days to live; damage to the papyrus prevents us from knowing if he was able
to extend his life through other rituals.¹²²⁵ There are several more general literary mentions
of magic being used to avert fate, although it is often unclear whether these should be
understood as references to rituals similar to those preserved in the magical papyri, or
instead as references to the private initiatory and purificatory practices carried out by
individuals who often called μάγοι, but which do not seem to be directly reflected in the
Egyptian papyri of the Roman period.¹²²⁶ A continual problem in Hellenic and Egyptian
literature dealing with fate is that of the relationship between fate and the gods.¹²²⁷ While
the magical papyri offer no elaborated cosmology describing this relationship, the
invocations and recipes regularly affirm that the invoked deity has power over fate and its

¹²²⁵ Here I have attempted to summarise briefly an episode complicated by the appearance of the god Osiris,
as well as damage to the papyrus itself. It seems that the spirit acts as an intermediary between Osiris and
Petese. See the discussion in Ryholt, The Story of Petese, pp.74-75. A similar story in which the summoning of
a spirit is described in more detail, and in a fashion comparable to the Roman rituals of apparition, is that of
Khonsuemhab and the Ghost, in which another priest summons an #x through a combination of offerings
((i)h.t nb.t nfr(.t), 2.4) and a spoken formula (2.5).

¹²²⁶ On these individuals see Dickie, Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World, pp.27-46, 60-74. Among
the references to magic as a force which may release the individual soul from the effects of fate are an oracle
preserved recorded by Porphyry and preserved by Eusebius, in which a god advises magical rites (μαγείαις)
including expiatory sacrifices (ἀποτροπισμοί), to escape from the bonds of fate (Praeparatio Evangelica
6.4.1-5); Iamblichus discusses this possibility in De Mysteriis (8.4-8, 9.3) but dismisses Porphyry’s expiatory
model in favour of a theurgic process of transcending fate by uniting (ἐνοῦσθαι, 8.7,8) with the gods who are
above it; Zosimos of Panopolis also records claims of Pseudo-Zoroaster that “all the evils of fate” (πάντα τῆς
εἱμαρμένης τὰ κακὰ) can be overcome through magic (μαγεία), but condemns it on the authority of Hermes
Trismegistos (On the Letter Omega 7); likewise Philostratus (Vita Apollonii 5.12.1-9) records that certain
γόητες claim to be able to alter fate (μεταποιεῖν/ φασι τά εἱμαρμένα, 7-8) through torturing spirits (βαςάνους
εἰδώλων, 6), sacrifices (ὑσίας βαρ/βάρους, 5-6), incantations (ἐπάσαται, 7), or anointings (ἀλεῖψαι, 7). That this
concept was a very early one is shown by a reference to the inability of the “Thracian
tablets of Orpheus” (Θρήσσαις ἐν σανίσιν, τὰς/ Ὀρφεία κατέγραψεν/ γῆρυς, 966-969) to overcome necessity
(ἀνάγκη) in Euripides’ Alcestis (963-973).

¹²²⁷ This topic is too large to provide a full bibliography, but a discussion of the Greek discourse on this issue
can be found in B.C. Dietrich, Death, Fate, and the Gods: The Development of a Religious Idea in Greek Popular
Belief and in Homer [by] B. C. Dietrich (University of London, The Athlone Press, 1965); see also the role of Isis
in averting fate, discussed in Thomas M. Dousa, “Imagining Isis: On some continuities and discontinuities in
the image of Isis in Greek Isis hymns and Demotic texts,” in Acts of the Seventh International Conference of
Demotic Studies Copenhagen, 23-27 August 1999, ed. Kim Ryholt(Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press,
2002).
Still connected with the interest in fate and the future is a concern with using rituals of apparition as part of healing practice, divining the nature of an illness and prescribing a treatment. Thus, the *paredros* of PGM 1.42-195 will not only tell the ritualist about a patient’s prospects, but also which herbs to use and how to heal them.\(^{1229}\) Similarly, an invocation to Imḥotep, apparently to be used in a dream oracle,\(^{1230}\) asks the deity to bring a “prescription for the illness which has happened to [the ritualist], and the means of using it”.\(^{1231}\) Other recipes are less explicit about this purpose of the rituals, but there is a long-standing connection between healing and divination in Egypt, from the consultation of the wise-woman (*tḥ rḥ.t*) in Ramesside Deir El-Medineh about the deaths of children\(^{1232}\) to Blackman’s description of female magician using a ritual of apparition to diagnose an illness and find its treatment in Upper Egypt in the late 1910s.\(^{1233}\)

This aspect of the ritual of apparition connects it not only to the many healing rituals within the Roman magical corpus, but also to the closely related practice of incubation, a feature of both Hellenic and Egyptian cults in Egypt. There is no way to clearly separate temple incubation from the dream oracles which occur in the magical papyri, and indeed, given the similarity of the more detailed descriptions of incubation, it may be that dream

---

\(^{1228}\) See for example PGM 7.236: “you are the one over necessity” (σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀνάγκης; again in the parallel texts in PGM 7.648; PGM 8.94, 95); PGM 13.713-714: “for this god is able to do everything” (δύναται/ γὰρ πάντα ὁ θεὸς οὗτος).

\(^{1229}\) PGM 1.190: δώσει δὲ [σοι καὶ] ἄγριας βοτάνας καὶ πῶς θεραπεύσει.

\(^{1230}\) The god is asked to come “tonight” (*n pḥy grḥ*, ll.4, 28); other instances of this stipulation (for example in PDM 14.137, 139, 149a) are found in dream oracles.

\(^{1231}\) PDM 12.28-29: w. t pḥye. t iw=s mtr r pī šn/ nty bpr n-im=ḥ y irm pī ky n ir=s.


\(^{1233}\) *The Fellāhīn of Upper Egypt*, p.75.
oracles represent a form of incubation in which the praxis – the spoken formulae and offerings – has overtaken the cultic setting – the temple or shrine as the ritual space – as the focal point of the ritual. Literary descriptions of incubation from Roman Egypt tend to focus on the temples of Sarapis at Canopus\textsuperscript{1234} and Alexandria,\textsuperscript{1235} while graffiti by visitors record healings carried out at the Osireion at Abydos\textsuperscript{1236} and the shrine to Amehotep son of Hapu and Imhotep at Deir el-Baḥri.\textsuperscript{1237} Alongside these brief mentions of incubation are a dozen or so fuller descriptions of dream oracles in literary and documentary texts ranging in date from the fifth century BCE to the sixth century CE (see table 32). Unlike older Egyptian accounts of divinely-inspired dreams\textsuperscript{1238} these instances are apparitions in response to invocatory rituals, usually consisting, like those in the magical papyri, of offerings and spoken formulae. Where the locations of these rituals are given, they generally take place either in the temples or shrines of the deities or sacred animal mummies. A full study of the relationship between these older rituals and the later magical rituals of apparition is beyond the scope of this study, and would be unlikely to prove definitive in any case, given the fragmentary nature of our evidence for the former;

\textsuperscript{1234} For example Strabo, \textit{Geographica} 17.1.17.
\textsuperscript{1235} For example Tacitus, \textit{Historiae} 4.81, who describes how two Alexandrians were told by the oracle of Sarapis that they could be cured by the emperor spitting in their blind eyes and trampling on their paralysed hand respectively.
\textsuperscript{1236} While most of the graffiti do not state the purpose of the visit, text 114 states that the visitor came “that they might be healed"(\textit{ἵνα ὑγιαίνῃ}), and text 107 states that the visitor was healthy (ὑγιαίνων) when they came on that occasion, implying they were sick on a previous visit. Other texts (368, 377, 390, 414) mentioning a desire for “salvation" (σωτηρία) imply that healing was the purpose of the visit (Paul Perdrizet and Gustave Lefebvre, \textit{Les graffites grecs du Memnonion d’Abydos} (Nancy: Berger-Levrault, 1919); see the discussion on pp.xv-xvi). For a discussion of the practice of pilgrimage to this shrine, see Ian Rutherford, “Pilgrimage in Greco-Roman Egypt: New Perspectives on Graffiti from the Memnonion at Abydos “ in \textit{Ancient Perspectives on Egypt}, ed. Roger Matthews and Cornelia Roemer(London: UCL Press, 2003).
\textsuperscript{1237} This is most explicit in texts 112, 129 and 208, which mention \textit{δεξαμενή} (Łajtar, \textit{Deir El-Bahari in the Hellenistic and Roman periods}). For more on this site and the cult practices of the Roman period see Bagnall, “The Last Donkey Sacrifice at Deir el-Bahari.”; Adam Łajtar, “The Cult of Amenhotep Son of Hapu and Imhotep in Deir el-Bahari in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," in \textit{«Et maintenant ce ne sont plus que des villages... » Thèbes et sa région aux époques hellénistique, romaine et byzantine. Actes du colloque tenu à Bruxelles les 2 et 3 Décembre 2005}, ed. Alain Delattre and Paul Heilporn (Brussels: Association Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 2008).
\textsuperscript{1238} Also excluded from consideration here is the apparent instance of incubation attested in the episodes 9-10 of the Opening of the Mouth ceremony; the fragmentary nature of our evidence makes this difficult to interpret definitively. For a discussion see Szpakowska, \textit{Behind Closed Eyes.}, pp.147-151.
nonetheless, I will regularly point out parallels in practice, in particular when discussing the formulae used in the magical texts.

As we might expect, healing is a recurrent concern in the older dream oracles. In P.Oxy. XI 1381 two healings are recorded, one in which the god prescribes a remedy, and another in which the god himself effects the miraculous healing. In the Blinding of Pharaoh the king dreams that he must have the tears of a virtuous woman (shm.t mnḥ) placed in his eyes to restore his sight, while in O.Hor 28 the author records a dream promising a remedy (phḥ.t, l.16) for the queen. From a further mention of the queen in O.Hor 2 it seems that this remedy may have been for childlessness, with the oracle confirming a son would be born to the royal family; this is one of the recurrent concerns of these dream oracles, attested in the Stela of Taimhotep, King Wenamun and the Kingdom of Lihyan, The Story of Petese (8.19-28), and Zacharias of Myteline’s Life of Severos.

The broad pattern of these rituals, despite their varying statuses as literary or documentary texts, is strikingly similar, with the ritualists being in almost every case a king or a priest, and the granting of a favour by the deity is often tied to particular cultic acts, and in particular the construction or repair of sacred buildings (Cairo JE 48864, Famine Stela, T.Spiegelberg, P.Leiden I 396, Stela of Taimhotep), although in P.Oxy. XI 1381 the work is instead the translation of a history of the deity’s cult. This implies a function of the dream oracle in legitimating the powers of individuals or temples, implicit in the Famine Stela and explicit in the two early Nubian examples (Cairo JE 48864 & Berlin 2268). This function continues into the Ptolemaic period, with many of Hor’s oracles representing interventions into the running of the ibis cult at the Memphite Serapeum, or else serving to legitimate the royal family.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1239}}\text{P.Petese II fr. C1, II.3-5. There is not enough context to be sure that this is an invoked dream oracle, and for this reason it is not included in table 32.}\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date of source</th>
<th>Participant(s)</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Offerings</th>
<th>Spoken formula</th>
<th>Appearance</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus, <em>Historiae</em> 2.141</td>
<td>V BCE</td>
<td>King Sethos</td>
<td>To get help against Sennacherib</td>
<td>Shrine of Hephaistos</td>
<td></td>
<td>King laments before image of Hephaistos</td>
<td>God appears in dream before the king promising help</td>
<td>Sethos wins against Sennacherib with the help of mice who eat the bowstrings of his enemies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo JE 48864</td>
<td>IV BCE</td>
<td>King Harsiyotef</td>
<td>To gain crown of Nubia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsiyotef is told that the temple complex of Amun of Napata has collapsed into the court of the North</td>
<td>Harsiyotef repairs the temple and is given the crown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin 2268</td>
<td>IV BCE</td>
<td>King Nastasen</td>
<td>To gain crown of Nubia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He receives a message that he will conquer (?) every land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archive of Hor</td>
<td>II BCE</td>
<td>Hor of Sebennytos, priest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Messages concern the running of the cult, confirm the legitimacy and safety of the royal family, confirm Hor’s own good fortune, remedy for a queen to allow her to live a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famine Stela</td>
<td>II BCE</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>To persuade the gods to relieve famine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Khnum appears before the king and agrees to open Nile floodgates</td>
<td>Famine is relieved, grant is made by the king to the temple at Elephantine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Characters</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Spiegelberg</td>
<td>II BCE</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Funerary chamber of Apis</td>
<td>A great man appears and admonishes the king, instructing him to perform cultic acts (2-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Leiden I 396</td>
<td>II BCE</td>
<td>King Nectanebo</td>
<td>To reveal the future</td>
<td>Nectanebo asks the gods to reveal what has been decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacrifice made</td>
<td>Nectanebo sees a vision of the gods talking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nectanebo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nectanebo orders work to be performed at the temple of Onuris at Phersos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM EA 1027 (147)</td>
<td>I BCE</td>
<td>Psherenptah, high priest of Ptah</td>
<td>To have a child</td>
<td>Imhotep appears and asks for work to be done in the holy of holies of Ankhawy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work is done in the holy of holies and Taimhotep conceives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setna II</td>
<td>I CE</td>
<td>Horus Paneshy, a lector priest</td>
<td>To find a way to combat the Nubian magicians</td>
<td>Thoth appears and tells Horus Paneshy where to find a book containing $h$ which will allow him to protect the king.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The temple of Hermopolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burnt offerings and libations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spoken formula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenamun and the Hagrite</td>
<td>I-II CE</td>
<td>King Wenamun; the Hagrite</td>
<td>To have a child</td>
<td>Bastet grants a son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Story of Petese 8.19-28</td>
<td>I-II CE</td>
<td>Prophet of Horus-of-Pe</td>
<td>To have child</td>
<td>Petition to Horus-of-Pe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The prophet's wife conceives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy. XI 1381</td>
<td>II CE</td>
<td>Author and his Healing</td>
<td></td>
<td>They call upon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The god appears in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The first time the god cures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Life of Severos of Antioch 17-19</td>
<td>Asklepiodotos of Alexandria</td>
<td>To have a child (17)</td>
<td>Temple of Isis at Menuthis (17)</td>
<td>Daimōn appears in the form of Isis (18)</td>
<td>Ritual is unsuccessful, but the couple adopt a child from one of the priestesses (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Life of Severos of Antioch 22-23</td>
<td>Paralios, student of philosophy</td>
<td>To discover if Paralios or his rival is a sorcerer (22-23)</td>
<td>Temple of Isis at Menuthis (17)</td>
<td>Sacrifices (23)</td>
<td>Initially daimōn appears in the form of Isis (22), but later no appearance confirms the message (23)</td>
<td>Paralios is unsuccessful in his petition (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33: Egyptian dream oracles
This function – of cultic and political legitimisation – is never explicitly mentioned in the magical papyri, although a related concern, the revelation and confirmation of details of ritual praxis, does appear in a few places. PGM 1.262-347 suggests that the ritualist ask the invoked deity about everything that is part of "magical practice" (μαγικῇ ἐμπειρίᾳ, l.331), giving as examples divination, Homero-mancy, dream-sending, dream-requests, dream-interpretation, and sickness. The most concrete instance of a divine revelation altering practice occurs in *The Mithras Liturgy*, in which a textual addition records that the ointment prescribed earlier in the ritual is no longer to be used, and the ritual is not to be performed three time a year. Instead the practitioner is to wear the beetle hesy created earlier as an amulet, and perform the ritual once a month at the full moon; the direct speech of the god to the author is cited as authority for this alteration. Less dramatic, but no doubt important, are instances where the deity is said to give the ritualist its own name during the apparition, to be used in later rituals. This process of using apparition rituals to gain technical instructions about the performance of certain practices may have played some role in the original composition of the magical papyri, and recurs in several literary accounts. In *Setna II*, Horus Paneshy prays to and receives from Thoth information about how to protect the king from the attacks of Nubian sorcerors; in his *De Virtutis Herbarum*, Thessalos describes how he sought an apparition ritual to amend the faulty recipes of king Nechepsos, and was able to use the information from the deity to produce his final herbal text. This topos is rather common in Roman-

---

1240 PGM 1.327-331: \(\dot{\epsilon}ρώτα αὐτόν περὶ οὗ θέλεις περὶ μαντείας περὶ ὀνειροπομπείας περὶ ὀνειραιτησίας περὶ κατακλίσεως περὶ πάντων/ \(\ddot{ο}\[σ\]ων ἐστίν ἐν τῇ μαγικῇ ἐμπειρίᾳ]. The sense of 'sickness' (κατακλίσεως) is not clear here; earlier in the same papyrus (PGM 1.188) the same word is used of an illness about which the ritualist can enquire for the purpose of treating it, whereas in PGM 4.2496 it seems to mean "causing illness". Either could conceivably be the case here; O'Neil (Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, p.31) translates "causing disease", whereas Parthey ("Zwei griechische Zauberpapyri", p.137) translates "Heilung von Krankheiten" ("healing of disease"), and Preisendanz (Preisendanz and Henrichs, *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri* (vol. I), p.19) gives 'Krankenlager' ("sickbed").

1241 PGM 4.475-829.
1242 PGM 4.792-798.
1243 εἶπεν δὲ μοι ὁ θεός... (l.792).
1244 For example in PGM 13.210-211: \(\ldots\) πάν εἰσέλθῃ ὁ θεός, κάτω βλέπε καὶ γράφε τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ ἤν διδωσίν σοι αὐτοῦ ὀνομασίαν.
period alchemical literature (see 2.2.4.3.3, fn.638); the most vivid instance is *Isis the Prophetess to her son Horus*, in which Isis is taught alchemy by a stellar angel.

While most of the rituals of apparition imply each ritual culminating with a single consultation, a few are intended to create an on-going relationship in which the deity becomes the practitioner’s *paredros*. These do not always appear to have been deities – in the magical corpus empowered physical objects are also referred to as *paredroi*, and it is not clear in every case that the acquisition of a *paredros* coincides with a ritual of apparition. Nonetheless, the relationship between the two ritual types is close enough that the stated functions of *paredroi* are a further useful indicator of the types of services ritualists would have required of invoked deities. The *paredros* of PGM 11a.1-40 is described as providing “a great bounty of benefits” and “whatever your heart desires,” but more concretely “domestic service”, including guarding the ritualists’ possessions and telling them what others are thinking about them. PGM 4.2006-2125 provides a similarly glowing account of its *paredros’* powers: he will attract others, cause sickness, send dreams, restrain anger, and bring dreams. The most elaborate description of the powers of a *paredros* comes in PGM 1.42-195, where the deity’s powers include sending dreams, bringing men and women without the need for οὐσία, killing, destroying, causing winds, bringing treasure, freeing the imprisoned, opening doors, causing invisibility, bringing fire, bringing food and drink, creating partially illusory (βλέπεσθαι μόνο[ν], 110) banquets served by daimōns, stopping and releasing ships, stops evil daimōns, controlling animals, transforming itself into any animals, carrying the ritualist in the air, freezing rivers and seas, bringing down stars, heating and cooling objects, lighting and extinguishing lamps, stopping and releasing ships, stops evil daimōns, controlling animals, transforming itself into any animals, carrying the ritualist in the air, freezing rivers and seas, bringing down stars, heating and cooling objects, lighting and extinguishing lamps.

---

1246 For example PGM 4.1716-1870 and PGM 12.14-95, where statuettes of the god Eros are *paredroi*, and PGM 4.1716-1870, where the *paredros* is a lamella inscribed with Homeric verses.
1247 PGM 11a.24-25: μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν/ δωρεάν.
1248 PGM 11a.25: …ὅσα τῇ ψυχῇ ἐνθυμῇ.
1250 PGM 11a.25-26: καὶ τὰς τοῦ ὑπηρεσίας.
1252 PGM 4.2076-2078: ἄγει δὲ κατακλίνει/ κατέχει καὶ ὀνειροπομπεῖ καὶ ὀνειραιτεῖ ἅμα.
shaking walls and making them blaze with fire,\textsuperscript{1253} as well as revealing the future and the minds of others, mummmifying and deifying the ritualist after death, revealing the course of illnesses, and teaching their cures.\textsuperscript{1254}

These claims, in particular those of the last text, are extravagant even by the terms of the magical corpus more generally, and certain similarities to literary topoi – for example the reference to the illusionary banquet\textsuperscript{1255} – may lead us to think that these more elaborate texts may to some extent represent a form of literary exercise as much as, or indeed rather than, functional ritual texts. If the ability of paredroi to bring men and women, cure diseases, and so on, was experienced as effective, we might well ask why the papyri containing them also include individual rituals for these purposes. However, despite the strain of believing in the phenomenological reality of such descriptions, we should note that Blackman’s description of ritual-specialists in Upper Egypt in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century included descriptions of two women whose authority relied on their ongoing relationships with spirits, whose presence was felt not only through the women’s ritual expertise, but also through manifestations such as possessions, during which one woman was addressed as if she was the male spirit, and the other, punished by her familiar for lack of ritual purity, would be paralysed in a manner that distressed her sons.\textsuperscript{1256} These, and similar descriptions of the interaction between humans and deities in societies where the existence of such beings is routine, should demonstrate to us that even if the most extreme descriptions of the paredros’ efficacy were never tested, or should be understood as hyperbole, their existence could nonetheless be experienced both socially and personally.

\textsuperscript{1253} PGM 1.97-127.

\textsuperscript{1254} PGM 1.172-192.

\textsuperscript{1255} Compare the description of the Lamia’s banquet in Philostratus, \textit{Vita Apollonii: οὐ γὰρ ἦλθεν ἐστῖν, ἀλλὰ ἦλθεν δὲ ἐξ ὁμοίων (4.25.49); for a further discussion of the literary parallels to this text see Gordon, “Reporting the Marvellous: Private Divination in the Greek Magical Papyri”, pp.73-74.}

\textsuperscript{1256} Blackman, \textit{The Fellāhīn of Upper Egypt.}, pp.183-187. The first woman’s spirit is called a “sheikh” rather than a familiar, presumably acquired through possession; the ritual known as the \textit{zār}, in which these possessions, usually of women, were dealt with, was an important feature not only of early modern Egypt, but also Ethiopia, Sudan, Somalia, and parts of the western Asia; see for example the classical discussion in I.M. Lewis, \textit{Eccstatic Religion. A Study of Shamanism and Spirit Possession}, Third ed. (London: Routledge, 1971 [2003]), pp.66-75, 91-93.
The example of *paredroi* nonetheless shows how rituals of apparition can easily bleed over into other types of ritual practice. Alongside the example of healing we have already considered, two rituals in PDM 14 suggest that rituals of apparition may have overlapped to some extent with thief-finding and erotic rituals. In PDM 14.1-92, alongside the deities the ritualist may invoke – gods (*ntr.w*, 79), spirits (*iyḥ*, 82), *hesy* (*hsy*, 83), and dead men (*rmṭ lw=f ṭmt.t*, 84) – the ritualist may bring a living man (*rmṭ lw=f ‘nh, 81*) or a criminal (*‘dq, 86*). Similarly, in PDM 14.150-231 the ritualist may bring not only a god (*ntr*, 155) or spirit (*iyḥ*, 156), but also a woman (*shm.t*, 159). Both of these rituals use boy seers – the first is a vessel divination, the second uses a lamp – and so the physical appearance of a living human being rather than the image of a god in or near the medium of apparition would constitute a major change to the conception of the ritual as a whole. However, another early 20th-century example from Blackman, in which a magician used a spirit to bring a woman to a consultation, provides a useful parallel; rather than the woman herself coming to the consultation, an apparition of her appeared before vanishing upon being dismissed. The truth of the apparition, in this account, was proved by the fact that she was covered in flour – and the real woman had apparently been making bread three miles away at the time of the ritual. The purpose of summoning living individuals was probably to observe – or in the case of criminals, identify – them, rather than making them physically present. Rituals to identify criminals appear elsewhere in the magical corpus, but the procedure, where it is discernable, generally seems to involve more mechanical processes, although two references to “bringing criminals”(*iny ‘dq, PDM 14.1056*, 

---

1257 Blackman, *The Fellāhīn of Upper Egypt*., pp.193-195. Edward Lane describes a similar account in which he enquired after one of his acquaintances who had long been confined to bed, and the magician’s boy medium described seeing a man “brought in on a bier, and wrapped in a sheet”, and further described his pale appearance and moustache. Lane was unable to confirm if the man had been bed-bound at the time of the consultation. Edward William Lane, *A n account of the manners and customs of the Modern Egyptians, written in Egypt during the years 1825, 34, and 35, partly from notes made during a former visit to that country in the years 1825, 26, 27, and 28* (London: Charles Knight and co., 1837), pp.373-374.

1258 The manner in which the three rituals contained in PGM 3.479-494 are intended to work is not clear to me.

1259 In PGM 5.70-95, and the parallel text(s) in SM 86 frs.A & B it seems that the ritualist identifies the criminals by causing their eyes to swell; similarly, in PGM 5.172-212 the thief will be unable to swallow food given to them, and in PDM 61.79-94 the ritualist appears to tie knots in flax while saying the names of the suspects, until the right one is indicated by their speaking.
1062) may imply that the use of apparition rituals was more common for this purpose than is immediately obvious.1260

It would of course be possible to further speculate on the kinds of questions which ritualists may have asked in their consultations, but I will restrict myself to one further suggestion, that of treasure-hunting, perhaps hinted at by references to paredroi bringing great benefits,1261 and bringing money and precious metals to the ritualist.1262

This function of apparition rituals is not directly attested in Roman-era texts1263 as far as I am aware, but contemporary descriptions of magicians include the discovery of treasure among their abilities,1264 and later handbooks1265 and accounts of specialists in Egypt and elsewhere often mention this as a characteristic practice.1266

---

1260 Accounts of rituals of apparition to find criminals are described by Viaud for 20th century Egypt (Gérard Viaud, *Magie et coutumes populaires chez les Coptes d’Egypte* (Saint-Vincent-sur-Jabron: 1978), p.104-105), and Murray for India and Morocco (M. A. Murray, “The Ink-Pool,” *Folklore* 67, no. 4 (1956), pp.212-213). Blackman provides another account of a ritual to find a thief, in which strips of paper on which the suspects’ names were written were inserted into a Qur’an and suspended over incense, with guilt being indicated by the movement of the book (Blackman, *The Fellāhin of Upper Egypt*, pp.195-196). Viaud describes a practice, reminiscent of PGM 5.172-212, in which a tāsah, or ladle, is heated and placed on the suspect’s tongue; they are held to be guilty if they are burned (Viaud, *Magie et coutumes populaires chez les Coptes d’Egypte*, p.103).

1261 PGM 11a.24-25: μέγας ἀγαθῶν δωρεάν.

1262 PGM 1: …βαστάζει χρυσόν ἄργυρον χαλκόν καὶ δίδωσί σοι όταν χρεία γένηται (99-100); …πενομένῳ χρήματα δώσει (173).

1263 The earliest Egyptian text providing a recipe for this purpose is perhaps ACM 128 (Cairo 45060), which includes a ritual “to bring up something of value” (ἐκθεις οὐχρήμα ἀντὶ ἀργυρίου, 52-61).

1264 See for example Lucian’s description of Alexander of Abonoteichus’ teacher as a γόης whose services included retrieving treasure (δησαυρῶν ξυπομπάς, *Alexander* 5.7-8), and the attempt of an individual named Chrysaorios to find treasure near Beirut with the help of necromancers (Zacharius of Myteline, *Life of Severos* 94-98).

1265 Among the most vivid is the description in the *Picatrix* (4.2.1) of a man being guided to treasure by a lunar spirit. See also the discussion of Norman Golb on his discovery of Judeo-Arabic magical documents from Islamic Egypt mentioning treasure-hunting, which he compares to 20th century Arabic documents from Egypt; he notes that parallel texts from pre-Islamic periods are unknown among Egyptian Jews (Norman Golb, “The esoteric practices of the Jews of Fatimid Egypt,” *The American Philosophical Society Yearbook* 1962 (1966)). Among such texts from the Cairo Geniza are TSK 1.7.4 2a.11-2b.11 (=MTKG II.27, X CE), and TSK 1.3 2b.15-3a.4 (=MTKG III.62, XVI CE); for a brief discussion of these practices see Peter Schäfer, “Jewish Magic Literature in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages,” *The Journal of Jewish studies* 41(1990), p.89.

1266 Among the most vivid is the description in the *Picatrix* (4.2.1) of a man being guided to treasure by a lunar spirit. See also the discussion of Norman Golb on his discovery of Judeo-Arabic magical documents from Islamic Egypt mentioning treasure-hunting, which he compares to 20th century Arabic documents from Egypt; he notes that parallel texts from pre-Islamic periods are unknown among Egyptian Jews (Norman Golb, “The esoteric practices of the Jews of Fatimid Egypt,” *The American Philosophical Society Yearbook* 1962 (1966)). Among such texts from the Cairo Geniza are TSK 1.7.4 2a.11-2b.11 (=MTKG II.27, X CE), and TSK 1.3 2b.15-3a.4 (=MTKG III.62, XVI CE); for a brief discussion of these practices see Peter Schäfer, “Jewish Magic Literature in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages,” *The Journal of Jewish studies* 41(1990), p.89.

1267 See for example Blackman’s description of rituals to discover treasure in early 20th century Egypt: Blackman, *The Fellāhin of Upper Egypt*, pp.88-90. Klaassen, in his review of English magical manuscripts from 1300-1500, describes the standard professional services of necromancers in England in the late Middle Ages as including “treasure hunting, return of stolen goods, detection of a thief and inflicting damage on someone by occult means” (Frank Klaassen, "English Manuscripts of Magic, 1300-
3.2.3.2 Spectacle and the Ritual of Apparition in literary texts

The constant figures in the corpus of Roman Egyptian magical texts are the ritualists themselves, occasionally accompanied by the children who assisted them in mediated procedures, but both from contextual references and from the wider body of magical artefacts we can be certain that many, if not most, of their rituals were carried out on behalf of clients or patients, who sought them out for their abilities to heal, curse, or mediate in various social crises. Among the rituals of apparition, however, there is little evidence that anyone other than the ritualist, and in some cases the boy seer, was to be present. Indeed, as Gordon has suggested, the implied purposes of the rituals themselves often suggest that the apparition of deities was a practice principally of interest to the ritual specialists themselves, who may have used them in their processes of self-verification, a question explored at greater depth below (3.3). Nonetheless, it is worth asking if these visually, and experientially, impressive rituals might not have been of broader interest to ancient individuals who were not themselves ritual specialists.

There are three texts within the Theban Library which imply a broader audience for at least some types of rituals. The earliest of these, PGM 12.160-178, is a ritual for release from bonds, which suggests that it be used when the ritualists “wish(es) to do something as a demonstration”, and goes on to describe binding another individual inside a house and freeing them with the formula to prove (τεκμηριοῦν) that it works. The *Mithras Liturgy* (PGM 4.475-829) also includes a brief excursus giving instructions for including a fellow initiate (συμμύστης, ll.732-733) in the ritual, who having purified himself, and being judged worthy and initiated by the ritualist, may

---


1267 There are also a few instances where the boys seem to be assistants rather than mediums; see for example PGM 1.42-195 and PGM 2.1-64; in the second instance the reference to the boy being “tested” (γυμναζομένος, l.56) may imply that his function is as a medium, this is not explicit.


1269 PGM 12.160: ...δέλης δὲ κρήτικόν τι ποιῆσαι...

also hear the message from the deity. Finally, and most dramatically, PGM 4.2441-2621 contains a framing story in which the prophet Pakhrates displays (ἐπιδεικνύναι) his power to the emperor Hadrian, “attracting” (ἄγειν) in one hour, striking someone down (κατακλίνει) in two, destroying (ἀναιρεῖν) in seven hours, and sending the emperor dreams. While this story is almost certainly fictional, it does imply that the authors of the magical texts were not averse to the idea of displaying their abilities for what we might term “spectacular” purposes – that is, for the benefit of spectators, rather than the immediate and functional benefit of clients or patients.

While insider texts of Roman Egyptian magic provide us with few definite attestations of spectacular performances, evidence from literary texts can be used to fill out the picture, suggesting that the ritual of apparition was a more broadly known, and experienced, phenomenon than we might assume from the esoteric texts in which they most often occur. Both Origen (reporting the Platonist philosopher Celsus) and Tertullian refer to individuals who perform rituals of apparition as if they are familiar characters within urban contexts, Carthage for Tertullian and perhaps Alexandria for Origen. Celsus and Origen refer to γόητες and “those trained by Egyptians” who invoke the souls of heroes (ψυχα ἡρώων) in the market-place, as well as performing exorcisms and healings, and creating illusory banquets and animals.

1271 PGM 4.732-750.
1272 PGM 4.2447-2456.
1273 For a discussion of the historicity of this passage see 2.3.6.2, fn.938.
1274 The concept of “the spectacle” in modern critical discourse is, of course, most closely associated with Guy Debord, and in particular with his Guy Debord, La Société du spectacle (Buchet-Chastel, 1967). Strictly speaking, Debord associated the Spectacle with the mass media which is characteristic of recent, industrialised societies; in his follow-up work he locates the origins of his “society of the spectacle” in the late 1920s (Commentaires sur la société du spectacle (Éditions Gérard Lebovici, 1988) §2). While late Roman Egypt is not of direct interest to his model of historical development, it would most likely fall under his definition of a “society of myth”, in which the sacred (le sacré) serves as the means by which the ruling classes maintain their ideological dominance; the key difference for his model is that the sacred is a “fixed image” (image immobile) which delineates the absence of social action available to the mass of spectators, while the modern spectacle expresses the wealth of what is permitted while eliminating real possibilities of action (“mais dans cette expression le permis s’oppose absolument au possible”) (La Société du spectacle, §25, 132, 186). A thoroughgoing application of either model – the society of the myth or of the spectacle – to the material under consideration here would be problematic, and of dubious value, but I will consider shortly how some aspects of Debord’s concept of the spectacular may be fruitfully applied to Roman Egyptian magical material.
1275 Contra Celsum 1.68.
1276 Apologeticum 23.1-3.
Tertullian refers to *magi* who call up spectres and the souls of the dead (*phantasmata, defunctorum animae*), as well as using child mediums (*pueri*) for oracles, and sending dreams. The fact that these references are so brief, but play a role in larger apologetic arguments, strongly implies that they expected their readers to be familiar with the individuals whom they mentioned; it was their interpretations which were novel, not the content being interpreted. To these, generally similar, apologetic works can be added another cursory mention in another piece of early Christian literature, the *Recognitiones* of Pseudo-Clement, in which the author considers travelling to Egypt and paying a priest to summon the soul of a dead person to answer his question of whether there is life after death. This brief passage, given its status as an imagined possibility in a pseudepigraphical text is even less reliable than the previous examples, but nonetheless implies that such a consultation was considered a possibility.

Fuller descriptions of spectacular rituals of apparition related to those in the Theban Library occur in several other texts: the fictional description of an act of necromancy carried out by the Egyptian priest Zatchlas in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*; the description of Thessalos' encounter with the god Asklepios in the narrative frame of his botanical work, *De Virtutibus Herbarum*; the descriptions of the tricks used by μάγοι in Hippolytus' *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, which includes accounts of direct visions of Asklepios and Hekate, as well as necromancy and vessel divination; the description of Plotinus' encounter with his own personal daimōn, brought about by an Egyptian priest, from his biography by Porphyry; the descriptions of Iamblichus' summoning of the deities Eros and Anteros in Gadara, as well as his encounter with an Egyptian who claimed to summon Apollo, both recounted by
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1278 *Metamorphoses* 2.28-30.  
1279 *De virtutibus herbarum*.  
1280 *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*.  
1281 Despite circumstantial evidence linking this work to the II CE Hippolytus, bishop of Rome, the authorship of this work is disputed, so here I use Hippolytus to mean the author of this work, regardless of his true identity; see the discussions in Gérard Vallée, *A Study in Anti-Gnostic Polemics. Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius* (Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1981), pp.41-54; Miroslav Marcovich, *Hippolytus. Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* (New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1986), pp.10-17.  
1282 *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* 4.28.1-13; 4.32.2-4.33.4; 4.35.1-4.36.2; 4.41.1-4.41.2.  
Eunapius. 1283

None of these accounts represent the ideal case – a first-hand account of a ritual of apparition by individuals present at the performance. Instead, they represent, without exception, fictional or pseudepigraphical accounts (in the cases of Apuleius and Pseudo-Thessalos), hearsay (in the cases of Porphyry and Eunapius), and, in the case of Hippolytus, an apparent extract from a previous encyclopedic work, albeit one with may have had some familiarity with real rituals of apparition. 1284 Nonetheless each of these accounts provides us with some suggestions as to the contexts in which real spectacular rituals of apparition may have taken place.

As in the descriptions of Origen, Apuleius situates the necromantic ritual in the marketplace (forum), 1285 although in his case this is perhaps opportunistic rather than
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1283 Vitae sophistarum 5.2.2-5.2.9.3; 6.11.1-6.11.11.9.
1284 Hippolytus' material concerning the works of the μάγοι in Book 4 ostensibly relates to his subsequent discussion of the appropriation of these same techniques by opposing Christian groups in Books 6-8, but the lack of clear correlation between the two sections, as well as his general method, suggests that he copied it almost verbatim from a pre-existing work; see the discussions in Vallée, A Study in Anti-Gnostic Polemics, pp.52-56; James A. Kelhoffer, “Hippolytus’ and Magic. An Examination of Elenchos IV 28-42 and Related Passages in Light of the Papyri Graecae Magicae,” Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum 11(2008), pp.539-542.

The nature of Hippolytus’ work is disputed; based on the similarity of several of the methods described by Hippolytus to those used by Alexander of Abonoteichus in Lucian’s Alexander 13 & 26, Hermann (Ganschinietz, Hippolytos’ Capitel Gegen die Magier, pp.12-13) suggested that both works ultimately depended on a lost work of the Platonic philosopher Celsus, whose title he proposed as Κατὰ Μάγων, based on a mention of a work of a similar title in Origen’s Contra Celsum (1.68.21-22); this work would be understood as a polemic similar in treatment to Hippolytus’ work in the Refutatio. Ganschinietz (Hippolytos’ Capitel Gegen die Magier (Refut. Haer. IV 28-42)(Leipzig: 1913), pp.12-24) and Kelhoffer (“Hippolytus’ and Magic”, p.547) prefer to see the source of the work as a handbook, with Kelhoffer pointing to similarities to the Greek magical corpus, and Ganschinietz suggesting that it may have been a work with the title Ἡ Θρασυμήδους Τέχνη mentioned in 6.7.1.4-5, which could have been similar in nature to Renaissance handbooks such as Giambattista della Porta’s Magiae Naturales (1558), which provided broadly similar means of producing marvels using naturalistic methods.

There is a shortage of ancient works describing the kind of fraudulent magic assumed by Hippolytus and his source; although the alchemical papyri from the Theban Library provide some suggestions that their users may have used naturalistic methods for deceitful purposes, producing adulterated metals, the closest examples we have are the Paignia of Democritus in PGM 7.167-186, and it is not entirely clear to me that the sort of natural remedies described here are true parallels to the elaborate deceptions described by Hippolytus. Nonetheless, certain details of the performance of the rituals, and the hymns, do have clear echoes in the magical papyri (see for example the discussion in Ganschinietz, Capitel Gegen die Magier, pp.30-75; Kelhoffer, “Hippolytus’ and Magic”, pp.522-539), so that even if Hippolytus’ source was not a handbook for μάγοι, its author seems to have had some first- or second-hand knowledge of the performance of such rituals.

1285 Metamorphoses 2.27.
typical, since the corpse is at that time being carried there. In Iamblichus’ evocation of
the two deities at the hot-springs of Gadara in Syria we can again assume an
opportunistic element to this somewhat fantastical story, since he is responding to the
insistent requests of his students. By contrast the other accounts assume some kind of
private location: Thessalos’ consultation takes place in a location described as a “pure
house” (οἶκος καθαρός),1286 and a house (ο ἴκος) is also the site of the evocation of
Asklepios described by Hippolytus,1287 while Plotinus’ personal daimōn is summoned
in a temple of Isis in Rome, described by the priest as the only pure place in the city.1288
Tertullian locates the activities of his magi in “common houses” (tecta viciniae).1289
These descriptions imply that the rituals may have taken place more often in private
locations, chosen and prepared according to criteria of purity akin to those described
in the magical papyri.

Still more interesting is the regular association of these rituals with the Egyptian
priesthood,1290 of the authors discussed here only Hippolytus and Tertullian do not
name their practitioners as Egyptians, preferring instead to designate them simply as
μάγοι;1291 Eunapius provides the example of Iamblichus as a non-Egyptian practitioner,
but his authority is constructed in relationship to an Egyptian, whose evocation of
Apollo he dislikes as merely the soul of a gladiator. This association between rituals
of apparition and Egyptian priests has been noted already, and likely reflects, to
varying degrees, both an underlying reality of Roman-era praxis, and the influence of
the texts of Manetho and Chaeremon (see 2.3.5.1).

The deities summoned in the rituals are varied, but one interesting feature, which we
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1286 De virtutis herbarum 21.
1287 Refutatio Omnium Haeresium 4.35.2.3.
1288 Vita Plotini 10.19-21.
1289 Apolgeticum 23.3.
1290 Origen, Contra Celsum 1.68.10: τα ὑπὸ τῶν μαθόντων ἀπὸ Αἰγυπτίων; Apuleius, Metamorphoses, 2.28:
adest Aegyptius propheta primarius; Thessalos, De Virtutis herbarum 12: ήσαν γάρ ἐκεί και ἀρχιερεῖς
φιλόλογοι καὶ γέροντες ποικίλοις; Eunapius, Vitae Sophistarum 6.11.11.2-3: ἄνδρός τινος ἱερεύς;
Porphyry, Vita Plotini 10.15: Αἰγύπτιος γάρ τις ιερεύς; Pseudo-Clement 1.5.1: εἰς Αἴγυπτον πορεύσομαι καὶ
τοῖς τῶν ἀδύτων ἱεροφάνταις τε καὶ προφήταις φιλιωθήσομαι καὶ μάγον ζητήσω.
1291 Tertullian, Apolgeticum 23.1; Hippolytus, Refutation Omnium Haeresium 4.32.3.14, 4.36.2.5, 4.42.1.1
and so on; in 4.28.2 Hippolytus does mention μάγων Αἰγυπτίων... ἡμιθραυσίμως, implying that in his
estimation at least some μάγοι were Egyptians.
will observe again in the magical papyri, is the equivalence of gods and dead souls. Thessalos is offered a choice between an apparition of a god or a dead soul,\textsuperscript{1292} while Iamblichus exposes a supposed god as the soul of a gladiator.\textsuperscript{1293} Thus while they were implicitly similar in nature, there was still some differentiation: a dead soul was of lower status than a god, and the act of invoking one had particular implications. Pseudo-Clement is dissuaded from seeking his vision when a philosopher points out the inherent impiety of invoking the dead.\textsuperscript{1294} Nonetheless, Apuleius’ description of Zatchlas’ necromancy is without any implication of impiety, and in fact the ritual functions within social norms, serving to expose the unlawful murder of the dead man; furthermore, the regularity of references to necromancy in the literary texts more broadly may suggest to us that whatever disapproval the practice attracted from Christian and Neoplatonist philosophers, their feelings may not represent those of individuals in the ancient Roman world more broadly.

Among the other references to deities of specific interest here is the mention in Hippolytus’ \textit{Refutatio} of the summoning of a fiery vision of Hekate,\textsuperscript{1295} a practice suggestive of Chaldaean theurgy, in which Hekate played a major role.\textsuperscript{1296} In Hippolytus’ text, this account appears alongside reference to a necromantic procedure involving a talking skull, and an invocation of Asklepios. While Asklepios here is invoked as the Epidaurian deity rather than the Greco-Egyptian Imhotep,\textsuperscript{1297} the instance of mediated divination calls upon the Greco-Egyptian sun-god Φρῆ,\textsuperscript{1298} and

\textsuperscript{1292} Thessalos, \textit{De Virtutis herbarum} 22.
\textsuperscript{1293} Eunapius, \textit{Vitae Sophistarum} 6.11.11-9.
\textsuperscript{1294} Pseudo-Clement, \textit{Recognitiones} 1.5.5-8.
\textsuperscript{1295} \textit{Refutatio Omnium Haeresium} 4.35-36.
\textsuperscript{1296} For a discussion of Hekate’s role in the Chaldaean system see Sarah Iles Johnston, \textit{Hekate Soteira: A Study of Hekate’s role in the Chaldean Oracles and related literature} (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990). The fiery apparitions, mentioned in fragments 146 and 148, are discussed on pp.111-133.
\textsuperscript{1297} Indicated by his identification in the invocatory hymn (4.32.5-14) as “son of Apollo” (Ἀπόλλωνος, l.4), and his association with cult sites at Tricca, Pergamum, and Epidaurus (ll.12-13).
\textsuperscript{1298} Invocations to Φρῆ are mentioned in \textit{Refutatio Omnium Haeresium} 4.28.3-3, 4.28.6.2; the name is, of course, a simple transliteration of the Egyptian ⲧⲣ ⲟ, ⲩⲧⲣⲏ, “Ra” or “the sun (god)”. The \textit{onomà} appears in this form in the Theban Library at PGM 4.718, 858, 1281, 2425; PGM 5.350, 352, 353; it appears several times in other magical papyri, in both this form and variants. The solar character of the ritual is confirmed by the use of the incense known as \textit{kuphi}, discussed by Plutarch, \textit{De Iside et Osiride} 372C, 383E-384C, as well as the carrying of laurel branches by the spectators (4.28.6.1).
thus the picture painted by Hippolytus, in so far as it can be trusted, is of μάγοι whose hybrid practice, like that of the owners of the Theban Library, embraces Chaldaean, Egyptian, and Greek ritual praxeis.

As we might expect, the purposes for carrying out spectacular rituals of apparition represents a subsection of the reasons for carrying out the rituals more generally discussed above (3.2.4.1). Most common among these is the desire to ask the invoked deity a question. The fullest account comes from Hippolytus’ discussion of an instance of mediated divination, in which the question is written on a piece of paper, which is then folded and burned so that it might be communicated to the deity;1299 if this account can be trusted we might expect the miraculous knowledge of the deity about a question of which the ritualist was unaware would enhance the spectacular nature of the performance. While Porphyry1300 and Pseudo-Clement1301 both suggest that asking questions was the one of the purposes of the rituals they describe, only Apuleius and Thessalos give the content of the questions, although the fictional or pseudepigraphal nature of these texts requires that we take their accounts with caution. In Apuleius’ account the invoked corpse is questioned about his own death,1302 while Thessalos uses Asklepios’ help to supplement a book of healing prescriptions which the same god had previously given to the Pharaoh Nechepsos.1303

As we might expect for spectacular rituals, the mere sight of the deity seems to have been sufficient motive for carrying out the ritual in some cases. Origen, an admittedly hostile writer, says that the works of the γόητες were carried out purely for show (ἀπόδειξις),1304 while Porphyry notes that the sudden disappearance of Plotinus’

---

1299 Refutatio Omnium Haeresium 4.28.1-2.1.
1300 Porphyry mentions that the sudden disappearance of the deity meant that ‘it was not possible to ask something’ ([μ]ήτε δὲ ἐρέσθαι τι ἐκγενέσθαι...[, Vita Plotini 10.25]).
1301 Pseudo-Clement tells us that he will pretend that he wishes to consult the dead soul "about a certain matter" (περὶ πράγματός τινος, Recogniciones 1.5.2).
1302 Metamorphoses 2.29.
1303 De Virtutis herbarum 26. The tradition that Imhotep-Asklepios was the deity who communicated to Nechepsos is preserved in P.Paris 19bis II.2-6, where Nechepsos is called Nekheus. For a fuller discussion see Moyer, Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism, pp.228-248.
1304 Contra Celsum 1.68.23-26.
daimón prevented the spectators from gazing longer upon it (ἐπιπλέον ἰδεῖν). Porphyry adds an additional motivation for the ritual, the desire on the part of the Egyptian priest to make a demonstration (ἀπόδειξις) of his wisdom (σοφία), and a comparable motive can be attributed to Iamblichus in the story told by Eunapius, summoning two deities as a proof (διάπειρα) of his superhuman abilities.

The accounts give us few indications of the size of the audience which might be present at a spectacular ritual of apparition. Apuleius seems to envision a funerary procession, and indeed most of the town of Larissa, as being present, but this is most likely fictional license. In the account of Thessalos he is alone with the priest, but in Hippolytus' account of mediated divination there are at least two spectators, including the questioner, while Porphyry's description again assumes at least two individuals alongside the ritualist, Plotinus and an unnamed friend.

One interesting, and perhaps unexpected, feature of spectacular rituals of apparition is the fact that several accounts assume that the audience not only watched, but participated in the ritual itself. Thus, for example, Thessalos was required to purify himself for three days prior to the ritual, while the audience in Hippolytus' description of mediated divination are to enter the ritual space speaking invocations and shaking laurel branches at the beginning of the ritual, in a manner reminiscent of broader Greek cultic practice. In Porphyry's account of the invocation of Plotinus' daimón, the unnamed friend took part by holding a bird, intended either as a

---

1306 Vita Plotini 15-17.
1308 Vitae sophistarum 5.2.1.4.
1309 De virtutis herbarum 18: ἁγνεύειν ἡμέραις τρισίν.
1310 Refutatio Omnium Haeresium 4.28.6.1-2: δάφνας ἔχοντας καὶ σείοντας καὶ κεκραγότας καὶ τὸν Φρῆν ἐπικαλοῦντας δαίμονα.
1311 A brief overview of the carrying of branches in Greek cultic practices can be found in Walter Burkert, Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), pp.43-44.
Finally, in his discussion of the invocation of Hekate, Hippolytus describes the μάγος instructing the audience how to respond to the apparition of the deity, falling to their faces in an act of fearful adoration. In each of these instances the role of the ritualist in the process remains primary, but the audience roles, though marginal, would have enhanced their sense of investment in the practices.

Finally, some of the accounts imply that the ritualist could expect payment for carrying out the ritual: Origen mentions that the μάγοι carried out their performances “for a few obols” (ὀλίγων ὀβολῶν), while Apuleius describes Zatchlas being offered “a great price” (grandi praemio), and the Latin version of Thessalos’ account implies that he too may have paid his Egyptian priest. In other instances it seems clear that the ritual is carried out without any expectation of financial reward: both Iamblichus

---

1312 Porphyry’s description of the occurrence is characteristically brief: ...τοῦ συνθεωροῦντος φίλου τὰς ὀρνεῖς, ἐς κατεῖχε φυλακῆς ἕνεκα, πυξάντος εἴτε διὰ φθόνον εἴτε καὶ διὰ φόβον τινά (“...because the friend who was a fellow-spectator strangled the birds, which he was holding for protection, either due to jealousy or indeed through a certain fear”, Vita Plotini 10.26-28).

The vagueness of his description implies that Porphyry may have been mistaken about the function of the birds, since, indeed, the use of birds as phylacteries is apparently unknown in the extant recipes for rituals of apparition. Noting this, Eitrem suggested that the birds were in fact intended as sacrifices, comparing PGM 12.14-95, in which birds are strangled to ensoul a statue of Eros, and PGM 13.372, where birds are kept alive during the invocation procedure to be sacrificed once the deity has appeared; certain passages in Porphyry’s writings (in particular Epistula ad Anebonem 2.8.b and De Abstinentia 4.16) imply that he considered death and sacrifice, and in particular the death of roosters, as polluting, and hence repulsive to divinities (Eitrem, “La théurgie”, pp.62-66). Hopfner understood the strangling of the birds as an apolusis or release procedure (Hopfner, Griechische-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszauben. vol.2 §125). Dodds thought that the birds, probably roosters, served as solar symbols, and that their use as phylacteries was genuine in this ritual, citing as a parallel a passage in Proclus’ De Sacrificio et Magia (150.15-17) in which roosters serve this apotropaic function (E. R. Dodds, “Theurgy and Its Relationship to Neoplatonism,” The Journal of Roman Studies 37 (1947), p.61; Dodds, The Greeks and the Irrational, pp.289-290).

1313 Refutatio Omnium Haeresium 4.35.4.4-6, 4.36.1.1-3. The spectators are described as being φρίξαντες τὸ παράδοξον τῆς θέας (“in awe of the wonder of the goddess”, 4.36.1.2), with the usage of φρίσσω here perhaps paralleling that in Plutarch, Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debet 26b.9-10, where it describes the feeling the superstitious man has in a temple, or Julian, Πρὸς Ἡράκλειον κυνικὸν 7 8.19, where it is used to describe the feeling of awe felt by the author towards the gods.

1314 Contra Celsum 1.68.11.

1315 Metamorphoses 2.28.

1316 While the epilogue is missing from the Greek version, the Latin paraphrases (both M & V) say that the priest released Thessalos recipiens aurum mihi sufficiens et res necessarias, translated by Moyer as “receiving money sufficient for myself, as well as some requisites” (Moyer, Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism., p.263), but it is unclear why Thessalos would receive money from the priest, and we may suspect that the Latin translation has confused sense of the passage.
and Porphyry’s priest carry out their rituals for the purposes of demonstrating their own abilities.

The picture which emerges from these descriptions of spectacular rituals is suggestive, if incomplete. While Origen, and to a lesser extent Tertullian imply that such performances were regularly carried out in public spaces, the fuller accounts suggest that they were more often carefully planned events carried out in private locations for small audiences, who may themselves have undergone purification rituals similar to those of the leading ritualist. It is clear that many literate individuals disapproved of these rituals and their practitioners, for various reasons. Hippolytus’ source seems to think that the ritualists are fundamentally fraudulent in their practices, a claim examined in more detail below (3.3.1), while in other cases it seems that the practices were degraded by the appeal they held for individuals on the lower levels of the social ladder.1317 In some cases the act of summoning a deity seems to have been felt to be inherently impious, in particular if that deity was a dead soul,1318 or if the ritualist claimed power over one of the higher gods.1319 In still other instances, however, it seems that the ritualists may have been looked down upon less because of their practice of rituals of apparition, but rather because of the other practices in which they were involved – in particular rituals of erotic compulsion, which were seen to threaten the chastity of young women.1320

1317 This is implicit in Celsus and Origen’s discussion of the marketplace performers, since the mere association with these individuals is understood by both to discredit Jesus; the theme is expanded in Contra Celsum 3.50.1-7 where Celsus describes the performers as avoiding “sensible men” (φρόνιμοι ἄνδρες), but seeking “youths” (μειράκια), “slaves” (οἰκότριβες), and “stupid people” (ἀνόητοι ἄνθρωποι). Artemidorus, though perhaps not referring specifically to those involved in apparition rituals, describes marketplace diviners as “exceedingly despised” (σφοδρὸς διαβεβηλημένος, Oneirocriticon 1.prol.35-36), though he considers this unfair (1.prol.36-42).

1318 See, for example, in the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.5.8 where necromancy is described as “hateful to god” (ἐχθραίνειν γὰρ τὸ θεῖον).

1319 Porphyry, Epistula ad Anebonem 2.8a, 2.8.c.

1320 Most explicit in Porphyry, Epistula ad Anebonem, 2.8a: αὐτοὶ δὲ ἄγειν εἰς παράνομα ἀφροδίσια τοὺς τυχόντας σὺν ἀκούσιν (“they do not refuse to lead anyone into illicit fornication”); see also the many narrative descriptions of magicians using their power to (attempt) to seduce women, among these are the stories in Pseudo-Clement, Homiliae 5.3.4-5, where an Egyptian skilled in magic assists the author in acquiring a young woman; Jerome, Vita Hilarionis 21, where a young nun is tormented by a magician trained by the priests of Memphite Asklepios; and of course the most famous of these, which occupies...
Despite the disapproval of these, predominantly Neoplatonic and Christian, authors, the general impression we get of spectacular rituals of apparition is that they did in fact serve to reinforce rather than subvert traditional ethical and cultic norms. Zatchlas uses necromancy to uncover a secret crime, while the invocation of Plotinus’ daimōn and the deities of Gadara serve to underline the mystical authority of philosophers; for Pseudo-Clement a vision of a dead soul might confirm the existence of an after-life. The fuller accounts preserved in Hippolytus describe individuals participating in rituals, by calling out and waving laurel branches, in much the same way as they might in a public festival. Indeed, for both Iamblichus and the emperor Julian, rituals of apparition served as proof of the veracity of the traditional cults. Thus, I would argue, spectacular rituals of apparition served as material expressions of the semiotic systems of the larger cosmology of the pagan Roman world. They were models of social and super-social relations, in which groups of individuals, supervised by legitimate ritual experts, entered into a reciprocal relationship with deities, mediated through the canonical acts of sacrifice and invocation, and received spectacular, in every sense of the word, confirmation of the truth value of their beliefs and practices.

3.3 Experience, efficacy, belief and fraud

In his introduction to the English-language translation of the *Greek Magical Papyri*, Betz expresses the problem that faces anyone confronting ancient magical texts:

> Why is magic so irrepressible and ineradicable, if it is also true that its claims and promises never come true? Or do they? Do people never check up on the efficiency of magicians?\textsuperscript{1322}

the *Confessio* and *Conversio Cypriani*, in which the efforts of the arch-magician Cyprian to corrupt the young virgin Justina are thwarted by her simple faith.


\textsuperscript{1321} Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*.p.xlviii. Compare the remarks of Meyer: “…most would agree that we should not ask, ‘Does it work?’ This is a question which allowed the negative appraisal of primitive magic as “pseudoscience” (Meyer and Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*, p.4).
He goes on to explore the theme, before concluding that “of course, it is all deception.”

Any attempt to explicate the intellectual and cognitive underpinnings of a system of practice as imperfectly attested as ancient magic carries with it the risk of over-reliance on external data which does not adequately relate to the primary material, and yet it seems that a full discussion of rituals of apparition must confront this stumbling block – the difficulty of squaring claims of magical efficacy with the methodological materialism upon which much modern scholarship rests. This problem is intimately engaged with still more immediate questions – if we understand the activities of the ritualists as fundamentally, and self-consciously, fraudulent, how does this reflect on late pagan cultic beliefs and practices more generally? How do we reconcile this with the huge number of magical recipes intended for specialists? How does it affect our models of the composition and transmission of the texts?

The following section will explore these issues through three related discussions, intended more as stimuli to further exploration than constituting a comprehensive answer. The first discussion centers on the problem of efficacy, asking whether, and how, individuals could induce experiences they understood as divine visitations. This discussion will rely to some extent on psychological, anthropological, and sociological accounts of modern phenomena, but will tie these wherever possible to evidence from the magical papyri and closely related literature.

The second discussion will look at issues of truth and testing, examining the ways in which notions of reliability could apply to ancient divination. This section will rely closely on the evidence from the magical papyri themselves, constructing a hypothetical schema within which concepts of ritual success and failure could be constructed and rationalised.

The third discussion returns to issues raised in the first, looking in more detail at how

---

rituals of apparition are described in ritual and literary sources, focusing on the
discontinuities between the way that deities may have been encountered, and how
those encounters are described in literary texts. A key source of information here is
the archive of the Ptolemaic priest Hor, whose extensive notes on his dream oracle
practices raise important questions about the role that memory would have played in
the development and shaping of the discourse of rituals of apparition.

3.3.1 The problem of efficacy

The purpose of this discussion is to ask whether the rituals of apparition in the magical
papyri worked, and if they did, how they worked. Part of this discussion is theoretical,
intended to lessen the strangeness of these rituals for the modern reader, but my
purpose is not simply to rationalise or psychologise these texts; instead, I hope that the
process of reconstructing the phenomenological experience of these rituals may help
explain specific features of the texts themselves.

It is worth first of all discussing the concept of “efficacy”, and looking at two other
approaches to explaining how magical rituals “work”. The first of these is what I will
call the “functionalist” or “psychologising” approach. This concept, already implicit in
the work of Durkheim and his school, is typified by Bronislaw Malinowski.1324 This
view argues that apparently irrational behaviour (for example, rituals) can be
understood in terms of the social function they fulfil rather than their explicit
purposes – thus, for example, curses, while apparently intended to harm an enemy,
may in reality serve to relieve the tension of the person carrying out the curse ritual.
While this can be a productive approach,1325 it assumes, firstly that all, or most,
behaviour in any culture must be adaptive, a proposition which cannot be taken for
granted, especially in the case of apparently innovative rituals, like those in the
Graeco-Egyptian magical tradition; and secondly, that the practice is sufficiently

1324 Most famously in Bronislaw Malinowski, Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native
Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea (Malinowski Press, 1922 [2008]).
1325 See for example Johnston’s exegesis of the Greek belief in the ἄ ωροι in Johnston, Restless Dead,,
pp.184-199.
widely dispersed that we can locate its function within the sphere of a particular society or part thereof. Again, this poses a problem when discussing magical rituals, in that we cannot be certain which parts of a particular society used and benefited from them. Sax sums up the conceptual problems with this approach more succinctly: “[t]he real, external world effects of ritual can be recognized only by the ‘objective’ historian or social scientist and do not correspond its ends as conceived by the ‘natives,’ since these are by definition nonrational.”

This approach, or a variation of it, is taken by Gager in discussing binding tablets. Drawing upon Wittgenstein’s response to Frazer’s *Golden Bough*, he argues that the commissioning of these tablets was a largely psychological affair – “[i]t may not be too much to propose that the chthonic powers to whom the tablet is dedicated represent the client’s sense of domination by psychological forces beyond his or her control” – and that the act of commissioning and depositing the tablets would itself serve as a psychological remedy to the client’s erotic desire. Thus the practice of cursing is explained in terms of its function – reducing excessive desire. But whatever the analytic power of this explanation – and it is not clear how this could be assessed in regards to a society which no longer exists – it explicitly denies the emic understandings of those who practiced these rituals. Gager warns us that it would be “a serious error to read [ancient curse texts] in an overly literal fashion,” and yet a literal understanding is surely demanded not only by literary and historical texts which describe individuals maddened by love spells, but also by legal and clerical codes which prescribed harsh penalties for these practices. Similarly unsatisfactory, in my opinion, are Gager’s attempts to explain the practical workings of curse tablets by
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1326 Sax, “Ritual and the Problem of Efficacy”, pp.5-6).
1327 Gager, *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World.*, p.82.
1328 It should be noted that functionalist-psychological explanations have been increasingly adopted by practitioners of modern magic, but this is probably best understood as a consequence of intellectual developments of 19th and 20th centuries than a phenomenon inherent in “magical thinking”; see for example the discussion in Pasi, “Varieties of Magical Experience”. A fuller account of the cognitive schema of some modern magicians is suggested in Luhmann, *Persuasions of the Witch’s Craft.*, pp.323-336; similar perspectives can be found in the interviews with practicing German magicians summarised in Gerhard Mayer, “Magicians of the Twenty-First Century. An Attempt at Dimensioning the Magician’s Personality,” *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft* 4, no. 2 (2009). A not-too-different approach seems to underlie the phenomenology of Susan Greenwood, *The Anthropology of Magic* (Oxford: Berg, 2009).
suggesting that the victim of the curse may have known about the ritual, either from the tablet being displayed publicly, or because they were otherwise made aware that a binding ritual had been commissioned against them. Although there is not space to develop an alternative theory here, first-hand accounts of similar practices suggest more nuanced and complex understandings of efficacy must be developed.\footnote{Gager’s argument risks circularity when he argues (Gager, \textit{Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World}, p.83) from Eunapius’ account of Philometor using an erotic spell on the philosopher Sosipatra that the spell must have been publicly known for the theurgist Maximus to know about it; in fact Eunapius tells us that Maximus found out through “sacrificial wisdom” (σοφίας δυτικῆς, \textit{Vitae Sophistarum} 6.9.6.3), that is, divination, and so any attempt to place this text within a historical context must answer more complex questions about the story’s origins, transmission, and telling – did Philometor use magic? How would Maximus, Sosipatra, or Eunapius have discovered this?}

If functionalist-psychological arguments\footnote{Another, more nuanced, version of this approach is found in David Frankfurter, “Curses, Blessings, and Ritual Authority: Egyptian Magic in a Comparative Perspective,” \textit{Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions} 5(2006), who argues that curses did not “[‘work’] in any other way but reflexively, functioning within social and performative contexts, fulfilling latent symbolic needs. Public execration of enemies, whether human or demonic, offered observers (and those otherwise trusting in its performance) a sense of certainty, determination, and cosmic security”.} discard the efficacy claims of the texts they study, the second approach, to look at magical rituals as “performative acts”, sidesteps them in favour of linguistic similes. This method of analysis draws on the theory of “speech acts”, in particular “illocutive” or “performative” speech acts, and rests ultimately on the work of J.L. Austin,\footnote{J.L. Austin, \textit{How to do Things with Words} (London: Oxford University Press, 1962).} who in a series of lectures at Harvard University in 1955 developed the idea that utterances could not only express propositions – “the door is open” – but also constitute acts in themselves; most famously he gave the case of public ceremonies such as christening a ship. Propositional statements can be true or false – the door may or may not be open – but if someone says “I christen this ship the Joseph Stalin” this cannot be falsified – the act of christening the ship is realised in the very fact of speaking. Instead of truth conditions, then, these illocutive speech acts had “felicity conditions”; if, for example, the speaker did not have the authority to christen a ship, if they christened the wrong ship, or if the christening was a joke, the act might be considered “infelicitous”, and hence not accepted, but it still cannot be said that was “false”.\footnote{Ibid, pp.12-19.} Towards the end of
his lecture series Austin realised that the situation was in fact far more complex, and that most speech acts had some kind of effect (a perlocutionary force) on the hearer comparable to illocutionary speech acts; in real-life contexts to say that “the door is open” may have, for example, the force of “I instruct you to close the door”, “I invite you to leave”, “I warn you that the way is now clear for dangerous ideas”, and so on.1333

Speech act theory has undergone further modification and development over the decades since Austin’s lecture series,1334 but its reception into the realm of ancient magic studies came about through the work of Tambiah, who argued in a series of influential articles that ritual activities in general – and magical rituals in particular – operated according to a logic similar to that of illocutive or performative speech acts – “as constitutive and persuasive acts they cannot be ‘falsified’, though individual instances of them may be declared normatively infelicitous or illegitimate”.1335 That is, such rituals do not make propositional claims; instead they, like illocutive acts, refer only to themselves, and to be “felicitous” must be carried out according to social convention. They rely for their effectiveness upon their correct execution: there can be incorrect performances, but “the ceremony itself cannot ever be said to have been proved to be false or untrue or ineffective.”1336

Tambiah’s formal description of ritual characteristics has proven useful, but his argument held a still more seductive promise, the demonstration that magic/ritual was a system to which true/false categorisations simply did not apply. His reception into ancient magic studies seems to have come in the early 1990s,1337 and has had a considerable impact. Among the examples of uses of his approach are Lesses’ analysis
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1333 “To perform a locutionary act is in general, we may say, also and eo ipso to perform an illocutionary act, as I propose to call it. To determine what illocutionary act is so performed we must determine in what way we are using the locution.” Ibid. p.98.
1336 “Form and Meaning of Magical Acts: A Point of View.”
of Jewish rituals of apparition in terms of Austinean speech acts, Gordon’s analysis of north African binding tablets in terms of “felicity conditions”, and Kropps’ analysis of Latin curse tablets in terms of their use of performative language. Clearly, this has proven a productive frame of reference for discussing elements of ancient magic, and yet, I will argue, it does not really tell us much about how ancient magic ‘worked’; in fact, it treats the deep epistemological claims of practitioners of ancient magic as, in essence, linguistic puzzles.

The fullest challenge to this performance-centred approach to efficacy was made by Gardner in 1983 in his analysis of initiation rituals among the Mianmin of Papua New Guinea. He argued that while certain parts of rituals – particular utterances, for example – may be illocutionary acts, this does not mean that the whole ritual is performative in the Austinean sense; to think so is to make “the mistake of characterising the whole of a complex sequence of acts in terms of the properties of certain parts of them”. That many rituals – including the ones being discussed here – do contain illocutionary speech acts is trivial to demonstrate; first person present verb forms such as “I call upon you” (ἐπικαλοῦμαι σὲ, τω = y ἄ σ n = k, τω = l ὑ ὧ h n, ὑ Ὣ m = k), “I adjure you” (ἐξορκίζω σὲ, τω = y ἱ ὧ y ὄ r = l r = t), and so on, are clear examples of such utterances. But even within the parts of the rituals which consist entirely of speech acts – the spoken formulae – these are not the only, or even most common,
form of utterances. And even more crucially, as Gardner points out, the illocutionary force of such speech acts cannot be considered a special feature of ritual in the narrow sense, or indeed magic; petitions to spirits “are no more performativé than a person’s attempts to persuade his bank manager to lend him money.”

This same issue was highlighted by Searle in several of his works in which he developed Austin’s theory of speech acts. Performative statements rely on the existence of social conventions; to christen a ship there must be a social convention of christening ships, and the speaker must perform it according to the established procedure. He notes that certain acts, however, do not fall into this category: to say “I hereby fry an egg” will not fry an egg, but the problem is not with the form of the declaration, but rather “it is just a fact about how the world works”. Lesses’ analysis takes us further; illocutionary acts in invocations worked because the social world of ancient practitioners was held to include not only human institutions, but also the “angelic/divine and demonic realms”. Thus a purely performative approach to the efficacy of ancient magic misses its most interesting feature – the fact that, as I have argued, the practitioners understood their activities not as merely linguistic acts, but as a form of technology, whose success or failure depended not simply on “felicity conditions”, but on the same causal reasons that might cause any technology to succeed or fail. To satisfactorily explain the efficacy of ancient magic we must take seriously its epistemic and metaphysical claims, even if we can only understand these
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1345 “We ordinary humans do not have the ability to perform supernatural declarations, but we do have a quasi-magical power nonetheless of bringing about changes in the world through our utterances; and we are given this power by a kind of human agreement. All of these institutions in question are social institutions, and it is only as long as the institution is recognized that it can continue to function to allow for the performance of declarations.”(John R. Searle, “How Performatives Work,” Linguistics and Philosophy 12, no. 5 (1989), p.549); see also Speech Acts. An essay in the philosophy of language (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), pp.33-42; Intentionality. An essay in the philosophy of mind (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp.171-172; John R. Searle and Daniel Vanderveken, Foundations of illocutionary logic(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp.56-57; John R. Searle, The Construction of Social Reality (New York: The Free Press, 1995), pp.81-84.
in terms of the phenomenology, or subjective experiences, of the ritualists involved.\textsuperscript{1348}

While the visions described in the magical papyri are clearly strange and exotic in terms of what might (inadequately) be characterised as the public discourse of modern Western societies, they are not so anomalous in the larger scheme of human experience. Surveys of “religious” and “mystical” experience carried out in Western countries over the last hundred years have persistently found that 10-60\% of individuals report having experienced some sort of preternatural experience over the course of their lives,\textsuperscript{1349} with the number reaching as high as 82.59\% in one recent study.\textsuperscript{1350} The range of experiences captured by these surveys is very broad, but experiences of communicating with (a) god, of the presence of superhuman beings, and visual or auditory hallucinations,\textsuperscript{1351} all comparable to the experiences described

\textsuperscript{1348} Compare the comments of Gardner: “The believer, like the scientist performing an experiment (at least in this regard), is engaging in an act which may fail for causal reasons. The atheistic scientist and the believer cannot be distinguished by reference to whether or not their activities involve belief in chains of causality. They do however differ in their beliefs about the kinds of possible causal chains that can exist” (Gardner, “Performativity in Ritual: The Mianmin Case”, p.350).


\textsuperscript{1351} See for example Rodney Stark, “Social Contexts and Religious Experience,” Review of Religious Research 7, no. 1 (1965), which found that 45\% of American Protestants and 43\% of American Roman Catholics surveyed “were "sure" they had experienced… a feeling of divine presence”; L. Eugene Thomas and Pamela E. Cooper (“Measurement and Incidence of Mystical Experiences: An Exploratory Study,” Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 17, no. 4 (1978)) found that among Connecticut college students 2\% had experienced mystical experiences (“awesome emotions, a sense of the ineffable, feeling of oneness with God, nature, or the universe”) and 12\% psychic experiences (“‘other worldly’ experience in which an extraordinary or supernatural element was present (e.g., ESP, telepathy, out-of-body, contact with spirits)’); Nelson (“A Survey of Mystical, Visionary, and Remote Perception Experiences”) found that among participants from the University of Queensland 46\% had experienced the presence of God, 26.6\% had had a mystical experience, 19.6\% a visionary experience, and 7.6\% had experienced “contact with the spirit realm”; Jeffrey S. Levin (“Age differences in mystical experience,” The Gerontologist 33, no. 4 (1993)) found that 32.5\% of Americans surveyed had experienced numinous experiences (“felt as though you were very close to a powerful, spiritual force that seemed to lift you out of yourself”), and 38.9\% spiritual experience (“felt as though you were in contact with someone who had died”); A. Y. Tien, “Distribution of hallucinations in the population,” Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology 26, no. 6 (1991) found that the prevalence of hallucinations in the general American population was probably at
in the magical papyri, are among those items well represented in such studies. One interesting aspect of these findings is that the numbers are often correlated with cultural factors of their respondent’s backgrounds – with higher percentages among highly religious individuals, in particular from groups which have a positive attitude towards visionary or mystical experience, and still more particularly those individuals whose participation is high. While survey data is less easily obtained for non-Western countries, studies suggest that these general findings have cross-cultural, and even cross-temporal validity.

Various explanations for these experiences have been proposed, from temporal lobe epilepsy to faulty agent-detection mechanisms, to the intervention of real superhuman beings, but the reasons for these experiential patterns need not concern us here. It is important to stress, however, that they do not represent instances of mental illness. The anthropologist Lurhmann points to two patterns of “hallucinations” based on the empirical data – one the result of psychotic phenomena associated with the psychiatric disorders classified as schizophrenia, and so on, and the other a normal phenomenon of mentally normal individuals in all, or nearly all, human societies. In fact, what is unusual about the public discourse of the modern least 10-15%, with an annual incidence at 4-5%; Joseph O. Baker (“The Variety of Religious Experiences,” Review of Religious Research 51, no. 1 (2009)) found that 14.8% of Americans had heard the voice of God speaking to them, while 5.7% had had a vision of a religious figure while awake.


This is, of course, the dominant view of most religious and spiritual traditions; for some more theoretical perspectives, see for example Jerome I. Gellman, “Experiencing God’s Infinity,” American Philosophical Quarterly 31, no. 1 (1994); Phillip H. Wiebe, “Finite Spirits as Theoretical Entities,” Religious Studies 40, no. 3 (2004).


West – though this is not true for many of its subcultures – is the fact that such experiences are accorded low truth value, and rarely spoken of; respondents to the surveys described above often report that they are discussing their experiences for the first time. In societies where this is not the case, and Roman Egypt was certainly one of these, such extreme experiences, even if not common, formed an important part of social understandings of reality, and these experiences, understood in our period as encounters with gods, spirits, and other superhuman forces, are abundantly attested in epigraphic, papyrological, and literary sources. My contention is that these must be understood not as merely rhetorical or conventional, but, in at least some cases, as records of an experiential reality, and it is against this background of a social knowledge of the reality of interaction with deities that rituals of apparition must be understood, as an attempt to regulate and regularise such encounters.

The problem is that the studies we have dealt with look only at spontaneous visions, not invoked experiences, and it is this aspect of rituals of apparition that poses a greater problem, especially as research into the induction of hallucinations is limited and inconclusive. Nonetheless, a few further insights, drawn from the fields of psychology and anthropology, may help to illuminate aspects of the Roman-period apparition rituals, and it is to these I will now turn.

The most straightforward of the apparition modalities is the dream oracle; all of us have experienced dreams, and are aware of their potential for bizarre content which may defy the laws of waking reality and perception. Dreaming is typically, though not uncontroversially, associated with the sleep phase known as rapid-eye movement (REM) sleep, typically reached within 80 minutes of sleep onset, and recurring in further cycles approximately 90 minutes apart between which the sleeper experiences the other four levels of non-REM sleep. Alongside REM sleep, however, hallucination-like content is also associated with the period immediately before, and immediately after, waking, and these experiences are known as hypnagogic or sleep

---

onset hallucinations, associated with sleep onset, and hypnopompic hallucinations, associated with the transition from sleep to wakefulness. These hallucinations often feel more like waking life than dreams, are generally beyond conscious control, and often have a feeling of heightened reality; descriptions of such hallucinations include vivid visions of lights, animals, or people in the room with the hallucinator. Interestingly, it may be these experiences which were primarily understood as constituting dream visions for those who used the magical papyri. In the Dream Request to Besa, attested in multiple papyri, the god is described as coming “when you are almost awake” (σχεδόν σου ἐ γρηγοροῦντος), and this association between hypnagogic states and dream visions is widely attested in ancient Greek texts. Nonetheless, whether practitioners understood dream oracles as consisting solely of hypnagogic hallucinations, or, more likely, accepted that REM sleep dreams could also constitute visions, their largely random content would likely have been unable to be interpreted as an oracle in some, or even most, instances. Research has shown that the

---


1362 The fullest discussion seems to be in Andreas Mavromatis, *Hypnagogia: the Unique State of Consciousness Between Wakefulness and Sleep* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987). Mavromatis describes phenomena including both abstract visuals (luminous wheels, moving bubbles of colour, entoptic light, patterns, “light charged clouds”, pp.14-15, 25-27) and figurative imagery (lines of writing, faces, animals, natural scenes; pp.14-16, 25-27). They may range in affect from transcendently beautiful to “hideous and terrifying” (pp.25-27). One hallucination he records consisted of “…little shafts of blue flame, like miniature lightning, [which] darted from the corners of the room. And then came the apparition: a man with a grotesquely horrible face, a wolf with the eyes of a lion, a huge serpent, a great black bear standing erect so that it reached the ceiling” (pp.33-35).

1363 The three instances of this recipe are found in PGM 7.222-249, PGM 8.64-110 & PGM 102.1-17. The portion in question only appears in the text contained in PGM 7.

1364 PGM 7.228.

1365 See for example Aelius Aristides, who describes a vision of Asklepios coming when he was “halfway between sleep and waking” (μέσως ἔχειν ὕπνου καὶ ἐγρηγορώσεως, Oratio Oratio/Ἱεροὶ λόγοι β’ 298.9-19). Tertullian notes that “they say that dreams are more sure and clear when they happen towards the end of the night” (certiora er colatiora somiari affirmant sub extimis noctibus, De Anima 48.1). Iamblichus notes that guiding voices may be heard both when going to sleep and just before awakening, describing “a state between sleep and wakefulness” (ἡ μεταξὺ τοῦ ὕπνου τε καὶ τῆς ἐγρηγορώσεως/ κατάστασις) as “divine and fit for reception of the gods” (θεία ἐστι καὶ πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν τῶν θεῶν/ ἐπιτήδεια, De Mysteriis 3.2.13-17, 36-39). Marinus describes Proclus seeing a vision of Asklepios’ serpent “between sleeping and waking” (μεταξὰ/ γὰρ ὄν ὕπνου καὶ ἐγρηγορώσεως, Vita Procli 2.744-745).
thoughts and concerns of waking life, what Freud called “day residues” (*Tagereste*) do play a role in dream content, but there is no evidence that any particular piece of content will manifest itself in a dream, and any residues that do may be distorted into barely recognisable forms. This would lead us to suspect that ritualists could not rely on any particular instance of a dream to provide them with suitable content for interpretation as an oracle, and in fact this is what the evidence suggests; two instances of dream oracles in PGM 2 (l.1-64, 64-184) provide instructions for rituals of compulsion to perform over the course of five or seven days respectively if the dream oracle is not fulfilled on each successive night (that is the dream content does not accord with expectations); in the first text, an alternative lamp divination recipe using a boy seer is suggested in case the dream oracle still does not work after five days. A similar, documentary, example is found in the archive of Hor. In O.Hor 13 he describes spending two days in supplication before he was able to receive a successful dream oracle.

Another apparition modality relatively susceptible to explanation is that of hypnosis, the term we would use to describe the interaction between practitioners of apparition rituals and the boy seers used in several texts. Hypnosis is a somewhat complex phenomenon, and therefore difficult to define, but it refers both to a process to put a subject in an altered state of consciousness, and the altered state itself. The state is associated with passivity, and selective attention, with subjects apparently aware of, and responsive to, only what the hypnotist directs them to be aware of or responsive too. More specifically, hypnotised subjects may feel as if their behaviour and aspects
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1366 Sigmund Freud, *Die Traumdeutung* (Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1899 [1982]).
1368 PGM 2.45-54.
1369 PGM 2.141-148.
1370 PGM 2.55-58.
1371 “…the day after spending two days/ in supplication…” (hrw m-si īr hrw 2/ (n) īr sbr, l.1-2).
1372 For an overview see Amanda J. Barnier and Michael R. Nash, “Introduction: a roadmap for explanation, a working definition,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Hypnosis: Theory, Research, and Practice,*
of their cognition are no longer under their conscious control, and may display physical behaviour – immobility or motion, for example – and experience cognitive and perceptual experiences – including abnormal ideation, post-hypnotic amnesia, and hallucination – according to either the hypnotist’s commands or socially given ideas about hypnotic behaviour.

It is the last of these, hallucination, which concerns us here. Subjects under hypnosis may respond to suggestions from the hypnotist to experience auditory and visual hallucinations which, as far as psychologists have been able to determine, have a subjective reality. This may be the case even where the hypnotist is not aware that they are suggesting the hallucinations. Such a phenomenon may lie behind the rash of patients in the latter half of the 20th century displaying multiple personalities under hypnosis, and describing false recovered memories, of, for example, Satanic abuse, alien abduction, or past lives, who apparently confabulated these stories under hypnosis in response to the inadvertent suggestions of their therapists. The descriptions of procedures which can be reconstructed from the magical papyri fall well within the spectrum of plausible hypnotic behaviour. The basic procedure in the recipes seems to have consisted of the boy seer lying prone with his eyes covered, while the ritualist recited a formula over him; the medium’s eyes would then be
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1373 J. P. Brady, "The Veridicality of Hypnotic, Visual Hallucinations," in Origin and Mechanisms of Hallucinations, ed. Wolfram Keup (New York: Plenum Press, 1970) reports that individuals asked to hallucinate a rotating, striped drum under hypnosis experienced nystagmus, the involuntary movement of the eyeballs associated with watching such an image. Particularly interesting, however, is the work of Barber, who demonstrated that many individuals (27% in a sample of 78 female students) reported visual hallucinations under suggestion even when they had not undergone hypnotic induction; it is unclear whether this indicates that some individuals are capable of experiencing hallucinations without induction, or simply that they respond to demand characteristics without induction, or some combination of the two ("Hypnosis, Suggestions and Auditory-Visual Hallucinations," ibid.). A review of studies in David A. Oakley, "Hypnosis, trance and suggestion: evidence from neuroimaging," in The Oxford Handbook on Hypnosis: Theory, Research and Practice, ed. Michael R. Nash and Amanda J. Barnier (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) concludes that hypnotic hallucinations show similar brain activation patterns to actually viewing objects, rather than simply imagining them.

uncovered, and he would generally be instructed to stare into a lamp-flame or vessel filled with liquid, and asked a series of leading questions which may have inadvertently described what they were expected to see. The medium was then expected to confirm that they saw the invited deity, and act as a go-between, passing messages from the ritualist to the god and back.

One of the reasons hypnosis is such a complex phenomenon to study is its variability. Because so much of its effects rely on the pre-existing ideas of the subjects about hypnosis, learned from their society, as well as on the suggestions on their hypnotists, hypnotised individuals can display a wide variety of behaviours across societies.

One particular feature apparently associated with hypnosis or mediumship in the Roman period was whole-body catalepsy – that is mediums would collapse and be unable to move until released; this detail may in part explain why it is that the mediums were usually made to lie down. Still more problematic for attempts to understand hypnosis, however, is its subjective nature, which can only be indirectly observed; in fact, individuals may act as if they are hypnotised, even when not experiencing the state of hypnosis, merely because they know it is expected of them, especially if the hypnotist is in a position of authority over them.

See for example PGM 5.33: "Let the throne be brought in" (εἰσενεχθήτω ὁ θρόνος); PDM 14.291: "Do you see the great god?" (n r-i r-i k n w r f p i n Tr i r-i r-); PDM 14.419: "Is the god coming in?" (n i w p i n Tr i y r-hn); PDM 14.510: "Has the light already appeared?" (n w i w p i w y n hptr); See also PDM 14.51-72, 547-533, which describe elaborate scenes in which the medium is instructed to ask Anubis to prepare a table and food for the deities to be consulted, with the consultation taking the form of a back-and-forth conversation between ritualist and medium.

D.M. Wegner, The Illusion of Conscious Will (Cambridge University Press, 2002). describes hypnosis as a "nightmare science" due to its capacity to take on whatever traits the researcher is looking for. More specifically, Orne showed that individuals told they would experience catalepsy in a certain arm before being hypnotised would then go on to demonstrate catalepsy after induction, regardless of the arm they were told they would experience it in ("The nature of hypnosis: Artifact and essence," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 58 (1959)).

The most explicit instance of this is PGM 4.850-929, an instance of possession mediumship, described as a "collapse" (κατάφθασις, l.850), a term associated with epileptic seizures associated with daimonic possession; compare Matthew 17.15-17; see also PGM 7.549 where the god is asked to make the boy medium "fall down" (παίδα τὸν παίδα κατασπασθῆναι). The description of boy mediums falling recurs in Apuleius, Apologia 27, 44-45, where his accusers apparently take a supposed boy medium relapsing into a trance and falling in his presence as proof of his status as a magician.

For a discussion of these "demand characteristics" see M. T. Orne, "On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: With particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications," American Psychologist 17, no. 11 (1962).
between true hypnosis and faked hypnosis is very difficult to tell, and some have argued that all hypnosis is a form of socially scripted role-playing. This phenomenon, known as the effect of demand characteristics, would almost certainly have played out in the rituals performed in Roman Egypt, in which the hypnotist was a ritual expert, and the subject, in most cases, a young slave (see 4.1.4).

Nonetheless, even if some mediums succumbed to demand characteristics and acted as if hypnotised when in a normal state of consciousness, it is almost certain that some boy seers would not be susceptible to hypnosis, and would have been equally unable or unwilling to fake such a state. Studies have consistently shown that only 10-15% of the population (“hypnotic highs”) are highly hypnotisable – able to display all or most of the behaviours associated with hypnosis. This number has been found to be stable not only across time, but across geographical, cultural, and linguistic boundaries. It was observed by some of the earliest practitioners of what we now know as hypnosis, and we would therefore expect the authors of the magical to be equally aware of it, and indeed, this seems to be the case. Hypnotisibility is difficult to predict; it correlates to some extent with a personality trait known as “absorption” –
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1381 Amanda J. Barnier and Kevin M. McConkey, “Defining and identifying the highly hypnotisable person,” in High hypnotisability: Theoretical, experimental and clinical issues, ed. M. Heap, R. Brown, and D. Oakley (London: Brunner-Routledge, 2004); see especially the discussion on pp.43-44, although the time periods (decades in most cases) are relatively small, and most of the cultural contexts studied could be characterised as “Western”. See also the discussions in Jean-Roch Laurence, Dominic Beaulieu-Prévost, and Thibault du Chéné, “Measuring and understanding differences in hypnotizability,” in The Oxford Handbook on Hypnosis: Theory, Research and Practice, ed. Michael R. Nash and Amanda J. Barnier (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), especially pp.225-228. Woody, Barnier and McConkey (“Multiple Hypnotizabilities: Differentiating the Building Blocks of Hypnotic Response,” Psychological Assessment 17, no. 2 (2005)) suggest that hypnotisability may have six separate components – direct motor, motor challenge, perceptual-cognitic (including hallucinations), and posthypnotic amnesia – which different subjects may display to greater or lesser degrees.

1382 Mesmer and De Puységar, experimenting with hypnosis in the late 18th century, and the Abbé de Faria in the early 19th, all noted the phenomenon of variable hypnotisability (Laurence, Beaulieu-Prévost, and du Chéné, “Measuring and understanding differences in hypnotizability”, pp.227-228).
the capacity of an individual to “lose” themselves in daydreams or narratives - but this correlation is not exact, and only measurable through standardised testing in any case. Another, and more reliable, correlation is with age: hypnotisibility is higher among children than adults, peaking at ages 9-12 and then declining and stabilising over the course of adolescence;1384 this characteristic of hypnosis may go some way towards explaining the preference for young mediums. Still, not all children are susceptible to hypnosis, so it would still be necessary to test their hypnotisibility, and the only way to do this would be by attempting to hypnotise them.

The fact that the composers of the magical papyri were aware of variability in hypnotisibility is shown by several short mentions of this fact in recipes. One text in PGM 13 gives a short formula to be used on boy seers unable to see the gods,1385 and several texts prescribe that mediums be tested beforehand to ensure they are suitable.1386 Only one text in PDM 14 (ll.1-92) gives a procedure for such a test, but as we would expect, it seems to be a shorter version of the induction procedure, to which a hypnotic high would respond by going into a hypnotic trance. The text is not entirely clear on how this is indicated – the medium’s ears are described as speaking (md.t, l.76), which Hopfner has understood as a ringing sound being heard in them,1387 while in the past I have suggested that the medium would display the characteristic sign of hypnosis by collapsing.1388 According to this understanding, the mention of left and right ears “speaking” was a technical term referring to the indication of the direction the medium would fall or sway in. While this is, perhaps, somewhat strengthened by the fact that the test, unlike the induction, is to be performed while the medium is

1383 For a discussion of the correlation see Barnier, Cox, and McConkey, “The province of “highs”.
1385 PGM 13.749-750: ἐπὶ τῶν μὴ καταυγαζομένων παιδῶν, ὅπως/θεωρήσῃ ἀπαραιτήτως.
1386 These include PGM 2.1-64, which demands that the boy used must be ‘tested’ (γυμναζομένος, l.56), as well as PDM 14.239-295 which says the boy must be ‘tested in his ears’ (ινατο δὲ τινα ἀποτελεῖται, ll.287-288). Another example may be in PGM 4.88-93, which instructs the ritualist to perform the ritual having ‘tested’ (προκωδωνίσας, l.89) the boy.
1387 Hopfner, *Griechische-Ägyptischer Offenbarungzauber*, vol.2 §264.
1388 Korshi Dosoo, “I see your lord in the light: Theurgic divination in Roman Egypt” (Honours Thesis. Macquarie University, 2010), pp.90-93. This hypothesis was inspired by a ritual in PGM 4.850-929, in which a medium released from a trance falls either to the left or the right.
standing (‘ḥr r-rd.wy.f=f, l6g), and hence able to fall, the text remains difficult to interpret. Most problematic for the thesis here is the fact that the test seems to envisage only three options – both ears speaking (“very good”), the right ear speaking (“good”), and the right ear speaking (“bad”) – which would seem to exclude the possibility of the medium not responding at all. There is no simple solution to this problem, but the fact that other texts mention mediums unable to perceive the summoned deities suggests that this was one of the primary concerns of testing, even if this particular example seems more concerned with the quality of those who could perceive deities.

As this brief discussion has shown, there is some evidence to suggest not only that mediated divination involved the process known to us today as hypnosis, but that the users of the magical papyri were familiar with some of its characteristic features. The final apparition modality to be discussed here – visions which appeared directly to the waking ritualist, is the most difficult to contextualise within a psychological framework, and so I will endeavour to keep my comments relatively brief.

One of the most readily comprehensible suggestions here is the use of hallucigens, chemical compounds which might have caused ritualists to hallucinate the visions they were expecting. In an appendix to his Arcana Mundi, Luck has argued that the use of such psychedelics, alongside other trance-inducing techniques, could have produced the mental states necessary for these exotic experiences, a practice he calls “narcohypnosis”.1389 Luck points out that many of the ingredients used in the incense burned during the invocation procedures – myrrh and frankincense among them – are known to be psychoactive; in addition to the use of incense as the method of delivery, we might note the use of eye- and body-paints, which again often include myrrh,1390 as well as, in some cases, mysterious fungal growths described as resembling bloody genitals, which develop in an eye-paint left in a dark place for weeks.1391 An even stronger example is given not in the magical papyri, but in the writings of Proclus, who

---

1389 Luck, Arcana mundi, pp.479-485.
1390 See for example the eye-paints described in PDM 14.115, 295-308, 805-840, 875-885.
describes smearing the eyes with strychnine;\textsuperscript{1392} strychnine poisoning is known to cause flashes of light in the visual field.\textsuperscript{1393} There seems to be some weak ancient confirmation for the use of smoke in inducing trances, and both Apuleius\textsuperscript{1394} and Pseudo-Galen\textsuperscript{1395} mention the use of incenses in this regard, but their testimonies are somewhat vague. Incense is mentioned alongside music and songs, so that it is hard to argue that the psychoactive scents, rather than the ritual as a whole, is responsible for the effect.\textsuperscript{1396} More generally, it is very difficult to gauge the effectiveness of the recipes given in the papyri. Generally the precise species and doses are unknown, and these would be vital to any strong argument for the importance of hallucinogens in rituals of apparition. A recent study suggested that the psychoactive properties of modern frankincense species may be merely "mild",\textsuperscript{1397} and while Luck argues that the species available in ancient times may have had more powerful effects,\textsuperscript{1398} it seems that the question of narcohypnosis must remain merely an intriguing possibility.

There are many other factors of magical practice which have been suggested to play a role in inducing hallucinations: some recipes suggest some form of fasting,\textsuperscript{1399} while

\begin{small}
\textsuperscript{1392} In Platonis rem publicam commentarii 2.117.1-3: τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τινες χυλὸν ἐνιέντες στρύχνου καὶ ποῶν ἄλλων εἰδάλα ἄττα δαιμόνων ἐν ἀέρι καθορῶσιν ("some see the images of daimons in the air after having put the juice of strychnine or other herbs into their eyes").
\textsuperscript{1393} Leonard Sandall, "An Overdose of Strychnine," The Lancet 147, no. 3787 (1896).
\textsuperscript{1394} Apologia 43: quin et illud mecum reputo posse animum humanum… seu carminum auocamento siue odorum delenimento soporari et ad obliuionem praezentium externari et paulisper remota corporis memoria redigi ac redire ad naturam suam, quae est immortalis scilicet et diuina; Luck (Luck, Arcana mundi. p.483) translates this as: "...that the human mind can be put to sleep… either through being called away by songs or through the soothing influences of smells, to step outside, so as to forget the present, lose the memory of the body for a while and return to its own nature which is, as we know, immortal and divine".
\textsuperscript{1395} Definitiones medicae 19.462.14-16: Ἐνθουσιασμός ἐστι καθάπερ ἐξίστανται τινες ἐπὶ τῶν ὑποθυμιωμένων ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ὁρῶντες ἢ τυμπάνων ἢ αὐλῶν ἢ συμβόλων ἀκούσαντες; Luck (ibid.p.484) translates this as "Enthousiasmos is a state of ecstasy produced in some people on (?) smoke in the sanctuaries, when they see apparitions, listening to drums or flutes or symbols (?)." As he notes, the text is probably corrupt, and συμβόλων (‘symbols’) should be corrected to κυμβάλων (‘cymbals’).
\textsuperscript{1396} Compare, for example, the comments of Porphyry that pipes, cymbals, tambourines, or another tune might cause possession, and Iamblichus’ subsequent comments in De Mysteriis 3.9; neither make any mention of incense.
\textsuperscript{1397} Arieh Moussaieff et al., "Incensole acetate, an incense component, elicits psychoactivity by activating TRPV3 channels in the brain," The FASEB Journal 22, no. 8 (2008), p.10. The study looked only at the effect of frankincense (\textit{Boswellia}) resin on mice, so that the relevance of its findings to humans is inferential.
\textsuperscript{1398} Luck, Arcana mundi., p.485.
\textsuperscript{1399} PGM 3.282-409, 4.52-85.
\end{small}
others prescribe sexual abstinence, isolation from human contact, and that the rituals take place in darkened environments. All of these have been suggested as factors which might contribute to the experiencing of visions; but again, this is not entirely satisfactory: an analysis of visionary practice among the indigenous groups of the American Plains has suggested that the determinants of such trances are highly dependent on cultural factors, rather than on fixed facts of human physiology or psychology.

More promising, perhaps, is the possibility that some of the practices used in rituals of apparition may have resulted in exotic perceptual experiences. A particularly relevant example of this was documented by the psychologist Arthur J. Deikman in 1963. In an example of what he called “experimental meditation” he had subjects stare at a blue vase for periods of time from five to 15 minutes. This simple practice, reminiscent of the manner in which the practitioners of rituals of apparition might have stared at vessels or lamp-flames, resulted in some dramatic perceptual phenomena: subjects reported the vase becoming more vivid, brighter, more luminous, unstable in shape, and even growing until it filled the visual field. These descriptions are particularly reminiscent of the descriptions of “light-bringing” in rituals of apparition – the stage preceding an apparition of a deity, in which a light would suffuse the medium of apparition, and become “vault-shaped”, developing “height, depth, and breadth.”

---

1402 Benedict Ruth Fulton, "The Vision in Plains Culture," _American Anthropologist_ 24, no. 1 (1922), see especially the summary on p.21.
1404 PGM 4.1104-1106 ὄψι/ τὸ φῶς τοῦ λύχνου καμοροειδὲς γινόμε/νον ("you will see the light of the lamp becoming vault-shaped.")
1405 PGM 4.970-971: "Let there be light, breadth, depth, length, height, brightness" (γενέσθω φῶς πλάτος, βάθος, μήκος, ψός, αὐγή); PGM 4.978: γενέσθω πλάτος, βάθος, μήκος, ψός, αὐγή ("let there be breadth,
Yet this, and other quirks of human perception do not seem to offer a full explanation for the experiences described in the recipes discussed here – self-induced visions of deities – and so I will briefly outline two partial, but suggestive, areas of psychological research which might contribute towards bridging this gap.

A few authors who have studied the phenomenon of hallucinations in the general population note that there seem to be certain groups of people more prone to mystical experiences; Deikman calls this group “trained sensates”; and Nelson notes that these individuals are often those who have tried in the past to induce praeternatural experiences. One possible explanation is the relatively little-studied phenomenon known as self- or auto-hypnosis, to be contrasted with the more common hetero-hypnosis, which has already been discussed. Like hetero-hypnosis, auto-hypnosis results in an altered state of consciousness, in which the subject may experience unusual phenomenological experiences, including visual, auditory, and tactile hallucinations. The process of entering into such a state, like the induction processes of hetero-hypnosis, are variable, but may include fixing the eyes on light, relaxation, concentration, verbal suggestion, and so on; some studies suggest that auto-hypnosis is both experientially and physiologically equivalent to hetero-

---

depth, length, height, light”); PGM 12.157: γενέσθω βάθος πλάτος μήκος αὔγη (“let there be depth, breadth, length, light”); PDM 14.4, 7: my p‘ wyn p‘ wstn hnt p‘ i= (y) hn (“let the light and the breadth come into my vessel.”)

hypnosis. I am reluctant, however, to do more than raise auto-hypnosis as more than
an intriguing possibility: it is far less studied than hetero-hypnosis, and its
introspective and apparently paradoxical nature make it a difficult subject. As Johnson
points out one key feature of classical hypnosis is the sense of a loss of agency, difficult
to reconcile with the self-directed processes of auto-hypnosis.\textsuperscript{1412} The research which
has been conducted tends to focus on therapeutic uses for stress-management and
pain-reduction,\textsuperscript{1413} and there is consequently little work on the kind of phenomena
that interest us here; one author sensibly warns clinicians not to teach subjects how to
produce hallucinations.\textsuperscript{1414}

A parallel source of evidence comes from the work of T.M. Luhrmann on what she
calls ‘sensory overrides’ – her preferred name for non-psychotic hallucinations.\textsuperscript{1415} In
her anthropological field work with modern charismatic Christians in the U.S.A., she
noticed that despite the encouragement for all members of the church to experience
divine presence, and the prestige associated with it, certain individuals were
acknowledged to be better at experiencing God’s presence through prayer than
others.\textsuperscript{1416} Even more interestingly, these “super pray-ers” tended to describe similar
experiences to one another, which were qualitatively different to their less gifted
colleagues: they reported hearing God’s voice in their heads, as well as vivid emotional
states, and even auditory, visual, and tactile hallucinations of his presence.\textsuperscript{1417}
Luhrmann has gone on to carry out research that suggests that this ability has two
aspects – innate talent, and training – which make it comparable to, for example,

\textsuperscript{1411} Kristina J. Luna, “Physiological Differences Between Self-Hypnosis and Hetero-Hypnosis” (Diss.
Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 2009), in particular p.65.
\textsuperscript{1413} See for example W. Malyska and J. Christensen, "Autohypnosis and the Prenatal Class," \textit{American
Journal of Clinical Hypnosis} 9, no. 3 (1967); Paul M. Balson, Clifford R. Dempster, and Franklin R. Brooks,
\textsuperscript{1414} Salter, "Three techniques of autohypnosis", p.434.
\textsuperscript{1415} For a discussion of her reasons, see T. M. Luhrmann, "Hallucinations and Sensory Overrides," \textit{Annual
\textsuperscript{1416} T. M. Luhrmann, Howard Nusbaum, and Ronald Thisted, "The Absorption Hypothesis: Learning to
\textsuperscript{1417} Ibid., pp.71-73.
athletic virtuosity.\textsuperscript{1418}

In a survey of congregants from the church she was studying, she found that those who more often reported vivid phenomenological experiences of divine presence – including hallucinations – tended to have higher absorption scores than those who did not.\textsuperscript{1419} As already discussed, absorption is a personality trait which allows vivid engagement with imaginary and sensory experiences, and is the only trait to correlate significantly with hypnotisibility. The second aspect, training, is suggested by a study in which she had two groups of subjects trained in different prayer techniques – one based on Bible study, the second based on kataphatic prayer, the technique used by charismatic churches.\textsuperscript{1420} This form of prayer focuses on visualisation; pray-ers are encouraged to visualise religious imagery as if present, and over the course of their training individuals who practiced kataphatic prayer reported increased vividness of mental imagery, and more importantly, more unusual sensory experiences, including hallucinations interpreted as religious experiences.\textsuperscript{1421}

This research suggests that it may be possible for some individuals to learn to induce visions, but it highlights two preconditions. The first of these is training: individuals must cultivate this skill over time. A striking parallel to this can be found in Sheila Walker's research on African and Afro-American possession cults, in which she stresses the need for initiates to "learn" how to be possessed.\textsuperscript{1422} There is less explicit evidence for this in our ancient sources, although there are a few suggestive references in the magical corpus to initiation practices.\textsuperscript{1423}

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{1418} Ibid., p.66.
\item \textsuperscript{1420} For this study see T. M. Luhrmann, Howard Nusbaum, and Ronald Thisted, ""Lord, Teach Us to Pray": Prayer Practice Affects Cognitive Processing," \textit{Journal of Cognition and Culture} 13(2013), and the discussion in Luhrmann, \textit{When God Talks Back}, pp.193-215.
\item \textsuperscript{1421} Luhrmann, Nusbaum, and Thisted, "Lord, Teach Us to Pray", p.171.
\item \textsuperscript{1422} Walker, \textit{Ceremonial spirit possession in Africa and Afro-America}, pp.52-56.
\item \textsuperscript{1423} The most explicit example is the description for allowing a fellow initiate (συμμύστης, 732-733) join in the ritual described in the \textit{Mithras Liturgy} in ll.732-749.
\end{footnotes}
tradition there are more concrete suggestions of initiation, though few explicit
descriptions of what this involves, and there are similar, though problematic
descriptions of apprenticeship in literary texts – Lucian of Samosata claims that
Alexander of Abonoteichus was trained as a youth by a magician, but this may
simply be the kind of slander what was also attached to Jesus of Nazareth.

The second aspect is the importance of vivid descriptions of mental imagery, and here
Luhrmann explicitly compares kataphatic prayer practice to Jewish Hekhalot mysticism, which grew out of the same cultural milieu as Graeco-Egyptian apparition rituals. As Luhrmann points out, the importance of such mental pictures resides in the fact that imagery seems to be processed by the same regions of the brain as actual sensory perceptions; it is a commonplace that what we see with our eyes does not relate directly to the outside world, but what we consciously perceive is at yet another remove from what we see with our eyes – a layer of processing intervenes between sensory input and perception, and it is here that expectations and mental imagery can intervene to shape perception. Research on hallucinations tends to suggest that they arise when internal phenomena – mental imagery or internal trains of thought – are attributed to an outside source, that is, inner thoughts are understood as arising from the outside world. Many lines of evidence – the research of

---

1424 See for example Marinus’ mention of Proclus learning theurgy from Asclepiogeneia, the daughter of the philosopher Plutarch (Vita Procli 679-683), and Eunapius’ description of Sosipatra’s initiation into the Chaldaean mysteries by divine strangers visiting her father’s house (Vitae Sophistarum 6.7.1-10).
1425 Lucian, Alexander 5.
1426 Origen, Contra Celsum 1.46.6-7: ...διαβάλλων Κέλσος φησὶν αὐτὸν παρ’ Αἰγυπτίοις μεμαθηκότα πεποιηκέναι (“casting aspersions, Celsus says that he [Jesus] did only what he had learned among the Egyptians [that is, Egyptian magicians]”).
1430 “It is a key point that vision is not only indirectly related to objects, but also to stimuli” (Richard L. Gregory, “Knowledge in Perception and Illusion,” Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences 352, no. 1358 (1997), p.1122).
1431 “The available evidence suggests that hallucinations result from a failure of the metacognitive skills involved in discriminating between selfgenerated and external sources of information” (Bentall, “The Illusion of Reality”, p.82).
Luhrmann and Walker, charismatic Christian prayer guides, modern handbooks on magic and spirit-channeling – all suggest, in fact, that the process of learning to experience such mystical states begins as an act of imagination, a sort of “play-acting” which is gradually experienced as more and more real as internal phenomena are understood and then experienced as encounters with external beings.

It is here, again, that the vivid imagery of the magical papyri, and the Graeco-Egyptian religious tradition more generally, would have played a vital role. The detailed descriptions of heavenly ascent in the Mithras Liturgy (PGM 4.751-824), or of the apparitions of deities on thrones with attendants, generally based on cultic iconography, would have provided rich material for visual hallucinations. As with the congregants in Luhrmann’s study, it is likely that not all magical practitioners would have been able to experience phenomenologically powerful states, but it is likely that some would have. These experiences, mediated perhaps by hallucinogens, physical and mental preparation, and the kinds of exotic perceptual experiences resulting from sustained attention, would have relied on a combination of innate talent, and training in cultivating and externalising internal mental imagery. For some, this may have resulted in vivid hallucinations; for others, it may have been more akin to the experiences described regularly by Luhrmann’s informants, of distinguishing God’s voice from their own inner thoughts.

The purpose of the foregoing discussion has been to show how the rituals of apparition contained in the magical papyri could have been experienced as efficacious,
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1432 Luhrmann, When God Talks Back., pp.72-100.
1433 Walker, Ceremonial spirit possession in Africa and Afro-America., pp.52-57.
1434 Luhrmann quotes from Graybeal and Roller’s 2006 prayer-guide Connecting with God: being aware of how God is supporting us and communicating too us is not always easy. We must train ourselves to listen for God and to respond to him” (quoted in Luhrmann, Nusbaum, and Thisted, “The Absorption Hypothesis”, p.70).
1435 See, for example, the description of pathworking exercises in Luhrmann, Persuasions of the Witch’s Craft, pp.191-202.
1436 See the discussion of channeling in Wegner, The Illusion of Conscious Will., pp.240-252. One of the instructional videos cited by Wegner (Kathryn Riddal’s 1988 Channeling: How to Reach Out to Your Spirit Guides) includes the following: “...as people begin to channel, they almost inevitably feel as if they are making it up... When my students complain that they’re just making it up, I tell them, ‘Good. Continue to make it up.’”
1437 This is described in PGM 4.930-1114 & 5.1-52; for a fuller discussion of apparitions see 3.3.3.
in a way that can be understood within the paradigm of the methodological materialism that is the predominant worldview of modern academia. This approach can shed light on particular details of the papyri – references to prophetic dreams experienced before awakening, and the need to test boy seers, for example – but I also expect that it has demonstrated the limits of such psychologising accounts. There is always the possibility of a loss of “texture” in such accounts, a reduction of the phenomenological depth of the encounter with a deity to the abstract but more mundane concepts of dreams and hallucinations. Nonetheless, I hope that this account has suggested that such rituals could have resulted in real, and subjectively powerful states, serving as a counterbalance to approaches which dismiss such practices as fraudulent, or assume that they can be understood entirely through functional or performative descriptions.

3.3.2 Truth and testing

As I have attempted to demonstrate in the previous section, it is likely that the practitioners of rituals of apparition often experienced their practices as efficacious, but this is only half the story. We have also seen that many of the psychological and perceptual effects upon which they may have relied would have been unreliable or inconsistent, and the recipes for rituals of apparition made not only implicit claims about subjective experience – that they would allow an individual to encounter a deity – but about objective facts, that the deity could then reveal hidden information about the cosmos or achieve superhuman feats. Once again, these facts must prompt us to ask whether the texts imply an honest engagement with their practices – if they acknowledged, and found strategies for coping with or understanding failure – or whether the texts’ authors were fundamentally fraudulent, refusing to acknowledge the possibility of failure.

In fact, multiple lines of evidence suggest that the former was the case – that ritualists were acutely aware that their rituals were unreliable. As has already been suggested, the multiplication of recipes, and archival approach to similar or near-identical texts
in single manuscripts implies an attempt on the part of the collectors of the Theban Library and similar collections to cope with this unreliability through experimentation by varying their techniques. One of the strongest suggestions of this experimental approach is found in the frequent references to “testing” of recipes. Alongside the vaguer “advertisement formulae” — “it is very good”, and so on — we find more specific references. Sometimes these state loosely that the recipe has been tested.\(^{1438}\) In other cases they may mention that the recipe has been tested a set number of times,\(^ {1440}\) that it was tested by a single (legendary) individual,\(^ {1441}\) or they may even invite the reader to test the recipe.\(^ {1442}\) The single example where the ritualist is told not to test it is the exception which proves the rule — such an admonishment would only be necessary in an environment where such testing might occur. As we have already seen, boy-mediums were tested as part of larger rituals, and these tests would seem, from what we know about the psychology of hypnosis, to have been effective: that is, the concept of “testing” was not merely abstract to practitioners of magic in Roman Egypt, but involved specific tests which demanded specific outcomes. A similar point is suggested by the alchemical material from the Theban Library, where a recipe for creating gold is described as “tested”,\(^ {1444}\) and we find recipes for testing gold, silver, and asem by heating or melting them and observing colour changes in the metal which

\(^{1438}\) As Dieleman mentions, these “advertisement formulae” have a long history in Egyptian medical, magical, and funerary texts, going back at least as far as the Middle Kingdom; see Dieleman, Priests, tongues, and rites., pp. 52, 275.

\(^{1439}\) For example PGM 1.247: Αμαύρωσις δοκίμη (“tested recipe for invisibility”); PGM 4.3007: Πρὸς δαμνιζομένους Πιθήκας δοκίμω (“Pibekhi’s tested prescription for those afflicted by daimōn”); PGM 11.40: ἡ πρᾶξις δεδοκίμασται (“the procedure has been tested”); PDM 14.115: [r] n wdj hyb lw=f dnt (“test d formula for securing shadows (?)”); PDM 14.119: w ph-ntr lw=f dnt (“a tested divine audience”); PDM 14.711: phbre …. t lw=f dnt (“a tested prescription”); PDM 14.856: twy=s gi n šn n pi ra lw=w gli n.im-f dd lw=f dnt m-šs sp-2 (“Here is a type of inquiry of the sun which is said to be very, very well tested”); [lw]=f lw=f dnt (“it is tested”).

\(^{1440}\) PDM 14.232 lw=f dd n.im-f dd lw=f dnt n sp 9 (“it is said to have been tested nine times”; PDM 14.424: nfr sp-2 ip lw=f dnt n sp 9 (“it is doubly good, tried, it has been tested nine times”); the repetition of the number nine here may be due to its position in Egyptian thought as a plurality of pluralities, 32. see also PDM Suppl.138, where the recipe is said to be nfr.wy sp 4 (“very good, four times.”)

\(^{1441}\) For example PGM 3.440-444: πεπείραται /ὑπὸ Μανεθω ("tested by Manetho").

\(^{1442}\) For example PGM 4.160-162: ἤν καὶ συνήν / δοκιμάσας διαιμέσεις τὸ παράδοξον τῆς εἰκόνας τιτόνας ("and after you have tested it you will marvel at incredible power of this procedure”).

\(^{1444}\) PGM 4.168: μὴ ἔξεταν τὸ ἐν συντή (“do not scrutinize what is in it.”)

\(^{1445}\) P.Leid. 1 397 l.331: πεπείραται (“tested”).
might hint at adulteration by cheaper metals;\textsuperscript{1445} these recipes, both alchemical and magical, employ the same vocabulary – \textit{πειράζω} and \textit{δοκιμάζω} in Greek, and their equivalent \textit{dnt} in Demotic.\textsuperscript{1446}

In the discussion which follows, I will attempt to draw out the schema implicit in the recipes for rituals of apparition, the framework within which success and failure could be conceptualised and responded to. This discussion will draw to some extent on the work of anthropologists such as Evans-Pritchard, who looked at systems of knowledge among the Azande,\textsuperscript{1447} and Luhrmann, who has discussed ways of coping with the apparent failure of spells and prayer respectively amongst modern-day English practitioners of magic\textsuperscript{1448} and American charismatic Christians.\textsuperscript{1449} The work of these authors shows that within such systems of knowledge disconfirmatory evidence does not immediately discredit the worldview or the practices they include. Instead these systems contain cognitive and rhetorical strategies for explaining how and why individual rituals may fail within functional ritual praxes. But this approach is not limited to systems dealing with what we might consider religious or supernatural phenomena. As the work of Thomas J. Kuhn has shown,\textsuperscript{1450} practitioners within the modern sciences must rely on conceptual frameworks which he calls “paradigms”, which both structure knowledge and allow normal research to take place.\textsuperscript{1453} Evidence

\textsuperscript{1445} P.Leid. I 397, recipes 42: Χρυσοῦ δοκιμασία (“test for gold”, ll.270-277); 43: Αργύρου δοκιμασία (“test for silver”, ll.278-282); and 62: Ασήμου δοκιμασία (“test for \textit{asem}”, ll.359-361).
\textsuperscript{1446} For the equivalence of \textit{πειράζω}/\textit{δοκιμάζω}, and \textit{dnt} see Crum 775a-b, s.v. \textit{ϫⲛⲧ} and 776a s.v. \textit{ϫⲛⲧ}, the Sahidic writings of two forms of the Demotic lexeme.
\textsuperscript{1447} Evans-Pritchard, \textit{Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande.}, in particular pp.63-83.
\textsuperscript{1448} Luhrmann, \textit{Persuasions of the Witch’s Craft.}, in particular pp.137-14.
\textsuperscript{1449} \textit{When God Talks Back}, in particular pp.208-209.
\textsuperscript{1450} Thomas S. Kuhn, \textit{The structure of scientific revolutions} (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962 [1996]). The enthusiastic reception of Kuhn’s work by historians and philosophers outside the realm of science, as in this work, was a development which surprised Kuhn himself (ibid., pp.208-209). Later, Kuhn’s understanding of the process of science altered somewhat, moving to a model in which scientific communities were the outcome of “evolution”, analogous to Darwinian evolution and speciation; see “The Road since Structure,” \textit{PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association} 1990 (1990). For a more general overview and assessment of Kuhn’s work, see V. Kindi and T. Arabatzis, \textit{Kuhn’s The Structure of Scientific Revolutions Revisited} (Taylor & Francis, 2013).
\textsuperscript{1453} Kuhn describes paradigms as “…accepted examples of actual scientific practice-examples which include law, theory, application, and instrumentation together provide models from which spring particular coherent traditions of scientific research” (Kuhn, \textit{The structure of scientific revolutions.}). He discusses the concept and function of paradigms at length in ibid, pp.43-51.
which apparently contradicts these paradigms does not, except in the comparatively rare crises he terms "paradigm shifts", 1452 cause the paradigms to be discarded. Instead they contain structures within which these disconfirmations can be ignored, explained as errors in methodology, or allow ad-hoc changes to the paradigm without upsetting the broader frameworks. 1453 Strategies for coping with failure are not, therefore, special features of magical or supernatural thinking, but rather necessary cognitive tools for dealing with a world of which we can only have imperfect knowledge.

To set out the terms of the following discussion, it is worth making explicit the two major ways in which a ritual of apparition could fail. Firstly, the ritual itself could be ineffective: the ritualist might perform the ritual, but the deity might not appear. Secondly, the ritual might seem to be a success, and the deity appear, but the information gained by the ritualist in the consultation might turn out to be incorrect or unsatisfactory. The magical papyri imply awareness of both possibilities, and suggest a number of strategies for rationalising and coping with both.

The possibility that the ritualist might not have an experience that they could interpret as a divine apparition is suggested not only by the discussion of efficacy above (3.3.1), but also by the existence of compulsive procedures which might be carried out if the initial invocations did not work. This possibility is most explicit in two recipes from PGM 2 (ll.1-64 & ll.64-184); the first of these offers an alternative ritual to be carried out if the primary dream oracle does not work after five days.

The first strategy for dealing with the failure of the ritual performance is to blame the ritual itself. As we have seen, the numerous references to "tested" rituals implies that there existed numerous rituals which were either untested, or that might be tested and found to be unsatisfactory. A second suggestion of awareness of this possibility is found at a textual and manuscript level, in the multiplication of variant recipes, and the inclusion of variants within individual recipes – a phenomenon which recurs in

1452 Ibid., pp.77-91.
1453 ibid.,pp.52-82.
the alchemical papyri. Thus, we can say that, implicitly, not all rituals of apparition were equal: some were inherently efficacious, some were less efficacious, and some, perhaps were simply not efficacious, and the only way to discover which was which was by attempting, and thus testing them.

The second possibility is that the ritual might fail not to the ritual instructions, but instead due to inadequacies of the ritualist, or its performance. This might be due to failure of the ritual protocols, in particular, perhaps, ritual purity: as PDM 14.515 warns “if you do not purify it, it will not succeed.” The variety of prescriptions for ritual purity – in terms of length of time, food, and sexual taboos – seems to have been broad enough that many ritualists might have conceivably failed to meet the purity requirements in any instance of a performance, although this fact might only have been realised in retrospect. Likewise, multiple, contradictory lists of required materia are often present in recipes, and the problem of special names for ingredients might pose further problems – does a reference to human bile refer to actual bile, or instead to turnip sap? Either possibility might turn out to be mistaken in the case of a failed ritual, and this point applied to complex recipes in the magical papyri in general – the specificity they demand constantly raises the problem that their instructions might not be carried out with precision. Then the performance itself might be subject to various infelicities – the failure of the ritualist to carry out the procedures in the correct sequence, or the correct manner, or even with sufficient fluency: what might happen if they or an accomplice dropped or fumbled materia, or had to pause to consult a formulary? The clearest suggestions of these are found in the paradoxical

\[ w=f-hpr \mtw=k \tm \tiy \ w'h \ r.r=f \ bw-lr=f \ hpr. \]

\[ PGM 12.424 \text{ tells us that human bile (χολὴ ἀνθρώπου) should be understood as turnip sap (βύνεως χυλός); the surrounding table (ll.401-444) provides numerous other examples of such interpretations; for a discussion of these see LiDonnici, “Recipe Ingredients in Greco-Roman Magical Materials” and “Single-Stemmed Wormwood, Pinecones and Myrrh: Expense and Availability of Recipe Ingredients in the Greek Magical Papyri,” Kernos 14 (2001).} \]

\[ An \text{ alternative, and perhaps complimentary, idea has been raised in a recent study of traditional private rituals in Brazil known as simpatias, which found that more complex rituals – those with a greater number of steps, more specificity, and greater repetition – were evaluated as more effective. If this finding can be generalised as a principle of human psychology, it may provide an explanation for why certain rituals – such as those in the Graeco-Egyptian magical tradition – tend to display these features cross-culturally; Cristine H. Legare and André L. Souza, “Evaluating ritual efficacy: Evidence from the supernatural,” Cognition 124 (2012).} \]
treatment of *onomata*, sacred names whose correct pronunciation was crucial to the ritual – as shown by the use of Old Coptic glosses in the Demotic papyri, and instructions to pronounce the sounds with particular vocal qualities in the Greek\textsuperscript{1457} – and yet which were clearly corrupted through the copying process, as shown by the imperfection of near-palindromes,\textsuperscript{1458} and the fact that some of these *onomata* do not have the number of letters claimed by the counts following their names.\textsuperscript{1459} If these errors could be introduced in the presumably more careful process of textual transmission, how many more could happen in a dynamic, and highly-emotionally charged, performance?

The final possibility was that the ritual itself was efficacious, and was being carried out correctly, but that the invoked deity was unwilling to come, and resisted the ritualist’s summons.\textsuperscript{1460} This is implied by the presence in invocations of Arguments (see 4.2.1); sections in which the ritualist gives the credentials which would make the difference between the deity ignoring and heeding their call. The very presence of these sections implies that the ritualist’s authority might be insufficient. But more explicit are the compulsive procedures themselves, whose existence is a testament to the fact that rituals often failed due to the deity’s refusal to cooperate. Frequently ritualists may try to circumvent this possibility by invoking still higher deities, who might force a lower deity to come regardless of their willingness, but this could, in the final assessment, merely move the problem a step higher in the divine ladder.

These explanations, and other, similar problems, could be used to explain the failure of any particular ritual to produce a subjectively satisfying apparition, but a second problem might arise if the consultation did take place, but the information given by

\textsuperscript{1457} For a discussion of this see 4.2.1.2.
\textsuperscript{1458} For example at PGM 1.293: ζεμιναεβαρκεδεβεβαβενεμε; PGM 4.1789: οξαροχαραρι; PGM 7.584-586: ιεεμβεβενε/μουνοθικερικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικικι�

\textsuperscript{1459} This occurs in PGM 4.385-1989, where a 100-letter name only has 98 letters, and PGM 4.3214, where an 18 letter name has only 17 letters. In general, this phenomenon is surprisingly rare, however: of the 18 instances in 6 papyri (PGM 1, 4, 5, 7, 8 & 13) I was able to find in the PGM corpus where letter counts follow *onomata* these were the only two where the counts were clearly incorrect.

\textsuperscript{1460} Compare *Chaldaean Oracles* fragments 221 & 223; in the former Hekate asks why she has been called through god-compelling necessity (θειοδαμοίς ἀνάγκαις), while the second refers to the “dragging of unwilling [deities]” (τοὺς ... ἐρύων ἀέκοντας).
the deity turned out to be either incorrect, or unsatisfactory. While we might conceive of this being a common problem with attempts to discern the future, as discussed above (3.2.3.1) questions about the future were only one, and perhaps not the most common, category of questions. More often, individuals in the ancient world would ask for help choosing between multiple options for a required problem, and in this instance the option selected by the god could be interpreted to be the better one. Regardless of how bad the outcome might be, the alternative could still be worse.

But even in cases where more concrete information was given, but turned out to be incorrect, the problem might be not with the deity, but rather with the ritualist. A common theme in Greek and Egyptian literature is the need to interpret ambiguous oracles, a concern which is very much apparent in the writings of Hor, the Ptolemaic priest whose dream oracles form a close parallel to the magical rituals of apparition.\footnote{See text 12 r ll.6-7, where he discusses a dream with a priest (w$hb$) called $Bn$-iw=$w$-sqm, and text 17a ll.3-10 in which he consults with four lector-priests ($b$-$rb$); vaguer, but similarly suggestive is Hor's mention of the priest (w$hb$) of the chapel of Imhotep in text 11.4.}

Again, an incorrect interpretation would only be revealed after it had been disconfirmed, and at this stage the ritualist might be able to reinterpret it to better fit the situation.

Yet another possibility was that a medium used to consult the god could have been at fault. As we have seen, the authors of the magical papyri were aware that not all boys were suitable as mediums, and yet the possibility remained that they might attempt to fake trances. Again, the recipes in the magical papyri imply an awareness of this: in one instance the medium be asked to describe the deity, and the recipe specifies that he is to be understood as telling the truth only if his description matches that provided by the text.\footnote{PGM 5.36-41. Hopfner (Hopfner, Griechische-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber, §157) suggests that this is to ensure that the deity is the correct one summoned (that is, not an ἀντίθεος), but the text says that if the conditions are met this proves that “the boy speaks truly” (ἁληθεύει ὁ παῖς), so that this interpretation cannot be supported. Compare Lane’s description of his consultation of a magician in the 18zos, in which he asks the boy-medium to describe various figures with whom he is apparently unfamiliar, including Lord Nelson, and he is able to describe them to Lane’s satisfaction (Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, pp.372-374).}
An even starker possibility was that the deity might not tell the truth; I am not aware of any instances where this is stated explicitly, but it is implicit in the numerous exhortations to the deity to speak truthfully in consultations, and Proclus admits that the gods might at times lie, rationalising that this is because those who invoke them are not always worthy of receiving the truth.\textsuperscript{1463} Related, but perhaps more sinister, is the possibility that the deity who appeared might not be the one the ritualist had summoned. Arnobius and Iamblichus both attest to a discourse among the practitioners of apparition rituals that a class of spirits known as \textit{antitheoi} might at times come instead of the invoked deity, and that these inherently evil beings would interfere with the process of a consultation.\textsuperscript{1464} While the magical papyri are largely silent on this possibility, there is a single reference in a dream oracle in PGM 7, in which the invoked deity is asked to send the true Asklepios, and not an “\textit{antitheos deceit-daimōn}”.\textsuperscript{1465} Iamblichus argues that the presence of \textit{antitheoi} was a consequence of moral and ritual failure on the part of the ritualist of the sort described above, and yet, even if his explanation was the accepted one rather than a rationalisation intended to free true theurgists from the uncertainties introduced by these daimōns, the presence of an \textit{antitheoi} might only be apparent after the ritual was over, and the information given by the deity was discovered to be unsatisfactory.

As I hope I have demonstrated, there were therefore multiple ways for practitioners to

\textsuperscript{1463} Proclus, \textit{In Platonis rem publicam commentarii} 1.37.15-20, 1.40.15-1.41.2.

\textsuperscript{1464} As Clarke points out, \textit{antitheoi} was originally a Homeric epithet meaning “equal to the gods”, but later came to refer to a class of beings which masqueraded as, but were opposed to, the gods (Clarke, Dillon, and Hershbell, \textit{Iamblichus: De mysteriis}, p.199 fn.244); compare \textit{antichristos} in, for example, the Epistle of John 2.18, 4.3 7.3. Iamblichus has a discussion of the \textit{antitheoi} in \textit{De Mysteriis} 3.31, introducing it as an “account [he] heard from Chaldaean prophets” (λόγον ἐν ποτὲ ἡκούσα, Χαλδαίων ποτὲ προφητῶν λεγόντων, 3.31.5-6). Arnobius (\textit{Adversus Nationes} 4.12) too claims that the magi say that “in their incantations \textit{antitheoi} then steal in instead of those invoked… who pretend that they are gods, and delude the ignorant with their lies and deceits” (\textit{suis in acquisitionibus… antitheos saepius obrepre pro accisis… qui deos se fingant nesciosque mendacius et simulationibus ludant}). See also Franz Cumont, \textit{Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism} (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1911), pp.152 &266 n.30, who suggests Zoroastrian influence on the concept of \textit{antitheoi}; and Hopfner, \textit{Griechische-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszaubers}, vol.1 §782-784.

\textsuperscript{1465} ll.635-636: τὸν ἀληθινὸν Ἀσκληπιὸν δίχα τινὸς \textit{antitheos} πλανοδαίμονος; see Hopfner (\textit{Griechische-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszaubers}, vol.2 §14). Morton Smith (\textit{Betz, Greek Magical Papyri}, p.136 fn.109) understand this “true” Asklepios to be the Egyptian Imhotep rather than the \textit{antitheos} Greek deity, but this seems to me an unnecessary inference.
understand failures of rituals of apparition, each of which implied solutions—more careful performance, further experimentation—without discrediting the system as a whole. This system was, we must remember, buttressed not only by the implicit authority of the texts and those from whom the practitioners would have received them, but broader societal ideas about how the natural, human, and divine spheres interacted, and of course, the type of low-level preternatural experiences which I have suggested are a more-or-less constant feature of human societies. In fact, anthropologists who work in communities where individuals claim superhuman powers often observe that their rituals seem to fail more often than they succeed, but they also note that suitably dramatic successes are required only occasionally to provide proof that the system is inherently functional.1466

3.3.3 Experience and memory

As the preceding sections have demonstrated, the recipes for rituals of apparition could have resulted in subjectively real and powerful experiences for those who practiced them, and even when this did not happen, a rhetorical schema was in place which could render failure comprehensible. But, as implied above, the subtle reality of some encounters may well have been at odds with the kind of dramatic epiphanies the recipes, and literary parallels, might lead us to expect. The purpose of this section is to first describe the apparitions mentioned in the papyri,1467 and then to look at how the role of cultural discourses in the construction of memories might help to explain the gap between experienced and ideal rituals of apparition, through a close reading of the

1466 Wade Davis, the anthropologist and author of Serpent and the Rainbow (Simon & Schuster, 1985 [2010]), probably one of the few ethnobotanical works to have a horror movie based on it, makes this point well in his response to critiques of his hypothesis: “it is only when the bokor [Haitian ritual expert] succeeds that his machinations become apparent – only when he causes others to believe the victim is dead and then revived. Once success in dozens of attempts would be sufficient to support the cultural belief in the zombie phenomenon” (“Zombification,” Science 240, no. 4860 (1988), p.1715).

texts from the archive of Hor.

As has already been mentioned, the apparitions of deities in the magical papyri is often preceded by the evocation of light, a process known as φωταγωγία, and possibly linked to the perceptual phenomena associated with sustained attention on an object.

The descriptions of light-bringing are associated almost without exception with lamp and vessel divination procedures, although in one instance the sun is the medium of apparition; the process may take place in rituals both with and without mediums. As the name would imply, the medium of apparition – the lamp, the vessel, or the sun – is filled with light, which increases as the process continues; the light is sometimes understood as entering the medium from without. The light is often described as a sort of gate-way to another realm – heaven, the abyss, the underworld, an idealised temple – which is revealed by the medium of apparition opening up.

Iamblichus, in his discussion of the process says that the light comes from a celestial body or the aether (that is, the luminous air above the moon), and is channelled through the medium.

Among the examples I have found where light-bringing procedures are mentioned most clearly:


PDM 4.965-967: “...come into this fire and fill it with a divine spirit” (εἴσελθε ἐν τῷ πυρὶ τοῦτοῦ/ καὶ ἐν πνεύματος εὐτὸν δόξας/ ματός); PDM 62.30-31: “...let the holy light come forth from the limitless into the abyss” (προελθέτω τῷ ιερῷ φῶς/ ἐκ τοῦ ἄπειρου εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον).

De Mysteriis 3.14.48-55 “...this light is from without and alone achieves all its effects serving the will and intelligence of the gods, the greatest light has a sacred brightness which, either shining from above
a volume of space – width, breadth, height – serving as the stage within which the apparition may take place.\textsuperscript{1473}

As a corollary to the presence of light, the ritualist may ask darkness to go away,\textsuperscript{1474} but other texts tell us that the light-bringing itself might also bring darkness.\textsuperscript{1475} Iamblichus is aware of this contradictory aspect of the practice, and suggests it may be due to a general principle that opposites are linked to one another;\textsuperscript{1476} nonetheless, one ritual contains a formula intended to retain the light to prevent it disappearing with the arrival of the darkness.\textsuperscript{1477}

The final stage of this first part of the apparition occurs when the deity or deities appear within the light.\textsuperscript{1478} This may be understood as the deity entering the space of

in the aether, or from the air, or moon or sun, or any other heavenly sphere, appears apart from all these things to be such a mode of divination that is autonomous, primordial, and worthy of the gods” (πᾶντα τὸ δὲ ἄνωθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰθέρος τὸ δ' ἐξ ἀέρος ἢ σελήνης ἢ καὶ ἡλίου καταλάμπον ἢ ἄλλης τινος οὐρανίας σφαίρας, φαίνεται ἐκ πάντων τούτων αὐτεξόδος καὶ πρωτουργός καὶ τῶν θεῶν ἐπάξιος ὅ τοιοῦτος ἄν τρόπος τῆς μαντείας).

\textsuperscript{1473} PGM 4.970-971: “Let there be light, breadth, depth, length, height, brightness” (γενέσθω φῶς πλάτος, βάθος, μήκος, ψύχών, φως, αὐγή); PGM 4.978: “let there be breadth, depth, length, height, light”;

\textsuperscript{1474} PDM 14.32: “Oh darkness, remove yourself from before him” (π' ἀπορρίψεις αὐτήν τήν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τῷ θεῷ); PDM 14.536-537: “May the darkness depart! Bring the light to me for my vessel-inquiry!” (my Sm n=f p' k' kē r. l. n y p' wyn n=y r-hn r p'y=(y) šn-hne); PDM 14.855: “Say, 'May the darkness depart from me! Come to me, oh light!'” (dd my-sm n=k p' kē r. l. n y p' wyn);

\textsuperscript{1475} PGM 4.974-975: “[Formula for] retention of the light, spoken once, so that the light-bringing will remain with you” (κάτω οὖν ἔξωθεν τέ ἐστιν αὐτή καὶ μόνη τῇ βουλήσει καὶ νοήσει τῶν θεῶν ὑπηρετοῦντα κέκτηται τὰ πάντα, τὸ δὲ μέγιστον φῶς ἔχει ἵππον καταυγάζον, τὸ μὲν ἄνωθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰθέρος τὸ δ' ἐξ ἀέρος ἢ σελήνης ἢ καὶ ἡλίου καταλάμπον ἢ ἄλλης τινος οὐρανίας σφαίρας, φαίνεται ἐκ πάντων τούτων αὐτεξόδος καὶ πρωτουργός καὶ τῶν θεῶν ἐπάξιος ὅ τοιοῦτος ἄν τρόπος τῆς μαντείας).

\textsuperscript{1476} De Mysteriis 3.14.26-30: “Since, however, either the contrary is receptive of its contrary by change and movement outward from itself... in virtue of these principles, those which draw down the light sometimes take darkness as an ally” (Εἰπεί δὲ καὶ ἢ τὸ ἐναντίον δεκτικόν ἐστι τοῦ ἐναντίου κατὰ μεταβολήν καὶ ἐκταται αὐτῷ ἐναντίον... διὰ ταύτα δὲ εἰκότως τὸ πονείτως συνεργὸν λαμβάνουσιν οἱ φωταγωγοῦντες...).

\textsuperscript{1477} PGM 4.974-975: “[Formula for] retention of the light, spoken once, so that the light-bringing will remain with you” (κάτω οὖν ἔξωθεν τέ ἐστιν αὐτή καὶ μόνη τῇ βουλήσει καὶ νοήσει τῶν θεῶν ὑπηρετοῦντα κέκτηται τὰ πάντα, τὸ δὲ μέγιστον φῶς ἔχει ἵππον καταυγάζον, τὸ μὲν ἄνωθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰθέρος τὸ δ' ἐξ ἀέρος ἢ σελήνης ἢ καὶ ἡλίου καταλάμπον ἢ ἄλλης τινος οὐρανίας σφαίρας, φαίνεται ἐκ πάντων τούτων αὐτεξόδος καὶ πρωτουργός καὶ τῶν θεῶν ἐπάξιος ὅ τοιοῦτος ἄν τρόπος τῆς μαντείας).

\textsuperscript{1478} See for example PGM 7.575: “[the boy medium says:] ‘I see your lord in the light’” (…ὁ ωρὼν κύριόν σου ἐν τῷ φωτί); PDM 14.484: “...he [the boy medium] says to you ‘I see the light in the flame of the lamp’” (w=f dd n=k tw=y nw r p' wyn hν t.i st.t n p' hbs).
the light,\textsuperscript{1479} or shining through it,\textsuperscript{1480} or taking form within the light;\textsuperscript{1481} Damascius describes an apparition where the latter takes place,\textsuperscript{1482} while Iamblichus\textsuperscript{1483} and Proclus\textsuperscript{1484} more specifically tell us that the light either illuminates or is itself the luminous vehicle for the essentially invisible divine form.

The apparition itself might have other effects; in one of the recensions of the \textit{Ogdoad of Moses} the lamps are said to burn more fiercely when the deity enters.\textsuperscript{1485} Again, Iamblichus mentions this as a feature of divine apparitions: in his conception higher deities – the gods – will cause sacrificial fires to burn more quickly, as they loosen the bonds of matter, while lower deities – heroes and daimōns – have a less pronounced effect.\textsuperscript{1486} The \textit{Chaldaean Oracles} seem to imply that during the apparitions of Hekate the epiphany would be preceded by an upheaval of the cosmos as the boundaries between the mortal and immortal spheres were breached:\textsuperscript{1487} the celestial bodies would disappear, perhaps in a parallel to the darkness caused by light-bringing, and

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{1479} PDM 14.43: "He [the boy medium] says, "Anubis is coming in" (\textit{mtw=f} \textit{gd r.inp} \textit{ly r-hn}); PDM 14.30-31: "The one who is outside, come in!" (\textit{p'i nty n-hnr/ r.im r-hn}); PDM 14.546-547: "Say it [the invocation] 9 times, until the light becomes great and Anubis comes in[to the vessel]" (\textit{ir=f-k qdl.\textit{f}n sp 9 / 8-mtw p'i wyn "wlf wj mtw r.inp ly'r-hn}).
\item \textsuperscript{1480} PGM 4.971: "Let the one inside shine through" (\textit{διαλαμψάτω ὁ ἔσωθεν}).
\item \textsuperscript{1481} PGM 7.563-564: "…may he take form in immortal and uncorrupted light" (…\textit{τυπώσηται τὸ ἀθάνατον/μορφὴν ἐν φωτὶ κραταιῷ καὶ ἀφθάρτῳ}); for this translation see Dodds, \textit{The Greeks and the Irrational}., p.299.
\item \textsuperscript{1482} Vita Isidori (ap Photium, Bibl. Codd. 181, 242) fragment 105: The mass of light on the wall seemed to condense and take on the shape of a face that was truly divine and supernatural and which gloried in a grace that was not sweet but severe; a face that was nevertheless very beautiful to behold and which for all its severity displayed no less of gentleness." (ὁ δ' ἐν τῷ τοίχῳ τοῦ φωτὸς φανεὶς ὄγκος οἷον παγεὶς εἰς πρόσωπον διεμορφοῦτο, πρόσωπον ἀτεχνῶς θεσπέσιον δή τι καὶ ύπερφυές, οὐ γλυκείαις χάρισιν ἀλλὰ βλοσυραῖς ἀγαλλόμενον, κάλλιστον δ' ὧν καὶ οὐδὲν ἦτον ἐπὶ τῷ βλαστρῷ τὸ ἡπτιον ἐπιδεικνύμενον).
\item \textsuperscript{1483} De Mysteriis 3.14.9-12: "This [light-bringing] somehow illuminates the aether-like and luminous vehicle surrounding the [deity’s] soul from which the vehicle the divine appearances, set in motion by the gods’ will, take possession of the imaginative power in us..." (Ἀυτῆ δή που τὸ περικείμενον τῇ ψυχῇ αἰθερῶδες καὶ αὐγοειδὲς ὄχημα ἐπιλάμπει θείω φωτὶ, ἐξ ὧν δὴ φαντασία θείαι καταλαμβάνουσι τὴν ἐν ἑκάτην φανταστικὴν δύναμιν...).
\item \textsuperscript{1484} In \textit{Platonis rem publicam commentarii}, 1.39.9-10: "they [those who see the gods] see by means of the luminous vestments of the [gods’] souls" (…..ἐφάται τοῖς αὐγοειδέσι τῶν ψυχῶν περιβλήμασιν.).
\item \textsuperscript{1485} PGM 13.1-343: "…for when the god cometh [the lamps] will burn more fiercely" (εἰσελθόντος γὰρ τοῦ ἵππου περισσότερον ἐξαφθήσοντα, ll.12-13).
\item \textsuperscript{1486} An important means of identification for you should lie in the mode of the consumption of matter: it is used all at once in the case of the gods. In the case of the archangels there is consumption of it over a short period, while in the case of angels there is a process of dissolution and absorption of it. In the case of daemons there is a harmonious organisation of it. In the case, again, of heroes, one notes adaptation to it in suitable proportions, and a clever managing of it." (\textit{De Mysteriis} 2.5); compare 5.11-12, where he describes his theory of the role of matter in sacrifice more generally.
\item \textsuperscript{1487} On this point see the discussion in Johnston, \textit{Hekate Soteira}., pp.115-119.
\end{enumerate}
the earth would quake. There is little sense of this in the magical papyri, although one text does refer to the deity shaking the earth as he comes.

Even where the light-bringing is not described, the apparition may be described as fiery or luminous: three texts seem to describe the initial form of the deity as that of a star. Texts outside the magical papyri are more explicit here, with Hippolytus envisaging the apparitions as fiery apparitions in the sky or on walls, Damascius provides an example of the latter. The *Chaldaean Oracles* describe the apparitions...
of Hekate as formless, swift-moving fire, and those of subordinate deities as brilliant mounted children; Proclus tells us that these luminous apparitions could be either formed, or remain formless,\textsuperscript{1494} and in general the Neoplatonist theurgists seem to have believed that the formless apparitions are more trustworthy.\textsuperscript{1495} Iamblichus, again keen to systematise, stresses the variability of the luminous forms.\textsuperscript{1496} Higher deities are larger, more stable, and brighter, while the lower deities are smaller, constantly shifting, and darker, so that while the gods are brighter than light itself, the apparitions of \textit{daimōns} “glow with clouded fire”, and those of dead souls are shadowy.\textsuperscript{1497}

This last point is interesting, since several texts most in PGM 7\textsuperscript{1498} and PDM 14,\textsuperscript{1499} imply that the deity’s apparition is itself shadowy. It may be described as a shadow, a dark-coloured boy, or the darkness caused by light-bringing. As already mentioned, one text in PGM 13 seems to understand a dark or gloomy countenance as an ill-portent for the ritualist’s fate,\textsuperscript{1500} but neither this, nor the idea that shadowy

\[\text{πρόσωπον διεμορφοῦτο, πρόσωπον ἀτεχνῶς θεσπέσιον δὴ τι καὶ ὑπερφυές, οὐ γλυκείαις χάρισιν ἀλλὰ βλοσυραῖς ἀγαλλόμενον, κάλλιστον δ’ ὧν καὶ οὐδὲν ἦτον ἐπὶ τῷ βλοσυρῷ τό ἦτον ἐπιδεικνύμενον.}\]

\[\text{1494 In Platonis rem publicam commentarii 1.37.9-11: “…the autophanies of the gods occur, sometimes appearing in unformed light, sometimes formed” (…αἱ αὐτοφάνειαι τῶν θεῶν ἐγένεται, ὡσοις τῷ φῶντα, ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπερφυίῳ τῷ τοῦ ἐπιδεικτοῦ.),}\]

\[\text{1495 For this point, and a more general discussion, see Dodds, The Greeks and the Irrational, p.299.}\]

\[\text{1496 De Mysteriis 2.4-52: “…while the images of souls appear shadowy... the images of gods flash brighter than light... but daimōns glow with clouded fire”... (…) τὰ δὲ τῶν ψυχῶν σκιοειδῆ καταφαίνεται... Τὰ μὲν τῶν θεῶν ἀγάλματα φωτὸς πλέον ἀστράπτει... Δαιμόνες δὲ θολῶδες διαφαίνουσι τὸ πῦρ).}\]

\[\text{1497 In PGM 7.846-861 the ritualist is said to see a shadow (σκιά) appear both in the sun (L854) and in front of them (L855-856), which they are to question; there is no statement of the deity’s identity, although the fact that the ritual takes place around midday, that the deity appears first in the sun, and that the ritualist wears a cat tail (a solar animal) suggests it to be a solar deity. PGM 7.348-358 describes a “dark-skinned boy” (παιδίον μελάνχρουν, 350) who appears to the boy medium.}\]

\[\text{1498 In PDM 14.150-231 the texts says that the medium will see the “shadow of a god by the lamp” (τι ὑβ τὸ τριτὶ ἀναφέρεται... Πρὸς τὸ πταιμένον τούτου φῶς).}\]

\[\text{1499 In PDM 14.1110-1129 the text promises that the ritualist will see “the shadow of every god and every goddess” (τι ὑβ τὸ τριτὶ ἀναφέρεται... Πρὸς τὸ πταιμένον τούτου φῶς, 1117) – the deities whose shadows are to be seen seem to be “the great gods who appear with the sun” (τι ὑβ τὸ τριτὶ ἀναφέρεται... Πρὸς τὸ πταιμένον τούτου φῶς, 1128), presumably the Ennead or the crew of the solar barque.}\]

\[\text{1500 PGM 13.259-260: ἐὰν δὲ σκυθρωπάτος φανή.}\]
apparitions are those of lower deities, is borne out by the evidence as a whole;\textsuperscript{1504} in fact the shadowy deities seem to generally be understood as the manifestations of solar or lunar deities.

In several instances the deity may appear in a more definite form derived from the iconography of traditional Egyptian or Hellenic cults;\textsuperscript{1504} one text describes the sun god seated on a lotus, carrying a flail,\textsuperscript{1505} while two more describe snake-\textsuperscript{1504} or lion-headed\textsuperscript{1505} deities, presumably imagined as resembling the therianthropomorphomorphic hybrids of Egyptian art. Kronos is described as carrying a sickle and bound by chains,\textsuperscript{1506} while Nephthys is described as a beautiful woman, riding a donkey as a nod to her relationship with the god Seth.\textsuperscript{1507} Again, the description of child-deities in the \textit{Chaldaean Oracles} fits this pattern, with the naked child perhaps referring to infant sun-gods like Harpocrates, and the gold-armoured rider reminiscent of Mithras and other divine horsemen.\textsuperscript{1508} In some instances, the deities come with attendants, who carry their seats;\textsuperscript{1509} Iamblichus notes in his discussion that higher deities are often accompanied by lower divinities.\textsuperscript{1510}

In other cases the deities are described as coming in the form of a human, usually a

\textsuperscript{1504} Compare PGM 3.612-632, a ritual where the ritualist’s own shadow is summoned to appear and serve the ritualist as a \textit{paredros}; this may also be the purpose of the mysterious recipe in PDM 14.115 titled “a tested formula for the security of shadows” (\textit{[r] \(n \ w\)l / h\(b\) \(l\w=f\ \(d\)\(n\)t\)}).

\textsuperscript{1505} Artemidorus (\textit{Oneirocriticon} 2.35, 40) notes that it is good luck to see the gods in their normal iconographic forms in dreams.

\textsuperscript{1506} PGM 4.930-1114.

\textsuperscript{1507} PGM 4.930-1114.

\textsuperscript{1508} PGM 4.3086-3124.

\textsuperscript{1509} PDM 11a.1-40.

\textsuperscript{1510} \textit{Chaldaean Oracles} fragment 146. For a discussion of this iconography see Johnston, “Riders in the Sky: Cavalier Gods and Theurgic Salvation in the Second Century A.D”.

\textsuperscript{1504} In PGM 4.930-1114 the deity comes on a lotus carried by two angels, while in PGM 5.1-52 the deity is carried on a throne by four men, and preceded by a censer.

\textsuperscript{1505} De Mysteriis II.7.1-6: “and in the visions we get a demonstration of the order which those we see maintain, the gods having gods or archangels about themselves, the archangels summoning accompanying angels, which are either arranged around them or otherwise being accompanied by many angels protecting them” (καὶ μὴν τῆς γε τάξεως, ἢν οἱ ὁρώμενοι ἔχουσι, γίνεται ἐν ταῖς ἀστροφίαις ἐπιθέσεις, τῶν μὲν θεῶν θεοὺς ἢ ἀγγέλους ἐχόντων περὶ ἑαυτούς, τῶν δ’ ἀρχαγγέλων προπομποὺς ἀγγέλους ἢ σὸν ἑαυτοὺς συντεταγμένους ἢ κατόπιν ἐπομένους ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ δορυφορίαν πολλὴν ἀγγέλων περὶ ἑαυτούς παραβαλλομένων).
priest, but in one instance a soldier (gōlósyrō, PDM 14.235), and in another in the form of a friend. This phenomenon – deities appearing in human form – is noted by Artemidorus in his Oneirocriticon, and of course has a long history in Hellenic literature. More specifically, he notes the connection between gods and priests, and Hor of Sebennytos records several real dreams in which gods appear in the form of priests.

An interesting, if somewhat vague, description of the appearances of deities occurs in PDM 14, where the god is often described as appearing in his sšt. This word originally meant something like "secret form", but was also the name of one of the cult statues kept in the temples, as well as the cosmic manifestations of the gods (as

---

1511 See for example PDM 14.93-114, where the deity appears "in the likeness of a priest wearing clothes of byssus on his back, and sandals" (p'i smte n w w'b lw=f t'y hbs n šš-n-nsw hr-lt. =f lw =f tij...<tbyt> r rd.wj=ʃt, 199), and PDM 14.232-238, where the deity appears "a priest...a man of the temple" (w'b / ... rmt-h.t-ntr.t t, 234-235).

1512 PGM 7.795-845: "he enters in the form of your friend whom you recognise" (σύνως ἐν φίλου σου σε γνωρίζεις σχήματι εἰσέρχεται, ll.798-799).

1513 See for example Oneirocriticon 2.44.5-6: "the gods appear in the shape and form of humans, because we have commonly deemed them to resemble us in form (Φαίνονται δὲ οἱ θεοὶ ἐν ἀνθρώπων ἰδέᾳ τε καὶ μορφῇ, ἐπειδὴ νενομίκαμεν αὐτοὺς τὰ εἴδη ἡμῖν ἐοικέναι).

1514 In Oneirocriticon 2.69 and 3.13 he states that priests carry the same respect among men as do the gods, and in 3.13 he further states that a man who dreams he has become a god will become a priest or prophet.

1515 In PDM 14.117-149 tells the ritualist that they will "see a sšt of the god standing by the lamp" (ḥr nw=k r w sšt-n-ntr lw=fšt n p'i-bnr-n p'i hbs, 147), while PDM 14.701-705 promises that they will "see the sšt of the god in the sound-eye [the moon]" (ḥr nw=k r p'i sšt n p'i ntr ḫn t' ti wḏš t, 701). PDM 14.232-238 asks the god to come in "your form of a priest, in your sšt of a man of the temple" (n p'y=k ḫbr n w'b / n p'y=k sšt n rmt-h.t-ntr.t t, 234-235). PDM 239-295 asks the deities to come in their ba-souls and their sšt-forms (nhs Ṽy=w by Ṽy=w sšt n n' rî:w n p'y=(y) ḫn, 263; nhse Ṽy=w by /ṛm| Ṽy=w sšt, 964; anḥf Ṽy=t'n by p'y=t'n sšt n' Ṽj | r n' rî:w n p'y=(y) ḫbs) this same text suggests the meaning of something like "iconographic form" for sšt, saying that the sšt of Khonsu is a scarab with the head of a ram, and the tail of a falcon, who wears two panther skins (mḥbr n hr n sr iw Ṽd=f n bk lw bs 2 ḫr-ʃ-f, 247).

1516 The Wörterbuch (s.v. sšt, WB 4.299) defines it as "form (of a God)"(Gestalt eines Gottes), derived from sšt (WB 4.298-299) "secret" (Geheimnis), which in turn seems to be a nominalised form of the verb sšti ("to make something secret"). The causative of sšti ("to be secret"). Wilson (A Ptolemaic Lexicon, p.934) defines it as "(secret) image", with the extended senses of "form, body". The CDD (s.455-456) defines it as "(secret) image, form", and notes its occurrence in P.BM.19588 and PDM 14.234-235 in parallel to ḫbr (=hrb, "form"), whose Coptic writing, ʿp两天 (Crum 701b) is used to translate the Greek εἶδος, ὁμοίωμα, and μορφωσις. For discussions of the writing of sšt(i) in Demotic texts see Mark Smith, "The Hieratic Group sšt3," Serapis 6 (1980), and "Two further instances of hieratic writings of sšt(i) (secret) image, form", in demotic texts," Enchoria 12(1984).

1517 See, for example, Edfu 7.2.129.16-130.2: "your sanctuary is pure and contains your great sšt of Behdety" (šš-t k m ḫbr m sšt=k wr ḫldt), and BM 57371 34: "he caused the sšt of Isis, the great goddess, to appear for eternity in qetem-gold" (tw=f ḫ' p'i sšt n is.t t' ntr.t t' t nil ḫp n nb nfr n [ktn]).
celestial bodies), their iconographic forms (in particular the scarab beetles), and ultimately their assumed forms more generally. The fact that the term appears unmodified in PDM 14 implies that something like the iconographic form of the deity is intended in these cases; this is also the form of the deities Thoth and Osiris encountered in dreams and in the underworld itself by characters in Setna II.

The position of the god varies between rituals: in some texts the deity is described simply as "beyond" the ritualist, while in dream oracles the deity is generally understood as standing by the ritualist, in the traditional manner of a dream vision. In other texts the deity may appear beside, or within the medium of apparition – the sun, the moon, the flame of the lamp, or the vessel – perhaps within the

---

1518 See, for example, plLeiden T 31 (BD t68) “rise up, oh one whose hidden sSt [that is, the night sun] lights the Duat” (tx tw imm sSt sjh d: t m st✈ t ir.t=ɛf) and Edfu 7.2 11.11-12: Khonsu being protected in the House of the Falcons in his sSt# of the moon” (wnn hsw hwti th iht ht-bik m sSt=ɛf n w-lib-kd).

1519 See for example Edfu 7.246.7-8: "you watch over their cult images in your beautiful sSt of the scarab" (hr mkt ɛb.w=sn m sSt=k nfr n pi`; BM 10238 12-13: "the scarab, which is the sSt of Ra" (pi` mhr nty pi`/ sSt (n) pi`-ɛf); Myth of the Sun’s Eye 5.26-27: "the scarab, which is the sSt of Ra, the great god" (pi` / mwhrr nty-ɛw pi` sSt n pi`-ɛf pi` ntr-ɛf pi`).

1520 One of the most interesting examples of this is in PDM Suppl.4.101 -116, a dream-sending recipe in which the deity invokes Anubis to send a “breathing (?) spirit to NN so that he [the spirit] may stand before [him] in the image of the god who is great in his [the victim’s] heart” (yX =f snsn r t# mn mtw=f oHo n#y- /D#D//f n p# sSß n p# nTr nty o# n H#ß=f, ll.107-108). There is a clear parallel here to the dream sending ritual in Pakhrates’ Agōgē (PGM 4.2441-2621), in which the goddess is asked to become "like the god whom she [the victim] worships" (ὁμοιωθεῖσα ώς θ(ε)ῷ, 2501-2502). here the sSt can only be understood as an iconographically recognisable form of a particular deity.

1521 One of the most interesting examples of this is in PDM Suppl.4.101-116, a dream-sending recipe in which the deity invokes Anubis to send a “breathing (?) spirit to NN so that he [the spirit] may stand before [him] in the image of the god who is great in his [the victim’s] heart” (yX =f snsn r t# mn mtw=f oHo n#y- /D#D//f n p# sSß n p# nTr nty o# n H#ß=f, ll.107-108). There is a clear parallel here to the dream sending ritual in Pakhrates’ Agōgē (PGM 4.2441-2621), in which the goddess is asked to become "like the god whom she [the victim] worships" (ὁμοιωθεῖσα ώς θ(ε)ῷ, 2501-2502). here the sSt can only be understood as an iconographically recognisable form of a particular deity.

1522 Setna II 2.4”: “Seta saw the sSt of Osiris the great god seated on his throne of fine gold” (|.r stn¥ nw r pi` sSt n wsir pi` ntr-ɛf / hms=k hr pi`=f bhd n nb nfr); 5:40: “he [Horus Paneshi] saw himself in a dream in the night, the sSt of the great god Thoth speaking to him” (|.r=f pr¥ r.r=f (n) rsw¥ n p# [grj]h[t] n-rn=ɛf iw pi` sSt n pi` ntr-ɛf dhwy md irm=ɛf).

1523 For example PDM 14.805-840: "you will see the gods beyond you (hr nw=k r ní ntr.w n pi`=k ‘br’, ll.823, 834); PDM 14.875-885: “he [the boy medium] will see the gods beyond him” (hr nw=ɛf r ní ntr.w ‘n pi`=ɛf-brn’, II.880). “Beyond” is not quite satisfactory as a translation in English for bn r (Erichsen, Demotisches Glossar, p.118; CDD 54-58) and its Coptic equivalent ⲃⲱⲗ (Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, p.33b); the sense seems to be that the deity is external to, but in the vicinity of, the ritualist.

1524 In PDM 14.117-149 the ritualist will see "a form of the god standing by the lamp" (hr nw=k r wɛ sSt-n- ntr iw=ɛf ‘h’ n pi`=ɛf-bn r pi` hbs, 147); in PDM 14.150-231 the medium will see the “shadow of a god by the lamp” (ti hybw.t n pi` ntr n pi` kde n pi` hbs, 1515); PDM 14.805-840: “I have seen the gods near the lamp” (wh-w sw=ɛf nw n ní ntr.w iw=ɛf n pi` kde n pi` hbs, L155).

1525 In PDM 7.846-861: "you will see a shadow [the deity] in the sun" (δύο[ŋ] σκιὰν εν ἥλιοι, L854) – in this instance the deity then appears beside the ritualist.

1526 PDM 14.701-705: “you will see the form of the god in the sound-eye [the moon]” (hr nw=k r pi` sSt n pi` ntr bn tî ‘w’d: t, L1701)
summoned light that suffuses it. In several texts a throne is described as being prepared for the deity, and although the deity is never explicitly described as sitting on it, this is clearly implied by its presence.1529

In two Demotic bowl divination texts miniature scenes are described as playing out in front of the boy-seer: after emerging from the light-bringing Anubis prepares a feast within the vessel, which other gods enter and consume, before one of them is selected to carry out the consultation.1530 There are striking parallels here to the divination procedure recorded by Edward Lane, in which the boy seer, under the instructions of the modern Egyptian magician, has a “man” in the medium of apparition clear a space before preparing a tent, and the deity (“the sultan”) and his servants (“soldiers”) are served bull-meat and coffee before the consultation.1531

In rituals where the deity appears unmediated to the ritualist, even greater interaction between the ritualist and the deity may take place: the deity may threaten1532 or share a meal with the practitioner,1533 or they may exchange items, with the deity giving the ritualist an amulet to control a paredros,1534 or a drink,1535 or the ritualist giving the deity a sword to kill an enemy.1536 In one instance the ritualist is even instructed to

---

1527 For example in PDM 14.489-515, where the ritualist invokes the deity to “come into the middle of the flame” (r.| lm r.|n n l| t m t n  l| y st t, l.497).

1528 This is implicit in every instance of vessel divination, but most explicit in those texts where entire scenes are described taking place in the vessel, for example PDM 14.528-553.

1529 Thrones appear in PGM 1.262-37, PGM 2.64-184, PDM 14.93-114, and perhaps in PGM 5.1-52. A throne also appears in Thessalos’ description of the invocation of Asklepios in De Virtutis Herbarum, where it is said that the god “was about to sit [on it]” (ἐμέλλεν ὁ θεὸς καθέζεσθαι, 23).

1530 These occur in PDM 14.1-92 & 528-553; there is a parallel here to the scene of gods appearing in a faked vessel divination described in Hippolytus, Refutatio Omnium Haeresium 4.35.1-2, in which the onlookers see the magos’ accomplices dressed as gods in a hidden chamber visible through a hole in the bottom of the vessel.

1531 Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, pp.370-372.

1532 In PGM 4.52-85 the deity threatens the ritualist threatens the deity with weapons in order to try to have them release the beetle suspended above a flame as a compulsive act.

1533 This happens most clearly in PGM 1.42-195; in PGM 1.1-42 the ritualist eats with their paredros, but it is unclear if this is with the manifest deity, or the mummified falcon into which it has been summoned.

1534 This occurs in PGM 11.1-40.

1535 In PGM 7.727-739 Apollo comes with a cup (σπονδεῖον, ll.735-737), from which the ritualist may drink if they ask.

1536 This occurs in PGM 12.1-13.
compel the deity by standing on his toe. But in spite of the strange irreverence of this last possibility, the apparition is usually implied to be a frightening and awesome experience.

As this summary has no doubt demonstrated, the magical papyri and related literature, describe the apparitions of deities as vivid, unambiguous, and powerful experiences, and yet the evidence of modern psychology and anthropology suggests that encounters with the praeternatural are usually more ambivalent – a sense of presence, or an inner thought understood as the intrusive voice of an external being. It is in bridging this gap that the writings of Hor become useful.

Hor of Sebennytos was born c.200 BCE, and probably served as a pastophoros at Temenēsi in his early life. By the mid-170s he had relocated to the Memphite Serapeum, where he seems to have served as an oracle connected with the ibis cult. Despite, or perhaps due to, his position in the cult he seems to have regularly come into conflict with those higher in the cult hierarchy, who he refers to as the “mighty men” (nḫ rmṯ.w dṛy.w), as a result of which he began to draft a petition to the king and queen in the late 150s. It seems that as evidence of his reliability he intended to include documents relating to successful oracles he had pronounced during the wars with the Seleucids between 172 and 168, the unrest in the Thebaid during the 160s, and various judgements of Thoth he had recorded against the “mighty men”. Hor’s notes for this petition, as well, perhaps, as other miscellaneous documents, constitute his archive, a collection of slightly less than 70 ostraca written in Demotic and Greek, discovered in a small building near the entrance to the ibis mummy catacombs, which perhaps served as Hor’s residence.

1537 This occurs in PGM 4.930-114.
1538 See for example PGM 3.187-262, where the deity’s arrival causes the house to shake; PGM 4.52-85, where the deity threatens the ritualist, who is urged not to be disturbed (µῆ ς ταραχθῇς, 71); and PGM 4.3086-3124, where the deity is again urged not to be afraid when they hear Kronos’ heavy footsteps (॥ ῥιο στὸ βουλώντας ἷς, II.3092-3093). Compare Hippolytus, Refutatio Omnium Haeresium 4.35.4.4-6, 4.36.1.1-3, where those who see the fiery apparition of Hekate fall to their faces in reverent awe (see also the discussion of this in fn.1312).
1539 The primary publication of Hor’s archive, as well as the main source of analysis of his texts, is Ray, The Archive of Hor.; further texts and observations are published in J. D. Ray, "Observations on the
Hor’s oracular practice seems to have consisted exclusively of dream oracles, of a type close to that described in the later magical papyri. Where his archive enables us to go further than the magical papyri is in the numerous accounts he gives of real, rather than hypothetical, dreams, connected in texts to specific dates, as well as, at times, to specific places and invocations. Before analysing these accounts, however, it is worth setting up a taxonomy of dream types.

In the modern West a dream is archetypally understood as a series of events in which the dreamer takes part, which may contain bizarre, “dreamlike” content, but which can nonetheless be reconstructed as a more-or-less coherent narrative; I will refer to this model as an episodic dream. By contrast, in many other societies, including that of the ancient Mediterranean, a type of dream is often described in which the dreamer sees a single visitor, usually understood as a deity, standing by their bed and communicating with them; this type of dream I will call the epiphany dream. This is not the only type of dream recorded in ancient Mediterranean societies: both ostensibly real dreams, and the type of ideal dreams recorded in handbooks for interpretation also imply that something like episodic dreams would also have been

---

1540 The terminology I am using here is that of Harris (William V. Harris, Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2009), pp.23-24); other authors may use slightly different terminology – Dodds, for example, refers to this as the “Homeric dream” (The Greeks and the Irrational, pp.104-105), while Hanson prefers the term “dream vision” (“Dreams and Visions in the Graeco-Roman World and Early Christianity,” in Aufstieg und Neder II.23.2, ed. Wolfgang Haase (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co, 1980), pp.1410-1412).
1541 Again, the terminology here is drawn from Harris (Harris, Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity, pp.23-24);
familiar to individuals in these societies. But both the magical papyri, and the literary descriptions of dream oracles assume without exception that the dreamer will experience either an epiphany dream, or a third type of dream, the scene dream, this last consisting of a vision of divine actors interacting with one another, in which the dreamer is only an observer rather than a participant. As we have seen, epiphany dreams may be understood to some extent as a consequence of hypnagogic phenomena (3.3.1), but we have also seen that these cannot be reliably induced.

When we turn to the 30 or so ostraca in which Hor describes dreams, we find that his descriptions can be divided into five categories. The first two are already familiar to us: one text describes a clear scene dream, in which Isis is seen walking across the sea, and reaches Alexandria, before giving a pronouncement guaranteeing the safety of the ruling dynasty; six texts describe episodic dreams, in which Hor lives out scenes from his daily life in the Serapeum, interacting with gods who sometimes appear in the guise of cult officials. But the remaining three types are less familiar: several of his texts give the pronouncements of deities on various matters, usually introduced with the verb $\text{dd}$ (“NN god says”). The context for these is not given, so we might assume, for example, that they represent words spoken directly by the gods in epiphany dreams. Other texts, including the Greek drafts, simply give predictions, attributing the authority either to specific gods or more generally to “oracles”

1542 Of 95 verified dreams listed by Artemidorus in his Oneirocriticon Harris classes only four as clear epiphany dreams (ibid., p.28); Dodds ("Supernormal Phenomena in Classical Antiquity," in The Ancient Concept of Progress and other Essays on Greek Literature and Belief, ed. E.R. Dodds (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), p.178 n.1) counts nine, but Harris thinks he is being too generous. Egyptian dream-books, while less explicit, tend to imply episodic dreams in which the dreamer sees a number of objects and performs various actions; for a good overview of the evidence see Luigi Prada, "Classifying Dreams, Classifying the World: Ancient Egyptian Oneiromancy and Demotic Dream Books," in Current Research in Egyptology 2011. Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Symposium, ed. Heba Abd El Gawad, et al. (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2012). Most of the dreams recorded in the Sacred Tales of Aelius Aristides are of the epiphany type.

1543 The clearest instance of this is the Dream of Nectanebo, copied by Hor’s contemporary and co-inhabitant in the Serapeum, Apollonius, in which the eponymous king sees Isis speaking to Onuris.

1544 O.Hor 1.

1545 O.Hor 8, 9, 11, 13, 15 + 15a, add. 59.

1546 O.Hor 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 23, 25, 28.
Finally, one text, described by its editor, John Ray, as “the most obscure document even in the present archives”, contains a series of fragmentary descriptions of perhaps five dreams; these descriptions seem to include direct speech, some imperatives, and brief interpretations of the meanings of the dreams, but no coherent narrative can be discerned from the text, and frequent erasures and corrections suggest it was written in some haste.

Research by psychologists working on dream recall over the last fifty years may provide us with some suggestions as to how to interpret this complex assemblage of data. Firstly we must remember that dreams are essentially accessible only through memories recalled on awakening; it is impossible for dreamers to describe their experiences as they happen. For this reason some researchers have taken the position that dreams are not real experiences at all, but confabulations created on awakening. Even if we do not subscribe to this extreme perspective, we must acknowledge the difficult nature of dream recall: when they are recalled there are strong indications that our recollections do not correspond straightforwardly to dream experience. Freud, the father of modern dream interpretation, wrote of what he called “secondary revision” ("sekundäre Bearbeitung"), in which the raw fragments recalled on awakening are reshaped, both to create a coherent narrative, filling the gaps forgotten at the margins of sleep, and to accommodate their contents to the moral and rational sensibilities of both the dreamer and the audience.


the extent that when individuals later recall their dreams, they seem to be remembering the report they gave of the dream on awakening, rather than the dream experience itself.\textsuperscript{1552} Although this research has focused on dream recall in modern Western societies, anthropological reports suggest something similar happening in cultures where epiphany dreams are understood as the normal form of dreams – on closer questioning it seems that the dreamer actually experienced an episodic dream, a segment of which is retold as an epiphany dream.\textsuperscript{1553} This implies that cultural patterns of describing dreams strongly influence the way in which they are reported.

If we return to Hor’s dream accounts, we can begin to suggest an overall pattern which might make sense of the varied evidence. On awakening, Hor would have a few minutes to recall the fragments of his dreams from the night before; he may have, on occasion, made brief notes of these, and John Ray has suggested that this is in fact what the anomalous O.Hor 14, with its fragmentary snatches of text, represents.\textsuperscript{1554} Once the process of secondary revision was complete Hor would remember not these snatches of events, but instead coherent episodic dreams, which he again records several times. From here, the dreams might undergo two possible further elaborations. The first is that the speech of the characters understood as gods in the episodic dreams might be extracted to form the pronouncements which appear without context in numerous texts; indeed, the form and contents of speech of the gods in the episodic dreams and in the pronouncements are noticeably similar. The pronouncements might then be further pared back to the simple predictions reported in a other ostraca. The other route of elaboration is the development of scene dreams from episodic dreams: here the imagery surrounding the divine utterance, rather than being removed, would become the focus, with the narrative approximating the visions

\textsuperscript{1552} See for example Piercarla Cicogna, Corrado Cavallero, and Marino Bosinelli, "Analyzing modifications across dream reports," \textit{Perceptual and Motor Skills} 55, no. 1 (1982); Piercarlo Cicogna, "Restructuring Dream-Recall," in ibid. 57 (1983); Caroline L. Horton, "Rehearsal of Dreams and Waking Events Similarly Improves the Quality but Not the Quantity of Autobiographical Recall," \textit{Dreaming} 21, no. 3 (2011). An survey and discussion of research on this issue can be found in Rosen, "What I make up when I wake up: anti-experience views and narrative fabrication of dreams".

\textsuperscript{1553} A discussion of this idea, along with some sources, can be found in Harris, \textit{Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity}, pp.47-48.

\textsuperscript{1554} Ray, \textit{The Archive of Hor}, p.132.
described in literary texts. That this model, or something close to it, is accurate, is suggested by the different contexts in which we find the different kinds of dreams: the scene dream occurs in a draft of a long memorandum for the priests, a context in which Hor might well want to stress, at once, the dramatic form and traditional imagery of his oracular vision.\textsuperscript{1555} The pronouncements and predictions similarly occur in drafts of documents to the royal family and officials, stressing the direct authority of the gods.\textsuperscript{1556} By contrast, the episodic dreams, furthest from the cultural ideal of oracles, do not occur in any ostraca clearly intended for a third party, and the occasional inclusion of invocations implies that they were for Hor’s own use.\textsuperscript{1557} Hor’s reshaping of his dreams according to his purpose and audience should not be understood merely as a cynical act of repackaging the message; from one perspective he was simply adjusting the focus of his account, and, as we have seen, it may be that when he remembered the dream oracles it was not the dream experience itself he recalled, but rather his retelling.\textsuperscript{1558}

![Diagram of dream experience stages](image-url)

**34: Development of Hor’s dream accounts**

\textsuperscript{1555} O.Hor 1, which describes itself as “a memorandum for the priests” (\(w\)\(\textsc{mkmk} \ i-hr \ n\)\(\textsc{w} \ w\)); as Ray notes, \textit{mkmk} seems to correspond to the Greek \textit{\upsilon\pi\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\alpha}\ (”memorandum, minutes”) (ibid., p.12 n.a)

\textsuperscript{1556} See for example the Greek texts (fragment, A, B, D, E), as well as O.Hor 2 & 3, containing predictions, all of which apparently drafts for letters to the king and queen; O.Hor 3 & 7, containing a pronouncement, are drafts of similar letters.

\textsuperscript{1557} Invocations are included in O.Hor 10, 13, add.65.

\textsuperscript{1558} Shushan (“Greek and Egyptian Dreams in Two Ptolemaic Archives: Individual and Cultural Layers of Meaning,” \textit{Dreaming} 16, no. 2 (2006).) suggests that the clear reworking of Hor’s dream texts, and their stereotyped content, suggest that at least some of them are “fictive” (pp.135-136), and he contrasts them to the dreams of the culturally Greek \textit{katokhoi} from the same period. I would argue that much of this apparent difference can be explained by the function of writing dreams: the \textit{katokhoi} seem to have tried to accurately record dreams so that they could then be interpreted, a practice mirrored by Hor in his episodic dream accounts. Hor’s more worked-up dreams, on the other hand, represent his understanding as invoked direct communications from deities, so that the message itself was the crucial information, not the material for interpretation.
While we have no comparable evidence for the users of the magical papyri we might posit a very similar process: the majority of their dream experiences would initially be recalled as episodic dreams, but the process of recalling and revising these experiences would allow them to be reshaped into epiphany dreams, confirming the pattern described in the handbooks. But this process need not only be assumed for dream oracles. Our instinctive understanding of memory is as a record which is made at the time of the experience, and stored to be accessed later in life;\textsuperscript{1559} we assume that memories are generally reliable, and indeed, they generally are, under normal circumstances. However, modern research on memory has stressed its dynamic nature, and its malleability. Memories are less like photographs taken once and later examined, and more like sketches recreated each time the memory is recalled. This process of construction draws upon a range of sources, not only the traces of the original experience, but also the demands and expectations of our individual and social contexts;\textsuperscript{1560} as Elizabeth Loftus, one of the foremost researchers in this area, puts it “we fill up the lowlands of our memories from the highlands of our imaginations”.\textsuperscript{1561} Her work has shown not only that memories can be substantially altered in the course of subsequent recollections – that elements can be added and

\textsuperscript{1559} Sutton et al. note that the “patchwork of more-or-less distantly related subdisciplines, each with their own dynamics and disputes” within the fields of memory research – including neuroscience, psychology, and philosophy of mind – can make it “extraordinarily difficult for humanities theorists to find the right scientific and psychological theories to on which to draw and with which to seek articulations” (John Sutton, Celia B. Haris, and Amanda J. Barnier. “Memory and Cognition,” in Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates, ed. Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz (Fordham University Press, 2010), p.209). Bearing this in mind, I try to rely in the following discussion upon well-established general principles of the modern understanding of memory rather than on specific or novel phenomena.

\textsuperscript{1560} As Sutton puts it, “[r]emembering is an activity that takes place in and over time. Neither the form of that activity nor the detailed nature of what is remembered is straightforwardly or monocularly determined by any internally stored information. Inner memory traces – whatever they may be – are merely potential contributors to recollection, conspiring with current cues in rich contexts” (“Remembering,” in The Cambridge Handbook of Situated Cognition, ed. Philip Robbins and Murat Aydede (Cambridge University Press, 2009), p.218). One of the earliest, and most influential proponents of this idea was the Cambridge psychologist Frederic Bartlett, who based his understanding on a number of experiments intended to model naturalistic contexts in which human memory might be used; see Frederic C. Bartlett, Remembering. A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology (Cambridge: Copyright Cambridge University Press, 1932 [2003]).

\textsuperscript{1561} Elizabeth Loftus, Memory: Surprising new insights into how we remember and why we forget (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1980), p.40.
removed – but that entire memories can be fabricated with basic prompting.\textsuperscript{1562}

I suggest that this provides a further clue towards understanding the exotic experiences of rituals of apparition; religious and mystical experiences are not only experiences, but also narratives, transformed by the mediation of culture both during the experience itself and every time they are recalled.\textsuperscript{1563} Here we might recall Gordon’s suggestion that strange visions, experienced during altered states of consciousness, might be the source of some of the more elaborate descriptions of apparitions in the magical papyri.\textsuperscript{1564} But the influence might also go the other way: both when encounters were described to others, and ultimately when they were recalled by the ritualists, the ideal forms, as recorded in literary and ritual texts, would interpose themselves, reshaping ambiguous or subtle experiences so as to conform more closely to the culturally expected dramatic epiphanies. This point applies not only to encounters as the focal points of rituals of apparition, but also to the rituals as a whole: any performance of a ritual might, and almost certainly would, be an imperfect performance, marred by disfluencies of performance, accidental infelicities, or, ultimately, ritual failure, but the ideal ritual, that described by the handbooks and in oral and literary texts, would interpose itself at each instance not only as the aspirational performance, but in memory itself, reshaping the traces of past experience.\textsuperscript{1565} From this perspective, the fact that our evidence is of ideal, rather than real, rituals, is not such a loss as it might first appear.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{1563} On this point see David Yamane, “Narrative and Religious Experience,” \textit{Sociology of Religion} 61, no. 2 (2000).
\item\textsuperscript{1564} Gordon, “Reporting the Marvellous: Private Divination in the Greek Magical Papyri”, pp.86-88; the rituals noted by Gordon as belonging to this category are PGM IV.52-85, 3091-93, & PGM VII. 348-58.
\item\textsuperscript{1565} Compare the comments of Rosalind C. Morris on the performance of gender in ritual: “… people must repeat, rehearse and enact their identities with some reference to a more perfect performance. They are, in short, required to constantly become what they are and to live with the knowledge of an existential inadequacy” (Rosalind C. Morris, “Gender,” in \textit{Theorizing Rituals: Issues, Topics, Approaches, Concepts}, ed. Jens Kreinath, Jan Snoek, and Michael Stausberg (Leiden: Brill, 2006), p.370).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
4. Ritual Components and Complexes

The preceding sections have explored the ritual of apparition from the perspective of its position within a larger body of praxis, within particular social settings, and from an experiential and intellectual perspective, but the following discussion will focus on the physical processes through which they were enacted. As already discussed, what we have in the formularies are not living rituals, but instead instructions giving ideal and often abbreviated accounts; inevitably, any account we construct of actual practice from such sources will be incomplete and even distorted, and the description offered here can only be one of several possible reconstructions. Nonetheless, the problems we face in understanding magical rituals are not necessarily greater than the problems of understanding any other type of ritual or quotidian practice from textual evidence, or even of reconstructing historical events from the accounts of ancient historians, which reach us having passed already through the filters of individual and social memory, the perspectives of particular writers with particular interests and limitations, and the vicissitudes of their manuscript histories.

The basic data of this following analysis was generated from synoptic comparison of 116 rituals of apparition in Greek, Demotic, and Old Coptic texts from the Roman period, supplemented with information from earlier and later texts in these languages, as well as Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic, as well as literary and documentary texts. The full list, with a classification of the type of ritual they describe, is given in appendix 5, but as suggested already (see 3.2.1-2) it is at times difficult to clearly demarcate rituals of apparition from other ritual types; some texts contain instructions for multiple rituals, of which the ritual of apparition is only one,\footnote{For example PGM 4.2441-2621, which includes erotic compulsion and other ritual uses, and PDM 14.1070-1077, which may also be used for erotic compulsion and dream sending.} while other texts may give very vague indications of their purpose. This problem is alleviated, however, by one of the most interesting characteristics of the magical papyri – the tendency of similar ritual processes to be used in rituals for different purposes. Thus the pairing of invocations with offerings is common not only to rituals of apparition, but also to, for example,
dream-sending and erotic compulsion rituals, while the construction of amulets and ensouled statues, and requirements of purity, time, and place are common to many different practices. For this reason, the fact that the ritual of apparition blurs at times into other ritual types is not a major problem for exploring its processes, and the meaning-function of particular practices can often be fully understood only in the light of texts of a variety of types.

As I have also tried to stress, the rituals contained in the magical papyri are extremely diverse, and so any synthetic picture will describe any particular text only partially, and many very poorly; this is an unavoidable problem. Yet another problem is that of reconstructing the sequence of rituals, and the linear progression of their components: since many texts do not present these in any clear order a number of plausible reconstructions can often be made, and while the synoptic approach can suggest which is most likely, this is another problem which cannot be entirely vitiated.

The discussion, then, will focus on ritual components, and the way in which they are combined into complexes. By component I mean either an object or an act which has a particular meaning-function within a ritual, and by complex I mean a sequence of acts in which one or more components are brought into a deliberate relationship with one another. Thus, the act of speaking a formula, and the act of burning an offering are both components, and performed together they constitute a ritual complex.

The details of the performance of these components, and their elaboration into complexes will be the focus here, but I will secondarily discuss their meaning-function. While explorations of meaning-function in magical texts are the prevailing, and perhaps most interesting, way of interacting with them, this approach raises still more problems. The reasons for performing particular acts are often not explicitly stated, and indeed the example of rituals performed in societies past and present should warn us that participants and observers will often change their understandings of rituals over time, and disagree with their contemporaries about the meaning-function of particular components. Thus praxis is more stable than interpretation, even in cases where we can plausibly suggest the functions of ritual acts.
Alongside this problem, the relationship between praxis and interpretation, there is the problem of where to look for parallels, and how widely. To some extent the parallels we accept will be based on which cultural models we identify as having influenced the composers of the magical papyri, and to a large extent this was the reason for the extended discussion of cultural influences in the preceding parts. A more acute problem is that of actually finding parallels – with the entirety of the pagan Greek and Egyptian, as well as early Christian, Jewish, and Near Eastern, religious traditions as potential sources, we risk flattening ancient Mediterranean magic with bland observations of similarity. Any exploration of ancient ritual practice must attempt to walk the fine line between overemphasising either the familiarity or strangeness of each practice.

I will mention here one illustration of these problems, since it is not one I will discuss at length elsewhere. In PGM 4.26-51 an initiation procedure is described, during which the ritualist sacrifices a rooster and then drinks its blood. The meaning-function would seem to be fairly clear – the ritualist absorbs the essence of the bird, and by partaking of the offering to the deity, creates a link between practitioner and god. In her discussion of this offering, Johnston tells us that “[d]rinking blood is not part of sacrificial procedure in any of the ancient Mediterranean cultures that influenced the PGM – indeed, blood-drinking is prohibited in many of them”, and therefore suggests that it is essentially an innovative practice extending the concept of the transfer of πνεῦμα for novel purposes. But while the drinking of blood was certainly not standard practice in Mediterranean cults, there are in fact records of certain Greek oracular cults where prophetesses drank the blood of sacrificial animals in order to become inspired by the gods. The ancient Mediterranean world was home to such a diverse patchwork of practices that it is very difficult to make firm statements about what was or was not standard, and indeed what was taboo in one cult could be.

1568 Pausanias mentions a cult to Apollo at Larisa in Thessaly, where the prophetess drinks the blood of a lamb (Graeciae descriptio 2.24.1), and Pliny discusses a similar cult at Aegira, where the victim is a bull (Historia Naturalis 28.41).
mandatory in another, so that simply finding parallels is often simply an exercise in combing through enough sources. It is precisely for this reason that I will attempt to make my discussion of ritual process within the papyri primary, and the inevitably incomplete and flawed discussion of meaning-function secondary.

The following chapter will consist of three unequal parts. The first will lay out the components and complexes from which rituals of apparition are constructed, first at the highest level – that of the ritual – and then at the level of each major procedure. This overview will be followed by two case studies, the first looking at speech acts, the second looking at offerings. These two acts are, of course, not unique to rituals of apparition, or even to magical rituals, but they are the two most commonly described ritual components, and thus have the most to tell us about how rituals were performed.

4.1 The structure of apparition rituals

The ideal ritual of apparition can be broken down into a sequence of four acts: 1) the preliminary procedures, during which the ritualist established a relationship with the deity; 2) the invocation, in which the ritualist summoned the deity to appear; 3) the apparition, in which the deity appeared and interacted with the ritualist; 4) the release, in which the ritualist asked the deity to leave. In addition to these, we can add the compulsive procedure, which would be interposed between the invocation and the apparition if the invocation was not initially successful. In papyri containing these procedures each of these stages consists of at least one act, usually the speaking of a formula, often paired with an offering; this is true even for apparitions, in which the ritualist may greet the deity with a salutation formula and offering. Thus, we can describe the “ideal” ritual of apparition as follows:
In addition to these clearly defined stages are a host of complexes which are often vital to the rituals, but harder to fit neatly into structural models; these include the processes of creating phylacteries to protect the ritualist during the invocation and apparition, the procedures involved with establishing the times and places for each ritual procedure, the preparation of the ritualist's body, the use of boy seers, and the creation and interaction with divine icons and media of apparition. The following discussions will attempt to provide synoptic overviews of each of these components, complexes, and procedures.

4.1.1 Establishment of time and place

4.1.1.1 Time

The specification of the times that ritual procedures were to take place was a way to sacralise the procedures themselves, linking them to the rhythms of cosmic time measured by the movements of the celestial bodies. Two literary examples of this can be found in the *Dream of Nectanebo* and *Isis the Prophetess to her son Horus*; in the first of these texts the ritual takes place at the full moon, “according to (the timing) of the gods”, while the second describes celestial angels descending to speak to Isis when the celestial spheres are in the correct alignment for their descent.

Times are specified for two ritual complexes: preliminary procedures and invocations, and they are generally specified in one of three ways: by time of the day, by lunar phase, and by the lunar position relative to the zodiacal signs. Most ritual texts specify

---

1569 κατὰ θεὸν , *Dream of Nectaebo* l.2.
only one of these, but a few specify the time by two, and in these cases it is almost without exception by both lunar phase and position. In addition to the instructions contained in rituals of apparition, two calendars contained in PGM 3 and PGM 7 provide lists of favourable lunar positions for various ritual types; these will also be considered here.

The instructions for preliminary procedures are surprisingly consistent; those which specify a time of day always indicate sunrise as the time to carry out the ritual. Fewer texts specify a lunar phase, but in those which do, there is again consistency, this time in instructing that the ritual be carried out in the first quarter of the lunar month – from the new moon to the beginning of the half moon of the seventh day. One text specifies that the ritual takes place at a specific part of the solar year, namely spring. In terms of meaning-function we can see a consistent interest in beginnings of cycles – of the day, of the month, and of the tropical year, which began with the vernal equinox and the arrival of spring – suitable times for ritual procedures which marked the beginning of the ritual as a whole. More crucial, however, is that fact that the preliminary procedures are almost without exception addressed to the sun god: carrying out the rituals at dawn would be a way to greet him on his rising, at the point at which he was most powerful.

---

1570 These are contained in PGM 3.275-281, PGM 7.284-299. Other texts specifying particular times for performance include PGM 7.300a-310 (ritual of erotic compulsion; to be performed with the moon waxing in Aries or Taurus); PGM 12.270-350 (creation of ring for favour; to be performed during the waning of the moon in Taurus, Virgo, Scorpio, or Pisces); SM 80.3-8 (instructions for producing a phylactery during the rising of Gemini).

When we turn to invocations, the more abundant evidence makes it harder to draw firm conclusions, but generalisations can still be made. Most rituals take place during the first half of either the day or the night, and they tend to cluster around the first and fifth hours — sunrise and sunset, and midday and midnight respectively. 

Unsurprisingly, rituals addressed to solar deities are generally carried out during the day, while those addressed to lunar, stellar, or Typhonian deities generally take place at night.

---

36: Timing of rituals of apparition: Hour of the day or night

When we turn to invocations, the more abundant evidence makes it harder to draw firm conclusions, but generalisations can still be made. Most rituals take place during the first half of either the day or the night, and they tend to cluster around the first and fifth hours — sunrise and sunset, and midday and midnight respectively. 

Unsurprisingly, rituals addressed to solar deities are generally carried out during the day, while those addressed to lunar, stellar, or Typhonian deities generally take place at night.

---

37: Timing of rituals of apparition: Position in the lunar month

---

372 PGM 2.1-64 (first day of month, 7th hour of night); PGM 3.642-632 (6th hour of day); PGM 4.154-285 (day or night); PGM 4.2006-2125 (sunset); PGM 4.3086-3124 (night); PGM 6.1-47 (sunrise during full-moon); PGM 7.222-249 (evening); PGM 7.359-69 (evening); PGM 7.846-861 (5th hour of day); PGM 8.64-110 (sunset); PGM 11a.1-40 (middle of the night); PGM 12.1-13 (night); PGM 13.1-34 (dark of the moon in Aries, middle of the night around 5th hour); PGM 13.646-734 (eighth day of month in middle of night); PDM 14.1-92 (before 7th hour day); PDM 14.150-231 (midday); PDM 14.695-700; PDM 14.856-875 (sunrise); PDM 14.1141-1154 (third hour of night); PGM 72.1-36 (6th hour of night);
The timing of invocations according to lunar phase is slightly less common than by hours of the night, but the patterns are even more consistent. The majority of instances specify that the ritual is to take place during the full moon, that is, on the fifteenth day of the lunar month. The rituals, in most of these cases, are addressed to lunar deities, but a significant number are also addressed to solar deities; of these some link the date to the Egyptian half-moon festival (15.ₙ.₁), when the sun’s light was understood as entering and filling the “sound-eye” of the moon (mḥ ṭḏ.₁) – thus the sun and moon were not opposed, according to this schema, but part of a complementary pair. The remaining rituals are either clustered around the new moon (at the very beginning and end of the lunar month), or in the first half when the moon was waxing; as with the preliminary procedures, the focus is on the first quarter of the month. It is difficult to make generalisations about these cases; the clearest instance is PDM 14.239-295, a lunar ritual which is to take place at any time during the waxing phase. In another case (PGM 2.1-64), a solar ritual is to take place at the beginning of the lunar month, when the moon would be invisible, while in another case a ritual to the Ursa Major (PGM 14.232-238) is to take place on the 3rd of the month, when the darkness of the moon might make the stars more visible.

---

1573 PGM 2.1-64 (first day of month, 7th hour of night); PGM 4.52-85 (full moon); PGM 13.1-343 (dark of the moon in Aries, middle of the night around 5th hour); PGM 4.930-114 (any day); PGM 5.1-52 (moon either full or not full, when it is in a solid zodiacal sign, or a term ruled by a prograde planet); PGM 5.370-439 (moonrise); PGM 6.1-47 (sunrise during full-moon); PGM 13.343-646 (before last appearance of old moon in Aries); PGM 13.646-734 (eighth day of month in middle of night); PDM 14.232-238 (third day of month); PDM 14.239-295 (4th to 15th day of month); PDM 14.695-700 (full moon); PDM 14.701-705 (full moon); PDM 14.875-885 (full moon)

1574 On this see Smith, On the Primaeval Ocean, pp.123-124.
The final, and least common, method of specifying timing is by the position of the moon relative to the signs of the zodiac. As previously discussed (2.2.4.3.2) the position of the moon relative to the zodiacal constellations would be simpler to calculate than any of the other planets except the sun, and its much shorter sidereal period (one lunar month compared to one solar year) would make it more convenient for recurrent rituals. The small number of data points here makes it difficult to draw conclusions; there is a slight focus on Virgo and Aries, the first signs of the Ptolemaic and Alexandrian systems respectively, but this focus is very slight, and the two instances in Aries are from two recensions of the same text, the *Ogdoad of Moses*.

The complexity of the timing instructions summarised here may seem, at first, bewildering, but behind this mass of overlapping systems a clear tendency can be discerned – there is a focus on transitional periods of cycles: the beginnings and ends of the diurnal, lunar, and stellar cycles.

4.1.1.2. Place

---

1575 PGM 2.64-184 (moon in Gemini); PGM 5.1-52 (moon either full or not full, when it is in a solid zodiacal sign, or a term ruled by a prograde planet); PGM 13.1-343 (dark of the moon in Aries, middle of the night around 5th hour); PGM 13.343-646 (before last appearance of old moon in Aries); PDM Suppl. 168-84 (moon in Leo, Sagittarius, Aquarius or Virgo).
The places within which rituals of apparition are to take place are specified roughly as often as the times, but their vagueness often makes them difficult to interpret. While one ritual tells us that it may be carried out in “any place” (PGM 4.154-285), others specify outside locations – open or deserted places,\(^\text{1576}\) by the river, the sea, or the fork of a road,\(^\text{1577}\) a place where grass grows,\(^\text{1578}\) and so on – and in the case of dream oracles instructions to go inside after having performed the invocation imply that open-air locations were sometimes expected,\(^\text{1579}\) even if not explicitly stated. But it is when we ask where they went inside to that things become more complex. Most often the ritual is to be carried out in a “house” (οἶκος, \(pr\))\(^\text{1580}\) or “place” (\(m\)\(^\text{3}\)),\(^\text{1581}\) which is to be pure (καθαρός, \(w\)^\text{2}b).\(^\text{1582}\) There is an exact parallel here in Thessalos' *De Virtutibus Herbarum*, where the author’s vision of Asklepios-Imouthes takes place in an οἶκος καθαρός prepared by the priest.\(^\text{1583}\) The meaning of these terms has been the subject of much speculation. Since both words for “house” can refer to a temple, Gee, amongst others, have suggested that the rituals of apparition were to take place in sacred sites\(^\text{1584}\) – this would align them with the practice of the Egyptian priest who carried out the invocation of Plotinus’ daimōn, as well as that described in most of the literary descriptions of dream oracles. Along different lines, Festugière has drawn attention to the fact that a “pure house” is also mentioned in the later *Picatrix*, where it is clear that the term refers to a temporary structure along the lines of a tent.\(^\text{1585}\)

Such a tent is described in the *Ogdoad of Moses*, where it compared to a type used for initiation.\(^\text{1586}\) But it is not clear that either “temple” or “tent” is appropriate as a general translation. The tent in the *Ogdoad* is described not as being an οἶκος, but being

\(^{1577}\) PGM 11a.1-40.
\(^{1578}\) PGM 4.3086-3124.
\(^{1579}\) PGM 2.1-64, PGM 7.478-90.
\(^{1581}\) PDM 14.695-700, PDM 14.841-850.
\(^{1584}\) PGM 13.652-3; the tent is described as both a καλύβη and a πέτασος.
constructed *inside* an οἶκος, and other texts suggest that a private dwelling place is intended by this term. The clearest indication of this occurs in the same text, where it is prescribed that the οἶκος be one in which no-one has died for a year – a strange specification to make for a temple. More suggestive are references to purifying the house – surely unnecessary for a temple – and descriptions houses as the ritualist’s “own place”, and clear references to bedrooms. It is possible, of course, that each word could have a different meaning in each text – that the translation “house” is appropriate in some instances, “tent” in others, and “temple” in still others – but this seems to violate the generally consistent use of vocabulary in the papyri, as well as to introduce unnecessary complexity. The papyri do, at times, make clear references to temples. Why would they not do so when describing the sites of rituals? It seems more likely that private dwellings, generally the ritualist’s own are envisaged, as suggested by the descriptions of Hippolytus and Tertullian.

In several text the ritual is to take place on the roof of the house, but in other cases the ground floor is specified; in one instance it is further stipulated that the room has no cellar underneath it, suggesting a desire to have the place be directly upon the earth itself. In other cases the room is to open in a specific direction – usually the east or south, although in one case, the west. It would be easy to assume that the orientation is intended to allow the ritualist to view a rising or setting celestial body, but in fact this does not seem to be the case: none of the instances where the door is to open to the east or west are to take place at these times, and a ritual addressed to Ursa Major takes place in a room open to the south, from which the

---

1587 PGM 12.1-343.
1588 PGM 2.1-64, PGM 2.64-184, PDM 14.750-771.
1590 PDM 2.64-184.
1591 See, for example, PDM 14.758: h. t-ntfr; PGM 4.1075, 3125, 3126: ἰπερών.
1594 PDM 14.750-771.
1597 PGM 13.1-343.
Asterism would be invisible. Additionally, in several of these, and other texts, the room is to be completely dark, and therefore closed to the outside world. The purpose of incorporating direction seems to be one of a higher than merely practical function, orienting the ritual space to the cosmic axis: in two other texts the ritual is to take place in the eastern part of the house.

Once the site of the ritual was selected, it had to be prepared. As we might expect in rituals in which purity was of such keen importance, purification was one aspect of preparation. This could be achieved with donkey milk, mud (presumably from the banks of the Nile), or natron water, or else by sprinkling sand, a highly significant act drawing upon the parallel procedures of sprinkling sand on the foundations during temple constructions, and back further to the creation, when sand emerged as the first stable point from the primeval waters. The space might also be marked by writing kharactēres around the space, either on the ground or around the door. Stephen Skinner has argued that “magic circles” should be understood as usual practice in rituals of apparition, but while a circle of kharactēres is described in PGM 7.846-861, and Iamblichus mentions ritualists who stand upon kharactēres, there is not enough evidence to confirm this with any confidence.

In dream oracles, the ritual space would have to include a bed; in each case it is to be a rush or reed mat, apparently freshly made, and placed directly on the ground – a recurrence of the concern with direct contact with the earth. Where kharactēres have been written on the ground, the bed may be placed beside them, and the head may be

---

1598 PDM 14.117-149.
1600 PDM 7.540-578.
1601 PDM 2.1-64.
1602 PDM 2.64-184.
1603 PDM 7.475-488.
1604 PDM 14.239-295.
1605 PGM 7.846-861.
oriented east, north, or south.\textsuperscript{1609} Again, these directions do not correlate consistently with other aspects of the ritual, although in the case where the ritualist’s head is to be oriented towards the north, the formula is addressed to Ursa Major, and the door of the room is to open to the south, creating a somewhat consistent orientation.\textsuperscript{1610}

As with the specifications of time, specifications of place are extremely varied, it seems that the bulk of rituals were expected to take place inside private dwellings, with certain portions – in particular preliminary invocation – being carried out beforehand in the open air. The dwelling-place might be ritually marked by its orientation or layout, or by purification.

### 4.1.2. Preliminary procedures

The ritual complexes I have called here “preliminary procedures” represent a fairly diverse set of practices, but they have two features in common – firstly, they take place before the invocation, and secondly, they are intended to create a relationship between the ritualist and either the deity being summoned, or other deities who might be able to help during the main ritual. In almost all cases, the deity invoked in these preliminary procedures is the sun god, although in the important case of the Ogdoad of Moses it is instead the gods of the hours and weeks who are called upon to assist the ritualist.\textsuperscript{1611} While preliminary procedures are not consistently marked by any single term, they are regularly referred to in Greek texts as “conjunctions” (συστάσεις, see 3.2.2.6).

Preliminary procedures often have requirements of purity (see 4.1.3.2) and time (see 4.1.1.1), with most of them taking place at sunrise. The most consistent feature in these rituals is the use of spoken formulae (see 4.2), sometimes accompanied by offerings (see 4.3). While their remaining features are often quite diverse, certain clusters of tendencies can be noted. The first of these involves the presentation of items to be

\textsuperscript{1609} PGM 2.1-64 (body in line with upper stroke of $\text{iNH}$ sign); PGM 2.64-184 (head to south); PGM 12.190-192 (head to east), PDM 14.117-149 (head to north).

\textsuperscript{1610} PDM 14.117-149.

\textsuperscript{1611} PGM 13.1-343, PGM 13.646-734, PGM 13.646-734.
used in the ritual to the sun: the lamp to be used in lamp divination, or a ring which is to be placed by the head during a dream oracle. In two cases the object – an egg or a leaf – has been written on before the speaking of the formula, and after being presented to the sun the object or the writing is consumed. The consumption of materia empowered through ritual processes is one which occurs in several places in the magical papyri, and has a long history in Egyptian practice, and so needs little more comment here. A related example of this practice can be found in the Ogdoad of Moses, in which small figures are made, are censed, and have formulae spoken over them, before being consumed; the speaking of the names of the gods of the hours and weeks links the figurines to these deities, allowing the ritualist to absorb their power.

A second important pattern in two texts is the presentation of the ritualists themselves rather than materia; these patterns are best seen when presented in tabular form.

---

1612 PDM 14.150-231.
1613 PGM 7.628-642, in this case the preliminary ritual is addressed to the Pole Star, and so it is this asterism to which the ring is shown.
1614 PGM 7.505-528.
1615 PGM 4.475-824.
Both rituals described in the two texts take place on the roofs of houses, and the temporal unfolding of both is linked to the solar cycle, either to the rebirth of the sun in the transition from night to dawn, or the growth of the sun’s power from dawn to midday. In both rituals the beginning and end points are marked by the speaking of formulae. In both rituals the practitioners are marked as symbolically “dead” through the covering of their eyes, and this is most explicit in PDM 4.154-285, where the ritualist is wrapped like a corpse, lies prone, and is described in the formula as having been overthrown by the god’s enemies; this procedure has important similarities to the employment of boy seers (see 4.1.4). Finally, the end of each ritual complex is marked by a minor apparition in the form of the appearance of a falcon, a solar animal. The empowerment of the ritualist through conjunction with the deity is marked in the first text by the falcon dropping a stone, which is carved and then worn by the ritualist, while in the second the transfer of power is more direct, and marked by the falcon striking the ritualist with its wings. That this act has restored the ritualist to life, now animated by divine power, is indicated by their arising from their prone state; the
divine power they now possess allows them to command other gods to appear in later performances of vessel divination.

The conceptual background to these two procedures may be found in an Egyptian ritual which displays clear isomorphism with them, the Uniting with the Sun (hnm-\textit{ln}). This ritual first appeared as part of the Opening of the Mouth ceremony, but became a part of the cultic practice of many temples in the Graeco-Roman period. The cult statue would be taken up to the roof of their naos, and exposed to the sun at midday, and as hymns were sung to it, its face would be uncovered, and the sunlight would strike it. Conceptually, the statue represented the body of the deity, standing in the same relation to the divine soul or \textit{b\textdegree} as a corpse to the spirit of a dead person. As this body was struck by the sunlight, it would be revivified, and the \textit{b\textdegree} soul would unite with its body. When depicted in visible form, this \textit{b\textdegree} typically took the form of a falcon. The parallels are very clear – the symbolically dead ritualist becomes a vessel for the power of the deity, transferred through the medium of sunlight and a falcon.

In both patterns of preliminary procedures the practitioner creates a link with sun, or the equivalent deity/ies. This is done by the presentation either of objects or the ritualist himself, an act marked by the familiar ritual complex of offering and formula. This link allows the ritualist to draw upon the power of the deity – either through power conferred directly by the god, or by the incorporation of empowered materia into the ritual, or the ritualist’s own body through consumption.

4.1.3 Preparatory procedures

4.1.3.1 Creation of phylacteries

Several texts prescribe that the ritualist must wear a phylactery during the procedure, and the reasons for this are often quite explicit: the deities invoked are powerful,

potentially dangerous beings, who may strike or throw unprotected ritualists who
summon them. While several texts describe apparitions as potentially frightening
experiences, the most dramatic description of the potential danger posed by deities is
given in the Contest for the Armour of Inaros, in which the scribe-of-the-god’s-book is
caught spying on the gods by Anubis using bowl divination. The deity leaps to earth
and kills the curious priest, either by wringing his neck, or by stopping or tearing out
his heart. The explicit or implicit purpose of the phylacteries was to prevent such
accidents from happening.

The phylacteries may be made of several categories of materia; most common among
these are small, flat objects which could serve as supports for writing—pieces of
papyri, metal lamellae, and the leaves of plants. Other materia might include
various items associated with deities: the rib of a boar (Kronos), the knucklebone of
a wolf (Apollo), a donkey skull (Nephthys), or the hairs of donkeys, goats, and
bulls (Seth-Typhon). All of these items might undergo preparation—usually having
onomata, kharaktēres, and/or images drawn on them, or being plaited into garlands in
the cases of hairs and leaves. The employment of these phylacteries during rituals
varied: they might be held, or placed under the foot in the case of animal materia, but
more often they were worn, either as garlands, around the neck, or bound to the

---

1619 PGM 1.271-272: “Be careful that you do not lose a leaf (of the branch being used as a phylactery) and
injure yourself” (Σβίπη δὲ μὴ ἀπολέσῃς φύλλον [καὶ] σεαυτὸν βλάψῃς); PGM 2.1-64: “if (during the ritual)
you feel a blow, chew cumin and drink unmixed wine” (ἐὰν δὲ αἴσθης πληγῆς κάστην/ [τὸ] κυμίνου
με[τ]ὰ ἀφρότου κατάπιε, 158-159); PGM 4.2441-2621: “the goddess lifts those without phylacteries into
the air and casts them down from aloft” (ἡ θεὸς τοὺς ἀφυλακτηριαστοὺς/ τοῦτο πράσσοντας ἀεροφέρεις
ποιεῖν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄψους ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ῥίψαι, 2508-2510); PGM 7.222-249: “wear the cloth around your neck
so that he (the god) will not strike you” (τὸ δὲ ῥάκος περίθου/ περὶ τὸν τράχηλον ἵνα μὴ σε πλήξῃ, 231-232).
1620 PK 1.11-18, PC 2.10-16.
1621 PGM 4.52-85; PGM 4.930-1114 PGM 4.2441-2621; SM 85.41-44.
1623 PGM 2.1-64; PDM 61.63-78.
1624 PGM 4.3086-3124. On the connection between Kronos and the boar, see Attilio Mastrocinque, Kronos,
Shiva, and Asklepios: studies in magical gems and religions of the Roman Empire (Philadelphia: American
1625 PGM 1.1275-1322.
1626 PGM 11a.1-40. The connection between Nephthys and the donkey comes about through her husband
Seth-Typhon.
1627 PGM 4.1331-1389.
1628 PGM 2.1-64; PGM 4.1331-1389.
deity’s arm. The choice of which arm does not seem consistent – different texts prescribe right or left, apparently without reference to the meaning-function of the ritual as a whole.

4.1.3.2 The ritualist’s body

The marking of the body through ritual means – the regulation of bodily functions and the adoption of certain signifiers –formed an important part of cultic practice in the ancient Mediterranean, and the prescriptions within the magical papyri must be seen against this broader background. While in many cases the requirements are general, indicative of common late antique concepts of self-fashioning, others, in particular those related to food and costume, appear to link the practices to the traditional Egyptian priesthood. Many of these aspects would have been known to a broader Greek speaking audience through the works of cultural translators such as Manetho and Chaeremon, so they may not be decisive indicators of cultural background; nonetheless, they are suggestive of the ideological orientation of the composers and users of the papyri.

Requirements for purity are prescribed both for preliminary procedures and invocations, and for boy seers as well as the ritualists. The majority of the texts are vague in terms of what this purity required – they may state that the ritualist should “avoid all unclean things” or “be pure in every respect”, and so on – but it seems that the texts assume an understanding of what this purity consisted of. This can, to some extent, be reconstructed from more specific mentions in other texts, and

1630 PGM 4.52-85 (left arm); PGM 4.2441-2621 (right arm); PDM 14.295-308 (not specified); PDM 14.805-840 (not specified).
1632 PGM 1.262-347; PDM 14.475-488.
1633 PDM 7.359-69.
seems to have had three aspects: sexual abstinence, food taboos, and physical cleansing.

Avoidance of sex, often stated as avoidance of women, is regularly prescribed for the ritualist, but more often for the boy seer, in which case the requirement is not merely for temporary abstinence, but virginity. Aside from general concepts of bodily integrity and preservation of vitality, which are not explicit in the magical papyri, we find suggestive references to the idea that avoidance of profane intercourse would cause the deity to sexually desire the ritualist, with this desire acting as one of the motivating forces of the apparition ritual.

The second aspect, food taboos, may consist of two aspects – fasting, and avoidance of certain types of food. The first is attested in only one text, while the second is attested in three, albeit with different stipulations. One text vaguely specifies the eating of pure foods, two proscribe the eating of flesh, to which one adds uncooked food, and wine, while yet another third bans the eating of fish.

The third aspect, physical cleansing, is rarely described in detail: ritualists are simply told to “purify themselves”. That this involved some kind of liquid is suggested by the use of an egg to clean the practitioner in one preliminary ritual, and the fact that this took place in private is suggested by the injunction to perform the act in front of a lamp in another text. This may help to contextualise another prescription, that...
the ritualist avoids bathhouses. Rather than relying on an understanding of purity which inverts normal ideas of purity, this probably draws upon the idea of warm baths as enervating and feminising, and the reputation of such places as morally suspect, and haunted by restless spirits. Thus, the purification was to take place alone and in private, rather than in the public bathhouse.

Rather than a constant state, most texts only stipulate a temporary period of purity in the lead-up to rituals, but, when considered in conjunction with requirements for particular timings according to the lunar phase and position, the demands of planning rituals in advance should become apparent. One recension of the *Ogdoad of Moses* for example, requires the purification to take place in the last 7 days of the lunar month, before the preliminary procedure itself is carried out on the first seven days of the new month, and the invocation takes place on the eighth. The most common length of time for purification is three days, which is also the figure given by Thessalos for his apparition ritual, while other texts may prescribe seven, or even 41 day purification procedures.

A final purity requirement, occurring only in dream oracles, is that the ritualist not speak to anyone between the performance of the invocation and the act of going to sleep; the meaning-function of this stipulation seems fairly straightforward – this type of ritual was the only one in which the apparition could not immediately follow the invocation, and to speak with another person would be to re-enter the sphere of mundane life, breaking the chain of ritual procedures.

---

1644 PGM 4.751-824
1646 PGM 13.646-734.
1647 PGM 3.282-499; PGM 4.475-824; PGM 4.850-929 (for the boy seer); PGM 4.930-1114; PGM 7.319-334; PGM 7.749-755
1648 *De Virtutis Herbarum* 18, 21.
1649 PGM 4.52-85; PGM 4.3209-3254; PGM 13.646-734.
1650 PGM 13.1-343; PGM 13.343-646.
Alongside the regulation of the body through purity requirements, texts describe marking it by the use of particular pieces of clothing and the application of body and eye paints. The most common costume prescribed is that of an Egyptian priest, clean linens and palm-fibre sandals; other texts may have the ritualist wear palm-fibre around the waist instead. Alongside this, materia from temples – specifically the black cloths worn by statues of Isis, may be worn around the hand and neck.

More regular than these requirements, however, are instructions to wear garlands or crowns. While one ritual uses the tail of a cat, these are usually made from laurel or olive leaves, but in a few cases they are made with other plants – marjoram or dark ivy; in this latter case, worn as part of a preliminary ritual, the choice of plant seems to mark the ritualist as symbolically “dead” prior to empowerment by the deity. In several cases the garlands are prepared by writing on them, or by attaching objects to them – a single shoted garlic in one case. The wearing of these crowns seems to serve two meaning-functions; firstly, garlands were typically worn by participants in cultic acts in the Mediterranean world, so that they were implicitly associated with worship of the gods. Secondly, they acted as a way for the ritualist to further link themselves to the deity, by wearing materia associated with particular deities; in this case they fulfil this function alongside other components, such as the holding of pieces of plants during rituals.

1652 PGM 1.262-347 (costume of prophet); PGM 3.282-409 (pure white linen); PGM 4.930-1114 (costume of prophet, palm-fibre sandals); PGM 4.3086-3124 (costume of Isaiac priest); PGM 13.1-343 (clean linens).
1653 PGM 4.850-929; PGM 4.1331-1389; PGM 102.1-17.
1655 PGM 7.846-861.
1656 PGM 7.846 (laurel garland); PGM 2.64-184 (laurel garland); PGM 3.282-409 (laurel garland); PGM 4.930-1114 (olive garland); PGM 4.154-285 (dark ivy); PGM 4.850-929 (garland worn by boy seer); PGM 4.930-1114 (olive garland); PGM 4.3172-3208 (olive garland); PGM 7.727-739 (marjoram garland); PGM 7.795-845 (laurel garland); PGM 7.1009-1016 (laurel garland); PGM 13.1-343 (olive garland); PGM 4.1331-1389 (hairs of donkey, bull, and goat plaited into phylactery and worn as crown). For the dark ivy (κισσὸς μέλας) as an indicator of death compare the necromantic rituals in PGM 4.1928-2005, 2006-2125, where it is used to crown a skull.
1657 PGM 4.930-1114.
Body paint is described in several rituals, although in only one are there clear suggestions the materials used may be halluciogenic.\textsuperscript{1658} The ritualist may be directed to anoint themselves with it, or more specifically to anoint their lips.\textsuperscript{1659} In still more cases, in particular in the case of dream oracles, the ritualist may be instructed to draw the deity or onomata on their hand;\textsuperscript{1660} this may then be wiped off during the release procedure,\textsuperscript{1661} or else licked off, and hence consumed as part of a preliminary procedure.\textsuperscript{1662}

The final way of marking the ritualist’s body involved using eyepaint;\textsuperscript{1663} in one case it is stated that this will help the ritualist to see the god clearly, and although one release procedure also specifies that the ritualist should apply eyepaint, the general meaning-function seems to be related to allowing the practitioner to view the apparition.\textsuperscript{1664} The procedures for making this eyepaint are varied, and may include not only ready-made eyepaints, but also water, animal materia (including blood, milk, and eggs), plant materia (including incenses, spices, and fruit juices), stones, and mould produced from leaving materia in vessels for long periods of time.\textsuperscript{1665} The application of the eyepaint is not generally specified, although in one instance a golden probe is used,\textsuperscript{1666} and in another the left and right eyes are to have different paints applied.\textsuperscript{1667} While we might expect that the paint was drawn around the lids, the use of the verb mh (“to fill”)
in Demotic may imply that the paint was applied to the whole eye-socket, the language echoing the filling of the moon (the "sound eye") with the light of the sun.1668

4.1.4 The use of boy seers

As already noted, boy seers are a feature of many rituals of apparition, but their employment is only roughly sketched in the majority of texts; the fullest accounts are found in PDM 14, but mentions of many similar details in other papyri where their use is prescribed suggest that it is describing a procedure which can be generalised to other texts.

The boy seers may be subject to purity requirements more rigorous than those of the ritualist (4.1.3.2),1669 and they may be tested before the ritual to ensure they will be suitable for the purposes at hand (see 3.3.2). As is the case with the practitioners in unmediated rituals, they may have eyepaint applied to one or both eyes1670 and they may have onomata written on their body.1671 In one text it is prescribed that they too wear a garland,1672 and another gives the option of a scarab hesy (see 4.1.5) being bound to the boy’s arm,1673 although in this case the hesy is said to function not as a phylactery, but as a means of causing the gods to come more quickly. Nonetheless, references to the deity posing a threat to the medium as well as the ritualist imply that they too may have worn phylacteries at times.

During the invocation the boy seer would face the medium of apparition – whether vessel, lamp, or celestial body – and they would typically sit or lie, or more rarely, stand, on either bricks or palm staves.1674 As with the instruction to be on the ground

---

1668 PDM 14.695-700: “fill your eye with black and green eye-paint” (mH ird.t = k/ n wyt mstm(.t), ll.695-696). On the “filling of the sound-eye” (mH-wD#.t) see Smith, On the Primaeval Ocean, pp.123-124.
1669 Purity requirements are mentioned in PDM 14.239-295 (general purity); PDM 14.750-771 (must be virgin); PDM 14.805-840 (must be virgin); PGM 4.850-929 (must be purified for three days); PDM 14.856-875 (general purity).
1671 PGM 62.24-46.
1672 PGM 4.850-929.
1674 PGM 4.850-929 (sits on unbaked bricks); PGM 7.348-358 (lies down); PDM 14.1-92 (lies on belly on four fresh bricks or palm staves); PDM 14.150-231 (sits on brick); PDM 14.239-295 (sits on brick); PDM 14.395-427 (lies down with chin on the bricks the vessel is resting on); PDM 14.475-488 (sits on new
floor, or to spread sand below the ritual space, the use of bricks seems to derive from the desire to have the ritual rest on secure foundations; bricks were another representation of the primordial mound, and were used with an apotropaic meaning-function in a variety of contexts, from the bricks upon which an Egyptian woman would stand to give birth, to the bricks placed in the corners of tombs. 1675

The ritualist would typically stand over the boy in the cases where the seer stood, and it seems that the boy would sit between the ritualist’s legs if he sat. The boy seer might hold objects in his hands – a lamp and censer in the case of one vessel divination, 1676 an ear of wheat in an instance of inspired divination. 1677 In several rituals the boy is covered with a white linen cloth, and his eyes are to be covered, often with the ritualist’s hands. 1678 As with the σύστασις described above, it seems that the meaning-function of the boy being prone, blinded, and covered with a cloth is to mark him as a dead “body”, ready for the deity to descend and inspire; this concept would seem to hold even in those instances, the vast majority, where the medium viewed the deity in the medium of apparition rather than speaking in the person of the god.

The ritualist would then speak the invocation formula over the seer, tapping his head with a finger, before the boy would have his eyes opened to view the deity. Certain texts imply that a question and answer process between ritualist and seer ensued; the ritualist would ask the seer if he saw light or the deity in the medium of apparition, and if the seer confirmed this, he might be asked to describe it to ensure that he was speaking truthfully. The ritualist might then speak a salutation formula to greet the god, or speak a light-bringing formula, intended to increase the light to allow the deity


1677 PGM 4.859-929.

to fully enter. This done, a further back and forth would then take place, in which the ritualist might ask questions or give instructions to the medium, and the medium would describe the god's behaviour and response.\textsuperscript{1679} The complex and contradictory dynamics involved – a young, hypnotised slave being asked to speak on behalf of a deity for an older, more powerful ritual expert – suggest that it would have been fascinating to know more about these events, but our evidence is extremely limited.

4.1.5 Divine icons and media of apparition

Although the purpose of apparition rituals was to summon deities to appear, part of the conceptual background of this practice was that deities manifested themselves through physical objects, which served as the focus of interactions between the deities and their worshippers. This idea was present both in traditional Egyptian cult, in which the $b^i$-soul of deities were understood as descending upon cult statues,\textsuperscript{1680} and within the philosophical traditions associated with theurgy, in which normally invisible and immaterial deities could make themselves known through their interaction with or entry into matter.\textsuperscript{1681} The objects used by deities in the magical papyri are of two types: firstly icons of a more traditional nature, two- or three-dimensional objects which functioned as bodies for the gods; and secondly, media of apparition, principally vessels and lamps, in which the deities could be seen. My reasons for grouping these together are two-fold: firstly, both serve fundamentally as points of contact between deity and ritualist, and secondly, the treatment of the two types of ritual component within the larger procedures suggests that they were thought of as functionally equivalent in many cases.

The component which I refer to here as the “icon” seems to be used only in direct apparitions and dream oracles where no medium of apparition would be present,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1679} Scenes like this are described in, among other texts, PGM 5.1-52, PGM 7.540-578, PDM 14.150-231, PDM 14:805-840.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
further strengthening the idea that the medium of apparition served essentially the same meaning-function. These icons could consist of four different types of object: first, small, three-dimensional representations of deities; second, supports containing two-dimensional drawings of deities, or a written formula; thirdly, rings carved with images of deities; and finally, mummified animals. In each of these cases the preparation of the icon often play a significant part in the ritual, and in this regard the magical papyri resemble the Neoplatonic theurgic tradition, in which the creation of ensouled images played an important role.

The last of these, the mummified animal, or hesy, is among the most interesting; although there is only clear one instance in which it appears as an icon the rituals of apparition, it appears several other times in other ritual types in the magical papyri and related texts. In this one instance the animal used is a falcon, the sacred animal of the sun god, which is then “deified” by drowning it in the milk of a black cow mixed with Attic honey. It is subsequently mummified by being wrapped in an uncoloured strip of cloth, and plastered, with the nails and hair of the ritualist and a papyrus marked with the vowels added to the bindings. The relationship between the mummy and the ritualist, established in one direction by placing the ritualist's own body parts in the wrappings, is strengthened as the ritualist drinks the asphyxiant – the liquid in which the falcon was drowned – absorbing the divine spark. This procedure is rich in meaning-function: despite the taboo of killing sacred animals in Egypt, their killing to produce sacred mummies was a common practice in the animal cults which flourished from the Late Period into Roman times. This contradiction was rarely

1682 PGM 1.1-42.
1683 See for example Herodotus' claim that killing a sacred animal was punishable by death (Historiae 2.65.18-22) the story of a crowd of Egyptians lynching a Roman who had killed a cat in Diodorus Siculus, Bibliotheca historica 1.83.5-9.
openly acknowledged, but both from the language used to describe the process in the magical papyri,\(^{1685}\) and from brief literary mentions,\(^{1686}\) it is clear that the act of killing an animal – specifically by drowning – was believed to be an act of translating it from one form of life into another, higher form, rather than destroying it. By sharing in the fate of the drowned Osiris they became “glorified ones” \((\text{h} \text{s} \text{y}. \text{w})\), divine beings; there were several \text{h} \text{s} \text{y} cults to drowned individuals, as well as to divine animal mummies.\(^{1687}\) The fact that Hor’s divinatory practice often involved incubation in the catacombs where the mumified ibises rested, as well as the invocation of the mumified bulls Osiris-Apis and Osiris-Mnevis, suggests a direct parallel to the practice in the magical papyri.\(^{1688}\)

Other \text{h} \text{s} \text{y}-making rituals varied the components to produce different meaning-functions; different animals might be chosen for their association with other gods –

---

\(^{1685}\) The term “deify” \((\text{ἀ} \text{π} \text{ο} \text{θ} \text{e} \text{o} \text{υ})\) is used in PGM 1.5, 6; PGM 3.600; PGM 7.629, and in the \text{Cyranides} in 1.21.99 and so on. In PGM 3.1 the process is described as “making it into a \text{h} \text{s} \text{y}” \((\text{ἐκποιεῖν} \text{ ἑ} \text{s} \text{i} \text{ē} \text{n})\).

\(^{1686}\) Among these are the rumours that Hadrian had Antinous drowned to use as a familiar spirit, and that the Apis was put to death by drowning at the end of its life. While neither of these seem to have actually happened, they demonstrate that the concept was a familiar one in the Roman period. For Antinous see Cassius Dio, \text{Historia Romana} 69.11.2-4; Aurelius Victor, \text{De Caesaribus} 14.5-7; \text{Historia Augusta} Hadrian 14.5-7. On the Apis see Émile Chassinat, “La Mise à Mort Rituelle d’Apis,” \text{Recueil de travaux relatifs a la philologie et à l’archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes} 38 (1916-1917); Alexandre Moret, \text{La mise à mort du Dieu en Égypte} (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1927); Otto Eberhard, \text{Beiträge zur Geschichte der Stierkulte} (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1938), pp.18-21. For Tertullian’s knowledge of the concept of the \text{h} \text{s} \text{y} see \text{De Baptismo} 5.20-30, and the comments in Samson Eitrem, “Tertullian de Bapt. 5,” \text{The Classical Review} 38, no. 3/4 (1924). Kropp (Kropp, \text{Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte}, vol.3 pp.112-113) suggests that drowning was the usual way of killing animals whose materia was to be used in magical rituals, but while there is some evidence of this happening in the \text{Cyranides} (see fn.1690 below), the fact that it is only specified in certain special instances makes this seem unlikely to me.


\(^{1688}\) Osiris-Apis and Osiris-Mnevis are mentioned in O.Hor 1 & 13; the latter also mentions the ibis mummies. Compare T. Spiegelberg, a record of a dream oracle which seems to take place in the funerary chapel of the Apis bull.
shrew mice (the moon), \textsuperscript{1689} the Nile perch (Neith)\textsuperscript{1690} – while the asphyxiant might be different types of water, oil, milk, or mixtures of these.\textsuperscript{1691} The specific use of milk and honey in the ritual described here links not only to libation practices (see 4.3.2), but also to the idea of rebirth, with milk as the food of the newborn child-god.\textsuperscript{1692} While the history of animal cults implies that the use of the mummy as an icon was its original function, by the time of the magical papyri other uses predominated; they might be used as sacrificial materia,\textsuperscript{1693} as parts of phylacteries,\textsuperscript{1694} invoked for curse or dream-sending rituals,\textsuperscript{1695} and the mummy itself might be discarded, perhaps buried,\textsuperscript{1696} in favour of using the asphyxiant liquid, empowered by its role in the ritual. In the ritual described here the consumption of the asphyxiant serves to imbue the ritualist with divine power, but in other texts it could be rubbed on the penis and/or face as part of a ritual of erotic compulsion, or fed to a victim as part of a curse to cause death, disease,

\textsuperscript{1690} PDM 14.335-55.355-65. While Neith is not specifically identified as the deity being invoked in the formula, it seems likely, based on the presence of the fish, that she is one element of the sycretistic goddess described. For the association between the Nile perch and Neith see Ingrid Gamer-Wallert, \textit{Fische und Fischekulte im Altertum Ägypten} (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970), pp.88-90.
\textsuperscript{1691} PGM 3.1-164 (cat in water); PGM 4.751-814 (475-829; sun scarab in oil); PGM 4.2441-2621 (field mouse and two moon beetles in river water); PGM 7.628-42 (lizard in oil of lilies); PDM 14.1-92 (scarab in the milk of a black cow); PDM 14.335-55.355-65 (Nile Perch in oil); PDM 14.376-94.742-749 (shrew mouse in water); PDM 14.636-69 (scarab of Mars in the milk of a black cow); PDM 14.743-749 (falcon in water); PDM Suppl.60-101 (scarab in bull fat and cow milk); \textit{Cyranides} 1.21.98-110 (falcon in spring water); \textit{Cyranides} 1.24.5-6, 19-20 (swallow in water or wine); \textit{Cyranides} 2.39.13-24 (falcon and hoopoe in rain water).
\textsuperscript{1692} Sylvie Cauville, \textit{Offerings to the Gods in Egyptian Temples} (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), pp.52-53.
\textsuperscript{1693} PGM IV.2441-2621 (the hesy are pounded and mixed with the offering incense).
\textsuperscript{1694} PGM 4.751-814 (475-829; the hesy is worn as a phylactery); PGM 14.636-69 (half of the hesy is fed to the victim in an erotic compulsion ritual, the other half is worn by the ritualist or client); \textit{Cyranides} 1.21.98-110 (parts of the hesy’s body are removed to make an amulet for foresight); \textit{Cyranides} 2.39.13-24 (the eyes of the hesy are used in various healing procedures).
\textsuperscript{1695} PGM 3.1-164 (the hesy is buried with curse tablets and invoked to curse the victim); PDM 14.376-94 (the hesy or part of it is fed to the victim to kill them, or draw them in an erotic compulsion ritual); PDM 14.636-69 (half of the hesy is fed to the victim in an erotic compulsion ritual, the other half is worn by the ritualist or client); PDM Suppl.60-101 (the hesy is enshrined and invoked to send a dream).
\textsuperscript{1696} PGM IV.751-814 (475-829; the mummy may be placed in a bean-field); PDM 14.335-55.355-365 (the hesy is placed in a hidden place); \textit{Cyranides} 2.39.13-24 (the hesy are buried). In PDM 14.376-94 the hesy’s heart or tail is buried in the victim’s home as part of a ritual to cause favour.
or erotic compulsion; its numinous power could be employed in a variety of sometimes contradictory ways.

The more typical icon is a statue, a small figurine corresponding roughly to traditional cultic iconography. The materials these are to be made from are closely specified, and they may either be carved from wood, or moulded from a compound of earth and vegetable materia. Similarly, two-dimensional images may be inscribed onto metal rings, lamella, or gemstones, or drawn onto a support with blood or a special ink. This use of blood may suggest that, in contrast to hesy, which were transformed into divine icons by transforming their existing animal life into divine life, icons made from non-animal materia required special processes to activate them. There is a clear similarity to the Egyptian practice of the Opening of the Mouth, in which statues, two-dimensional images, corpses, and temples were made into suitable dwelling places for the b3-souls of the gods and spirits by processes including spoken formulae, sacrifices, and touching with a range of implements and animal parts. In one text this activation process is realised when a ring is dipped in oil used to produce a lizard hesy, drawing on the power of the asphyxiant, and in another a statue of Hermes is endowed with breath by writing a formula on a piece of papyrus, or the windpipe of a goose, and inserting it into the statue, before reciting the same formula three times.

The icons – whether hesy, statues, or formulae written on metal lamellae – received similar treatment in rituals of apparition; they would typically have the censers or

---

697 PGM 7.628-42 (ring empowered by being dipped in asphyxiant); PDM 14.335-55, 355-65 (asphyxiant rubbed on face or penis for erotic compulsion); PDM 14.376-94 (the asphyxiant will blind the victim if they drink it); PDM 14.743-749 (the asphyxiant will kill the victim if they drink it); Cyranides 1.24.5-6, 19-20 (drinking the asphyxiant will cause incurable sores)
699 PGM 12.144-52.
700 PGM 7.628-642.
701 PGM 7.740-755.
702 PGM 5.440-58.
703 PGM 12.144-52.
704 PGM 7.795-845.
705 PGM 7.628-642.
706 PGM 5.370-439.
altars used in offerings placed before them, and they might be placed inside specially constructed wooden shrines, or crowned with leaves. In contrast to the procedures for creating icons, the specifications for vessels are fairly simple. A variety of terms for vessels are used, and although the precise referents are not necessarily clear, the listing of multiple choices suggests that they refer to different choices, presumably of varying depth and intended function. The material they are to be made of it most often bronze (χάλκεος, hmt, and less often clay, and they may also be specified as being “new” or “good”. Before being used in a ritual, they might be cleaned, have onomata or images drawn on the inside or outside, to mark them more directly as divine icons. In one instance the bowl is covered in wax and in others objects may be placed inside or bound to the bowl: a magnet, stones, plant, or animal materia. The liquid placed in them is always oil or water, or a combination of them both. Specific types of water or may be used to connect the ritual to particular deities: rain water for heavenly gods, or Anubis; seawater for earthly gods; river water for Osiris and Serapis or Aphrodite.
springwater for the dead; water which has not seen the sun, settled water, or pure water for Anubis. The use of water and oil together matches much earlier descriptions of vessel divination surviving from the XIX Dynasty, although in this case the procedure followed older Mesopotamian practice, and involved observing and interpreting the patterns made by the oil on the surface of the water, an instance of technical divination rather than apparition.

Lamps, like vessels, may be made from bronze or clay. In the latter case it is usually specified that they are unglazed, so that they retain their white colour, rather than the red of the lead used in the glazing process. Various types of oil might be specified for the procedure – genuine oil, clean oil, oil of dew, radish oil, sesame seed oil mixed with cinnabar, olive oil, oasis oil – and again, these might have a specific meaning-function: butter is used to summon an šḫ-spirit, and oil of roses to bring a woman. Alongside the oil, the wick is often described carefully: it may be made of byssus, sailcloth (for an šḫ-spirit again), reed grass rubbed with sheep-fat, or linen, and it often had onomata or a formula written on

---

1731 PDM 14.239-295
1734 On this see Betz, Greek Magical Papyri, p.336.
1738 PGM 2.1-64.
1739 PGM 8.64-110.
1741 PDM 14.750-771.
1742 PDM 14.150-231.
1743 PDM 14.150-231; see also PGM 1.262-347, where rose oil is used, but the purpose of bringing a woman is not specified.
1745 PDM 14.150-231.
1746 PGM 4.930-1114.
1747 PGM 7.540-578.
Lamps are almost ubiquitous in the rituals of the magical papyri, and not only in rituals of apparition – within the corpus of texts looked at here 34 mention lamps, and only thirteen of these are clear instances of lamp divination. Their meaning-function probably derived not only from their use as divine icons, or miniature sacrificial fires (see 4.3.2), but also as the only way to illuminate rituals which might take place at night or in otherwise lightless rooms.

The placement of the icon – whether a hesy, statue, vessel, or lamp – was a key part of the ritual set up, often determining the axis on which ritual acts were performed; as such they might be oriented to the cardinal points. Vessels and lamps were often placed on or between bricks or palm staves, while vessels might be placed on the ritualist’s knees, and lamps on tables, lampstands, tripod, wolf-heads, or hung on walls. In rituals where a lamp was present, but not the medium of apparition, it might be placed near the vessel which fulfilled the purpose, by the ritualist’s head for dream oracles, or held in the hand of a boy seer. If offerings were to be made for the ritual, these were generally oriented towards the icons or media of apparition, and they were also addressed in the invocation formulae.

4.1.6. Invocations, apparitions, and compulsive procedures

The central act of the ritual of apparition was the invocation, in which the deity was asked, invited, or commanded to appear to the ritualist or boy seer. This act consisted almost without exception of a spoken formula, often accompanied by an offering, and

---

1749 PDM 14.117-149 (lamp faces north); PDM 14.150-231 (lamp set up in eastern niche).
1752 PDM 61.63-78.
1753 PGM 7.549-578.
1754 PGM 4.3172-3208.
1755 PGM 1.262-347.
1757 PDM 14.841-850.
1758 PDM 14.1141-1154.
for this reason will be discussed more fully in the sections dealing with those ritual acts. Alongside these practices, the invocation might be punctuated by the extinction of the lamp, in the case of dream oracles. Once the invocation had taken place, the procedure known slightly misleadingly as “light-bringing” (φωταγωγία) might take place; this is best attested in mediated rituals, and consists in formulae spoken to cause the light already in the medium of apparition to increase in volume (see 3.3.3). Once the deity appeared, a further formula might be spoken as a salutation, and in some instances the ritualist might share a meal with it. Even once the deity appeared, however, it might refuse to respond to questions; in these cases a compulsion formula might be spoken. This type of compulsive formula should be distinguished from those spoken during compulsive procedures, which were carried out not during apparitions, but if the invocation failed. These procedures always consist of spoken formulae, and sometimes offerings; in some cases the formulae were to be spoken by the boy seer rather than the ritualist.

4.1.7 Release procedures

The final stage of the ritual of apparition was the release (ἀπόλυσις), marking the end of the procedures, and allowing the deity to leave. This stage is often called the “dismissal”, implying the deity is told to leave, but the term refers literally to the act of unbinding, and several magical and theurgic texts imply that the deity was constrained to appear to the ritualist, and was eager to leave. As such, the primary concern in most of the release formulae seems to be not that the deity leaves, but that it leave without harming the ritualist or seer, and that the practitioner reserves the right to call on it again.

Alongside speaking of formulae and making offerings to the deity, release procedures could consist of a wide range of acts. These might involve the ritualist or seer closing

---

1760 PGM 7.359-69, PGM 7.478-90, PGM 22b.32-35 (the formula is repeated until the lamp goes out).
1761 For example PDM 14.489-515 (boy seer speaks compulsive formula).
1762 For example PGM 1.184, where the deity tells the ritualist “I am eager for heaven” (σπεύδω γάρ εἰς οὐρανόν). See also above, fn.1459.
their eyes again,1763 removing ritual objects – garlands,1764 the cloth covering the boy, or the lamp and vessel held by the boy,1765 wiping images drawn on the hand for dream oracles,1766 extinguishing lamps,1767 reversing the objects held in the ritualist’s hands,1768 and various other similar procedures;1769 all of these acts break the order created in the course of the ritual, removing things from their assigned places.

Alongside the release of the deity, the light summoned in light-bringing might be released,1770 as might the medium in inspired mediumistic divination;1771 again this release would consist of a spoken formula

4.2 Speech acts

Of all the ritual components and complexes we have looked at, those which I refer to here as “speech acts” are the most common in the rituals of apparition. Nearly every recipe we have includes at least one, and in the few cases where no formulæ are recorded we can probably assume that it was understood that some kind of formula should be inserted. Indeed, since formulæ often occur without accompanying instructions in magical texts, it seems that these were considered the key pieces of information conveyed in handbooks.

The formulæ contained in magical handbooks were the first aspects of these texts to be receive sustained attention,1772 and they have consistently attracted interest from scholars:1773 in particular, the metrical hymns have been the subject of several studies,

1763 In PGM 4.930-1114 the boy seer is to close his eyes again, as they were during the invocation.
1764 In PGM 4.930-114 the ritualist releases the pebble they are holding as a phylactery, removes their garland, closes their eyes, and smears their eyes with koptic kohl.
1766 In two of the versions of the Dream oracle of Bes, PGM 7.222-249 & PGM 102.1-17.
1767 PGM 1.262-347.
1768 PGM 1.262-347.
1769 PGM 4.52-85: the ritualist releases the beetle suspended above a lamp as a compulsive offering; PGM 11a.1-40: the ritualist frees the paredros by burning the phylactery which binds her to serve.
1770 PGM 4.930-114.
1771 PGM 4.850-929.
1772 See the discussion in 2.1.4.
1773 The best work to date on this subject is, in my opinion, that of Riesenfeld, "Remarques sur les hymnes magiques". For other general works on the magical formulæ see Graf, "Prayer in Magic and
as being among the relatively few surviving examples of pagan Greek liturgical texts.\footnote{The magical papyri were one of the major sources drawn upon in Carolus Ausfeld, "De Graecorum precatitionibus questiones," \textit{Jahrbücher für classische Philologie} 28(1908).} In addition, the numerous divine epithets and historiolae contained in the formulae have served as a rich vein of information on religious beliefs and practices in late antiquity. My focus here, however, is not on the information conveyed in the formulae, but rather on their function as speech acts – that is, as ritual acts carried out through utterances, and the meaning-function of these acts as units within larger ritual complexes.

These speech acts are realised linguistically through the use of all the tools available to human languages – the purposeful employment of specific vocabulary, morphological forms, syntactic constructions, and so on. Although I will briefly discuss the speech acts with which studies of magical formulae are commonly concerned – identification of deities, and historiolae – my focus will be on five less discussed types of speech act: 1) imperatives; 2) onomata; 3) performatives; 4) autocletics; and 5) interjections. The meaning of many of these is self-evident, although two may be less immediately obvious. "Performatives", briefly discussed already at 3.3.1, are clauses which would be translated into English as first-person noun + simple present verb: “I call upon NN” and so on. "Autocletics"\footnote{I must apologise for this neologism, coined to avoid the awkward alternative construction “I am”-phrases.} are clauses in which speakers identify themselves: these are typically translated as “I am NN” or “my name is NN”.

Alongside their form, we can describe speech acts by their purpose; and here I adapt the terminology established by Karl Ausfeld to describe the structure of Greek religious ritual\textsuperscript{2}; Miriam Blanco Cesteros, "El Himno Mágico: Recursos y estilos de un género coactivo," in \textit{Que los dioses nos escuchen}, ed. Cristina de la Rosa Cubo, Ana Isabel Martín Ferreira, and Emilio Suárez de la Torre (2012); Miriam Blanco, "The Magicians who Sang to the Gods," in \textit{Poetic Language and Religion in Greece and Rome}, ed. J. Virgilio García and Angel Ruiz (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013).

hymns. According to this model, the speech acts within a formula can be divided into three types. Firstly, the Call invites, greets, and identifies the deity. Next, the Argument provides a rationale for the deity to assist the speaker – this may include reference to past, present, or future acts of piety by the speaker, the use of historiolae to establish a precedent for the assistance, or the mention of the authority on which the request is made. Finally, the Petition asks the deity to perform a specific act for the speaker.

The third way in which speech acts can be categorised, alongside form and function, is by their syntactic position within rituals of apparition. They may be used in preliminary procedures, invocations, light-bringing procedures, compulsive procedures, salutations, compulsive procedures carried out during apparitions, and release procedures. Of these, invocation procedures are far the most common, but examples survive in the handbooks of all these types, as well as a few others which I will not discuss here in detail – light-retaining and light-release procedures.

These three dimensions – form, purpose, and syntactic position – will serve as the basis of the speech act analysis which will shortly follow. This analysis was generated from 160 formulae from magical handbooks, as well as comparative material from literary and documentary texts – principally Hippolytus’ Refutatio Omnium Haeresium and ostraca from the Archive of Hor – as well as spoken formulae from the Egyptian and Greek religious and magical traditions. For the purposes of this study I have elided any supposed distinction between hymns, spells, prayers and so on – all of the spoken
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1776 Ausfeld, "De Graecorum prectionibus quaestiones". Ausfeld uses the terms invocatio, pars epica and precatio. Bremer, noting the epic narrative of the type implied by the term pars epica is really restricted to the marginal case of the Homeric Hymns, preferred the terms invocation-argument, and petition (J.M. Bremer, "Greek hymns," in Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World, ed. H.S. Versnel (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981), pp.194-196). I use here English words in preference to Latin or Greek terms to avoid confusion; the Latin invocatio for Call would be too close to “invocation”, used here to refer to a stage within the ritual of apparition, while the use of Greek terminology might imply that these terms are used within the papyri, rather than imposed by modern scholars. For a more general look at the classification of parts of Greek hymns see W.D. Furley and J.M. Bremer, Greek Hymns: The texts in translation (Mohr Siebeck, 2001), pp.51-59, and for a comparable study of Egyptian hymns see Jan Assmann, Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete (Artemis, 1999).

1777 These are found only in PGM 4.930-1114.

1778 A few of these formulae have been counted more than once, since they may occur in more than one syntagmatic position; a full list of all formulae and their classification can be found in Appendix 4.
formulae, including the metrical hymns, seemed to have been intended to function in a similar way, and so the distinction is not relevant for a structural analysis of the type carried out here. One interesting side result of this work has been the elucidation of important differences between the use of speech acts in the two languages – Egyptian and Greek – and so I will discuss these, and their implications for questions of composition and dependence, as they arise. The formulae used in rituals of apparition share many features in common with formulae used in other types of ritual, and in particular with the invocations without accompanying ritual instructions, and so many of the remarks here will have broader applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Demotic</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary procedures</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invocations</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-bringing procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive procedures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salutation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive procedures in apparition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release procedures</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41: Apparition ritual formulae analysed

4.2.1 Speech acts within ritual complexes

4.2.1.1 Terminology used for formulae

A wide range of terms are used in the magical papyri to refer to formulae; the most general in Demotic is *gdl-md.t* (literally, "words to be spoken"); this is used to refer to
formulae used in invocations,\textsuperscript{1779} as well as preliminary procedures, light-bringing procedures,\textsuperscript{1780} compulsive procedures,\textsuperscript{1781} salutations,\textsuperscript{1782} and a variety of other purposes, including testing boy seers,\textsuperscript{1783} finding thieves,\textsuperscript{1784} and most other ritual types found in the Demotic papyri. Occasionally \textit{md.t} ("word") may be used on its own in the singular or plural to refer to invocations.\textsuperscript{1785}

Similarly broad, and overlapping several times with \textit{dd-md.t},\textsuperscript{1786} is \textit{sš} ("chant, call, reading", and so on); again, it is used to refer to formulae used in preliminary procedures,\textsuperscript{1787} invocations,\textsuperscript{1788} and releases,\textsuperscript{1789} as well as rituals of erotic compulsion,\textsuperscript{1790} going before superiors,\textsuperscript{1791} and so on. Another term with extensive usage is \textit{rš} (literally, "spoken thing") but it most often refers to formulae used in other types of rituals, particularly those intended for healing and erotic compulsion, occurring very often in the titles for these rituals.\textsuperscript{1792} Less often, it may be used to refer to invocation formulae,\textsuperscript{1793} and in the construction \textit{rš n wdt} ("sending formula") it refers to a release formula.\textsuperscript{1794} The final general term, \textit{sš(w)} translates literally as "writing(s)", but again, it refers primarily to spoken formulae, including those used for invocations,\textsuperscript{1795} as well as several other ritual types.\textsuperscript{1796} Interestingly it is once used to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1779} For example at PDM 14.1, 99, 124, 177; PDM Suppl. 135, 26, 150, 170.
\item \textsuperscript{1780} PDM 14.502.
\item \textsuperscript{1781} PDM 14.171, 173, 214, 231.
\item \textsuperscript{1782} PDM 14.419.
\item \textsuperscript{1783} PDM 14.74.
\item \textsuperscript{1784} PDM 61.86.
\item \textsuperscript{1785} At PDM 14.459; PDM 61.68. For this usage compare the Coptic form, \textit{Ⲟⲟⲧⲉ} (Crum 196a), used to refer to incantations, and to translate the Greek \textit{ἐπαοίδη} ("magical song").
\item \textsuperscript{1786} For example at PDM 14.99, 124-125, 435.
\item \textsuperscript{1787} For example at PDM 14.473, 476.
\item \textsuperscript{1788} For example at PDM 14.99, 125, 484.
\item \textsuperscript{1789} For example at PDM 14.506.
\item \textsuperscript{1790} For example at PDM 14.435.
\item \textsuperscript{1791} For example at PDM 14.456.
\item \textsuperscript{1793} At PDM Suppl.168, also referred to as a \textit{dd-md.t} (at l.170).
\item \textsuperscript{1794} At PDM 14.85.
\item \textsuperscript{1795} For example at PDM 14.154, 177 (also described as \textit{dd-md.t}), 396, 416, 671, 674, 763, 768.
\item \textsuperscript{1796} Ritual to cause favour: PDM 14.332; Ritual of erotic compulsion: PDM 14.349, 381; Ritual to cause "evil-sleep": PDM 14.680.
\end{itemize}
refer to a formula not actually given in the papyrus, which presumably the owner was supposed to know or have access to—the “formulae for praising Ra at dawn at his rising” (nš sš. w n dwi; r fp dwe m šf). Alongside these usages, it may be used to refer to onomata and kharaktēres intended to be written down rather than spoken. 

In conjunction with these generic terms we find several more specific words used to refer to particular types of formulae. PDM 14 contains the word thm (literally, “invitation”), twice referring to a formula used in compulsive procedures, and one more time in reference to a formula for a light-bringing procedure. The term htr (“compulsion”) twice occurs, as we would expect, in reference to formulae used in compulsive procedures, but once seems to refer to a formula intended to be used as part of the invocation process. The final specialised term, w½ (literally, “sending”) refers, as we would expect to a release procedure.

In Greek we find a similar mix of specific and general terms for spoken formulae. Most common is λόγος, a word of incredible semantic range; here the essential meaning seems to be something like “spoken formula”, and it may be used to refer to almost any such formula in the magical papyri. Twice it is used to refer to metrical hymns used as invocations in rituals of apparition, but a more interesting use of the term is to refer to onomata strings, identifying them by their incipits; thus, for example, the string of onomata that begins μασκελλί μασκελλω is called the μασκελλί (μασκελλω) λόγος.

---

1797 It seems possible to me that this formula is the one preserved in three copies in three other very similar mediated lamp divination rituals later in the papyrus, which is to be spoken to the sun at dawn; the three versions are at ll.474-475, 478-479, 512-515. This formula consist almost entirely of onomata, rather different from the more traditional cultic hymn which Dieleman suspects from the very traditional title of dwi r (Dieleman, Priests, tongues, and rites., p.55).

1798 For example at PDM 14.124a, 174a.

1799 At PDM 14.148, 172 (where it is also referred to as a gdl-md.t and a htr).

1800 At PDM 14.205.

1801 At PDM 14.172 (also referred to as a thm and a gdl-md.t), 214 (also referred to as a gdl-md.t at l.215).

1802 At PDM 14.867

1803 At PDM 14.737; compare the related term r i n wd (“sending formula”), referred to above.

1804 At PGM 4.1956; PGM 7.667.

1805 Among instances of this usage can be found at PGM 1.195: τιευβαθάλδου λόγος; PGM 1.195 - ια[ρ]βαθα λόγος; PGM 2.157: Άρπον Κουφι ια ρ λόγος; PGM 3.77 ιαεω λόγος; PGM 3.90 μασκελλί μασκελλω (λόγος); PGM 3.270-ιαεω λόγος; PGM 4.181: οβερομενδου λόγος; PGM 4.1034: ιαεω ουαεη λόγος; PGM 4.1308: δοηηζηηηη λόγος; PGM 7.302: μασκελλί λόγος.
Elsewhere the term is used to describe formulae with recognisable words, again by their incipits. In one case a formula is referred to as the σιγή σιγή λόγος (“the ‘silence, silence’ formula”). In some cases the formula may be described more specifically as ὁ λόγος (ὁ) λεγόμενος (“words/formula to be spoken”); in others an invocation formula may be referred to as an αὐτοπτος λόγος.

Εὐχή is another term used to refer broadly to formulae in the magical papyri; it is often, but not exclusively used to refer to the metrical hymns. Graf suggests that the formulae designated as εὐχή display the tripartite structure (Call-Argument-Petition) of Greek hymns, but it is not clear to what extent this differentiates them from formulae more generally. The clearest conclusion I can see is that εὐχή is never used to refer to strings of onomata – the formulae it designates always consist largely or entirely of recognisable Greek words. Significantly less common than either εὐχή or λόγος is ἐξαίτησις (“request”), used once to refer to a formula used in a preliminary procedure, once to refer to a metrical hymn used in a ritual of erotic compulsion. 'Επαοιδή (“magical song”) is sometimes used as a title for formulae, but most often it is used within formulae themselves, as a poetic self-reference. ‘Εξήγησις is used once to refer to an invocation formula; it is unclear if this should be understood as “statement” or “narrative”, or something similar.

The more specific terms for formulae are generally those used to refer to the procedures as a whole. Thus, for example σύστασις (“conjunction”) can be used as the

---

\textsuperscript{1806} At PGM 4.573, 623; this refers to the formula at PGM 4.558-560.
\textsuperscript{1807} For example at PGM 1.132; PGM 1.143; PGM 4.858; PGM 4.3997, PGM 7.232.
\textsuperscript{1808} For example at PGM 3.699, PGM 5.53.
\textsuperscript{1809} For example at PGM 2.9, 13; PGM 4.42785; PGM 6.5. The εὐχή referred to at PGM 3.498 contains a short metrical section (PGM 3.540-550), but is largely without meter.
\textsuperscript{1810} Non-metrical εὐχή include those referred to at PGM 3.9, PGM 7.756, PGM 12.103.
\textsuperscript{1811} Graf, “Prayer in Magic and Religious Ritual”, p.189.
\textsuperscript{1812} At PGM 4.1290-1291.
\textsuperscript{1813} At PGM 4.436.
\textsuperscript{1814} For example in PGM 2.96 where it refers to a metrical hymn used in an invocation; PGM 20.15 (a formula for healing); PGM 122.1, 5 (formulae for erotic compulsion and healing). The last of these uses the form ἐπῳδή.
\textsuperscript{1815} For example at PGM 1.317; PGM 4.1975; PGM 7.992. The instance in PGM 4 uses the form ἐπῳδή.
\textsuperscript{1816} PGM 8.73-74. It refers to a metrical hymn to Helios, described as “a formula (?) (spoken) to the rising sun” (ἐξήγησις αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἥλιον/ δύνοντα, II.73-74).
name of a formula\(^{187}\) used in the preliminary procedure as well as the procedure itself; the same applies to ἐπάναγκος ("compulsion"),\(^{188}\) χαιρετισμός ("salutation"),\(^{189}\) and ἀπόλυσις ("release").\(^{190}\) However, as with the more specific terms in Demotic, these words do not correlate strictly with the formulae used in the relevant stages of rituals of appariation. Thus, for example, ἐπάναγκος may also refer to compulsive procedures used in rituals of erotic compulsion\(^{1821}\) and dream-sending,\(^{1822}\) as well as formulae used in the preliminary procedures of rituals of appariation,\(^{1823}\) and the χαιρετισμός may also refer to a formula used in the invocation itself\(^{1824}\) as well as one used in greeting a deity when it appears. Thus, in both Greek and Demotic, whether we assume that this terminology was originally developed to refer to clear stages of the ritual process, in the form in which we encounter them in the magical papyri the terms may be understood as referring to the meaning-function of the formulae rather than their syntactic position: ἐπάναγκοι and htr.w are formulae which function to constrain deities to obey, rather than strictly those used when they fail to respond to their initial summons.

4.2.1.2 Speech acts within ritual complexes

Like all of the ritual processes described in the magical papyri, the manner in which speech acts are to be carried out is highly specified. The most straightforward of these is by instructing that the formulae are to be repeated. Where this is made explicit, the most common number of times is seven (27 instances) – in one case this is doubled to seven times two – but the formula may also be repeated three (8), four (4), nine (3), or eight (2), times; in one instance the ritualist is simply instructed to speak the formula

\(^{187}\) PGM 4,930.
\(^{188}\) Used to refer to the formula used in compulsive procedures in PGM 4,1035, 1295, 3110-3111; PGM 5,434; PGM 13,732.
\(^{189}\) PGM 4,1046.
\(^{1810}\) PGM 3,258; PGM 4,83, 916, 1057, 1066 (τῆς αὐγῆς ἀπόλυσις), 318; PGM 5,41; PGM 7,333, 738; PGM 62,36.
\(^{1811}\) PGM 4,1436, 2575; 2677-2679.
\(^{1812}\) PGM 12,114.
\(^{1813}\) PGM 13,26, 55, 382.
\(^{1814}\) PGM 2,87; the word is abbreviated here. Although the formula’s function as an invocation formula is not explicit, the other formula in the ritual (ll.81-87) is spoken to the rising sun, and so cannot be the main invocation formula for this dream oracle, and the fact that the ritualist is to be asleep during the apparition presumable precludes it from being used as a true salutation formula.
“many” times. This repetition is also a feature of older Egyptian ritual practice, and symbolism can readily be found for each of the numbers – seven as the number of vowels and planets; three as the number of plurality; four as the number of seasons, directions, and elements; eight and nine as the numbers of the Ogdoad and Ennead respectively.

More complex is the manner in which the formulae are to be spoken. One text instructs obliquely that the formula is to be spoken “with fire and breath”, while two others state that they are to be spoken with “a loud voice”. These vague references are filled out with more detailed instructions in other places: the ritualists are told to breathe heavily in and out, filling their lungs and then emptying them in bellows that peter out into hisses as they expire, straining their sides and bellies. Still more detailed, but recognisably a description of the same general mode of enunciation, is a set of instructions preserved in the *Oracle of Sarapis* (PGM 5.1-52), that the ritualist speak each one of a series of vowels in a different manner: the first “rolling like a wave”, the second short, “as a spiritual threat”, the fourth “like a baboon”, and the sixth “with savour, aspired”. These descriptions highlight three particular aspects of this artificial manner of speaking: the first of these is the concept that the manner of speaking might have implications for the meaning-function of the formula.

---

1825 See the examples collected in François Lexa, *La Magie dans l’Égypte Antique*, 3 vols (Paris, 1925), vol.1, pp.101 fn 13 & p.102 fn.1. As Lexa points out, four is the most common number of times, with seven occurring more rarely.

1826 PGM 4.617-618: ταῦτα πάντα λέγε μετὰ πυρὸς καὶ πνεύμα/τος.

1827 PGM 12.164: ἐπικαλοῦμαι ύμᾶς τού<><> μεγά<><> ἕπειρ<><> τῇ μ[ε]γάλῃ φωνῇ; more uncertain, due to the extensive reconstruction, is PGM 72.15-16: ...[φ][ων][η]/(ἐπευχόμενος μεγά/λη...)

1828 PGM 4.658-659: "...below a long bellow like a horn, letting out all your breath, straining your sides" (...μύκωμαι/ μακρὸν κερατοειδῶς ἀποδιδοὺς τὸ πνεῦ/μα μα βασανίζων τὴν λαγόνα, μυκώ); PGM 4.705-708: "...bellow a long bellow straining your stomach, so that you excite the five senses, until you run out (of breath)" (...μύκωμαι μακρὸν βασανίζων τὴν γαστερά/ ἵνα συνκινήσῃς τὰς πέντε αἰσθήσεις μα/κρὸν εἰς ἀπόθεσιν/ μυκώ); PGM 4.713: "...bellowing for a long time..."(...μακρὸν μυκώμενος,...); PGM 13.943-948: "breathe out, in, filling up,... in, throwing a below, a cry,... draw in, filling up, closing the eyes, bellow as much as you can, then moaning, let it out in a hiss" (πνεῦσον ἔξω ἔσω διαπλήρωσον/... ἔσω προσβαλόμενος μύσασαι ὅλο/λυγμές... ἔκκειες ἔσω, πληρεύ/ καμμύων, μύκηκας, δέσον δύνασαι, ἐπείτα σ/τενάξας συριγμῷ ἀνταπόδος).

1829 PGM 5.24: τὸ ἰμαχοπλήνων τὸ στόματι, κυματούργον (ἐνον).

1830 PGM 5.25: τὸ ἰ ὡ συπτροφή πρὸς πνευματικ(ήν) ἀπειλ(ήν).

1831 PGM 5.27: τὸ ἐκ κυνοκεφαλίστι.

1832 PGM 5.29: τὸ ἦ μεθ’ ἱδρυνής βασύνων.
Another formula, preserved in PGM 7 describes a list of noises which a ritualist might make; among “silence”, “popping”, “hissing”, “wailing”, and “bellowing” is the “compulsive sound” (φθόγγος ἀναγκαστικός, l.778), that is, presumably, a sound which was specifically related to the ἐπάναγκος. The second idea is that the sound of a formula might resemble that of an animal. In the Ogdoad of Moses and other texts parts of the formulae claim to be written in the languages of animals, specifically those of baboons, falcons, and other birds, and within Egyptian cosmology baboons in particular were understood as greeting the sun-god on his awakening. The suggestion that the ritualist might be mimicking these divine chorists in the strange manner of pronouncing formulae is strengthened by texts where the ritualist is explicitly instructed to pronounce the formula in the manner of a baboon or dog.

While baboons are capable of many types of vocalisation, the type implied here would seem to be the “wahoo” call, a “loud bark, the ‘wa’ [followed by] a second, lower amplitude ‘hoo’” – a violent, startling sound which may be audible a kilometre away.

---

1833 PGM 7.766-779. The sounds are described as “companions of the name” (σύντροφος το ὀνόματος, l.766) of the moon-goddess, presumably noises meant to accompany the speaking of her name. These include σιγή (l.766), ποππυσμός (l.767), συριγμός (l.769), ὀλολυγμός (l.770), μυκηθμός (l.773).

1834 For a discussion of this idea see Herman te Velde, “Some Remarks on the Mysterious Language of the Baboons,” in Funerary Symbols and Religion, ed. J. H. Kamstra, H. Milde, and K. Wagendonk (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1988). The baboons are described in earlier texts as “shouting” (ḫīt, tyš), probably descriptions of the “wahoo” call and other similar vocalisations (Wilson, A Ptolemaic Lexicon, pp.608, 1123-1124). The fact that earlier texts mention the imitation of baboons as a feature of praising the gods in earlier temple ritual suggests that the mode of enunciation described here may derive from earlier practice; this would help solve the problem of how Roman-era ritualists might know what baboons sounded like, since it seems that the baboon was largely or wholly extinct in Egypt by the Middle Kingdom, or shortly thereafter (Wassell, Ancient Egyptian Fauna pp.76). Baboons were certainly imported into Egypt during the Ptolemaic period as part of the animal cults, although it seems that this would have ceased early in the Roman period with the restriction of funding to animal cults (Jaap Goudsmit and Douglas Brandon-Jones, “Evidence from the Baboon Catacomb in North Saqqara for a West Mediterranean Monkey Trade Route to Ptolemaic Alexandria,” The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 86 (2000)); on the end of the animal cults in the first or second century CE see Dieter Kessler and Abd el Halim Nur el-Din, “Tuna al-Gebel. Millions of Ibises and Other Animals,” in Divine Creatures. Animal Mummies in Ancient Egypt, ed. Salima Ikram (Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 2005), p.149, although the evidence here is for Tuna al-Gebel, and it is difficult to make generalisations for other cults, which may have ended earlier or later.

1835 PGM 4.1006-1007: λέγε ὡς κυνοκέφαλος; PGM 5.27: τὸ ἐκ κυνοκεφαλιστί.

1836 PGM 4.929: εἶτα ὡς κύων. Compare the Book of Thoth B02, 10/9-10: “…he then went about in the hall of the dog… he understood the barking of these and the cries of the land of their fathers” (ph=f mtwn ĥn pi ĥi n pi ḏsm.../ m=f ni ṛwh.w n ni.w irm ni y sbh.w nw ’iš it.w”).
often heard at dawn, when the baboons would be understood as greeting the sun.\textsuperscript{1837}

This combination of doglike “bark” coupled with a noise which might be understood as a lower intake of breath or hiss would appear to be what the ritual instructions describe. While we cannot be certain exactly how this artificial way of speaking would have sounded, it seems likely that this is also what is described in the Demotic texts as “drawing voice” \textit{(sk (n) hrw)}.\textsuperscript{1838} Variously translated as “drawling”,\textsuperscript{1839} “panting”,\textsuperscript{1840} and “whispering”,\textsuperscript{1841} the clearest description seems to be that which occurs in a later Coptic text, which describes a possessed man crying out and “drawing voice through his nose like a wild-pig” \textit{(ⲉϥⲥⲉⲕϩⲣⲟⲟ ρⲧⲛⲛⲧⲁⲧⲛ ϋⲓ ρⲧⲣⲓⲣⲓⲛⲗⲉ)}.\textsuperscript{1842} Here it is clear that grunting is being described, but the fact that it the text specifies that he drew his voice through his nose suggests that snorting per se was not the defining feature; instead it implies that to draw one’s voice was to make a violent, continuous noise linked to strained breathing, either through the nose, as snorting, or as the shouts implied by the descriptions in the Greek magical texts, and comparisons to baboons and dogs.

If this is what is described by the instructions to speak “with fire and breath” we can understand another meaning-function to this mode of enunciation: the manipulation of πνεῦμα. This substance, regularly mentioned in the speaking instructions, was at once the material from which deities were made, the spark of life, the means of perception carried through the blood vessels, and most importantly, the breath.\textsuperscript{1843} The speaking instructions contained in the \textit{Mithras Liturgy} occur as part of a series of instructions on regulating the breath, drawing in πνεῦμα from the rays of the sun.
using it to ascend into the celestial spheres, and expelling it in powerful vocalisations. These violent breathing exercises would undoubtedly have resulted marked physiological and subjective effects: in this same text the act of bellowing the formula is described as “exciting the five senses". Here we can turn to the last of the three points of interest in the instructions from the Oracle of Serapis, in which the ritualist is to speak _eta_ “with savour". The concept that “radiant speech" could have a physical effect on the world was a key one in ancient Mediterranean cosmologies; most famous today is the idea that the Judaean god ordered the cosmos through speech, an idea developed in the Gospel of John with the λόγος, the divine word, as the agent of this creative act. The idea however had an older Egyptian precedent in the Memphite Theology, attested from reign of Shabaka (c.720–706 BCE), and a more directly relevant example within the Theban Library itself, in two of the recensions of the Ogdoad of Moses. In this account the creator gives seven laughs – implicitly connected to the seven vowels spoken by the ritualist at the end of the historiola – each of which creates a deity. This radiant vocalisation is affected by his emotional state – thus, when he is gloomy while laughing he creates the terrifying goddess of fate, laughing while gladdened he creates the god of time, and speaking while frightened he creates the almighty god Iaō. If the speech of ritualists in imitating the gods partook of this same power of radiant speech – the word realised in breath – it seems reasonable to assumethat their emotional state might also affect the creative outcome of their words, and thus explaining the instructions to speak with certain emotions – “with savour", and so on.

---

1844 PGM 4.537-538: “Inhale breath from the (sun’s) rays” (Ἐλθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκτίνων πνεῦμα).
1845 PGM 4.705-708: “...bellow a long bellow straining your stomach, so that you excite the five senses, until you run out (of breath)” (...μύκωμα μακρόν βασανίζων τὴν γαστέρα/ ἵνα συνκινήσῃ τὰς πέντε αἰσθήσεις μα/κρὸν εἰς ἀπόθεσιν/ μυκῶ).
1846 PGM 5.29.
1847 Here I draw upon Assmann’s exposition of the Egyptian concept of the “radiant power (_ḥ.tw_) of the sacred word” (Assmann, The Search for God in Ancient Egypt, pp.87-92).
1848 Gospel of John 1.1-3.
1850 This historiola is found in PGM 13.162-209, 473-563.
The texts prescribing this mode of speaking are in a minority, so it is hard to be certain that this was standard practice, or maintained consistently throughout formulae, although it does not seem impossible – this kind of bodily praxis seems exactly the kind of detail more readily passed on through in-person instruction than through textual description. Nonetheless, there are occasionally other manners of speaking demanded – one text instructs the ritualist to speak “to yourself, not saying anything”, while the initiation procedure of the *Mithras Liturgy* instructs the practitioner to speak the words with “a soft voice”, but in this latter instance the purpose is clearly specified: it is so that the would-be initiate cannot hear them.

The other bodily postures of the ritualists are prescribed with almost as much detail as their voices. Most straightforwardly this may concern their spatial orientation, usually towards a cardinal direction: thus the practitioner is most often instructed to face east, usually for rituals invoking the rising sun, as is often the case with preliminary procedures; west, to address the setting sun, or funerary deities; north, generally in rituals addressing the Ursa Major, or they may be instructed to face particular celestial bodies – the sun, moon, or a constellation, without specifying which direction they will be in. The most complex instance occurs in the *Decad of Moses* (*PGM* 13.734-1077), in which the ritualist is to address a vowel to each direction – east, north, west, south, down to the earth, and then up, first to the air (ἐν ἀήρ, l.831), then to

---


1852 *PGM* 4.745-746: “...speak over his head in a soft voice so that he may not hear them” (... λέγε ἀυτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς/ κεφαλῆς ἀτόνῳ φθόγγῳ, ἵνα μὴ ἀκοῦσῃ). Based on this reference, several authors have in the past argued that whispering was the normal mode of enouncing formulae, but this seems unwarranted. See for example Hopfner, *Griechische-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, vol.2 §40; Samson Eitrem, “Exkurs: Die 5. und 17. Epode des Horaz”, *Symbolae Osloenses* 12, no. 1 (1933), p.32 fn.2.


1854 *PGM* 4.1275-1322 (preliminary ritual); *PGM* 4.1928-2005 (preliminary ritual, spoken to the setting sun); *PGM* 8.64-110 (to the setting sun); *PDM* 14.627-636 (the ritual invokes Osiris); *PDM* 14.750-777; *PGM* 7.478-90; *PGM* 12.190-192; *PDM* 14.1078-1089; *PGM* 72.1-36


1856 *PGM* 1.42-195.

1857 *PGM* 1.42-195 (apparently addressed to the [...δ]ίπτυχος, perhaps an asterism).
the heavens (οὐρανός, l.832), presumably the upper air. Where the words are not addressed to the deity in the form of a celestial body, they may be spoken over the medium of apparition, by which we may understand either that this object functions as the deity, or else that it is empowered through the speaking of the formula. Thus the formulae may be spoken to the lamp, or the vessel, the boy seer, or other materia used in the ritual.

Alongside these indications of the direction of the speech, the ritualist may be directed to assume particular positions, placing their hands upon their heads or rubbing them, kneeling, stamping seven times, stretching out their hands to the moon, or tapping the boy seer’s head with a finger. During the speaking of the formula they are often instructed to control their eyes: most often to close them during the invocation before opening them to behold the apparition, although in other texts they may be instructed to look to the side or to avoid looking at the medium of apparition. Where a boy seer is used the medium rather than the ritualist may be instructed to close their eyes during the invocation.

As this discussion has been intended to show, the speaking of words was as much a physical as a verbal act, but alongside this process other physical actions were to take place. The most common of these is the act of making an offering to the deity, usually

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1859}}\text{PGM 2.1-64; PGM 4.930-1114; PGM 7.664-68; PDM 14.150-233; PDM 14.1078-1089.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1860}}\text{PGM 4.154-285.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1862}}\text{See for example PDM 61.63-78, where the formula is spoken to a laurel leaf which has a series of onomata and images written on it; the leaf is then placed under the ritualist’s head. Compare P. Macq. I I 15.20-21, where the formula is spoken over embalming salts (cité par le texte) before these are placed under the ritualist’s head – on the basis of the parallels I understand ως υπάρχον διάκρισις here as having its literal meaning of “under the head”, rather than on the extended sense of “before, in front of”.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1863}}\text{PGM 7.1-36.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1864}}\text{PGM 7.1009-1016.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1865}}\text{PGM 4.1331-1389.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1866}}\text{PDM 14.117-149.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1867}}\text{PDM Suppl. 130-38.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1868}}\text{PDM 14.475-488; PDM 14.856-875; PDM 14.875-885.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1869}}\text{PGM 4.930-1114; PDM 14.528-553; PDM 14.805-840; PDM 14.841-850.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1870}}\text{PGM 7.335-47.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1871}}\text{PDM 61.63-78.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{1872}}\text{PDM 14.1-92; PDM 14.528-553; PGM 62.24-46.}\]
in the form of a burnt offering of vegetable, mineral, or animal materia (see 4.3); the pairing of spoken formulae with offerings was a longstanding part of both Egyptian and Hellenic\textsuperscript{1873} cultural practice. Other actions are specified in a few other instances, however: the ritualist may be instructed to anoint themselves with oil or eye-paint,\textsuperscript{1874} or hold an object,\textsuperscript{1875} which they may be instructed to shake,\textsuperscript{1876} wave in the sacrificial smoke,\textsuperscript{1877} or display to the deity.\textsuperscript{1878}

As acts within larger ritual complexes, speech acts may be used to help connect the different components of each ritual together into a unified whole; here I will refer to this function as concord, extending the metaphor of ritual as a language-like phenomenon. This is accomplished in many ways in the magical papyri, but I will discuss three here. The first, and most straightforward of these, is when the same formula is used multiple times in the same ritual, tying together the different complexes which constitute the larger ritual. Thus, for example, the same ritual may be spoken for the invocation, preliminary procure, salutation, or compulsive procedures, or else to two different deities within the same ritual.\textsuperscript{1879} A second possibility, and one that probably occurred more than is strictly recorded, is the writing of the spoken formula; thus the spoken formula may also be written on objects used in the ritual or, in the case of dream oracles, placed by the ritualist as they

\textsuperscript{1871} Ausfeld, “De Graecorum precationibus quaestiones”, pp.506-507; Furley and Bremer, Greek Hymns: The texts in translation, p.32.
\textsuperscript{1872} PGM 4.930-114: "... smear (your eyes) with koptic kohl" (release procedure; ἐγχρίου/ στίμι κοπτικόν, ll.1069-1070); PGM 12.190-192 (oil).
\textsuperscript{1873} PGM 4.1331-1389 (single-shooted Egyptian onion).
\textsuperscript{1874} PGM 1.42-195 (preliminary procedure: holds and shakes falcon head; main ritual: holds and shakes myrtle branch).
\textsuperscript{1875} PGM 5.440-458: “hold the left in your right hand and a spray of olive and laurel in your right and wave them towards the lamp” (κρατεῖ τῇ ἀριστερᾷ σου τὸν/ ἐξακτύλιον τῇ δε δεξιᾷ σου κλάδον ἐλαίου/ας και δάφνης κατασείων τῷ λύχνῳ, ll. 451-453); PGM 7.628-642: “wave the ring through the smoke of the frakincense” (περιένεγκον τὸν δακτύλιον ἐπὶ/ τῆς ἀτμίδος τοῦ λιβάνου, ll.638-369); PGM 7.740-755: “wave the [metal] leaf around the smoke” (περιένεγκον…/ περὶ τὴν ἀτμίδα τὸ πέταλον, ll.742-743); PGM 7.795-845: “having incensed the branch, place it by your head” (λιβανωτίσας/ τὸν κλάδον θὲς πρὸς κεφαλὴν σου, ll.842-843)
\textsuperscript{1876} PGM 7.628-528 (preliminary procedure: ring shown to the Pole Star); PGM 7.505-528 (preliminary ritual: egg shown to the sun before being consumed); PGM 72.1-36 (lamella shown to Ursa Major).
\textsuperscript{1877} PGM 2.1-64 (same formula spoken to the sun and moon); PGM 5.370-439 (same formula spoken to the sun and moon); PGM 14.475-488 (same formula used for invocation and compulsive procedure); PDM 14.475-488 (same formula spoken as preliminary formula, invocation, and salutation).
Finally, spoken formulae may be used to create a link between two objects; the clearest example of this is when the same formula is spoken both to the sun in a preliminary procedure, and then to the lamp in the main invocation; in this case the sun itself is linked to the lesser light of the lamp, so that the sun god may be contacted through it.

4.2.2 Types of speech acts

Alongside the physical components of the speaking of formulae – their enunciation, physical postures, and accompanying actions – the linguistic components constitute equally, if not more important, sources of their meaning-function. Here I will provide a relatively brief discussion of the ways in which speech acts are realised linguistically, focusing on the categories and functions already introduced (see 4.2).

4.2.2.1 Identifying deities and historiolae

Two aspects of the formulae – the identification of deities and historiolae – have received the bulk of the attention in studies to date, and not without reason: these often contain fascinating information about cultic practices and beliefs, as well as clues to the meaning-function of the rituals themselves. Nonetheless, there is already abundant material discussing these aspects, and so for this reason, I will restrict my remarks on them to a few points.

A deity can be identified in a number of ways, most commonly by either a name or an epithet. In turn, names may be those of deities drawn from the stock of the cults of the ancient Mediterranean, or they may be onomata, that is names which apparently originate not from public cults, but the rather belong to the amorphous tradition of names created from pieces of different languages or language games, including the use of gematria and palindromes. Neither of these categories are necessarily as clear-cut as it may initially seem – in the case of cultic names, an important question arises

\[\begin{align*}
1880 & \text{ PGM 2.1-64 (same formula spoken to the lamp and written on laurels placed by the ritualist’s head);} \\
1881 & \text{ PGM 7.1009-1016: same formula spoken and written on laurels placed by ritualist’s head).} \\
1882 & \text{ PGM 4.930-1114; PDM 14.117-149; PDM 14.150-231.}
\end{align*}\]
of whether Greek names – Asklepios, for example – should be understood as representing a Hellenic deity, or an Egyptian deity understood through the lens of the *interpretatio graeca*, or as some sort of fusion of Hellenic and Egyptian elements; in many cases I would suggest the last option to be the correct one. In terms of *onomata*, which will be discussed at further length below (4.2.2.3) there are instances both where an apparent *onomata* may in fact be an established divine name in a language other than the primary one used in the text, or may be an established divine name which is nonetheless treated like an *onomata*. Epithets are less problematic, but again can be divided into two types: the first is of single-word descriptions, while the second is of more elaborate attributions in the form of subordinate clauses.

Both of types of speech act – identifying deities through either names or epithets – serve one of two purposes. Firstly, as parts of the Call they specify the deity being summoned, and they do this in two paradoxical ways. By enumerating names and epithets of deities they may pinpoint more narrowly the deity being invoked, so that the one who comes is exactly the one needed, and not, for example, an imposter or hostile entity – they may do this by naming specific cultic sites or acts performed by the god. But they may also draw upon multiple deities, in a sense “creating” the desired divinity by compounding desired aspects of multiple divine figures: thus, for example, the text may call upon a deity named simultaneously as Zeus, Helios, Mithras, and Sarapis. To some extent this tendency towards syncretism was a more general feature of late antique religiosity, but in the magical papyri it seems to serve a

---

1882 See for example PGM 7.628-42, where the deity is identified as the Memphite Asklepios, that is, Imhotep.
1883 See for example PGMXXX, where the Hermes is described in a way that suggests he is simultaneously understood as the Greek Hermes (the description of the statue as carrying a herald’s staff and wearing winged sandals), and the Egyptian Thoth (the use of an ibis egg, the lunar associations).
1884 See for instance Ἰάω, the name of the Jewish god, at time had to distinguish from the vowel strings; see for example Ἰαω· Ἰε· Ἰεω at PGM 1.16.
1885 Compare the comments of W. D. Furley: “Greek prayers were usually addressed to] a combination of gods almost like ingredients in herbal medicine: not one, but a combination of active ingredients was thought most efficacious.” (W. D. Furley, “Prayers and Hymns,” in *A Companion to Greek Religion*, ed. Daniel Ogden (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), p.123).
1886 PGM 5.4-6.
fairly specific purpose. In rare instances the name of the deity will be left out of written formulae, to be inserted by the practitioner.

While epithets may serve the same functions – identifying and conflating particular divine figures in the Call section of formulae – they also have a further use, serving as part of the Argument. They may do this either by establishing that the deity in question is one in whose nature it is to give requests – “you are said to be the prophet of events... who send forth oracles by day and night”, says one formula – or else by establishing that the deity is one powerful enough to perform the desired task, or to rouse another deity to come for the consultation.

This function of the epithet shades into the historiola, and indeed, such descriptions can be thought of as abbreviated historiolae. A historiola is a brief story of a mythic character, which serves to provide a precedent for the ritualist’s actions; the practitioner brings mythic time, and hence the divine power described in the myth, into the present moment. This type of speech act is very well established in older Egyptian practice, and although such acts are more common in other ritual types – healing or erotic compulsion procedures, for example – they still occur in rituals of apparition. Among the more notable examples is the historiola which occurs in the

---

1887 For the conflation of Zeus, Helios, Mithras, and Sarapis, for example, compare Nonnus, *Dionysiaca* 40.369-410, where Herakles of Tyre is identified with a dizzying array of deities: Helios, Belos, Ammon, Apis, Cronos, Zeus, Sarapis, Zeus of Egypt, Cronos, Phaethon, Mithras, Delphic Apollo, Gamos, Paieon, and Ouranos. See also P.Oxy. 11.1382 (II CE) II.22-23, a fragmentary literary text where a deity is named as Διὸς Ἡλίου μεγάλου Σαράπιδος ἀρετὴ; and P.Oxy. 8.1148 (I CE), an oracle fragment where a god is addressed in II.1-2 as Κύριε μου Σάραπι, Ἡλιε ἔυεργέτα.

1888 See for example PGM 4.236: “Oh NN god” (ὅτις θ(εό)ς).

1889 In this case they function as an Argument of the type *da quia hoc dare tuum est*; see the classification in Bremer, “Greek hymns”, p.196.

1890 PGM 5.410-412: μοιρῶν προγνώστης σὺ/ λέγῃ καὶ θείος Ὄνειρος ἡμερινοὺς [καὶ]/ νυκτερινοὺς χρησμοὺς ἐπιπέμπω.

1891 See for example PGM 2.8, where the deity is called “[you] who control this night and are master of it” ([ὁ] τὴν νύκτα ταύτην κατέχων καὶ ταύτης δεσποτεύων). The question of whether it is the deity itself or a lower emanation who appears is rarely entirely clear in texts, and may be deliberately elided, but later in the same text the deity is invoked to “force a friendly daimôn of prophecy to come to me” (νῦν μοι ἐλθεῖν ἀνάγκασον φίλον/ δαίμονα χρησμισθην, 53-54).

1892 See for example PGM 2.8, where the deity is called “[you] who control this night and are master of it” ([ὁ] τὴν νύκτα ταύτην κατέχων καὶ ταύτης δεσποτεύων). The question of whether it is the deity itself or a lower emanation who appears is rarely entirely clear in texts, and may be deliberately elided, but later in the same text the deity is invoked to “force a friendly daimôn of prophecy to come to me” (νῦν μοι ἐλθεῖν ἀνάγκασον φίλον/ δαίμονα χρησμισθην, 53-54).

formula for the preliminary procedure of Nephotes’ Sustasis (PGM 4.154-285), in which the ritualist is identified with a soldier of Helios-Typhon, who fought with the god against the other deities, only to be cast down; the ritualist thus asks the god to raise, and hence empower, his soldier in recognition of their relationship.1893 By contrast, in the invocation formula of the Oracle of Kronos (PGM 4.3086-3124) the ritualist recounts a story based on that contained in Hesiod’s Theogony, in which Kronos is overthrown and chained by his son Helios; in this case the ritualist is identified with Helios, gaining the sun god’s power over the invoked deity.1894 The most elaborate historiola is the already-mentioned theogony of the Ogdoad of Moses, in which the act of retelling the story of the gods’ creation and naming grants the ritualist the knowledge necessary to summon the deity, and, by imitating the creator’s vocalisations, the authority to command them.

4.2.2.2 Imperatives

The most common form of speech act in the formulae is the use of imperatives to command the deity to perform certain actions; these are found in both Egyptian and Greek, and in the majority of formulae in all syntactic positions, from preliminary procedures to release rituals. In both Greek and Demotic these are expressed using the normal forms for the imperative; the imperatives in Greek may be aorist or present, active or medio-passive, second or, less commonly, third person, and are almost without exception singular.1895 Demotic texts likewise use both verbs where the imperative is identical to the infinitive, and verbs with separate infinitive forms.1896 Alongside the imperative, Egyptian texts may use the optative with a very similar meaning, and with a similar range of verbs being used; Demotic texts using the form my+verb+subject, or the periphrastic my+lr+subject, while Old Coptic texts exclusively use the latter, written as ṯⲧⲧⲧⲧ+subject; this is the standard form in

1893 PGM 4.185-200.
1894 PGM 4.3098-3108.
1895 On rare occasions optatives may be used in the place of imperatives, see for example “may you come gracious” (τάξεις ἔλθοις, PGM 1.303); the use of this unusual form may be due, in part, to its inclusion in one of the metrical hymns, which are written in a deliberately elevated style.
Coptic. Alongside these forms, the imperative force of a main clause may be continued in subordinate clauses; in Egyptian this is marked by the conjunctive, whereas in Greek it is formed with either ἵνα + the subjunctive, or, more often a participle. Within the structure of the formulae, the imperatives, and, where they fulfil a comparable function, the optatives, serve to express the Petition, naming the desired outcome of the ritual.

The most common imperatives are those which can be translated into English as “come”, or more specifically, “come to me”. While this injunction can be found in older cultic hymns from both the Egyptian and Greek traditions, it takes on a new and more vivid meaning in rituals where the deity is to appear visibly to the practitioner rather than simply be present at their worship; the injunction “come to me” appears not only in invocation formulae, but regularly in other formula types, in particular compulsive and light-bringing formulae. The ubiquity of “come to me” in the formulae is by its occurrences in the invocations recorded by both Hor and Hippolytus, in very different contexts, and find echoes in other relevant texts, the *Dream of Nectanebo*, and one of the dreams of the Memphite *katokhite*.

---

1897 See ibid., pp.139-144. As Johnson points out, my is historically the imperative form of the verb ḏ. The fact that optatives seem to generally have third person subjects may indicate that they are comparable in function to the Greek third-person imperatives; compare the comments of Ort-Geuthner (*Grammaire Démotique du Papyrus Magique de Londres et Leyde* (Paris: Libraire Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1936), §145c) and Layton (*A Coptic Grammar with Chrestomathy and Glossary. Sahidic Dialect* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2000), §340) on the complementary roles of the imperative and optative forms.

1898 For example PGM 4.23-24: ἱεροτούμει ἡ λεῖα ἡ ἵνα ἀνasking γινεῖν ἄλλα; PDM 14.1081-1082: wnH=k ῥ.ἵ=γ y tι mn pθ nτη/ mtw=k sde irm[=y]/ hr pθ nτη-iw=y ’Sn. fs-k’.

1899 For example in PGM 7.329-330: ᾿αλίδησθι μου τὰ ἔκτα ᾿αν μου ἀργομνήσις.


1901 See the discussion of invitations for the god to come in Serge Sauneron, “Un hymne à Imouthès,” *Bulletin de la Société française d’Égyptologie* 63(1965), pp.77-78.


1903 In l.18 we find “come to me” (ἐλθέ μοι). Here, however, it is spoken by the god Ares-Onuris to Isis in a scene dream. The same phrase appears in a dream recorded by Ptolemaios the Memphite *katokhite*, this time spoken by the dreamer to the god (UPZ 1:78.23-24).
come (to me)  
PGM 4.76 (ἔλθε); PGM 4.89 (Διαλέγω); PDM 12.37; PDM 12.38;  
PDM 12.39; PDM 12.42; PDM 14.10; PDM 14.133; PDM 14.139;  

εἰσέλθε  
PGM 4.965; PGM 4.1002; PGM 4.1007; PGM 4.1013; PGM  
4.1019; PGM 4.1023; PGM 4.1031; PGM 4.3220; PGM 5.444;  
PGM 12.158; PGM 13.207; PGM 13.701; PGM 4.1041; PGM  
4.1045; PGM 62.34  

ἐλθέ  
PGM 1.296; PGM 2.83; PGM 3.257; PGM 4.875; PGM 4.999;  
PGM 4.3106; PGM 7.247; PGM 8.84; PGM 11a.10  

ἄπελθε  
PGM 1.26; PGM 1.29; PGM 7.555; PGM 7.559;  

answer (me)  
PGM 14.194; PDM 61.75; PDM 61.76  

dd... wih  
PDM 14.132; PDM 14.138; PDM 14.523; PDM 14.634; PDM  
Suppl.177  

σὴν  
PDM 14.497; PDM 14.525; PDM 14.827  

σὴλε  
PDM 14.523; PDM 14.851; PDM 14.1082  

χρημάτιστη  
PDM 7.369; PDM 7.358; PDM 7.444  

χρημάτισσον  
PDM 1.297; PDM 4.951; PDM 4.2503; PDM 5.421; PDM 5.444- 
445; PGM 7.248; PGM 7.996; PGM 12.150; PGM 12.158; PGM  
14.106; PDM 62.35; PDM 77.20  

open  
PGM 12.21; PDM 12.22; PDM 14.5; PDM 14.189; PDM 14.396;  
PDM 14.805; PDM 14.861  

ἀνοίγε  
PDM 7.326; PDM 62.29  

appear (to me)  
PDM 14.130; PDM 14.131; PDM 14.132; PDM 14.294; PDM  
14.401; PDM 14.462; PDM 14.593; PDM 14.198  

φάνητι  
PDM 4.999; PDM 4.1045; PDM 5.416; PDM 7.331; PDM 7.550;  
PDM 7.574; PDM 7.641; PDM 11a.10  

send (to me)  
PDM 14.499; PDM 14.543; PDM 14.857  

ἀνάπεμψ  
PDM 14.499; PDM 14.526  

πέμψον  
PDM 1.317; PDM 4.968; PDM 7.634  

listen (to me)  
PDM 14.699  

έπακουσον  
PDM 2.83; PDM 4.870; PDM 4.1948  

κλῦθι  
PDM 2.85; PDM 2.118; PDM 2.315; PDM 4.1963  

leave  
PDM 2.178; PDM 3.263; PDM 4.3122  

χωρεῖ  
PDM 1.94; PDM 2.181; PDM 3.260; PDM 4.920; PDM 4.1061;  
PDM 5.41  

42: Imperatives as speech acts

The next most common request is for the deity to answer the ritualist, unsurprising  
given the fact that in most cases rituals of apparition were intended to provide  
answers to questions. Following “answer me” in frequency is the injunction “open to  
me”, attested largely in invocation and compulsive formulae; in these speech acts the  
ritualists are calling upon the medium of apparition, and the divine realm, to open up  
and reveal the deity (see 3.3.3), or else for either their own or their medium’s eyes and
ears to open to sense the deity and their response. The next three most common commands are for the deity to “appear”, the deity to “send” either a lower deity or an answer, and for the deity to “listen” to the ritualist. The injunction to “listen” is particularly common in formulae for preliminary procedures, perhaps as a consequence of the importance of the practitioner gaining the deity’s attention for the main ritual. “Send” has the unusual distinction of occurring in one of the oldest Egyptian texts mentioning a ritual of apparition, the Ramesside-era story of Khonsuemhab and the Ghost, in which the titular character, a Theban priest, summons a restless ḭḥ by calling upon the gods to “send (him) that august spirit”.

Other commands may be less common in invocation rituals, but more common in other types of formula. Thus, for example, preliminary procedure formulae may command the god to be “conjoined” to the ritualist, while light-bringing texts regularly call upon the light to “increase”, release rituals, unsurprisingly, call upon the deity to “leave”, and both preliminary and release rituals call upon the deity to “be benevolent”. In this last instance the reasoning may be different in either case: preliminary rituals require the deity to be well disposed for the apparition to come about, whereas release rituals, intended to be used when the potentially dangerous deity is already present, request the deity to depart, leaving the ritualists and their seers unharmed.

4.2.2.3 Onomata

The strings of unrecognisable words and vowel-strings which I call here onomata occur in almost every formula, and the few in which they are not found tend to be either very brief, or else consist of metrical verses in Greek. The opposite phenomenon, formulae consisting entirely of onomata, is also attested, and with slightly greater frequency. In general, however, the onomata are integrated into the

---

1904. 2.5: imm ḭw n-i ḥḥḥ ṣḥḥ ṣḥḥy.
1905. Among the examples of formulae without onomata are PGM 1.94-95; PGM 2.178-180; PGM 2.230-232; PGM 3.622-625; PGM 4.2502-2505; PGM 5.400-421.
1906. Examples of formulae consisting entirely of onomata include PGM 1.133-142; PGM 4.311-312; PDM 14.1165-1166.
syntax of the Greek or Egyptian texts, appearing throughout formulae – at the beginning, at the ends, and at various positions in the middle.

Although there is no explicit theory of *onomata* given in the magical papyri, we can to some extent reconstruct an outline of how they were understood; an *onoma* may be referred to in the texts as a “name” (ὄνομα), a “formula” (λόγος), or a “writing” (ςς), and these terms may be used fairly indiscriminately for the same sequences. As these terms imply, they seem to have often have been thought of as representing the “true” names of deities, and as such imbued with an inherent power; for this reason simply speaking certain names constitutes a speech act. An example of this where the meaning-function is fairly transparent is found in *Nephotes’ Sustasis*, in which the formula to summon a deity ends with the speaking of the hundred-name letter of Helios-Typhon, compelling the subordinate deity to come; the same name is used alone as the release. A more dramatic example can be found in the third recension of the *Ogdoad of Moses*, in which the speaking of the god’s name in full is credited with the power to throw the entire cosmos into confusion.

In other cases, the *onomata* may function within the normal syntax of sentences, being used as the predicate in autocletics – “I am Muroi Muribi Babel Batho” – or in similar constructions where the deity is named – “your name is Barbariel”. The latter instance could be understand as a Call, but, like the speaking of a bare *onomata* or an autocletic, asserting knowledge of the deity’s secret name may serve as an Argument, providing the force which gives weight to the Petition. Similarly, *onomata* may serve as

---

1907 For example PGM 1.36, 146; PGM 3.417, 430; PGM 5.438.
1908 For example in PDM 14.1056, where the μασκελλι μασκελλω formula is identified as “the names of the gods” (n r n w n n nfr w).
1909 For example at PGM 1.195; PGM 2.157; PGM 4.1570; PGM 7.302.
1910 For example at PDM 14.124a, 174a.
1912 PGM 13.872-877: “I call upon your name, the greatest among the gods; if I say it in its entirety there will be an earthquake, the sun will stand still, and the moon will be afraid, and the rocks and the mountains and the sea and the rivers and all liquid will be petrified, and the whole cosmos will be thrown into confusion” (ἐπικαλοῦμαι σου τὸ ὄνομα τὸ μέγιστον ἐν/ θεοῖς ὃ ἐὰν εἴπω τέλειον ἔσται σεισμὸς ὁ ἥλιος/ στήσεται καὶ ἡ σελήνη ἐνφοβος ἔσται καὶ οἱ πέτραι καὶ τὰ ὄρη καὶ ἡ θάλασσα καὶ οἱ ποταμοί / καὶ πᾶν ὑγρὸν ὕποπτωρθήσεται ὁ κόσμος / ὁ ἄλος συνχυθῆσεται, 873-877).
1913 PDM 14.126i: rin/ mwr jy mwr jy bbr l b3-l,th b3-m l.
1914 PGM 4.1029-1030: ὄνομα σοι Βαρβαρήλ.
the direct or indirect object in performatives – “For I speak your true names, ἰόερβηθ ἰὀπακερβηθ...”;1915 “I adjure you by the Ento Tapsati Legenisthō...”.1916 Again, in all of these instances the onoma is understood explicitly as a name or sequence of names. We can infer similar understandings where, for example, the onoma stands where we might expect a name or epithet. Thus in PGM 5a a sequence of onomata is interposed between the name of the god in the vocative, and the imperative giving a command;1917 it seems clear that this list is to be understood as a continuation of the name of the deity.

Alongside this understanding, however, is the idea that some onomata constitute utterances in another language – either that of a foreign people, animals, or deities. This is most explicit in two of the recensions of the Ogdoad of Moses, where the interpretations of various names are given: “the enneamorphos greets you in hieratic, ‘Menephōiphōth’, meaning ‘I go before you, Lord’.1918 This is also implicit in instances where formulae begin or end with long onomata, or consist of onomata alone.

Onomata allow, and even encourage, experimentation, and alteration to fulfil different meaning-functions. It is clear that at least some of them derive from the principle of isopsephism, that is that they are constructed on the basis of the numerical value of their constitutive characters, and there are numerous instances where the number of letters they consist of is highlighted, not only, I would suggest, to ensure their correct transmission, but to highlight their inherent efficacy. Numbers were linked to the fundamental forces and constituents of the universe – the four directions, the seven planets, the twenty-four hours - and thus had inherent power. In other cases, onomata could be manipulated through oral representations of written processes – thus they could diminish or increase in the manner of a letter formation, conceptually increasing or decreasing in power. Similarly, although the effect of palindromes is only fully realised in written form, it can be represented to some extent in speech – by

1915 PGM 4.278-279: λέγω γάρ σου τὰ ἀληθινὰ (_TCP_)/ ἵωερβηθ• ἵωπακερβηθ•.
1916 PGM 7.555-6: ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς κατὰ τοῦ ἐντω ταψατι λεγηνισθω...
1917 PGM 5a.i: Ἡδὲ ἐννεαμορφος χαοτάτη/ ἐις σανδουμ/ ἵωερβηθ•
1918 PGM 13.159-162: ὁ δὲ ἐννεάμορφος ἀσπάζεται σε/ ἱερατιστί μενεφωϊφωθ• λέγων 'ἵναυα/ ὃτι· προάγω σου/ κύριε; compare the parallel in ll.469-471.
reading out the reversed word. This effect is utilised in the *Oracle of Kronos*, in which
the release formula consists of a reversal of the *onomata* used in the invocation
formula: here, again, the meaning function is clear – the invocation, in which the deity
is asked to come, is the reverse of the release, in which they are asked to go.

4.2.2.4 Performatives

Performatives are one of the most characteristic features of Roman-era magical texts,
and their usage is particularly revealing for compositional questions. In Greek they are
formed with first person present indicative singular verb forms, either in the active or
middle voice; in Demotic they are formed using the first person singular of the first-
present (*tw=y+verb*).

The vast majority of performatives fall into two categories, those translated in English
as “I call (on you)” and similar phrases, and those translated as “I adjure you”; less
common are “I ask you”, “I sing to you”, “I thank you”, “I command you”, “I bind you”, “I
imitate you”, “I see you”. Of these “I ask you” is particularly common in formulae for
preliminary procedures, while the others are more or less equally common or
uncommon in all formula types. The function of these within formulae is fairly
straightforward. “I call on you” can be used to as part of the Call, but also as part of the
Argument. This latter function is usually signalled by the performative being preceded
by a conjunction of reason (*ὅτι*, *Dd*, ϫⲉ): “do NN thing because I call on you”. These
clauses may then be extended by providing further information – the ritualist calls
upon the deity by their name, or on the authority of a higher deity. Here the speech act
– the call itself – has a radiant power contrary to the normal mechanism of
performatives in everyday life.

Performatives of the type “I adjure you” are even stronger examples of this type,
deriving their power primarily from their performance, although they implicitly make
reference to the social convention of swearing oaths, and they may provide a basis for
the adjuration – “by your name”, “by NN authority” – and so on. Again, the use of a
conjunction of reason may highlight the function of the adjuration as an Argument.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Category</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I call (on you)</td>
<td>τωγένοις</td>
<td>PDM Suppl.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐπικαλοῦμαι</td>
<td>PGM 4.871; PGM 4.959; PGM 4.996; PGM 4.1345; PGM 4.3219; PGM 4.3230; PGM 5.4; PGM 7.350; PGM 8.94; PGM 12.147; PGM 12.155; PGM 13.138; PGM 13.443; PGM 13.698; PGM 77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καλω</td>
<td>PGM 1.301; PGM 2.101; PGM 2.139; PGM 4.261; PGM 4.398; PGM 7.564; PGM 7.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>κληζω</td>
<td>PGM 1.355; PGM 1.325; PGM 3.211; PGM 3.214; PGM 4.271; PGM 4.1963; PGM 4.1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>παρακαλω</td>
<td>PGM 7.834; PGM 7.839; PGM 72.20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I adjure (you)</td>
<td>τωγενοις</td>
<td>PDM 14.277; PDM 14.1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εξορκιζω</td>
<td>PGM 4.274; PGM 4.3235; PGM 7.494; PGM 7.836; PGM 7.1006; PGM 12.148; PDM 14.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ὁρκιζω</td>
<td>PGM 1.342; PGM 1.345; PGM 1.305; PGM 3.226; PGM 4.978; PGM 4.3205; PGM 7.242; PGM 7.556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43: Performatives as speech acts

Within the Greek hymnic tradition, performatives of the type "I call on you" are extremely common, although those of the type "I adjure you" are, for obvious reasons, apparently unknown in the traditional cults. The origin of this type of performative is difficult to trace. The earliest examples seem to be found in first century CE binding tablets, and there is a mention of their use by an exorcist in Lucian of Samosata’s *Philopseudes*; the use of the verb εξορκιζειν in other first century texts to refer to exorcism more generally implies that this may reflect a broader usage. These instances, used in curse and exorcistic rituals, suggests that performatives of this type were absorbed into the tradition of Mediterranean magical ritual around this time, spreading, presumably, from these to other ritual types.

---

1920 *Philopseudes* 16.
1921 Acts of the Apostles 19.13-17; see the discussion in Roy D. Kotansky, "Greek Exorcistic Amulets," in Ancient magic and ritual power, ed. Marvin Meyer and Paul Mirecki (Leiden: Brill, 1995). The earlier, fourth or third century BCE, example of the Phalasarna tablet discussed by Kotansky on pp.253-257 can no longer be accepted; as he himself noted (p.28 fn.8) the performative “we adjure” (ὁρκῶμεν, l.5) is in fact a misreading; Kotansky suggests “we ward off” (ἀρκῶμεν), while the most recent re-edition has “ward off with escorts” (ἀρκοῦ μεμπομπα[ῖς]). For the original reading see David R. Jordan, "The Inscribed Lead Tablet from Phalasarna,” Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 94 (1992); for a more recent reading see "The Inscribed Lead Tablet from Phalasarna, Crete (Inscriptiones Creticae 2.223-5 no. xix.7),” in The Getty Hexameters. Poetry, Magic, and Mystery in Ancient Selinous, ed. Christopher A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
There is a striking difference in usage in Demotic texts. While performatives appear in 54% of Greek invocation formulae, they only appear in 11% of those in Demotic; in practice this amounts to only five texts which contain performatives, and this number is barely increased if we look to formulae in other ritual types. This striking phenomenon demands some kind of explanation. There is no grammatical barrier to the use of performatives in Egyptian; their presence in a few Demotic texts, and their ubiquity in an identical form in later Coptic invocations is testament to this. Similarly, there would appear to be no lexical gaps in Egyptian which would prevent the use of verbs comparable to those used in Greek texts: the verb used for “to call”, ὄς, continues to be employed in Coptic texts (ⲟⲟⲟ), where it is used alongside and interchangeably with Greek loanwords such as ἐπικάλει. The verb “to adjure” is more problematic; the expected verb here would be ὅκ, “to swear an oath”, which appears in Demotic as a performative, although I have not been able to find any transitive examples – “I adjure” being essentially a transitive form of “I swear”. Transitive examples can be found in Coptic, however, and, in the form ὅφκ, this verb regularly appears as a performative in Coptic invocations, alongside the Greek loanword ὀρκίζω. The comparable term in Demotic, however, seems to be “I cast ⲧⲓⲥⲡⲧⲡ”. This word, ὄφ, is a difficult one to express in English, but it seems to correspond to a concept of divine compulsion which can manifest itself as either a curse or inspiration, and which was

---

1922 There are two more instances of performatives in two rituals of erotic compulsion in PDM 14: PDM 14.636-669: “I cast ⲟⲟⲟ against you today” (ⲧⲓⲧⲡ Ⲝⲟⲩ Ⲝⲣⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉⲩ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉⲩ, l.656); PDM 14.1026-1045: “I cast ⲟⲟⲩ against you” (ⲧⲓⲧⲡ ⲛⲟⲩ Ⲝⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉⲩ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉⲩ, L.1036).

1923 For example in P.Macq. I 1: “I give thanks to you and I call upon you” (ⲧⲓⲧⲡⲟⲧ ⲡⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲝⲧⲟⲟⲩ/ⲧⲓⲧⲡ ⲝⲧⲟⲟⲩ, I.1-2; while the parallel text in P.Berl.Kopt. 5527 also uses ὄφ, the version in London Ms.Or. 5987 L1 uses ὑⲧⲡⲧⲡⲧⲡ (L1); London Ms.Or. 6796 (2,3): “I call upon you today” (ⲧⲓⲧⲡ ⲝⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉⲩ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉⲩ, verso L1). Compare P.Mil.Vogl.Copt. 16: “I call upon you Prabaoth” (ⲧⲃⲧⲡⲧⲡⲧⲡ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉⲩ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲉ ⲡⲧ ISC
invoked in legal proceedings as a means of enforcing or expressing judgements. The use of a performative to express the act of casting $hyt$ is not, apparently, used in Demotic texts outside the magical papyri, and even within these texts, it is not the only way that the compulsive force of $hyt$ is expressed. For this reason, I would suggest that this particular form is a calque based on Greek usage, with the concept of $hyt$ used to express the sense of divine compulsion, in preference to the more prosaic $\text{crk}$.

If the ubiquity of performatives in Greek stems from their use in the Greek hymnic tradition, it might be reasonable to assume that their paucity in Egyptian is due, in turn, to the fact that Egyptian prayers generally begin not with the performative “I call NN god”, but rather with exclamations of the form “praise to NN god”, or “hail NN god.” This would provide a fairly neat explanation, with all performatives in Demotic magical texts understood as displaying the influence of similar Greek texts, but this is too neat; the performative “I call” occurs in one of the invocations recorded by Hor, and also in a Demotic text from first century BCE Armant, containing a hymn to the Buchis bull. It is, of course, possible that these too represent Greek influence.
Whatever the origin of the use of performatives in Demotic texts, the fact remains that they are in the minority; Demotic texts tend to rely on interjections to fulfil the Call function of formulae, and on autocletics, as well as historiolae, to compose the Argument. It is therefore striking that later Coptic invocations make extensive use of performatives, using not only borrowed Greek verbs, but also, as we have noted, the Egyptian word ḫwḏ, already utilised as the equivalent of the Greek ἐπικαλοῦμαι in Demotic texts. All of this suggests that Greek and Demotic invocations, despite their undoubted contact, were generally subject to different compositional norms. While later Coptic texts may demonstrate some awareness of the Demotic tradition, their structure, and the borrowing of verbs of invocation from Greek, seems to suggest that Greek invocations are their main models. In this context, it is worth finally mentioning the fact that performatives never appear in Old Coptic magical formulae – although this fact is perhaps less significant, given the fact that we have so few of them. Nonetheless, this would seem to suggest that the Old Coptic texts are following the same compositional norms as Demotic texts, and do not represent an early stage of the tradition represented by later Coptic invocations.

4.2.2.5 Autocletics

Autocletics are speech acts in which the ritualists identify themselves, but rather than giving their personal identity – a process signalled in the papyri by the use of “NN” (mn, δὲῖνα) – they take on the identity and authority of a divine being; it is this assumption of power that constitutes the speech act discussed here. These acts consist of two forms, those translated in English as “I am NN”, and those translated as “My name is NN”. The function of these statements is as part of the Argument, in which they serve as the authority on which the later Petition is made, and as such they are often preceded by conjunctions of reason. In general, the identity (“NN”), is expressed by a name, very often that of a god, and still more often an onoma, but there are also instances where a noun phrase or relative clause is used to identify the assumed identity in a more descriptive manner.
Autocletics are usually found in invocation formulae, although they also occur in formulae for compulsive procedures, and, in a few striking instances, in formulae for preliminary procedures. There is a marked contrast, however, in usage between languages: only 14% of Greek invocation formulae use autocletics, compared to 54% of Demotic examples; again, Old Coptic examples follow the practice of Demotic texts, although the fact that 67% of them display autocletics is less secure, given that we have only three examples. Later Coptic texts make extensive use of autocletics\(^\text{1931}\) representing, in this respect, a clear continuation of earlier practices.

The presence of autocletics in Roman-era magical texts seems to derive from their usage in older Egyptian formulae; they regularly occur in Egyptian texts of the type usually designated as magical – those for healing and protection\(^\text{1932}\) – though less often in hymns of praise. Nonetheless, this concept derives from more general Egyptian cultic practice, in which participants in rituals took on the identity of deities, participating in the radiant power of divine action. The Egyptian origin of this type of speech act is signalled in Greek texts by the surprising occurrence of the Egyptian first person pronoun in its pre-nominal form, translatable as “I am” – occuring several

\(^{1931}\) They seem to be slightly less common than in Demotic texts, and the figures usually invoked are Christian rather than pagan; see for example London Oriental Manuscript 6796 [2], [3], [1]: “I am Mary” (ἈΝΟΚ ΤΗ ΡΙΨΗ, recto l.21); London Oriental Manuscript 6796 [4], 6796: “I am Jesus the Christ” (ἈΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΤΕ ΠΗΧΗ, l.10); P.Mich.inv. 593: “I am Seth, the son of Adam” (ἈΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΑΝΗΡ ΠΔΛΑΜΗ, 3.11, 4.1-2).

\(^{1932}\) See for example the discussion in Podeman Sørensen, “The Argument in Ancient Egyptian Magical Formulae”, pp.9-10.
times in transliteration in Greek texts. Still more surprisingly, it seems that, in at
least some instances, the Greek-speakers using these texts understood the meaning of
the word; it precedes an onoma in two recensions of the Ogdoad of Moses, but is not
included in the letter count which follows, signalling that the distinction between
pronoun and onoma was understood. Elsewhere, however, for example where it
occurs at the end, rather than beginning, of lists of onomata it seems that it was
understood simply as another onoma.

Interestingly, no autocletics appear among the invocations recorded by either
Hippolytus or Hor; in Hippolytus’ case this is not so surprising, since he was
presumably entirely reliant on Greek sources, but Hor’s case is more striking.
Nonetheless, he achieves the same effect in several invocations by speaking in the
person of a deity without formally identifying himself with them; a similar pattern,
recording the words of the god, occurs a few times in the Roman-era magical papyri.

4.2.2.6 Interjections

Interjections are an amorphous category of lexicalised formulae which serve a fairly
specific, but difficult to define, function. In English, these are typically translated as
“hail!”, “praise NN!”, “may NN live!”, “oh!”, and so on. From a morphological perspective,
these are either imperatives, or, more rarely, optatives, in either Demotic and Greek,
although the imperative force has been lost in the process of lexicalisation. While they
may literally mean “rejoice” or “praise NN”, they serve rather as set phrases, which
have no propositional content as such, but instead express emotional or relational
content. Interjections are often described as conveying information about the
speaker’s state of mind, but in the case of set phrases of the type we are looking at here,

---

1933 As αναγ (PGM 13.459, PGM 13.520), ανοκ (PGM 7.345, PGM 13.150), or ανοχ (PGM 11.49, 153; PGM
13.190).
1934 PGM 13.150-151, 190-191, 520.
1935 See for example O.Hor 18 verso l.9: “Thoth speaks before you” (md.t i-ɪr-ḥr-sk ḏḥwty), compare l.17 of
the same text. Something similar is found in PGM 4.253-254: “for this is what the great god desires and
commands you” (τοῦτο γὰρ δέλει καὶ ἐπιτάσσει σοι ὁ μέγας ὃ(ὅς)κ(ε)).
1936 For the Egyptian optative as fulfilling the role of a third-person imperative, see fn.1896.
they instead serve as as culturally and linguistically fixed ways to perform specific speech acts, namely the acts of greeting and praising deities.\textsuperscript{1937}

There is a distinct difference in usage between Greek and Demotic texts in their use of interjections; the only interjection found in Greek formulae is χαῖρε (“hail”), and in Greek invocations they appear in only 5% of formulae,\textsuperscript{1938} although as we might expect the usage is higher in the formulae for preliminary procedures (18%) and salutations (67%), but in these cases the overall numbers are too low to place too much confidence in these numbers. The usage in Demotic (43%) and Old Coptic (33%) invocations is much higher, probably reflecting, once again, a the recapitulation of different textual norms. The most common form of the interjection in Demotic texts – hy + god’s name – is attested as early as the \textit{Pyramid Texts},\textsuperscript{1939} and thus belongs to a continuous tradition of ritual utterances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Category</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hail!</td>
<td>hy, i</td>
<td>PDM 14.126, 216, 528, 535, 698, 807; PDM Suppl 130, 131, 132, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>χαῖρε</td>
<td>PGM 2.87, 99; PGM 4.939, 940; PGM 7.597, 508; PGM 62.33; PGM 72.17, 18;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise to him!</td>
<td>iwe=f</td>
<td>PGM 4.14, 15 (ευοῦτα); PDM 14.628, 632, 633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The clearest function of interjections is as part of the Call – they serve the function of welcoming the deity, but their presence brings into relief the inadequacy of the Call-Argument-Petition model to fully describe the functions of speech acts within formulae; through their relational or affective they also assert and confirm a relationship between the deity and the speaker, implicitly serving, therefore as part of

\textsuperscript{1937} For an example the discussion concerning interjections in linguistic circles see Felix Ameka, “Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech” in \textit{Journal of Pragmatics} 18 (1992).

\textsuperscript{1938} As we might expect, we find this form in both of the two instances where a formula is described as a χαφετισμὸς (PGM 2.87-141; PGM 4.1048-1052).

\textsuperscript{1939} For example: “hail red crown, hail yen-crown, hail great crown, hail Great-of-Magic crown, hail Nezret!” (hy n.t hy yn hy wr.t/ hy wr.t-hk’/.w) hy nzr.t, §§196a-b).
the mechanism providing power to the formula as a whole, and thus as part of the Argument.

4.2.2.7 Tendencies in the use of speech acts

The goal of this section has been to lay out, relatively briefly, the ways in which speech acts in rituals of apparition are realised through linguistic processes. Here I will summarise some of the tendencies within the use of speech acts across formulae; some visual demonstrations of these can be seen in tables 46-57 at the end of this section.

Firstly, when we ignore the striking differences in usage between languages, the patterns of occurrence of speech acts in formulae is generally the same across syntactic positions; although invocations tend to have the most diversity in their use of speech acts this may simply be due to the fact that they represent the category best represented in the analysis. The only exception to this role is release formulae, which in both Greek and Demotic tend to display a much greater reliance on imperatives than other speech act types.

When we turn to the differences in the use of speech acts by language, the differences become far more significant; as we have seen, Greek makes a far greater use of performatives, both for the purpose of the Call (“I call you”) and the Argument (“I adjure you”); by contrast Demotic texts often use interjections (“hail!”) and autocletics (“I am NN”) for these same purposes. Old Coptic texts follow the patterns established in Demotic texts, which suggests that they belong, essentially to same compositional tradition. This is significant, since although they are written in the same language and belong to the same archive (the Theban Library), the Old Coptic texts do not occur in the same papyri as the Demotic – all three are found in the predominantly Greek PGM 4 – and are separated from the Demotic papyri by approximately a century. By contrast, they do not seem to be linked directly to later, standard Coptic texts, which to some extent seem to be instead an adaptation of the Greek language texts, using performatives very heavily – often with Greek verbs. Nonetheless, they also display a
significant use of older Egyptian textual practices, including the use of autocletics and interjections. All this suggests that cultural norms of textual production were powerful enough to keep the Demotic and Greek traditions separate on a structural level, despite extensive contact and borrowings at the level of praxis – many of the deities and onomata, for example, occur in both corpora; this is true even when invocations in one language occur in papyri alongside instructions in the other language.

This point is particularly interesting in view of Dieleman's argument that the Demotic texts may represent translations of older Greek texts. While his reasoning is sound, his insight should not be overgeneralised – as discussed above (2.3.5.1), different ritual types might have different cultural origins, so that what is true of erotic compulsion texts, for example, may not be equally true of apparition rituals. But more concretely, the fact that Demotic/Old Coptic and Greek formulae seem to be subject to different compositional norms – most apparent when we look at performatives, autocletics, and interjections – suggests that even if the Demotic/Old Coptic material was influenced by Greek material, and some formulae are even translations from Greek, the majority were most likely composed independently, following Egyptian cultural norms.1940

Leaving aside the question of cultural dependence, we are left with the fact that the linguistic forms of the speech acts – in terms of vocabulary and morphology – are heavily standardised across corpora, and even between languages. While I will not speculate extensively on the compositional processes which led to this replication, it is worth briefly mentioning the speculations of Calvo Martínez, who suggested that the magical formulae should be thought of as a primarily oral phenomenon, generated from a range of “types” (“tipos”) of formulae which had some fixed and some variable parts, according to the needs of the occasion.1941 It does seem to me that this account is right in its general outlines: it appears that the composers were conscious that both genre and meaning-function required the use of certain set forms and vocabulary, but that the selection and arrangements of these parts allowed for variation, and hence

1940 On the question of a Greek influence on or origin for the Demotic spells, see Dieleman, Priests, Tongues, and Rites, pp.292-294.
1941 Calvo Martínez, “El Himno a Helios”, p.158.
alteration, perhaps even in the transmission of written texts. These stereotyped speech acts – “I call you”, “I adjure you”, “I am NN”, “hail, NN!” – not only performed a ritual function, but from a compositional point of view they may have served as the building blocks from which formulae could be built.

It is worth briefly comparing the Roman-era formulae with their roughly contemporary literary depiction in Hippolytus, and their earlier, documentary parallels in the Archive of Hor. The two examples preserved by Hippolytus contain broadly the same features as the invocations in the handbooks – they identify the deities, include brief onomata, and contain the most important request (“come to me”) phrased either as an imperative, or an optative; they are much more syntactically complex than the majority of the invocations, but they share this feature in common with the metrical Greek hymns, which they most closely resemble. The examples in Hor, by contrast, are often very short, consisting simply of the imperative “come to me”, and the name of the deity; the presence of two much longer invocations among these, however, may suggest that the extremely abbreviated versions are to be understood as the incipits of longer formulae, rather than complete texts in themselves. The presence of the imperative “come to me” in all of the invocations in this archive serves as a clear indication that they belong to the same genre as the later Demotic texts, but there are clear differences on several levels. Hor makes far less use of all other speech act types, including the exclamations and autocletics we might expect within the Egyptian tradition, and he contains a relatively unusual performative. At the level of content, there are still more striking differences – the focus in Hor’s invocations is often on the personal relationship between the worshipper and the deity, expressed by the possessive article – the deities are called “my lord”, “my lady” – and so on, and this close relationship is documented in Hor’s records of his dream experiences. Secondly Hor’s texts have a far more pronounced focus on place than the later texts; he constantly identifies the deities by their cultic sites, particularly within the Serapeum complex, tying his practice closely to the

1942 Refutatio Omnium Haeresium 4.32.2.15: δεῦρο, μάκαρ; 4.35.5.8: Ελθοίς εὐάντητος ἐφ’ ἡμετέρῃ θυηλαῖς.
official temple cults and the places in which he lived and worshipped. In the Roman-era texts we find formulae which have become far more standardised and impersonal, but more cosmopolitan, absorbing features from traditions from across the Mediterranean, and even reaching beyond these into the realms of divine and animal language.

46: Speech acts in invocations by language

47: Speech acts in Greek invocation formulae
48: Speech acts in Demotic invocation formulae

49: Speech acts in Old Coptic invocation formulae

50: Speech acts in invocation formulae in Hippolytus
51: Speech acts from invocations in the Archive of Hor

52: Speech acts in Greek preliminary invocation formulae

53: Speech acts in Demotic preliminary invocation formulae
54: Speech acts in Demotic compulsive formulae

55: Speech acts in Greek compulsive formulae

56: Speech acts in Greek release formulae
4.3 Offerings

The act of sacrificing, or more broadly, offering to the deities, was one of the archetypal acts of ancient Mediterranean cultic practice, and indeed of many other traditions throughout the world. It is no surprise, then, that the process of offering is the most frequently attested ritual complex, after the spoken formula, in the magical papyri. Offerings in the rituals of apparition can be divided into three types: 1) materia consumed on fires as burnt offerings; 2) liquids poured as libations; and 3) foods placed and left untouched as food offerings. All three types will be discussed here, although the focus will be on the first two, since these are by far the more common. The terms used for these are fairly standard in the Greek texts – θύω and ἐπιθίουω, and related noun formations, are used to refer to burnt offerings, while libations are covered by the verbs σπένδω, ἐπισπένδω, and more rarely ἐπιχέω and ῥαίνω (“sprinkle”); these are the standard terms of Hellenic cultic terminology. By contrast, the Demotic texts describe the act of placing (dy) the objects on the fire without using any technical vocabulary, despite the availability of cultic language – for example gll, swy (both “burnt offering”), wdn (“libations”) – to refer to offerings.

Within rituals of apparition, offerings can occupy four syntactic positions: they may be used in preliminary rituals of conjunction, in the main invocations, as part of compulsive procedures, or within release procedures. In all four of these positions
they are nearly always accompanied by spoken formulae; as we have seen (4.4), this is a standard part of both Hellenic and Egyptian sacrificial practice.

As Johnson stresses in her discussion of the act of sacrifice in the magical papyri, these offerings should be understood against the background of broader cultic practices, and we must be cautious about assuming that they are deliberate inversions of standard rituals rather than extensions of the same underlying logic. The importance of sacrifice in ancient cult meant that ascribing improper offerings – in particular human sacrifice – to other groups was a standard topos in ancient polemics between religious traditions, and these accusations were regularly attached to practitioners of magic, not only in literary texts, but even in legal definitions of magic. One particularly vivid example of such an accusation can be found in the Vita Severini, in which a group of would-be magicians attempt to sacrifice an Ethiopian slave in the hippodrome of Beirut in order to invoke a daimōn. Their plan was frustrated when they were interrupted by passers by, allowing their intended victim to escape. Of course, there are no instances of human sacrifice in the magical formularies, and the materia used in rituals of apparition is, for the most part, far more quotidian.

4.3.1. Offerings in Hellenic and Egyptian religion

Before discussing the offering procedures used in the magical papyri it is worth briefly outlining standard sacrificial procedures in the Hellenic and Egyptian traditions. The archetypal Hellenic sacrifice (θυσία), attested from Homer onwards, was of a bull, which would be led in procession to the altar, accompanied by music, before being stunned and bled, with the fat, thigh-bones, and certain other small parts burned whole as offerings to the gods; the remainder of the animal would then be butchered,
cooked, and eaten by those present, the innards (σπλάγχνα) first of all.1946 While cattle were the most prestigious victims, the most common, in fact, were goats and sheep, while pigs, both adult and juvenile, were also common in certain ritual contexts.1947

The second type of sacrifice, the burnt-offering (ὁλόκαυτος) is most often associated with chthonic deities; this involved the killing of smaller animals, ideally black, and usually pigs, but also roosters and other animals.1948 In these rituals the blood would be allowed the pour into a pit, before the animal would be burnt in its entirety. These two forms of sacrifice – archetypally Olympian and chthonic – must be taken as ideals, and there is evidence that between these two poles there was a great deal of variation in actual cultic practice.1949

The same caveat – that cultic practice admitted huge variation – must be borne in mind when we turn to Egyptian religion. The most visible form of offerings, commonly depicted in temples and tombs, and on illustrated papyri, was the food offering – archetypally bread, beer, and meat.1950 Of primary importance among the various forms of food offerings was the “Ritual of the Royal Ancestors”, in which the resident deity would be presented with a varied menu of animal and vegetable food on an offering table. This ritual formed an key part of the daily sequence of temple rituals for much of Egyptian history, and the food, rather than being destroyed by fire, would be reverted (wdb) to subsidiary deities, before being distributed to priests and other

---


temple staff. Conceptually, the deities would, at each stage, draw sustenance from the food.

Alongside these better-known food offerings, however, there is evidence that burnt-offerings took place from at least the Middle Kingdom. Burnt offerings were often described as a symbolic destruction of the god's enemies rather than an act of honouring or sustaining the deity, but literary and documentary, as opposed to cultic, descriptions tend to elide this aspect, representing the burnt offering simply as an act of thanksgiving or piety. Importantly for our purposes, burnt offerings are described in two of the Demotic literary descriptions of dream oracle rituals.

An important witness to the practice of sacrifice in the ancient Mediterranean is the set of Egyptian libelli which survive on papyrus, dating to June and July 250 CE. These serve as evidence that those recorded in them participated in the mandated, empire-wide sacrifice ordered by Decius, widely, though not uncontroversially, understood by modern scholars as an anti-Christian measure. These texts, and the associated literary evidence, provide a suggestion of the basic requirements of late-antique sacrificial orthopraxy. Firstly, the petitioners state that they have always (ázēi)

---

1952 Arne Eggebrecht mentions plant and animal ashes being found in vases in Naqada II graves, but the first clear indications are found in the Middle Kingdom ('Brandopfer' in LdÄ, vol.1 pp.848b-850b).
1954 See for example the description in the *Shipwrecked Sailor*: “I made burnt offerings to the gods” (|r|=|/ zbl-n-sd.t n ntr:w, 55-56), where the narrator is apparently thanking the gods for surviving the shipwreck; *Teachings of Onchsheshonqy*: “Make burnt offerings and libations in the presence of the god. May his fear be great in your heart” (|i=ry grl wdn m-bîh pî ntr my ’y tîy=f sndy.t n bîty. t=k, 14.10), where burnt offerings appear to be understood as a typical pious act; see also O.Hor 9: “I shall offer a bird as a burnt-offering […] upon the altar before Isis every year (|i=yr ir w’d pd (n) gll […]| hr tî hw.y.t m bîh t=r n trp.t n b,t, v.3-4). In these, and numerous other Demotic descriptions of sacrifice, there is no mention of any concept of the destruction of enemies.
1955 *Seta II*: “he made burnt offerings and libations before Thoth…” ([îr=f nîy=f gdly.w nîy=f wdn.w m-bîh gdwy.t, 2.6]; *King Wenamun and the Kingdom of Libya*: “he made burnt offerings and libations before Miyses” ([îr=f kîl’ wtn [m-bîh] mîy-ks, fr.1.18).
sacrificed to the gods; secondly, they list the three components of the sacrifice: they have performed a libation (ἔσπεισα), “sacrificed” (ἔθυσα), and “tasted” (ἐγευσάμην) the sacrificial victim. Equally interesting is what is not stated, namely the nature of the sacrifice, and here the literary descriptions are of little more help; from the mention of tasting the victim we can assume the partial burning of some kind of animal.

4.3.2 Materia and the procedure of offerings

The most common form taken by offerings in the rituals of apparition is the burnt offering, but even within this single category there is a great deal of variation, which I will attempt to briefly summarise here; full descriptions of these can be found in table 58. As with the sacrifices described in the libelli, burnt offerings undertaken as part of magical rituals should be understood within the context of the ritualist’s broader cultic practice; thus, for example, the only instruction provided for the offering in PGM 1.1-42 is that the ritualist should “sacrifice (to the deity) according to [the ritualist’s] custom”.1957

Where the instructions are more detailed, Greek texts specify that the offering is made on either a “censer” (θυμιατήριον),1958 or “altar” (βωμός),1959 while the Demotic texts tell us the offering is to be made either in an “offering dish” (ἡμ),1960 a “censer” (ἡμ(e)),1961 or an “altar” (hw.t);1962 texts in both languages offer the flame of a lamp (λύχνος, ḫbs) as another possibility.1963 The distinction between the different terms is not necessarily clear: the prescribed implement, whether a θυμιατήριον, βωμός, or hw.t is usually prescribed to be made out of “earth”,1964 clay,1965 or “unburnt clay”1966 – probably

1957 PGM 1.24-25: ποι/.spyan τοῦ δυστιγόν ὡς ἔθος ἐχεῖται.
1958 PGM 1.53; PGM 3.296; PGM 4.214; PGM 4.1320, 1318; PGM 4.3193; PGM 7.741.
1960 PDM 1.415.
1961 PDM 14.79, 80, 81, 82, 84 86, 89; PDM 14.98; PDM 14.154; PDM 14.872.
1962 PDM 1.497; in the following line the same object is referred to as an ἡμ, hw.t is the Coptic ὁμή, corresponding to both βωμός and θυμιατήριον (Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, p.601B).
1963 PDM 1.24; PDM 14.124; PDM 14.416; PDM suppl.159.
1964 PGM 1.53: γηίνου θυμιατηρίου; PGM 2.26: χάλκου ἢ γηίνου θυμιατηρίου; PGM 13.8: β'/(π)μὸν γῆίνον;
1965 PDM 14.97: ε.τ hw.t ἢ s tn.
1966 PDM 1.282: βωμόν ὁμόν
synonyms for the same material – although a βωμός may be described as large enough to place other objects, such as a tripod, on top of it,\textsuperscript{1967} while a θυμιατήριον, on the other hand, may be small enough to be placed on a tripod,\textsuperscript{1968} so that we may assume that a βωμός was typically much larger than a θυμιατήριον. Alongside earth/clay, the θυμιατήριον might be made of bronze,\textsuperscript{1969} or described as “good” (καλόν),\textsuperscript{1970} while a Demotic text prescribes that the $\text{Ob}$ be “pure” (\textit{w'Ob}).\textsuperscript{1971} The placement of the sacrificial vessel varies; in the first recension of the \textit{Ogdoad of Moses} the altar is to be set up in the middle of the house in which the ritual is taking place,\textsuperscript{1972} while in PDM 14.150-231 the boy seer is to hold the lamp in one hand and the $\text{Ob}$ in the other, with offerings made in both vessels.\textsuperscript{1973} In most cases, however, the offering is to be made in front of the divine icon or medium of apparition, whether it is a liquid-filled vessel,\textsuperscript{1974} the lamp,\textsuperscript{1975} a throne,\textsuperscript{1976} the boy seer,\textsuperscript{1977} or the head of a wolf.\textsuperscript{1978}

Alongside the type and placement of the offering-vessel, several texts prescribe the use of a specific type of fuel; charcoal from a heliotrope,\textsuperscript{1979} olive tree,\textsuperscript{1980} grapevine,\textsuperscript{1981} or an unspecified tree,\textsuperscript{1982} or else wood from a cypress tree,\textsuperscript{1983} grapevine.\textsuperscript{1984} The rationale for using particular fuels is not always clear, although the use of heliotrope charcoal in PGM 1.42-195 is probably a way of marking the preliminary ritual as being addressed to the sun. An interesting case is offered by \textit{Solomon’s Collapse} (PGM 4.850-929), a ritual which contains two sacrifices, the first as part of the invocation, the second as part of

\textsuperscript{1967} PGM 5.201: λαβὼν τρίποδα ἐπὶ βωμὸν γῆνον.
\textsuperscript{1968} PGM 3.296: …ἐπὶ βωμὸν γῆνον τῷ τρίποδι ἐπίθες ἐπὶ βωμὸν γῆνον.
\textsuperscript{1969} PGM 2.26: …χαλκοῦ ἢ γηίνου θυμιατηρίου.
\textsuperscript{1970} PDM 3.296.
\textsuperscript{1971} PDM 14.154.
\textsuperscript{1972} PDM 13.1-343.
\textsuperscript{1973} PDM 14.150-231.
\textsuperscript{1974} PDM 14.1-92.
\textsuperscript{1975} PDM 14.750-771.
\textsuperscript{1976} PDM 14.93-114.
\textsuperscript{1977} PDM 14.239-295.
\textsuperscript{1978} PDM 1.262-347.
\textsuperscript{1979} PGM 1.63-64: …ἀνθράκων ἀπὸ ἡλιοτροπίου β[σάνης]…
\textsuperscript{1980} PDM 14.97-98: …dbet / n ht n ñyt…
\textsuperscript{1981} PGM 4.918-919: …τὸς ἀνθράκας τὸς/ ἀμπελίνους…
\textsuperscript{1982} PDM 14.2469: …ποιήσας ἀνθρακιάν...
\textsuperscript{1983} PGM 13.17: …ξύλα κυπαρίσσινα…
\textsuperscript{1984} PGM 4.907-908: ἀμπέλινα ξύ/λα; PGM 4.544: ξύλων ἀμπελίνων.
the release: the invocation sacrifice uses grapevine wood (907-908), while the dismissal uses grapevine charcoal (918-919). This raises an interesting problem – are the terms wood and charcoal here being used interchangeably, or does the release, used in the case that the deity does not leave readily, utilise a hotter charcoal fire as a means of compulsion? In either case, an insight into the reasons for using particular woods is provided by the second recension of the Ogdoad of Moses, where it specifies the use of cypress wood and pinecones as fuel “so that even without the incenses, the sacrifice will have a pleasant smell.”

The most common type of materia used in burnt offerings is not, as we might expect, animals or animal parts, but instead resinous incense; most prominent here is frankincense (snte, ilbwn) used in 22 of the sacrifices analysed. While we might expect myrrh (hl, ζύμρνα) to have a similarly broad use, in fact it is specified as an offering in only eight sacrifices – myrrh is used more often in creating the inks used for writing formulæ and kharaktēres. Nearly as common as myrrh is storax (στύραξ), while less frequent are malabathron (μαλάβαθρον), nard (νάρδος), bdellium (βδέλλα), pine resin (ῥητίνη), and ammoniac incense (imwny’k t’h/rymy’mt’r). Also belonging loosely to the category of resins is kuphi (ϰόφι), a mixture of incenses whose origins lay in Egyptian cultic

---

1986 Of the three terms habitually used in the Demotic magical papyri for resinous substances snte poses the greatest problems of interpretation. While it was read in the past as ‘nt (Erichsen, Demotisches Glossar, p.65), Quack has pointed out the form is clearly derived from the hieratic writing of snfr (Joachim Friedrich Quack, "Korrekturvorschläge zu einigen demotischen literarischen Texten," Enchoria 21 (1994), p.68; "Weitere Korrekturvorschläge, vorwiegend zu demotischen literarischen Texten," Enchoria 25 (1999), p.48). Quack, the TLA (s.v. snte), and Griffiths/Thompson (Demotic Magical Papyrus) translate this word as “frankincense” (German “Weihrauch”), whereas Johnson (inBetz, Greek Magical Papyri) prefers “myrrh”; the equivalent Coptic term is cont, probably “resin” (Ψητινη; Crum, A Coptic Dictionary. 346b). Since ΣL, Ομα, seems to be the Egyptian word for myrrh, I suggest that snte be understood as either ‘frankincense’, or a non-specific resin.
1987 See for example the mentions of myrrh in PGM 1.9, PGM 2.6, PGM 4.2143, PGM 7.999, PGM 12.399, PGM 36.333. Compare the discussion in LiDonnici, “Single-Stemmed Wormwood, Pinecones and Myrrh”, pp.66-68.
1988 See the discussion in Griffith and Thompson, Demotic Magical Papyrus., vol.1.p.102 n.1.23. This would be understood as a transcription of Αμμωνιακοῦ θυμιάματος, see Dioscorides, De materia medica (recensiones e codd. Vindob. med. gr. 1 + suppl. gr. 28; Laur. 73. 41 + 73. 16 + Vind. 93) 3.84.
practice. These incenses are often specified as being of a particular type – uncut (ἀτμητός) or male (ἀρσενικός) frankincense (λιβάνος), Troglodytic (τρωγλῖτις) myrrh, hieratic kuphi (κυφὶ ἱερατικὸν) – all of these are probably to be understood as particularly luxurious goods, available in marketplaces throughout the Mediterranean world, though not easily gathered by a lone practitioner. Of these incenses only frankincense, and less often, myrrh, are used alone, though more often the resinous incenses are used alongside other plant and animal materia to create compound incenses. In several instances these are then formed into pellets (bmn(.t), τροχίσκοι, κολλούρια, only a small number of which might be used in any performance of the ritual; the same principle is at work in PGM 4.2441-2621, where the pounded compound incense is placed in a box and stored for later use. Here the magical handbooks display a practical concern for economy at odds with the often ostentatious materia they require.

Alongside these incenses other items of plant and mineral origin are regularly offered – the most common of these include oils, cassia, pinecones, cumin, rue, costos, wormwood, sesame, flowers (including crocus and lily), fruits (including dates and mulberries), salt, earth, and magnets; the full list of these can be seen in table 58. Again, most of these items are used as part of larger mixtures rather than being offered on their own.

The final major category of materia used in burnt offerings is, of course, animal materia, sometimes of entire animals – roosters or pigeons sacrificed during the ritual,
but more often their bodies mixed into offering incense, or else body parts – brains, hearts, fat, and so on – or their secretions – dung and honey. The process of killing the animal is not given in any of the instances where a living specimen is used, so that we should probably expect that the animal had its throat slit, as was standard in Hellenic practice, although there is also the possibility that they may have been strangled. This method is described the ritual to ensoul a statue of Eros in PGM 12.14-95, where the ritualist is instructed to choke (ἀποπνίγειν, ll.33, 35) eight birds and burn them before the image to impart their breath (πνεῦμα, l.33) into it. While the conceptual background to this ritual is not identical to that of the rituals of apparition, a reference to the invoked deity drawing breath in the second recension of the Ogdoad of Moses suggests that the strangling of sacrificial animals may have performed a meaningful function. The animals used in these few instances are, without exception, small birds, which would have been among the cheapest victims available; roosters may be specified as white (ἄλολευκος, λευκός), and as uninjured (ἀσυνής), and without blemish (τελείος).

The meaning-function of these various types of materia will be discussed below, but here it is worth drawing attention to a few tendencies. Firstly, we can see the predominance of non-animal materia, a striking contrast to the importance of animal sacrifice in the normative models of both Egyptian and Hellenic offerings. Of the 49 sacrificial procedures examined only 17 use animal materia; of these 17 only 7 use entire animals, and of these 7 only 4 – three of which are recensions of the Ogdoad of Moses – kill the animals as part of the offering process itself. The use of incense as part of burnt-offerings was a feature of Egyptian practice as far back as the New Kingdom, and a shift in cultic practice in the first few centuries CE saw the

1998 PGM 13.376-378: ...ὅταν μέλλῃς/ἀπογεύσεσθαι ἄλεκτρα θύσον ἵνα ὁ θεὸς ἀφθόνως λάβῃ/ πνεῦμα; l.370: ... πνεῦμα λάβῃ. Compare Porphyry's description of the strangling of a rooster during the invocation of Plotinus' daimōn (see fn.1311 for a discussion). That strangling birds for burnt offerings was practiced in Egypt is suggested by O.Hor 9, in which Hor tells of a dream in which men were "sacrificing a bird after throttling it" (ἰν χ ϛ ἰπν (n) γλ m-si ìgt, t.5). Ray (Ray, The Archive of Ḥor., p.45) understands ìgt to be ἵνα, which would correspond to Greek πνίγειν (Crum, A Coptic Dictionary., p.540b).

increasing predominance in of non-animal materia in burnt offerings. Not only were these cheaper than animal sacrifices, but philosophical and theological discourses were often suspicious of or hostile to animal sacrifice, seeing it as at best unnecessarily ostentatious and at worst an impious and violent act. Thus the predominance of non-animal materia in the rituals of apparition again parallels broader religious patterns.

The second phenomenon to be noted here is the use of materia which might be thought of as atypical of cultic practice – these might include salt, earth, dung, brains, and magnets. Graf understands the first two of these, as everyday objects, whose burning by the practitioner represented a ritual alienation from the everyday world; however, Eitrem has pointed out several Greek and Roman parallels to the use of salt as a burnt offering, and even in the ideal Greek bull-sacrifice salt was, according to the Homeric scholia, mixed with the barley which was cast over the victim and altar. Similar arguments could be made for many other unusual items of materia; while dung might be understood as archetypally unpleasant, Artemidorus notes it is good luck if seen in a farmer's dream, and its use as fuel would have provided a precedent for placing it on fires. For this reason, I suggest that the concept of meaning-function is a more fruitful way to conceptualise the role of unusual examples of materia than subversion – there is frequently a logic behind their employment which goes beyond marking rituals as different from standard cultic practice. The meaning-function of some materia is suggested in table 58, and will be discussed more fully in 4.3.4.

---

2003 Scholia in Homerum, Scholia in Iliadem (scholia vetera et recentiora e cod. Genevensi gr. 44), Book 1, verse 449bis.
2005 See Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, p.41. Dung (ḥry(f)) was certainly used as fuel in New Kingdom Deir el-Medina (Jaroslav Černý, "Some Coptic Etymologies," *Ägyptologische Studien*, no. 29 (1955), pp.36-37; Jac J. Jansen, "Accountancy at Deir el-Medina: How Accurate Are the Administrative ostraca?," *Studien zur Älteren Kultur* 33 (2005)).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Burnt offerings</th>
<th>Marking</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 1.42-195</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td>Uncut frankincense</td>
<td>Solar: frankincense, heliotrope</td>
<td>Preliminary ritual addressed to the sun</td>
<td>ἐπίθυον λίβανον ἄ[τμητον] καὶ φόδινον/ ἐπιστυδήνων ἐπίθυσας[ ἐπὶ γης/νου θυμιατηρίου ἐπ’ ανθράκων ἀπὸ ἡλιοτροπίου β[ιστάνης (62-64)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.1275-1322</td>
<td>Unmediated: unclear</td>
<td>Rue (?)2006</td>
<td>Compulsive: Rue</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἐπίθυε ἐξαιτούμενος ἄρμαρα (1294)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.1928-2005</td>
<td>Unmediated: unclear</td>
<td>Uncut frankincense and rue (?)2007</td>
<td>Compulsive: Rue; Solar: frankincense</td>
<td>Ritual is intended to compel the dead spirit to serve the ritualist; the formula calls upon the sun.</td>
<td>ἐπίθυδας ἄρμαρα καὶ λίβανον/ ἄτμητον (1990-1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.154-285</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel</td>
<td>Uncut frankincense</td>
<td>Solar: frankincense</td>
<td>Ritual is addressed to the sun</td>
<td>ἐπίθυε ἐπὶ θυμιατηρίου γείνου ἄτμη/τον λίβανον (214-215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 1.42-195</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td>Trogloditic myrrh</td>
<td>Lunar: myrrh</td>
<td>Ritual is addressed to the moon</td>
<td>ἐπίθυον τρω/γλίτιν ζ(μύ)ρ(ναν) (71-72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 1.262-347</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td>Wolf’s eye, storax, cassia, bdellium, aromatic herbs</td>
<td>Apollo: wolf’s eye</td>
<td>Ritual is addressed to Apollo</td>
<td>ἐπιθύε δὲ ἐπικαλούμενος λίβανον/ ἄτμητον καὶ στροβίλους δεξιοὺς δώδεκα καὶ ἀλέκτορας βʹ, τῷ Ἡλίῳ ἔνα καὶ τῇ Σελήνῃ/ ἑνα, ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἐπὶ χιαλίκαιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 2.1-64</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>1) Uncut frankincense, 12 right-whorled pinecones, 2 unblemished gizzard stones of a rooster; 2) Frankincense</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ritual seems to be marked primarily as solar (frankincense), but the same</td>
<td>λιβάνου χόνδρον ἐπιτιθέντος &lt;σου&gt;/ τῇ δρακάλλι ἔταυ/α [ή] λύκου (13-14) ἐπίθυε δὲ ἐπικαλούμενος λίβανον/ ἄτμητον καὶ σ[ἐ][ρ]βίλους θειούς δ[ή]βεκα καὶ ἀλέκτορας σ[σ]πίλους βʹ, τῷ Ἡλίῳ ἔνα καὶ τῇ Σελήνῃ/ ἑνα, ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἐπὶ χιάλικαιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2006 Grese (Betz, Greek Magical Papyri., p.63 n.175) assumes that “armara” is the compound incense described at ll.1308-1316, but this is not clear from the text itself. Riess (Ernst Riess, "Notes, Critical and Explanatory, on the Greek Magical Papyri," The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 26 (1941), p.53) suggests that it may come from the Hebrew mārā (מָרָא), “bitter”, and suggests it may be myrrh. He notes (p.53 fn.1) that Skeat had linked it to ἁρμαλά, which Dioscorides (De Materia Medica 3.45) describes as rue or πήγανον ἄγριον; Riess rejects this on the basis that rue never appears in incense offerings, but it does show up in two fumigations for healing procedures in two texts from the Cairo Genizah (םגיפ in MSF Geniza 18, 195; רומח in T.-S. NS 322.10 (c.XI CE), tb.10).

2007 See note above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGM</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Raw Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGM 2.64-184</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>White rooster, pine cone</td>
<td>ἕγων ὄλυσεν τὸν ἅλλακτον καὶ ἔφευφον καὶ περίμενε εὐχήμενον/ ἦς τὴ δύσι ἁπτόσφη (73-75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 3.187-262</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td>Pellets made from one ounce each of dried fruit, honey, oil of date palm, magnet boiled and pulverised</td>
<td>κομπάνου τὰ ξυρὰ κόψας καὶ μίξας ὁμοῖα μέλιτος/ τῷ αὐτάρκει καὶ λιπαρῷ τῆς φοίνικος καὶ μάγνητον/ λίθον λειώσας καὶ ἐψησον ὁμοῖα/ καὶ λείωσον (187-191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 3.282-409</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (?)</td>
<td>Laurel; single shooted wormwood with single stem; &quot;sunborn&quot; plant, &quot;moonborn&quot; plant, lotus fruit pulp, lily, buniüm²⁰⁰⁸</td>
<td>ἐπίθυε δάφνη (311) [θυσάμενος σπένδε οἴνῳ μέλινον/ (327) μόνον] ἀρτεμίσιαν μονόκλωνον ἡλιόγονον σεληνόγονον ....ωϊβ..την μ....για λωτημίτραν κρινάνθεμον βούνιον (331-332)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 3.612-632</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td>Wheat-meat, ripe mulberries, unsoftened sesame, uncooked fig-leaf, beetroot</td>
<td>Θυσάμενος ἄλευρα καὶ ὥριμα συκάμινα/ καὶ σαμανέκχυτον καὶ θρίον ἀπυρόν/ ἐν οἷῳ σπείρας οἴνον (612-614)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.52-85</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td>Shared food: ritualist</td>
<td>[ἐξ]λώνιν εἰς τὰ ἀπολιωτικὰ μέρη τῆς πόλεως/ ἕκημις ἢ τῆς σίκιας μονής/ ἐν ἄγορες ἀπόρριπα/ ἔνα ἀνελειφθέντα μέρη (58-60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.850</td>
<td>Mediated: Male frankincense</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἑγίνου δυσιστιρίου (23-26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁰⁰⁸ Grese and Meyer (Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, p.27) follow the LSJ in translating κρινάνθεμον as "houseleek", but Dioscorides (*De materia medica* [recensiones e codd. Vindob. med. gr. 1 + suppl. gr. 28; Laur. 73, 41 + 73, 16 + Vind. 93, 3.102 & 3.122] lists this as the name for either the κρίνον βασιλικόν or ἡμεροκαλλές, both types of lily.

²⁰⁰⁹ Again, Grese and Meyer (ibid., p.27) translate the relevant word (βούνιον) as "turnip", but both the LSJ and Osbaldeston (*Dioscorides. De Materia Medica*, p.675) suggest that this should instead be understood as a member of the genus *Apioideae*, which includes carrot, anise, cumin, coriander, parsley, parsnip, and silphium. It was probably the (presumably fragrant) leaves or seeds used, not the root as implied by the translation as "turnip".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Papyrus</th>
<th>Formulation</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Rituals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.1275-1322</td>
<td>Unmediated: unclear</td>
<td>4 drams of frankincense, 4 drams of myrrh, 2 ounces of cassia leaf, 2 ounces of white pepper, 1 dram of bdellion, 2 drams of amomum, 2 drams of saffron, 2 drams of terebinth storax, 1 dram of wormwood, X of vetch plant, hieratic kuphi, brain of a black ram, Mendesian wine and honey</td>
<td>Compulsive: pepper, brain of black ram</td>
<td>ζύτον ή μέλι ή γάλα/βοτες μελαίνης (906-909)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.1331-1389</td>
<td>Unmediated: unclear</td>
<td>Fat of a black donkey, fat of dappled she-goat, fat of black bull, Ethiopian cumin</td>
<td></td>
<td>λαβὼν/ ὄνου μέλανος στέαρ καὶ αἰγὸς ποικίλης/στέαρ καὶ ταύρου μέλανος στέαρ καὶ κυμίνου αἰθιοπικὸν ἀμφότερα μῖξον/καὶ ἐπίθυε πρὸς ἄρκτον (1308-1316)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.2441-2621</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream; other functions including erotic compulsion</td>
<td>Shrew-mouse hesy, moon beetle hesy, river crab, fat of dappled virgin goat, dung of baboon, 2 ibis eggs, 2 drams storax, 2 drams myrrh, 2 drams crocus, 4 drams Italian sedge, 4 drams uncut frankincense, onion; all well pounded</td>
<td>Lunar: shrew mouse, moon beetle, baboon, ibis eggs</td>
<td>λαβὼν μυγαλὸν/ἐκθέωσον πηγαίῳ ὑδάτι καὶ λαβὼν καὶ/θέρους σεληνιακοὺς δύο ἐκθέωσον ὕδα/τι ποταμίῳ καὶ καρκίνον/καὶ στῆρ ποταμίῳ καὶ καρκίνον/κρόκου στύρακος τερεβινθίνης ἀνὰ δραχμὰς βʹ ἀρτεμίας δραχμὴν αʹ κατανάγκης βοτάνης [...]) κύφι/ιερατικὸν ἐγκέφαλος κριοῦ μέλανος ὁλος/σύνω λευκῷ μενδησίῳ καὶ μέλιτι/ἀναλάμβανε καὶ ποίει κολλούρια (1331-1335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4.3086-3124</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td>The heart of a catfish, and horse-manure</td>
<td>Kronos: catfish</td>
<td>λαβὼν ἄλλος χοίνικας δύο ἄληθὲ τῷ/χειρομυλίῳ (3087-3088); ἐπίθυε δὲ τῷ ἄληθι/σφάγνον μετὰ σιλούρου καρδίας καὶ κόπρου</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
known from Egyptian sources (Griffiths, *De Iside et Osiride*, pp.342-344), there is a probably allusion to it in the *Tale of the Two Brothers*, where one of the characters castrates himself, and throws his penis into the Nile, where it is consumed by a catfish (*nfr*, 7.9).

The links between Kronos and the horse are allusive, but significant; in his horse form he was seen as the father of the Centaur Chiron; see Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 6.126; Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica* 2.1231-1241 and the *Scholia* to this work adds that the horse was the form taken by Kronos when he fled the gigantomachy (47.19-48.2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 13.343-646</th>
<th>Unmediated: direct</th>
<th>5 pinecones full of seed; rooster, pigeon; seven kinds of incense: malabathron, styxra, nard, costos, cassia, frankincense, myrrh, with rose, lotus, narcissus, white lily, eraphyllon, gillyflower, marjoram, ground to powder, mixed with unmixed wine. The resins and flowers used are intended to encompass all seven planetary gods.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Οὶ ἀναψάσας τὸν βωμὸν ἔχει παρεστῶτας σοι τοὺς δύο ἀλεκτρυόνας (681-682)</td>
<td>2 roosters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.1-92</td>
<td>Mediated: vessel</td>
<td>Shell or contents of crocodile egg/crocodile eggshell and anise stalks (to make the deities come and answer truthfully); frog’s head (to make the deities speak); bile of a crocodile and frankincense (to force the deities to come); copper sulphate (to bring living man); soru, <em>i</em>ekh-stone, Compulsive: bile of crocodile and myrrh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mtw=k iny ʕj ʔ[t] lw=s w/b / mtw=k s r w n p i nhī ĭrm tyk 7[t] n hmi (65-66) l ir= k dy t kwke n swh t n <em>woe</em> n-ge p i ny sn=s r t i st t (78); l ir= k dy t tp n <em>kpryg</em> r p i ʔh (79); l ir= k dy t shy n msh hr snke sr r p i ʔh (79-80); l ir= k dy t ĭh n <em>eau</em> r p i ʔh ĭrm t i kwke n swh t nty-hry (80-81); l ir= k dy t glgigintsy r p i ʔh (81); l ir= k dy t s i-wr sr ĭny n y lh r p i ʔh (82); l ir= k dy t hity. f n hyt t n-ge w n t (82-83); l ir= k dy t gr r h y n im r p i ʔh (84); l ir= k dy t hs n <em>eau</em> hr s n sb t h-č t r p i ʔh (84); l ir= k dy t s i-wr sr ĭny n y lh r p i ʔh (86) l ir= k iny w mār mtw=k dy t ʃm=f n ʃy y w/m = mtw=k dy t sf r p i ʔh (88-89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2012 Harris (J. R. Harris, Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1961), pp.179-180) suggests the *s-i-wr* stone to be the σῶρυ mentioned in, for example Zosimus, Chapters of Zosimus to Theodorus 2.217.19; PGM 12.196; Dioscorides, De materia medica 5.74.4.3; Galen, De methodo medendi libri xiv 10.927.2. Both the *s-i-wr* and the σῶρυ occur in medical contexts as part of remedies for eye diseases, and although it seems to be some kind of stone of mineral, exactly what is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.93-114</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>Pellets made from wild goose fat, myrrh and qes-ankh stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.117-149</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>Frankincense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.150-231</td>
<td>Mediated: lamp</td>
<td>Frankincense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.395-427</td>
<td>Mediated/unmediated: vessel</td>
<td>Shoot of Anubis-plant (placed on the lamp); Anubis: shoot of Anubis-plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.750-771</td>
<td>Mediated: lamp</td>
<td>Myrrh, willow leaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 14.856-875</td>
<td>Mediated: sun</td>
<td>Frankincense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 72.1-36</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (?)</td>
<td>Moss from savin tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 77.1-24</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (?)</td>
<td>Frankincense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM Suppl. 149-62</td>
<td>Unmediated: unclear</td>
<td>Shoot of the &quot;great-of-love&quot; plant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rituals of compulsion

unclear; Harris notes suggestions that it is melanterite (ferrous sulphate) or a pyrite. References to "Egyptian soru" (σῶρυ Αἰγύπτιον) in Galen, _De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos libri x_ 12.859.14 & 12.682.1 suggest it occurred in Egypt.

**sup** The "great-of-love" plant (_wr-mr.t_) may be connected to Thoth through his epithet "the greatly loved one" (_mr-wr_); see LAGG 2.443-444.
PGM 2.1-64
Unmediated: dream
Brain of black ram (day 2); little nail of right forefoot of nearest ankle of black ram (day 3); ibis brain (day 4); image of akephalos burnt in bathhouse in clothing of biaothanatos, or suspended above lamp (day 5)
Compulsive: nails, brain, image of deity

PGM 2.64-184
Unmediated: dream
Nails of a sheep (day 4); nails of a goat (day 5); hair/knucklebones of the a wolf (day 6); lampwick from piece of cloth from biaothanatos (day 7)
Compulsive: nails; Apollo: Wolf
Apollo is main deity invoked in the ritual

Release procedures
PGM 1.262-347
Unmediated: vessel
Wolf's eye, storax gum, cassie, balsam gum, valuable spices
Apollo: wolf's eye
Ritual is addressed to Apollo; this is the same offering used in the invocation

PGM 2.64-184
Mediated: vessel
Myrrh

PGM 4.850-929
Unmediated: vessel
Sesame seed, black cumin

PGM 12.153-160
Mediated: vessel
Slough of snake
Deity: slough of snake
The deity invoked is serpent-headed

PDM 14.1-92
Unmediated: vessel
Ape dung

58: Burnt offerings in rituals of apparition
The third component of standard sacrificial practice highlighted by the *libelli* – tasting of victims – is barely attested in the rituals of apparition, although, given the scarcity of animal sacrifice, this is to be expected. Nonetheless, the second recension of the *Ogdoad of Moses* does describe the tasting (ἀπόγευσίς, l.376) of one of the sacrificed roosters, which takes place after the sacrifice itself; before tasting the ritualist is to call upon the gods of the hour and the day so that they will be conjoined (συσταθῇς, l.379) to him.

While the burnt-offering was in process, the ritualist might empower objects by waving them through the smoke – branches,\(^{2014}\) rings,\(^{2015}\) and metal leaves.\(^{2016}\) All of these instances are found in dream oracles, and the empowered objects are subsequently placed under the ritualists’ heads while they sleep – we might imagine that the rationale here was to connect the offering to the apparition in rituals in which, otherwise, they were separated by the need to finish the offering and fall asleep.

Libations are described in several rituals of apparition; with one possible exception\(^{2017}\) these always occur alongside burnt offerings, and it seems that they are to be poured while the materia is burning. The liquids used in libations are usually part of a small set: wine,\(^{2018}\) water,\(^{2019}\) milk,\(^{2020}\) honey,\(^{2021}\) or some combination of these: wine and honey,\(^{2022}\) or

---

\(^{2014}\) PGM 5.440-458: “hold the left in your right hand and a spray of olive and laurel in your right and wave them towards the lamp” (κράτει τῇ ἀριστερᾷ τοῦ τόν/ δακτυλίου τῇ δὲ δεξιᾷ τοῦ κλάδου ἐλαι/ας καὶ δάφνης κατασείων τῷ λύχνῳ, ll. 451-453); PGM 7.795-845: “having incensed the branch, place it by your head” (λιβανωτίσας τὸν κλάδον δὲ πρὸς κεφα[λήν σου], ll.842-843).

\(^{2015}\) PGM 5.440-458: “hold the left in your right hand and a spray of olive and laurel in your right and wave them towards the lamp” (κράτει τῇ ἀριστερᾷ τοῦ τόν/ δακτυλίου τῇ δὲ δεξιᾷ τοῦ κλάδου ἐλαι/ας καὶ δάφνης κατασείων τῷ λύχνῳ, ll. 451-453); PGM 7.628-642: “wave the ring through the smoke of the frakincense” (περιένεγκον τὸν δακ[τ]ύλιον ἐπὶ τῆς ἀτμίδος τοῦ λιβα[νου], ll.638-649).

\(^{2016}\) PGM 7.740-755: “wave the [metal] leaf around the smoke” (περιένεγκον.../ περὶ τῆν ἀτμί[δ]α τὸ πέταλον, ll.742-743).

\(^{2017}\) The alternate instructions for mediumistic divination in PGM 2.1-64 mention pouring radish oil on the censer (τῷ δημιατηρίῳ ἐπιέγεσις τοῦ ἐλαίου, l.58); although it does not explicitly mention offerings, it seems reasonable to assume that the main offering described in ll.23-26, or something similar, is envisaged.

\(^{2018}\) PGM 3.282-409, PGM 2.64-184, PGM 4.850-929.

\(^{2019}\) PGM 1.42-195, PGM 4.850-929.

\(^{2020}\) PGM 4.850-929.

\(^{2021}\) PGM 4.850-929.

\(^{2022}\) PGM 13.1-343.
wine, honey, milk, and water,\textsuperscript{2023} less often beer,\textsuperscript{2024} oil,\textsuperscript{2025} or blood\textsuperscript{2026} may be used. As we might expect, these are often specified – the milk may be that of a black cow,\textsuperscript{2027} while the water may be specifically rainwater\textsuperscript{2028} or rose water.\textsuperscript{2029} To some extent, these liquids may have been thought of as interchangeable – Solomon’s \textit{Collapse} tells us that wine, beer, honey, or milk may be used as libations. These fluids – with the exception of beer, which was particularly Egyptian – played important roles in both Hellenic and Egyptian cultic practices. Wine mixed with water was the usual libation in “Olympian” sacrifices, while unmixed wine, or mixtures of wine, water, milk, honey, and oil, were used in other ritual types, often characterised as honouring chthonic deities and the dead.\textsuperscript{2030} Likewise, Egyptian libations, which often accompanied burnt offerings,\textsuperscript{2031} all of these liquids were associated with fertility and the Nile flood,\textsuperscript{2032} while beer\textsuperscript{2033} and wine\textsuperscript{2034} were also

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[2023] PGM 1.262-347.
\item[2024] PGM 4.850-929.
\item[2025] PGM 2.1-64.
\item[2026] PGM 2.64-184; the blood is that of a dove.
\item[2027] PGM 4.850-929: γάλα/βοὸς μελαίνης (ll.908-909).
\item[2028] PGM 1.262-347: ὀμβρίου ὕδατος (l.287).
\item[2029] PGM 1.42-195. In the Betz edition of the PGM ὀμβρίου ὕδατος is translated here and in PGM 7.222-249 as “rose oil”, but the presence of rose water (κλαμπέτα and variants, رطمو) in two Coptic papyri (P.Heid.inv.Kopf.685 16.9, 15; P.Heid.Inv.Kopf.686 251, 257), as well as two later Christian Arabic magical texts from Egypt (Nessim Henry Henein and Thierry Bianquis, \textit{La Magie par les Psalms. Édition et Traduction d’un Mancrit Arabe Chrétien d’Égypte} (Cairo: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire, 1975), Psalms 34, 40, 44, 126, 144; Gérard Viaud, \textit{Les 151 Psalmes de David dans la Magie Copte} (Paris: Editions Perthuis, 1977), Psalms 44, 143) suggests to me that water rather than oil may be intended here; compare however Michigan 593 p.8 ll.6-12 where rose oil (ἢ ἐρφαλίου) is certainly intended.
\item[2031] Quaegebeur notes the use of wine and milk in libations accompanying burnt offerings (Quaegebeur, “L’Autel-à-feu et l’abattoir en Égypte Tardive”, p.342).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
associated with goddesses such as Hathor, and milk was associated with nourishment, particularly that of infant and dead deities.

Food offerings occur only as part of invocatory sacrifices, and in most cases consist of cakes, bread, and/or lumps of salt placed beside the medium of apparition. While the rationale for these actions is never stated it seems clear that they are to be understood as providing further sustenance for the deities, following the logic of Egyptian reversion offerings and Greek offerings of cakes and bread. Interestingly, these objects occur in groups of seven in each instance in instructions for rituals of apparition.

Two anomalous rituals serve as examples of offerings which do not fit neatly into any of the categories already discussed. PGM 4.52-85 instructs the ritualist to place half of their food in a vessel, and at the end of seven days to go to the eastern section of the city, village or house and throw the leftover food on the ground, before returning to their home, followed closely by the threatening deity. This seems to be an adaptation of the Hellenic idea that morsels of food that fell on the ground could be dedicated to the dead, a conception also apparent in PGM 4.1390-1495, a ritual of erotic compulsion which uses similar morsels of food to call upon the spirits of heroes, gladiators, and the violently dead.

---

2035 On milk libations, see Poo, "Liquids in Temple Ritual", pp.3-4; Cauville, *Offerings to the Gods in Egyptian Temples*, pp.52-55.

2036 One of the most important rituals in Roman Philae was the ferrying across of Isis from her temple to the abaton where she would visit her husband Osiris and perform rituals on his behalf; these included food offerings, as well as libations of milk and water (Dijkstra, *Philae and the end of Ancient Egyptian Religion*, p.203).

2037 In PGM 1.262-347 7 flat cakes (πλακοῦντας, l.288) and 7 round cakes (πόπανα, l.288) are placed near the lamp; PDM 14.1-92 seven clean loaves of bread (ʾk iww w′b, l.65) and seven lumps of salt (tyk... n ḫmr, l.66) are placed near the vessel; in PDM 14.239-295 seven clean loaves (ʾk iww w′b, l.287) are again placed on bricks near the vessel.

2038 For a discussion of bread and cake offerings in Egyptian cultic practice see Cauville, *Offerings to the Gods in Egyptian Temples*, pp.69-74; for Greek practice see Emily Kearns, "Cakes in Greek Sacrifice Regulations," in *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*, ed. Robin Hägg (Uppsala: Svenska Institutet i Athen, 1994).

2039 For a discussion of this idea see Johnston, "Sacrifice in the Greek Magical Papyri", pp.351-353.
The second anomalous ritual is found in the *Oracle of Kronos* (PGM 4.3086-3124), in which, along with a burnt offering to the invoked deity, the ritualist is to grind a large quantity of salt\(^{2040}\) in a handmill while speaking the invocation. The meaning-function of this unusual practice is difficult to discern – it is unclear, for example, if it should even be considered as an offering. Eitrem has convincingly compared the act of winding the handmill to the whirling of a rhombos in traditional Greek compulsion rituals – the repetitive, circling motion serving to draw the deity.\(^{2041}\) The meaning-function of the salt is still less clear: is the salt a reference to the tears of Kronos, as Hopfner suggests,\(^{2042}\) or a reference to the idea of sowing salt to destroy the fertility of the soil – here used either to compel Kronos as an agricultural deity,\(^{2043}\) or reference his castration at the hands of his son?\(^{2044}\) Uncertain ases such as these highlight the diversity and complexity of ancient ritual practice.

### 4.3.3 Marking of materia in offerings

Having outlined the procedures followed in offering rituals, it is worth looking at the meaning-function of some of the types of materia used. This discussion can be neither comprehensive nor definitive – the diversity of interpretations in literature discussing the magical papyri, and the resistance of many rituals to straightforward interpretation makes this inevitable. Instead I will highlight some general principles and problems of interpretation.


\(^{2042}\) Hopfner, *Griechische-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, vol. 1 §593. According to Plurarch “tears of Kronos” (Κρόνου δάκρυον) was the Pythagorean name for the sea (*De Iside et Osiride* 364a).


\(^{2044}\) In the best known myths it is of course Kronos who castrates his father Ouranos, and there is no mention of Zeus castrating Kronos in the *Theogony*. There is a significant evidence, however, that by the Roman period the idea that Zeus had in turn castrated his father was a common one; see for example Proclus’ allusive description of Kronos as “castrator and castrated” (τέμνων καὶ τεμνόμενος; *In Platonis Cratylum commentaria* 105.31), and Porphyry’s more straightforward assertion that “Kronos is bound and emasculated in the same manner as Ouranos” (ὁ Κρόνος καὶ δεθεὶς ἐκτέμνεται ὡς ὁ Οὐρανός, *De antro nympharum* 16.15-16). For a fuller discussion see Mastrocinque, *Kronos, Shiva, and Asklepios*, pp.15-27.
The clearest way that materia may be marked for meaning-function is through connections to the deities they invoke. Thus white animals, roosters, pinecones, lotuses, laurel, and frankincense seem to have particular associations with the sun, and are often used in rituals invoking solar deities, such as Helios and Apollo; myrrh, and shrew-mice may have lunar associations; doves are connected to Aphrodite, wolves to Apollo, catfish and horses to Kronos, and donkeys and bulls to Seth-Typhon. This connection is still clearer with materia whose names contain clear references to particular deities – heliotrope (solar), Anubis-plant (Anubis), the “great-of-love” plant (Thoth). The Ogdoad of Moses intensifies this marking, burning incense which is compounded from incenses and flowers associated with each of the seven planetary deities. This marking, however, is not always clear; the idea that frankincense is primarily solar, and myrrh lunar is complicated by rituals where frankincense is burned to lunar deities, and myrrh to solar deities, or the same, apparently solar, offering is made to both the sun and the moon. Thus the primary marking of both myrrh and frankincense seems to be as a ritually important substance, with its association with particular deities as secondary.

What is the rationale for burning materia associated with particular deities? The most obvious answer here is that the choice of materia created a link to the deity, attracting them by offering up physical object with which they had a pre-existing connection. This is clearly the understanding of Neoplatonist theurgists, who understood each deity to be linked sympathetically to a series of symbols (συνθήματα) scattered throughout the cosmos, through which they could be contacted. However, as we have already seen, burnt offerings could be understood as having a variety of functions – the smoke might be understood to nourish or attract the deity, but it could also be understood as annihilating the materia offered in the flames.

2045 As in PGM 4.2441-2621.
2046 As in the sacrifice accompanying the release in PGM 2.64-184.
2047 This is the case with the offering in PGM 3.282-409.
This idea is most present in compulsive practices. Thus, for example, PGM 2.1-64 provides a series of escalating options for dealing with continual failure to produce an apparition, the last of which is to burn an image of the deity, the Headless One, in the fire of a bathhouse. This seriousness of this act – clearly designed to harm the deity – is such that the text provides alternative instructions in case the practitioner finds this too extreme. In this case, the image may be suspended above the lamp, so that the damage is threatened rather than enacted. This same practice – the suspension of materia connected to the deity – is repeated in PGM 4.52-85, where the ritualist is instructed to hang a horned beetle from a stallion’s hair over a fire so that the smoke just reaches it; when summoned, the frightening deity will demand that the ritualist release the beetle, but protected by a phylactery, the ritualist is to wait until they receive a response to their question, and then release the beetle at once.

More often, the compulsive function of a burnt-offering may be marked by the inclusion in it of materia understood as having inherently compulsive power; in terms of incenses this seems to be particularly true of “bitter” incenses – for example, rue and myrrh. The compelling virtue of this latter is particularly clear in two rituals of erotic compulsion, where it is invoked as deity, described as “the bitter, the difficult, who reconciles fighters and who forces those who are not won over by love to love...the flesh-eater and burner of the heart”, and “the stirrer-up of seas and mountains, who burns up the marsh of Akhalda”. These materia are not, interestingly, used in burnt-offerings specifically for the compulsive portions of rituals of apparition; instead they may be used in preliminary practices and invocations of deities who might be particularly relalcitrant or difficult – Ursa Major or the spirits of the dead.

---

2049 Compare the comments of LiDonnici, “Single-Stemmed Wormwood, Pinecones and Myrrh”, p.77.
2050...σὺ εἶ ἡ ζύμωνα, ἡ πικρὰ ἡ χαλεπὴ ἡ καταλλάσσου/σα τοὺς μαχομένους ἡ φρύγουσα/ καὶ ἀναγκαζόμεσα φιλεῖν τοὺς/ μὴ προσποιουμένους τὸν Ἐρωτα/ πάντες σε λέγουσιν Ζύμωναν/ ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω σε σαρκοφάγον καὶ/ φλογικὴν τῆς καρδίας, PGM 4.1498-1504.
2051...ἤ πτραμοῦς καὶ ἐρή ἀναπαράσασα ἡ καταφλέξασα τὸ Ἑλος τοῦ Ἀχαλδα, PGM 36.335-336.
The compulsive rituals themselves tend to use animal materia; here the most common body parts would seem to be parts of the feet of the animals – their nails or knucklebones – and brains.\textsuperscript{2052} The first set of these seems best explained by the idea of the feet as the means of locomotion; burning these might be thought of as lighting a fire beneath the feet of the deity. The brains are a slightly more complex case – Johnston has suggested that the brain, a superfluous material in traditional Egyptian thought, might have been understood as an undesirable or even unpleasant item of materia.\textsuperscript{2053} However, I would suggest a different function, and one relying not on traditional Egyptian understandings of the brain as a superfluous organ, but on the more recently imported Greek understanding of the brain as the centre of consciousness.\textsuperscript{2054} Again, in PGM 4.1496-1595 myrrh is invoked to burn the brain of the ritual’s victim just as it is being burned, this burning of the brain serving to control the victim’s behaviour.\textsuperscript{2055} Thus, the brain offered up in these compulsive procedures would be connected to the brain, and hence mind, of the deity itself.

The final type of marking I will discuss here is that of concord; as with speech acts, offerings may be used to create cohesion within strings of ritual components. Concord in offering rituals generally involves the use of shared materia: thus in two of the recensions

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Brains are burned as part of compulsive offerings in the following rituals: PGM 2.64-183 (dream oracle; uses the brains of a black ram and the brains of an ibis); PGM 4.1275-1322 (invocation of Ursa Major, purpose unclear; uses the brains of a black ram); PGM 4.2891-2942 (ritual of erotic compulsion; uses the brains of a vulture); the rationale behind the use of black ram brains in PGM 7.528-539, a victory ritual, is less clear, but can be suspected on the basis of the other examples. In general, we can see that black rams are the animal from which the brains are usually taken, presumably deriving from that animal’s role as the archetypal necromantic sacrifice (Ogden, \textit{Greek and Roman necromancy}, pp.171-172), but the role of the ibis is less clear, since the ibis is a lunar bird, and the ritual in PGM 2.64-183 is addressed to a solar deity. The connection between the vulture and Aphrodite, the goddess invoked in PGM 4.2891-2942 may derive, as Johnston suspects, from a connection between the the Greek goddess and the Egyptian vulture goddess Nekhbet (Johnston, “Sacrifice in the Greek Magical Papyri”, p.350); a series of bronze statues from Alexandria appear to depict a syncretic goddess identified by Anton Hekler as Isis-Nekhbet-Aphrodite as a woman wearing the vulture’s headdress usually depicted on the King’s Wife in Pharaonic art (Anton Hekler, “Alexandrinische Aphroditestatuetten,” \textit{Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien} 14 (1911)).
\item Johnston, “Sacrifice in the Greek Magical Papyri”, p.350 fn.15.
\item PGM 4.1496-1595: “As I burn you up and you are powerful, so burn the brain of her whom I love, NN” (ὡς/ ἐγώ σε κατακάω καὶ δυνατὴ εἶ/ οὗτῳ ἥς φιλῶ, τῆς δ(ε)iphers) κατάκαυ/σον τὸν ἐγκέφαλον, 1540-1543).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
of the *Ogdoad of Moses* the same blend of materia is used both as an offering to the deity, and as the base of the ink used to write upon a natron stela, which is later licked off by the ritualist. PDM Suppl.149-162 provides another example of the same materia being used as both ink and a burnt offering. PGM 4.1331-1389 uses the fat of a donkey, a goat, and a bull as the base of the offering, and this same fat is smeared on the ritualist’s lips, while hairs from these animals are plaited into a cord and worn around the head as a phylactery. The mediated divination ritual in PGM 2.1-64 also creates a three-way concord: radish oil is poured over the boy seer, then collected, and part of it is burned in the lamp, while the remainder is poured as a libation over the altar. Similarly, PGM 1.262-347 uses the same materia both for the invocation sacrifice and for the release. The final example is especially interesting. In the dream oracle PGM 2.1-64 two images of the deity are drawn on papyrus at the same time; one of these is then placed by the ritualist’s head as they sleep. The second is burned or suspended over a lamp as a compulsive procedure on the fifth day.

4.3.4 The Rationale of offerings in rituals of apparition

As we have seen, behind the diversity of the offerings in rituals of apparition we can see some basic principles at work, and while these cannot sufficiently explain every aspect of practice, they go some way towards elucidating the ritual technology at work.

The essential structure of the offerings is fairly conventional for ritual practice in the Mediterranean of the third and fourth centuries CE: burnt offering, usually of plant materia, accompanied by libations, and sometimes food offerings, with the ritualist perhaps tasting the victim if an animal was used. This agrees very closely with the archetypal pattern of sacrifice mandated by Decius’ decree. The basic structure can be expressed as follows:
As I have suggested above, the praxis of the many procedures is probably primary, and the meaning-function secondary. This is almost certainly the case with a practice such as sacrifice, which had a history of several millennia behind it in each of the cultures which contributed to the magical papyri. As briefly sketched earlier, sacrifice was a point of particular theoretical concern in the early centuries CE – the spiritualisation of sacrifice, or the denigration of physical offerings, was apparent in several ideological streams – among these we might count the early Christian interpretations of the death of Jesus of Nazareth, the development of Rabbinic understandings of sacrifice in the absence of the Jerusalem temple, as well as Plotinus' avoidance of cultic practices, and Porphyry's decisive turn from animal sacrifice. On the other hand, we have cross-currents stressing particular aspects of sacrifice – Iamblichus' focus on the importance of physical acts, and
the Emperor Julian's anachronistic devotion to animal sacrifice.\footnote{For a discussion of some of these contradictory and conflicting attitudes, see Bradbury, "Julian's Pagan Revival and the Decline of Blood Sacrifice"; Shaw, Theurgy and the Soul, pp.12-17; Guy G. Stroumsa, "The End of Sacrifice. Religious Mutations of Late Antiquity," in The Roman Empire in Context, ed. Johann P. Arnason and Kurt A. Raaflaub (Wiley-Blackwell, 2011).} These attitudes carried with them particular interpretations – for Porphyry and the early Christians blood sacrifice was seen as an act that fed the lower, malevolent daimōns, while Iamblichus asserted, by contrast, that the consumption of materia by deities served to loosen the bonds of matter,\footnote{De Mysteriis 2.5, 5.11-12.} allowing it to rise up the sympathetic chain that bound the higher emanations of divinity to the lower reaches of embodied matter.

There is little suggestion of such ideological conflicts in the magical papyri. The concept of sacrifice is key not only to rituals of apparition, but several other types of ritual, although the comparative scarcity of animal sacrifice is probably to be understood within the context of the general pattern of late antique cultic practice. The basic meaning-function of offerings in these rituals is probably the same as in most instances of sacrifice in this period; it served as an act which brought the deity and worshipper into communion. This link – independent of its interpretation as an act which honoured or sustained the deity, or destroyed its enemies – was what allowed the ritualist to communicate with and make requests of the invoked god or spirit. I am aware of only one point in the papyri where the meaning-function of sacrifice is made explicit, the example already briefly mentioned from the second recension of the Ogdoad of Moses. In this text the ritualist is to sacrifice one pigeon and one rooster to the deity, and leave one of each alive. The deity is described as receiving breath (πνεῦμα) from each sacrifice,\footnote{...ὅταν μέλλῃ ἀπογεύεσθαι ἀλέκτορα θῦσον ἣνα ὁ θεὸς ἀφθόνως λάβῃ/ πνεῦμα (ll.376-378); ...ινα αν πνεῦμα λάβῃ (l.370).} and as possibly wishing to sacrifice one of the birds itself when it arrives.\footnote{...ἐὰν εἰσελθὼν βουλήθη ἐπιθυεῖν (l.374).} Here the idea of the deity as receiving sustenance from the sacrifice seems to be primary, but we should not assume that this meaning-function was understood the same way by all practitioners for all sacrifices.
5. Conclusions

At the beginning of this work I promised an eclectic approach to suit eclectic material, and I find now that the results have been equally heterogenous. The nature of the Roman-era magical material resists grand theorising, and while previous scholars have suggested several general conclusions, and I have added a few more tentative ones, it seems that there is much more work to be done before we can claim a thorough understanding of the ritual practices of this period. In lieu of a conclusive statement on the Theban Library or the ritual of apparition, I will make some general remarks on some of my more striking findings, and suggestions for future work.

First, and most reassuring, it seems that there is secure evidence that the Theban Library, and possibly other magical archives, were a real phenomenon of Roman Egypt. The evidence for the unity of the Theban archive is, of course, not as strong as that for the Kellis Archive, whose archaeological context is clear. But the significant shared content and common history of the ten papyri make it the more difficult task, in my opinion, to argue that these texts are unrelated; the existence of the Theban Library seems a much simpler hypothesis. If its existence seems likely, the questions of its creation, consolidation, and deposition in ancient times remain problematic, despite the assumptions which have accumulated; I have suggested some probabilistic answers to these questions, but they remain speculative (2.2.4.2, 2.3.1).

Equally interesting is the Theban Library’s place in Roman-era magical practice more broadly. It is very difficult to grasp this in any manner other than through brute statistical methods (2.2.4.1), and despite the limitations of this approach, the results have managed to provide a more accurate overview of the evidence. The most important result of this study was a confirmation that healing practices were the dominant concern of the Roman-period. While many scholars already suspected this, the discourse, at least in the anglosphere, has been to suggest that Egyptian magical practice at this time was focussed
on mystical and aggressive magic – revelation spells and curses. These are of course much more prominent than in earlier periods, but the idea that they predominate seems to be an artefact of the large and unrepresentative archives which dominate the PGM – the Theban, Hermonthite, and Fayum archives. Against this background, the predominant interest of the Theban collectors in rituals of apparition and alchemy is particularly striking, and this last practice in particular must be taken into account in any discussion of the Theban Library.

The lexicographical studies undertaken as part of this project (principally in 3.2.2, but to a lesser extent in 3.2.3.1 and 4.2.1.1) have been of great value in my own conceptualisation of the material, in particular in understanding the relationship between the Egyptian and Greek components. There are points where the Demotic and Greek texts appear to be drawing on the same syntactical or lexical resources. The regular Demotic pattern of varying future injunctive and conjunctive verb forms in ritual instructions seems to closely mirror the use of imperatives and participles in Greek, and we find comparable technical terms, among them those for compulsive (htr, ἐπαναγκος) and release (wß, ἀπόλυσις) formulae and procedures. These similarities are also striking on a level of praxis; perhaps not immediately obvious in my structural analysis is the fact that identical ritual procedures are often replicated not only across manuscripts, but also between texts in different languages.

Nonetheless, there are important differences in the material which should not be elided. As I have stressed at several points, the oft-repeated idea that pH-nTr, αὐτοτος and σύστατις are equivalent terms seems to be without foundation. The fact that there is no neat emic term to refer to rituals of apparition as a whole, and we must rely on an etic term, is revealing in itself. Despite the fact that these rituals as a whole seem to have constituted a clear category of praxis, ritualists either used narrower terms to refer to the specific modality they were employing (ὄνειραιπτόν or pH-nTr for a dream oracle, for example), or else used the much more general terms “inquiry” (ἐν) or “oracle” (μαντεῖον),
suggesting that they saw their “magical” rituals as fitting firmly within the broader practice of cultic and technical divination.

Similarly, an analysis of the speech acts used in formulae reveals clear divisions between Egyptian and Greek practices – the use of performatives in Greek, and the use of interjections and autocletics in Egyptian. That this fault line separates the Demotic and Old Coptic texts from the Greek and Coptic material is significant, especially in view of the fact that they are found side by side in individual manuscripts, and in view of Dieleman’s argument that the Demotic texts may have been inspired by earlier Greek examples. In PDM 14 we find Greek invocations with Demotic instructions, and in PGM 4 we find Old Coptic invocations with Greek instructions. This suggests that practitioners in these traditions engaged in something like “code-switching”, consciously drawing on different normative models for spoken formulae in Greek and Egyptian. These features are set in even sharper relief by the existence of texts in each language which seem to have features more typical of the other: do we understand these as direct translations, or perhaps original compositions drawing on the norms of the other tradition, or simply as anomalous outliers? These questions, along with features such as the use of loanwords, calques, phonetic transcriptions, and of course, content, will need to be examined more thoroughly if questions of composition are to be seriously understood.

Alongside questions of language, questions of structure and practice are equally important, though the methodological problem of describing these makes summarising them more difficult. Simply viewing texts synoptically can reveal many new insights; particularly surprising to me was the picture which emerged of the strange, baboon-like manner of enunciation for spoken formulae (4.2.1.2). This is all the more striking given that it is at odds with earlier descriptions, based primarily on literary evidence, which suggested that formulae were more often whispered. This highlights the importance of remaining conscious of the diversity of our evidence, as well as of allowing the papyri to speak for themselves. If this synoptic approach can bring out recurrent features with
particular clarity, its shortcomings are also apparent in the few, but important, cases where rituals resist all attempts to fit them into larger patterns. Here PGM 12.1-13 is particularly striking, a ritual of apparition with no offering, no consultation, and very few other ritual procedures.

The hardest questions to answer have been those of the social context of the Theban Library and similar texts. While I have tried to draw these out (2.3, 3.2-3), I cannot escape the feeling that the picture is very incomplete, due simply to the lack of evidence available to us. More fruitful, perhaps, are attempts to describe the experiential and cognitive worlds of the practitioners, which the papyri seem better able to speak about. Despite the danger of trying to read the minds of those long-dead, perhaps an unavoidable danger for the ancient historian, it seems to me that the careful use of insights from modern psychology, anthropology, and cognitive science can not only allow deeper readings of certain aspects of our texts, but allow them to speak to the human experience more broadly. I have found my own discussions with practicing scholars in these fields very valuable, and I hope that I am able to extend this line of inquiry in the future.

At a much more basic level, however, this project has shown me that a great deal of work remains to be done at a purely papyrological level. While time has prevented me from including the text editions produced alongside my analytical work, the process has exposed the limitations of present editions to provide answers to many questions of interest to contemporary researchers. In a few places the interventions of earlier editors pose major issues for basic issues of interpretation, and in others the lack of interest in issues such as *mise-en-page*, *Schriftbild*, lexical signs, and signs of use such as marginal notes prevents the sort of engagement sought by a generation increasingly concerned with questions of materiality and texts as artefacts. Current moves to re-edit and re-translate the magical handbooks, such as the University of Chicago project headed by Faraone and Torallas Tovar, offer the possibility of breaking free of the chrysalis of the *PGM*. This new approach will depend on a level of detail which would surely have seemed
superfluous to earlier generations, more concerned with basic questions of interpretation. 
Care must be taken not only to acknowledge the material aspects of papyri, but also their 
provenances and possible relationships to other texts – both as members of larger 
archives, and on the basis of shared content. The handbooks must be separated from the 
applied material, while at the same time doing justice to the vital connection between the 
two bodies of evidence, and to the relationship between the papyrus sources and the 
handbooks which survive in the manuscript tradition – the *Cyranides* and similar works. 
While the lack of modern translations has meant these are often less-known than the 
magical papyri, similarities of praxis make an engagement with both bodies of material 
crucial for an understanding of either. Similarly, the full breadth of the available 
handbooks must be dealt with, even if, like Betz and his contributors, we must admit that 
the quest for complete coverage is in the last analysis, unachievable. This would involve 
taking into account not only the Greek texts published in *Supplementum Magicum*, but 
also the miscellaneous Greek,\(^{2060}\) Demotic,\(^{2061}\) and Coptic texts\(^{2062}\) which are comparable in 
date, and even the deeply problematic, but important P.BM EA 10808;\(^{2063}\) traditional 
Egyptian transliterated into Greek characters, whose use of the *maskelli* formula 
demonstrates its allegiance to the magical genre, even if its contents have yet to be 
definitively deciphered. These desiderata, undeniably daunting in their scale, seem to me 
the necessary conditions for any project which seeks to truly supersede the works of 
Preisendanz, Betz, and their collaborators, rather than merely update them. 

If this represents the major challenge for modern scholars of ancient Mediterranean 
magic, a series of smaller projects would also suggest themselves from my own work. A

\(^{2060}\) These might include P.Berl.inv. 11734, P.Berl.inv. 17202, P.Berl.inv. 21227, P.Berl.inv. 21149, P.Duk.inv. 729 
\(^{2061}\) Depending on the definitions adopted, O.Strassburg D 1338, P.Princ. Dem. 2, P.Tebt.Tait 18, P.Tebt.Tait 19, 
& P.Vienna D 6321 could be included. 
\(^{2062}\) The dating of Coptic papyri poses more problems, but if we take the sixth century CE as the limit of our 
corpus we might include P.Cologne 10235, P.Kell.Copt. V.35, P.Mil.Vogl. Copt. 16, the Michigan Hoard 
(P.Michigan 593-603), and even perhaps, dependent on palaeographic work, P.Cologne 20826, P.Michigan 
190, P.Michigan 49324, Yale 882(A), P.Yale 1791, P.Yale 1800, and the London Hay Collection (see 2.3.2.10). 
\(^{2063}\) On this text see above, fn.504.
comprehensive linguistic survey of the Greek and Demotic texts in the corpus would be valuable in answering questions of dependence and composition, as well as providing another piece of data to the important on-going investigation of ethnic and linguistic identities in the ancient Mediterranean. The magical papyri represent a body of evidence in which the use of the two languages is not only directly comparable, but almost certainly traceable in many instances to the same groups of writers. While such a study would have to avoid the pitfall of seeing Egyptianisms or Hellenisms in every text, this unique corpus holds considerable promise for discussing ideas of language interaction. Two particular projects which occur to me are the extension and improvement of my own work on speech acts to include formulae from other ritual types, looking at a broader and more precise range of features, as well as a study of how the ritual instructions are constructed at both the levels of syntax and lexis.

In parallel to this linguistic study, a wider, and more detailed structural analysis of praxis would be desirable; my original intention was to perform analyses comparable to those provided for formulae and offerings for all the other ritual processes, but this idea had to be abandoned when I realised the complexity not only of this project, but of the work to be done contextualising the Theban Library and the ritual of apparition. This broader analysis would remain sensitive to the different types of ritual in the papyri, but incorporate identical practices demonstrated in multiple ritual types – the practices of icon-making, purity, and offering across rituals of apparition, erotic compulsion, healing, and so on. Some work in this direction has already been done, but it seems to me that much more remains, and such an approach could also fruitfully incorporate not only earlier Pharaonic and later Coptic material, but also the Arabic, Aramaic, and Hebrew texts, in particular Egyptian sources, such as those the Cairo Genizah. At the broadest level, such an analysis could also take in the medieval manuscript tradition, and the observations of later visitors to 19th and 20th century Egypt, but this work would need to avoid the problem of treating material either superficially, or in a way which dilutes the
peculiar features of the times and places of our early evidence into a placeless, timeless “magical tradition”.

These proposed projects would without doubt be demanding, but my own work to date has suggested they would nonetheless be very rewarding. The magical papyri represent a rich source of material, and I have never come away from working on them without fresh questions, and more rarely, new insights.
## Appendix 1: Abbreviations used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANRW</td>
<td><em>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Bohairic (Coptic Dialect).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>The Campbell Bonner Magical Gems Database, <a href="http://www2.szepmuveszeti.hu/talismans/">www2.szepmuveszeti.hu/talismans/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Coffin Texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Demotic (stage of the Egyptian language).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Lycopolitan (Coptic Dialect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMPG</td>
<td>Léxico de magia y religión en los papiros mágicos griegos en línea, <a href="http://dge.cchs.csic.es/lmpg/">http://dge.cchs.csic.es/lmpg/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Middle Egyptian (Stage of the Egyptian Language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Old Coptic (Coptic dialect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sahidic (Coptic Dialect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLA</td>
<td>Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae, <a href="http://aaew.bbaw.de/tla/servlet/TlaLogin">http://aaew.bbaw.de/tla/servlet/TlaLogin</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Archival Sources

Theban Library Papyri

PGM 1

Alternative sigla: P.Berl. Inv. 5025 + Warsaw MN 140159; Anastasi 1074 (1857)
Trismegistos number: 88396

British Museum AES Ar.232

This document is the catalogue of the 3rd Anastasy collection, originally put together in the 1840s, and eventually auctioned in Paris in 1857. According to the notes from J.T. (John Taylor) on the sheet inserted into this document, the annotations to the catalogue were probably made by Samuel Birch when he visited Livorno in 1846. Birch was trained in Chinese, and some of his notes include Chinese numerals. Presumably these indicate his valuations of the pieces, which he wrote thus to prevent Anastasy's agents from reading them.

[p.49] Manuscrits de Thèbes en Papyrus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Boîte</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimensions en pouces anglais</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Birch’s Notes</th>
<th>PGM Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grec, rouleau plat, caractères petits coupé en deux</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4¼ endomagé [sic]</td>
<td>[None]</td>
<td>PGM 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Lenormont, Catalogue d'une collection d'antiquités égyptiennes. Paris, 1857

This is the catalogue for the eventual sale of the collection, written by François Lenormant. He probably had access to the catalogue listed above, although it is unclear how much of his description of the discovery of the papyri, given on p.84, is based on knowledge from Anastasy or his agents, as opposed to his own inference.
2° Papyrus.

Voici une des plus riches séries de la collection; les papyrus montent au nombre de soixante, et quelques-uns ont une très-haute importance. – Malheureusement ils sont tous encore roulés, et on n’a pu juger de leur contenu qu’en déployant avec la plus grande précaution le commencement des volumes. – La partie la plus curieuse de cette série est celle que forment nos n°s 1072-1075. M. Anastasi, dans ses fouilles à Thèbes avait découvert la bibliothèque d’un gnostique égyptien du second siècle, et une partie de cette bibliothèque avait passé avec sa première collection dans le musée de Leyde; c’est de là que venait le fameux texte magique en écriture démotique et deux petits papyrus grecs pliés en Corme de livres qui font plusieurs des plus beaux ornements de ce musée. Mais ce n’était pas là toute la découverte, et, dans la nouvelle collection de M. Anastasi, nous avons un supplément très-important à joindre aux textes étudiés par Reuvcns dans ses Lettres à M. Letronne. D’abord un grand traité magique en écriture démotique, comme celui de Leyde, deux traités grecs du même genre, enfin un ouvrage complet également gnostico-astrologique, en grec, tracé sur des feuilles de papyrus pliées comme nos livres modernes, et écrites sur les deux faces.

1074 – Long manuscrit grec, magique et astrologique, d’une écriture très-fine, probablement complet, brisé en deux parties.

PGM 2

Alternative sigla: P.Berl. Inv. 5026; Anastasi 1075 (1828)
Trismegistos number: 88397
British Museum AES Ar.232

See notes to PGM 1 for a description of this document.

[p.49] Manuscrits de Thèbes en Papyrus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue no. (?)</th>
<th>Boîte</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimensions en pouces anglais</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Birch’s Notes</th>
<th>PGM Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grec rouleau plat, écriture [sic] sur</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>très-peu endommagée</td>
<td>Greek [[frag (?)]] well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See notes to PGM 1 for a description of this document.

[p.87]

1075 – Grand Manuscrit grec magique.

**PGM 4**

Alternative sigla: P. Bibl. Nat. Suppl. gr. no. 574; Anastasi 1073 (1857)
Trismegistos number: 64343

British Museum AES Ar.232

See notes to PGM 1 for a description of this document.

[p.49] *Manuscrits de Thèbes en Papyrus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Catalogue no. (?)]</th>
<th>[Description]</th>
<th>Dimensions en pouces anglais</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Birch’s Notes</th>
<th>PGM Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hauteur</td>
<td>largeur on grand diamètre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>Grec à livre de 36. feuillets don’t 24 ecrits de deux côtés, caractère très petit, d’environ 50 lignes par page cont. matièr...</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>très-bonne</td>
<td>Coptic manuscript well written(?) 五十 [50] manuscript containing with (?) name of Nephotes who writes to Psammeichus King of Egypt well written very (?) well(?) I read over front part of for (?) Ἴ [100] Αφροδίτης φιλομαντειον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See notes to PGM 1 for a description of this document.

[p.86]

1073 – Manuscrit sur feuilles de papyrus pliées en livre, formant 33 feuillets écrits des deux côtés, à 60 lignes environ per page. - Traité de magie et d’astrologie gnostique, en grec, supposé écrit par un nommé Néphotes et dédié au roi Psammétique; entre autres choses curieuses, il contient une série de prescriptions et de recettes sur la manière de faire les amulettes et les pierres magiques. En tête sont trois pages de copte, qui débutent par l’histoire d’un fromage mystique pour la composition duquel s’associent Osiris, Sabaoth, Iao, Jésus et tous les autres éons. Ce fromage n’est autre que la gnose. - Ecriture du second siècle de notre ère.

PGM 5

Alternative sigla: P. Lond. 46; Anastasi 4 (1839)
Trismegistos number: 64368

British Museum, Dept. of Ancient Egypt and Sudan, AES Ar.246

*This document is the catalogue of the 2nd Anastasi collection, purchased by the British Museum in 1839. The following information describes PGM 5, described as one of the papyrus. At the beginning of the list it notes that “[b]oîte en fer manquée. A.[rrivé] danse [sic] la caisse”.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Inventory no.]</th>
<th>[Provenance]</th>
<th>[Description]</th>
<th>Conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thèbes</td>
<td>Mscr. en 7. feuillets, mscr. grec sur papyrus contenant des lignes qui indiquent une matière astrologique. Haut 11½ x 4¾ pouces anglais</td>
<td>bonne cons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PDM/PGM 12

=P.Leid I 384; Anastasi 75 + 75a (1828); P.Leid. V
Trismegistos numbers: 55954 (PDM/PGM 12) & 55946 (Myth of the Sun’s Eye)

Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, RMO inv.3.1.6

This document is titled 'Catalogue original de la collection d'Antiquités Egyptiennes [sic] d'Anastasy', and represents the catalogue of the collection sold in 1828. The following information describes the part of PDM/PGM 12 included in the catalogue. Although the inventory number is missing, it would have been number 75. A marginal note reads "[Av]ec le no.66"; no.66 is P.Leid. I 397.

[p.99]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory #</th>
<th>No. of pieces</th>
<th>Description:</th>
<th>Dimensions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Papyrus Grec en plusiers morceaux (complet.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the back of the document is a section titled “Precis du Catalogue des Antiquités Egyptiennes [sic]”. In the section titled “Manuscrits Egyptien [sic]” there is further information on the papyrus.

[Manuscrits Egyptien] Sur Papyrus, avec ou sans figures & scènes, ecrits, en Caractères Hiérogliphiques, Encoriques ou Démotiques, ouverts, ou encore cachetés, divers avec légendes, ou videmations (?) en Grec [No.:] 75

In the third of three supplements ("Troisieme Supplément au Catalogue d'Antiquités egypriennes [sic] de Mr Cher. D'Anastasij") still more information is given about this papyrus:

75 – 1 – Manuscrit sur Papyrus d'une côté Grec et de l'autre Demotics [sic] – Haute 7

Rijksmuseum van Oudheden. Inventaris 4. april 1829-okt. 1838

This is the inventory-book for the Rijksmuseum, and records the notes made by Caspar Reuven (?) on acquiring PDM/PGM 12. One of the entries has no number, it seems possible that it refers to PDM/PGM 12.

[p.31]

[No number] 1 Papyrus Grec en plusiers morceaux (complet) ce papyrus le trouve avec le No 66

3e Supplement.

“2 Fragments appartenent au No précédent

Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, RMO Archief Humbert, 19.3.1831

This is the document described as the “Triplicata”, a letter written by Jean d’Anastasy and copied in triplicate on 18 March 1828. Addressed to his agents, it describes his intention to give three additional items to the purchaser of his 1828 collection, ultimately the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden. No.3 in this list is the second part of the document now known as PGM 12, called no.75a by Reuven.

[p.2]

Vous pouvez annoncer en même terms aux Agents de S.M., qu’outre les objets dont vous avez donné les Supplément au Catalogue général, j’en ai encore trois autres, qui je me ferais un

[p.3]

un [sic] devoir de vous expédier au plus tôt, pour être ajoutés à la Collection totale: Ces objets consistement:-

1: En un Casque de bronze, trouvé sur une Momie.

2: En un Manuscrit grec sur papyrus, en forme de livre, qui paroit être un traité d’Astrologie; &

3: En un fragment de papyrus manuscrit bilingue grec & démotique, que je suppose appartenir à celui de même matière qui est déjà porté au 3.\textsuperscript{me} Supplément du Catalogue: Puisque par un heureux hasard, j’ai eu l’occasion de le racheter de la main des Arabes (qui suivant leur frauduleuse coutume l’ont probablement détaché du papyrus principal afin d’en tirer un plus grand prix par la double vente) je me fais un scrupule de le réunir comme membre au corps que je crois être le sien, et j’éprouve une véritable satisfaction de pouvoir procurer au possesseur de ma collection un avantage qui peut être précieux.
Ces trois nouveaux Objets, je vous les adresse dans le dessein [sic] formel que vous
les remettiez à ce Possesseur, dans le cas même que le traité en seroit deja conclus,
& la livraison en aurait été entièrement effectuée.

PGM 13
Alternative sigla: P.Leid I 395; Anastasi 76 (1828); P.Leid W
Trismegistos number: 64446

Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, RMO Archief Humbert, 19.3.1831

This is the document described as the “Triplicata”, a letter written by Jean d'Anastasy and
copied in triplicate on 18 March 1828. Addressed to his agents, it describes his intention to give
three additional items to the purchaser of his 1828 collection, ultimately the Rijksmuseum van
Oudheden. No.2 in this list is the document now known as PGM 13. This extract deals only
with this papyrus; for a longer extract see the notes to PDM/PGM 12.

[p.3]

2: En un Manuscrit grec sur papyrus, en forme de livre, qui paroit être un traité
d'Astrologie; &

PDM/PGM 14
Alternative sigla: P. Leid. I 383; Anastasi 65 (1828) + P.Lond.demot.10070; Anastasi 1072
(1857)
Trismegistos number: 55955

Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, RMO inv.3.1.6

This document is titled 'Catalogue original de la collection d'Antiquités Egyptiennes [sic]
d'Anastasy', and represents the catalogue of the collection sold in 1828. The following
information describes the portion of PDM/PGM 14 purchased by the Rijksmuseum.

[p.98]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory #</th>
<th>No. of pieces</th>
<th>Description:</th>
<th>Dimensions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 65          | 1             | Grand Papyrys en carectères Hiératiques ou demotiques se deroulent en (?) rituel à pâges [sic], les lignes entremelées de caractères Grecs | Hauteur 10
|             |               |              | Diamet: 2 ½ a |
|             |               |              | [sic] 2¾    |
At the back of the document is a section titled “Precis du Catalogue des Antiquités Egyptiennes [sic]”. In the section titled “Manuscrits Egyptien [sic]” there is further information on the papyrus.

Grand Papyrus en menus & beaux Caractères Hiératiques ou démotiques entremêlés de Caractères Grecs dans presque toutes les pages plus ou moins. Sur le revers écrit avec lacunes; dans la partie supérieure seulement en hiéroglyphes, Hiératique ou Démotique & Grec [No.] 1

Rijksmuseum van Oudheden. Inventaris 4. april 1829-okt. 1838

This is the inventory-book for the Rijksmuseum, and records the notes made by Caspar Reuvens (?) on acquiring the Leiden part of PDM/PGM 14.

[p.30]

65 - Grand papyrus en carectères hieratiques ou démotiques se dérulant en rituel a pages, les lignes entremêlées de caractères Grecs dans presque toutes les pages et espaces plus ou moins. Sur le revers écrit avec lacunes dans la partie supérieure seulement en hieroglýphes; caractères hieratiques ou demotiques et Grecs (Manuscrit unique jusqu’ici) (Thèbes) Mons. le Prof. Rosellini le dit en 4 langues; Mr Peron en fait demander au Colonel J.I. (?) Humbert la permission de pouvoir venir de Turin expressément pour voir ce papyrus, mais cela lui fut refusé.

N.B. Mr. Rosellini a inexactement décrit ou fait connaître ce Papyrus unique en son genre dans la feuille de Globe, on il ne parle pas des inscriptions et figures sur le dos du Papyrus, il ne parle pas non plus du grand nombre des lignes Grecques intervallées (?) parmi les carateres démotiques et les hieroglyphes (etc.)

British Museum AES Ar.232

See notes to PGM 1 for a description of this document.

This catalogue record describes the London half of PDM/PGM 14.

[p.49] Manuscrits de Thèbes en Papyrus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue no. (?)</th>
<th>Boîte</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimensions en pouces anglais</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Birch's Notes</th>
<th>PGM Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Démotique rouleau plat en caractères très-petits long 78, de dix pages à contour, avec hiéroglyphe, et des mots grecs dans plusieurs endroits entre le ligne de démotique, puis dans une page onze lignes de grec en gros caractères avec écritures derrière – manque le commencement et la fin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>id. [passable]</td>
<td>very fine small hand [or frag?] 三十五 [35]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Lenormont, *Catalogue d'une collection d'antiquités égyptiennes*, Paris 1857

*See notes to PGM 1 for a description of this document.*

[p.87]

1072 – Grand manuscrit magique en écriture démotique, avec transcriptions grecques dans l'intérieur des lignes, comme à celui de Leyde. Écrit sur des deux faces; le même que ce dernier.

**British Museum, Birch. Catalogue Slips of Papyri. Vol.2 10,000-10,332; Dept. of E. & A. Antiquities**

*This is a description by Samuel Birch of the London half of PDM 14; as we can see, he recognised its similarity to the Leiden portion.*

10070 [British Museum EA no.]

[note in left margin:] Anastasi 1072

Bilingual papyrus in Greek and demotic consisting of 10 pages, very neatly written and divided by margins of vertical lines, beyond which lines however the text is
occasionally written. The main body of the text is demotic and written in black with a few words explanatory of certain demotic words in Greek, written above the demotic lines. In one portion of the text an invocation in Greek to a god or daimon is introduced. The text on one side consists of 8 Pages, the tenor of which is of a mystical or magical nature like the later Rituals, and this papyrus is evidently similar if not actually a part of the Leyden Papyrus (Leemans Monumens Égyptiens du Musée d’Antiquités des Pays Bas à Leide Pl.1 to foll.). The I. Page has 28, the 2nd, 29, the 3rd, 35, the 4th, 8 l. of demotic followed by a paragraph in Greek, mystical invocation in Greek of 10 lines followed by two paragraphs, one of 3, and the other of two lines of demotic. the [sic] 5th page has 34 l. of demotic the 6th, 37, the 7th, 32, th 8th, 2 paragraphs of 11, the other of 7 lines of demotic the 9th 35 lines of demotic the 10th. of 35 lines of demotic, in the back are 4 endorsements the 1st of 2 Pages 1. of 13 the other of 9 lines of demotic the 2nd of 2 paragraphs 1. of 2 the other of 5 lines of demotic the 3rd of paragraphs of 11 + 7 lines of Greek and demotic the 4th has 3 paragraphs 1. of 7 lines, demotic, 2 of 7 lines, demotic and 1 Greek. the 3rd. 8 lines demotic.

7 ft. 1 [ong].

9 ¾ in.[ide].

PDM Suppl.

Alternative sigla: P. Louvre E3229; Anastasi 1061 (1857)

Trismegistos number: 64218

British Museum AES Ar.232

See notes to PGM 1 for a description of this document.

It is unclear which of the texts listed below is that which is now designated PDM Suppl.; there is not enough information here.

[p.49] Manuscrits de Thèbes en Papyrus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Catalogue no. (?)]</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimensions en pouces anglais</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Birch’s Notes</th>
<th>PGM Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Demotique, rouleau</td>
<td>10½</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>assez bonne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Demotique, rouleau</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mutile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Demotique, rouleau</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>mutile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Lenormont, *Catalogue d'une collection d'antiquités égyptiennes*, Paris 1857

See notes to PGM 1 for a description of this document.

[p.86]

1061 – Assez gros manuscrit funéraire en écriture démotique.

**P.Leid. I 397**

=Anastasi 66 (1828); P.Leid. X

Trismegistos number: 61300

Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, RMO inv.3.1.6

This document is titled 'Catalogue original de la collection d'Antiquités Egyptiennes [sic] d'Anastasy', and represents the catalogue of the collection sold in 1828. The following information describes P.Leid. I397.

[p.98]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory #</th>
<th>No. of pieces</th>
<th>Description:</th>
<th>Dimensions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Livre en papryrus de 20 feuilles don’t 18. écrites en beaux caracteres grecs, contenant 104 formules de procedé (?) chimiques. D'une parfaite conservation. (Thèbes)</td>
<td>Haut: 11.7/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the back of the document is a section titled “Precis du Catalogue des Antiquités Egyptiennes [sic]”. In the section titled “Manuscrits Egyptien [sic]” there is further information on the papyrus.

Grec Livre en papryrus , en beaux & menus caracteres grecs, contenet [sic] 104.formules de procédés chimiques [No.:] 1

Rijksmuseum van Oudheden. Inventaris 4. april 1829-okt. 1838

This is the inventory-book for the Rijksmuseum, and records the notes made by Caspar Reuven (? on acquiring P.Leid. I 397.

[p.31]
66 – Livre en papyrus de 20 feuille don’t 8 écrites en beaux caractères Grecs, contenant 104 formules de procédés chimiques d’une parfaite conservation (Thèbes)

**Non-Theban Library Papyri**

**PGM 3**
Alternative sigla: Louvre no.2391 (P. Mimaut frgs. 1-4), Mimaut no.541 (1837)
Trismegistos number: 64511

J.-J. Dubois, *Description des antiquités égyptiennes grecques et romaines, monuments coptes et arabes, composant la collection de feu M.J.F. Mimaut*, Paris 1837

This is the auction catalogue for the 1837 sale of Mimaut’s collection following his death. PGM 3 is number 541.

[p.86]

Fragment d’un manuscrit grec, en lettres onciales, et dont le sujet est astrologique./ Ce manuscrit, divisé en un grand nombre de morceaux qui ne sont point encore assemblé, est opistographe, et divisé en colonnes de texte mêlé de quelques figures de formes monstrueuses, et d’une exécution toute-a-fait barbare./ Haut, moyenne, 9 pouces. - Larg. encore inconnue

**PGM 6**
Alternative sigla: Anastasi 5 (1839); P.Lond. I 47; British Library papyrus 47
Trismegistos number: 60673

British Museum, Dept. of Ancient Egypt and Sudan, AES Ar.246

This document is the catalogue of the 2nd Anastasi collection, purchased by the British Museum in 1839. The following information describes PGM 6, described as one of the papyrus. At the beginning of the list it notes that “[b]oite en fer manquée. A.[rrivé] danse [sic] la caisse”. 
5 [Lost in damage to papyrus] | Memphis | Mscr. en fait (?) semblable au précédent. Carton en feuille. Hauteur Pṣ. 12¾ sur 6½

Note on Sleeve

*The sleeve containing PGM 6 contains information on its purchase and origin, presumably taken from the catalogue.*

1839 Anastasi 5; Purchased of M. Anastasi, Sept. 1839 (from Memphis).

**PGM 7**

Alternative Sigla: P. Lond. 121

Trismegistos number: 60204

**British Library, Minutes: Purchases 1879-1888, pp.294-295**

*This note records the purchase of PGM 7, 8, & 11a*

[p.294]

At a committee, 12 May 1888

**Papyri from Egypt**

1. Report by Mr. Renouf 9 May, submitting collection of papyri by Mr. Budge and offered by a native through a London firm (Messrs Bywater, Tanqueray & Co.) for £650.

The collection contains

A hieroglyphic [sic] Book of the Dead, 80 feet long x 14 1/2 inches, written about B.C. 1000 and finely illustrated; discovered in a tomb last year.

A hieratic papyrus inscribed on both sides with chapter of a religious work; written about B.C. 400; measuring 11 feet x 10 inches.

Fragment

[p.295]
Fragment of painted leather hieroglyphic copy of Book of the Dead from Thebes:
well executed:
and
Three Greek papyri:

Mr Renouf strongly recommends [sic] the purchase on the understanding that £150 of the amount will be paid by the Department of Manuscripts for the Greek papyri.

2. Report by Mr. Thompson, 9 May, recommending that the Greek papyri be secured for his Department at the price named (£150).

Sanctioned

Principal Librarian

They consist of

[p.296]

A roll, 8 feet long, containing Astrological and horological matters, perhaps of the 2nd century [PGM 7].

An imperfect roll, of the same character and probable date [PGM 8].

Portions of a tribute roll, 2nd or 3rd century, with two charms or horoscopes of the same period [PGM 11a].

PDM 61

Alternative sigla: P. BM EA 10588
Trismegistos number: 55956

British Museum – Merlin Collections Database

The Merlin Collections Database is a digitised catalogue of archival material held in the British Museum. The following entry contains information on the Acquisition Register volumes, and includes information on the ‘Register of unnumbered Objects from the Old Collections’, the earliest documentation we have on PDM 61.

AES Standard Report

AES: PRN: YAR 74834
Reg. No.: AES Ar.580

Title: Acquisition Register volumes (series)

Volumes 1-12 run sequentially by date from 1861-1971. Volume 13 was compiled in 1927 by H.R.H. Hall, the new Keeper, apparently 'sweeping up' after the departure of Budge in 1924. It is a 'Register of unnumbered Objects from the Old Collections' (O.C.) and includes items from virtually every important collection that had been acquired.


Register of Unnumbered Objects from the Old Collections [19]27.1.22 H.H.

= Acquisition Register Volume 13, AES Ar.580

As explained above, this Register lists otherwise uncatalogued items in the Department of Egyptian Antiquities, including the earliest mention of PDM 61. There is no acquisition information, unfortunately. The earliest dated item in this catalogue seems to be BM EA 8674, cat. no.31 “Wooden Ushabti; uninscribed”, purchased from Charles Towney in 1805/14; the latest seems to be BM EA 60005, #133, “Rude wooden figure of Amen-Re”, purchased in from Somerset Lowry-Corry, 2nd Earl of Belmore in 1849. While most of the objects are undated, those which do have dates are mainly from the 1840s.

[p.67; describes PDM 61]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[British Museum EA no.]</th>
<th>[Catalogue no.]</th>
<th>[Description]</th>
<th>[Dimensions]</th>
<th>[Other Notes]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10588</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>Demotic and Coptic magical papyrus. R part of 6 pages V part of 5</td>
<td>Length (as mounted) 38&quot;</td>
<td>Mounted in two frames</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: List of rituals of apparition

The following table lists the texts giving instructions for rituals of apparition known to me from papyri found in Egypt dating from the approximately the second to the eighth centuries CE. My text divisions may differ slightly from those in Betz, where I have divided a ritual based either on content or paralinguistic markers (indentation, paragraphos, and so on) in the original papyri. Invocations without accompanying indications of purpose are not given.

This table does not include texts which seem to be artefacts produced in the course of apparition rituals; these might include SM 65 & 66, a potsherd and lead tablet respectively, containing invocations.

The somewhat idiosyncratic layout of this table is intended to give an immediate sense of the relationships between ritual texts, manuscripts, and archives. In the first column is the name of the papyrus, coloured if it belongs to one of the two archives to contain rituals of apparition, the Theban and Hermonthite archives. In the next column is a list of all of the texts describing rituals of apparition belonging to each papyrus. In the third column is the type of ritual described in the text, categorised according to the classification system set out in 3.2.1. If the text contains instructions for more than one type of ritual, these are listed one after another. In the final column is Hopfner’s classification of the ritual, according to his list in *Griechische-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, vol.2, §75; where his numbering system diverges significantly from my own I indicate the line references he gives. His classifications, untranslated from the German, are:

I. Die theurgische Divination


   b. Die persönliche Erscheinung (αὐτοφάνεια) der Gottheit dier auf Erden an sich, ohne jedes Medium oder Immanenzmittel und zwar

      1. im Wachen

      2. im Schlaf (Traume)

II. Die magischen Divination

Die persönliche Erscheinung der Gottheit an einem bestimmten Immanenzmittel und zwar:

   a. höhere Stufe der magischen Divination: Die Gottheit wird in ihrer Gestalt sichtbar
1. im Licht des Leuchters (Lychnomantie)

2. im Wasser der Schüssel, der Schale, des Bechers (Lekanomantie)

b. niedere Stufe der Erkenntnis: Der Gott fährt in ein belebtes Wesen ein, bleibt unsichtbar, spricht aber aus dem menschlichen Medium, während es sich in enthusiastischer Erregung oder im somnabulen Trancezustand befindet.

III. Die goetische Divination.
Die Gottheit geht unsichtbar in leblose Medien ein und belebt sie, sodass sie sich in bestimmter Weise bewegen, oder sie verändert gewisse Eingenschaften und verwandelt sie manchmal in ihr Gegenteil.

IV. Die Nekromantie

These are discussed in more detail at 3.2.1.

**Key**

■ = Theban Library papyrus

■■ = Hermonthis Archive papyrus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papyrus</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Hopfner type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGM 1</td>
<td>1-42</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (paredric)</td>
<td>Theburgic b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42-195</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (paredric)</td>
<td>Theburgic b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>262-347</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td>Magical a1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 2</td>
<td>1-64</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>Theurgic b2 (1-183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mediumistic: direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64-184</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>Theurgic b2 (1-183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 3</td>
<td>187-262</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>282-409</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>494-611</td>
<td>(Sustasis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>612-632</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (paredric)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>633-731</td>
<td>(Sustasis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 4</td>
<td>11-25</td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52-85</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td>Theurgic b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Range</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-93</td>
<td>Mediumistic direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154-285</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel + (sustasis)</td>
<td>Magical a2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475-824</td>
<td>Anagoge + (sustasis)</td>
<td>Theurgic a (+ theurgic b1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850-929</td>
<td>Inspired Mediumistic</td>
<td>Magical b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930-1114</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct/lamp</td>
<td>Magical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275-1322</td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323-1330</td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1331-1389</td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td>Theurgic b1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928-2005</td>
<td>Unmediated: unclear</td>
<td>Magical a2 (1908-2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2125</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>Necromancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2140-2144</td>
<td>Unmediated: unclear</td>
<td>Necromancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2441-2621</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream + other functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including erotic compulsion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3086-3124</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td>Theurgic b1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3172-3208</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>Theurgic b2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3209-3254</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel</td>
<td>Magical a2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 5</td>
<td>1-52</td>
<td>Mediated: direct/vessel (?)</td>
<td>Theurgic b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53-69</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel</td>
<td>Magical a2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>370-439</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>Theurgic b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>440-58</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>Theurgic b2 (454-472)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 5a</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 6</td>
<td>1-47</td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 7</td>
<td>222-249</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>Theurgic b2 (230-257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250-254</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream (binary oracle)</td>
<td>Theurgic b2 (230-257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>255-259</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream (binary oracle)</td>
<td>Theurgic b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>319-334</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel</td>
<td>Magical a2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>335-347</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (?)</td>
<td>Theurgic b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>348-358</td>
<td>Mediated: direct</td>
<td>Theurgic b1 (356-366)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>359-369</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>Theurgic b2 (367-377)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>478-90</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>505-528</td>
<td>(Sustasis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>540-578</td>
<td>Mediated: lamp</td>
<td>Magical a1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>628-642</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>664-685</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Range</td>
<td>Unmediated Process</td>
<td>Theurgic b1/b2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703-726</td>
<td>dream</td>
<td>Theurgic b2 (694-708)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727-739</td>
<td>direct</td>
<td>Theurgic b2 (730-751)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740-755</td>
<td>dream</td>
<td>Theurgic b2 (730-751)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795-845</td>
<td>dream</td>
<td>Theurgic b1 (793-805); Theurgic b2 (806-821)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>846-861</td>
<td>direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>993-1009</td>
<td>direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009-1016</td>
<td>dream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 8</td>
<td>64-110</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream Theurgic b2 (65-111)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmediated: lamp (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 11a</td>
<td>1-40</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (paredric) (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM/PGM 12</td>
<td>PDM 12.21-49</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PGM 12.1-13</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (paredric) (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PGM 12.144-52</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream Theurgic b2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PGM 12.153-160</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PGM 12.190-192</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream Theurgic b2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 13</td>
<td>1-343</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>254-261</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>343-646</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>646-734</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM/PGM 14</td>
<td>1-92</td>
<td>Mediated: vessel Magical a2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93-114</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117-149</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream Magical a1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150-231</td>
<td>Mediated: lamp Magical a1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>232-238</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream (binary oracle) Theurgic b2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>239-295</td>
<td>Mediated: vessel Magical a2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>295-308</td>
<td>Unmediated: sun (?) Magical a2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>395-427</td>
<td>Unmediated/ unmediated: vessel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>459-475</td>
<td>Mediated: lamp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>475-488</td>
<td>Mediated: lamp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Range</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492-555</td>
<td>Mediated: lamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516-527</td>
<td>Mediated: lamp (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528-553</td>
<td>Unmediated/mediated: vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627-636</td>
<td>Mediated: vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670-674</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695-700</td>
<td>Unmediated/mediated: moon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701-705</td>
<td>Unmediated: moon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-771</td>
<td>Mediated: lamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805-840</td>
<td>Mediated: lamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmediated: lamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmediated: lamp (alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841-850</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851-855</td>
<td>Mediated: vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>856-875</td>
<td>Mediated: sun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875-885</td>
<td>Unmediated/mediated: sun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070-1077</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream + (erotic compulsion, dream-sending)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1078-1089</td>
<td>Mediated: lamp /Ursa Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110-1129</td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1141-1154</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream /lamp (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1163-1179</td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1180-1181</td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1199-1205</td>
<td>Unmediated: lamp (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 17b</td>
<td>1-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmediated: dream (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 22b</td>
<td>27-31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmediated: dream (binary oracle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmediated: dream (binary oracle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 46</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM 61</td>
<td>1-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmediated: vessel (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63-78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 62</td>
<td>24-46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mediated: vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 72</td>
<td>1-36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 77</td>
<td>1-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmediated: direct (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 102</td>
<td>1-17</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM 110</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM Suppl</td>
<td>130-38</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149-62</td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>168-84</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM 79</td>
<td>12-18</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream (binary oracle)</td>
<td>Theburgic b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM 85</td>
<td>41-44</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td>Theburgic b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM 93</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream (binary oracle) (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Berol 17202</td>
<td>20-22</td>
<td>(Unclear)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Macq. I i</td>
<td>15.20-21</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo 45060</td>
<td>38-40</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan 593</td>
<td>10.4-8</td>
<td>Unmediated: dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Formulae used in rituals of apparition

The following formulae were used in the speech act analysis in 4.2.2. This is not intended to be a comprehensive list of all formulae in the magical papyri, but includes the majority of those which are explicitly to be used in rituals of apparition. Some texts appear under more than one heading; in these cases it was felt that the text instructed or allowed their use for more than one procedure.

Invocation formulae

PGM 1: 26-36, 148-153, 296-327
PGM 2: 1-10, 14-16, 71-78, 81-87, 87-141
PGM 5: 4-23, 54-63, 400-421, 441-445
PGM 8: 74-84, 91-103
PGM 11a: 6-11
PDM 12: 21-47
PGM 12: 2-5, 147-152, 155-158, 192
PGM 22b: 28-31, 34-35
PGM 46: 3-4
PDM 61: 68-78
PGM 62: 24-27
PGM 72: 17-21
PGM 77: 5-20
SM 79: 15-18
PDM Suppl.: 130-135, 150-156, 170-179

Preliminary Procedure formulae
Compulsive formulae

PGM 2: 52-55
PGM 3: 627-630
PGM 4: 1038-1046, 1296-1300
PGM 5: 435-439
PGM 62: 29-31, 33-35
PDM Suppl.: 183

Light-bringing formulae

PGM 4: 959-973
PDM 14: 206-212, 501-503, 545-546

Compulsive formulae (for use during apparition)

PGM 4: 311-312, 3228-3245
PDM 14: 1165-1166

Salutation formulae

PGM 4: 1048-1052, 3224-3226
PGM 11a: 15-17
PDM 14: 419-420, 477-479

Release formulae
Release of brightness

PGM 4: 1067, 1068-1070
Appendix 5: Magical discourses, Ritual Collections

The following appendix consists of a paper presented at the 2013 Congress of Papyrology in Warsaw, submitted for publication in the Congress Proceedings. It is included in this thesis to explain the methodology used to generate the tables in 2.2.4.1. Differences in the choice of information to exclude means that the figures in the two analyses are slightly different, although the conclusions are the same; this analysis includes miscellaneous and unclassifiable texts, which are excluded from the analysis in 2.2.4.1.

A recurring question in the study of magical texts from Roman Egypt concerns their place in the broader history of Egyptian magico-religious practices – whether the rituals they contain represent new phenomena and interests peculiar to the social and religious conditions of Roman Egypt, or are in some sense a continuation of older, Pharaonic practices. This discussion does not aim to provide a conclusive answer to this problem, but instead attempts to sketch out a methodology by which the range of magical practices attested in Roman Egypt can be characterised, allowing clearer comparison with earlier and later periods, and a more precise contextualisation of individual texts and archives within the period.

As with any aspect of ancient Mediterranean life, the magical papyri must be understood as partial and fragmentary witnesses to the phenomena they attest; not only must we take into account the vicissitudes of survival, discovery and publication, but written magical texts cannot provide evidence for the unwritten traditions which certainly existed alongside them. Among the pieces of evidence suggestive of magical practices unknown in surviving written sources are a petition from late second century CE Karanis, describing what David Frankfurter colourfully describes as “fetus magic”,2064 as well as an assemblage of painted bones from the same village, described by Andrew Wilburn.2065

---

Despite these caveats, it is common, and perhaps unavoidable, for scholars to attempt to characterise periods of Egyptian history according to the surviving evidence. Thus Jan Assmann comments that in the shift from Pharaonic to Graeco-Roman magical practice:

> We are now no longer dealing not only with preventive medicine and protection, but with all kinds of sanctification ceremonies, mantics, shamanistic visions and so forth.\(^{2066}\)

More specifically, Jacco Dieleman observed in a recent study that:

> In the Graeco-Egyptian formularies, attention has shifted to rites to conjure up a deity for private oracular consultation and rites to influence other people's behaviour or even to harm them. Recipes for healing and protection occur in small numbers only. The Graeco-Egyptian manuals are thus more concerned with social and spiritual than with physical well-being. This reflects changes in social structure and religious sensibilities in contemporary society. \(^{2067}\)

Similar observations on the shift from a Pharaonic magical practice focused on spells of healing and protection, to a focus on aggressive curse and erotic spells, and private revelatory rituals in the Roman period, are made with varying degrees of stress by Joris Borghouts,\(^{2068}\) Geraldine Pinch,\(^{2069}\) and others. While characterisations of Coptic magic are less frequent, due perhaps to fact that such texts have been published less systematically,
Brashear comments on the prominence in Coptic magic of healing, exorcistic, erotic and curse practices, while noting the paucity of mantic procedures.\footnote{2070}

By contrast, authors such as François Lexa\footnote{2071}, Robert Ritner\footnote{2072} and David Frankfurter\footnote{2073} have emphasised continuity in practice from the Pharaonic and into the Graeco-Roman and even Coptic periods, while writers on more recent Egyptian magical practices, Edward Lane in the 19th century,\footnote{2074} and Winifred Blackman\footnote{2075} and Gérard Viaud\footnote{2076} in the 20th, describe a range of practices which seem to most closely approach the Roman period in their interests and variety. Indeed, it might seem reasonable to assume that many of the underlying determinants of magical practice would have remained relatively constant until quite recently. In particular, we might think here of the social pressures of urban or rural life, and the range of medical complaints which appear to be represented more or less consistently in all periods. Therefore if these two best documented periods – the modern and the late Roman – appear so similar, perhaps we should be suspicious of the idea that their practices are aberrant, compared to the less documented Pharaonic and Coptic periods.

To further explore this question, I have classified the contents of magical material from the Pharaonic to early Islamic periods according to the purposes of the individual spells and recipes. The first corpora analysed according to this method were the most commonly consulted modern collections of magical texts, Borghouts’ ‘Ancient Egyptian Magical

\footnote{2074} E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, London 1837.
\footnote{2075} W. Blackman, *The Fellâhin of Upper Egypt. Their religious, social and industrial life with special reference to survivals from ancient times*, London 1968 [1927].
Texts' for the Pharaonic period; for the Roman period the two editions of the 'Greek Magical Papyri (PGM), \(^{2077}\) the original editions and German translations edited by Karl Preisendanz and Albert Heinrichs, \(^{2078}\) and the later English translations edited by Hans Dieter Betz, \(^{2}\) which included a broader range of Greek, and several Demotic, texts. For the Coptic period Meyer and Smith’s ‘Ancient Christian Magic’ (ACM) was used. \(^{2079}\)

Classifications of spells were not based solely on the titles of the spells, since semantic shift could result in terms generally used for one type of ritual being transferred to rituals for different purposes; \(^{2080}\) instead the classifications were based on the spell's purpose(s) as described in the body of the text, where such descriptions were given, or inferred from the ritual instructions where possible. Where spells were described as having multiple uses, these were each tallied separately. Where the purpose was not explicit, and could not be securely inferred, it was simply classified as ‘unclear.’ My classification scheme made use of 14 categories of spell-types, or better, spell-purposes, further subdivided into 57 more precise sub-categories. While a full discussion of the categories is not possible here, the five most common are as follows:

---

\(^{2077}\) I exclude from consideration here the principal Spanish (J. L. CALVO MARTÍNEZ and Dolores SÁNCHEZ ROMERO, *Textos de Magia en Papiros Griegos*, [Biblioteca Clásica Gredos] Madrid 1987) and French (M. MARTIN, *Les papyrus grecs magiques*, 2002) translations, since their content closely follows the selection of Preisendanz; the former excludes a few papyri whose contents are unclear (for example PGM XXVa, LX), and the latter consists of selections from the longer formularies (PGM I, II, III, IV, V, VII, XII & XXXVI). An analysis carried out at an earlier stage of this project showed that the make-up of the Spanish collection was essentially identical to that of Preisendanz.


\(^{2080}\) Two obvious examples are τελετή and ἀγωγή, which the LSJ suggests are usually translatable as ‘initiation in the mysteries’ and ‘love-charm’. The former is used in magical papyri to refer to rituals in general, in particular the consecration of amulets, and in P.Kell. I 86 it seems to refer, by extension, to the amulet itself. The latter is used in PGM IV.2006 to refer to a necromantic procedure for acquiring a familiar daimon, while in PGM IV.2441 it refers to a slander spell (διαβωλή) whose uses include cursing, dream sending and dream revelation. A lack of sensitivity to semantic shift in the technical vocabulary of ancient Mediterranean magic can easily lead to misunderstandings, as in PGM XXXVI.102 where the term ἐμπύρον (‘[ritual] using fire (i.e. a burnt-offering)’) is translated as ‘fire divination’ by E. O’Neil in the Betz PGM edition, despite being an erotic ritual.
1. Healing: Consists of rituals intended to treat pre-existing medical problems and diseases; practices intended to avert future illness are classified as 'protection'. I include in 'healing' contraceptives, abortifacients, and recipes which purport to increase sexual pleasure, stamina and potency.

2. Divination: Includes not only revelatory spells, but also sortition oracles determined through chance. In this category I also subsume other sub-categories of spell for acquiring knowledge or increased cognitive abilities: rituals intended to improve intelligence or memory, as well as those for gaining knowledge of closed letters or the thoughts of others.

3. Erotic: Includes rituals intended to attract a new sexual partner, or ensure the fidelity of an existing one. Despite its clear relationship to the next category, the large quantity of spells of this type, as well as their distinctive features, merited its inclusion as its own category.

4. Control of others: Includes a broad range of related rituals, most prominently those intended to restrain the anger of others, separate or reconcile couples, or gain the favour of social superiors.

5. Curse: Practices intended to cause physical harm to others or their possessions, up to and including death.
Figure 1 Proportions of spell types in groups of magical texts

The results of applying this analysis to the four modern collections are shown in the lowest four bars of figure 1. We can see that these results broadly confirm the impressions
sketched out for the three bodies of practice: the Pharaonic spells are almost entirely concerned with healing (48.7%), and the closely related practices of exorcism (14.2%) and protection (16.2%); the Coptic material, though more diverse, is likewise dominated by healing practices (32.2%), with curses (14%), erotic (6.6%), protective (8.7%) and control (8.4%) spells well represented, along with a smattering of less common practices. By contrast, the Greek and Demotic collections are even more diverse than the Coptic, with an important place given to divination (16.2%).

It should be noted, however, that we can already see that our picture of the Roman period has been somewhat exaggerated; divinatory (16.2%) and erotic (13.9%) practices, though prominent, are each only slightly more common than healing (11.4%), while curses are less common (6.2%). I would suggest that the impression of the prominence of these and other, more aggressive spell types in the Roman period, is exaggerated by the fact that divination, curse and erotic rituals are often long and complex, in comparison to the numerous but far shorter healing spells. As a result a very different impression is gained when we reduce each ritual to a single point of data. There is no reason to think that longer or more complex rituals were performed more often, and were thus a more significant part of a ritualist’s repertoire, than simple ones; indeed, the opposite is likely to be true.

At this point, it is worth noting the nature of these collections. The *PGM* was intended, at its conception, to be a list of all known magical texts in Greek; from its original edition under Preisendanz, to the later edition under Heinrichs, and the still later translation under Betz, it has aimed at, though never quite achieved, a complete coverage of published materials. By contrast, the collections of both Borghouts and Meyer are

---

2081 The numbers given here are for the PGM edition of Betz.

2082 In his foreword in the second volume of PGM, Preisendanz (*Papyri Graecae Magicae* (cit. n.15), pp.v, vi) noted that the collection as it then stood should contain all of the significant published pagan documents, although they had not striven for completeness of coverage of texts on ostraca, or of the ‘Christian’ papyri. Similarly, Betz’s preface to the second edition of his translation (*H. D. BETZ, The Greek Magical Papyri in*
intended to be merely illustrative selections.\textsuperscript{2083} Thus, we should be somewhat suspicious of the overall picture they provide, since these collections both reflect, and play a role in shaping, our common impressions of these periods.

In order to gain an unbiased picture of the practices of any period, the ideal solution would be to collect and classify the practices recorded in every available artefact of ancient magic, and use this data as a basis for comparison. This would include not only the magical papyri, but also written material on ostraca, metal and wooden tablets, and magical gems. Even this, however, would not be sufficient. Many lapidary texts describe magical gems whose iconography is not unambiguously ‘magical’,\textsuperscript{2084} and many Christian amulets are brief copies of Biblical texts, whose amuletic function is not necessarily transparent in any particular instance.\textsuperscript{2085} Still more problematic is the fact that relying upon this evidence would produce a bias in favour of those rituals most likely to produce physical artefacts on durable supports, excluding those which produced artefacts using metals other than lead, which might have been destroyed by corrosion or by recasting,\textsuperscript{2086} and obscuring practices, like revelatory divination, which might produce no artefacts at all.\textsuperscript{2087} For this reason I restricted the next stage of the survey to the magical handbooks, or formularies, written in Greek, Demotic and Coptic from I-VI CE.\textsuperscript{2088}

\textit{Translation Including the Demotic Spells}, Chicago 1992 [1986]) notes that the original edition expanded as widely as was then possible upon the collection of Preisendanz, although by the time of the second edition the idea of adding new texts, while considered, was rejected. The survey I have carried out here strives to include, as far as possible, both ‘pagan’ and ‘Christian’ papyri.

\textsuperscript{2083} BORGHOUTS, \textit{Ancient Egyptian Magical Texts} (cit. n. 5), p.vii; MEYER and SMITH, \textit{Ancient Christian Magic} (cit. n.16), p.6-7.


\textsuperscript{2085} I thank Magali de Haro Sanchez for making this point clear to me.


\textsuperscript{2087} The only two instances of applied artefacts of Roman-era Egyptian divination known to me are numbers 65 and 66 in R. W. DANIEL and F. MALTOMINI, \textit{Supplementum Magicum, [Papyrologica Coloniensia]} Opladen 1989-1991 (SM) vol. 2. The former is a terracotta bowl sherd apparently used for vessel-divination, the latter is a lead tablet inscribed with a spell for mediumistic divination.

\textsuperscript{2088} These texts include all formularies from the PGM and \textit{Supplementum Magicum} (SM) collections, as well as the early papyri from Meyer/Smith (ACM) not already included in the PGM or SM. Alongside these, the following texts were included: O.Strassburg D 1328, P BM 10808, P. Kell. I 85 a + b, P.Berl.Inv. 11734, P.Berl.Inv. 21227, P.Berl.Inv. 17202, P.Berl.Inv. 21149, P.Duk.Inv. 729, P.Kell. I 82, P.Kell. I 88, P.Kell.Copt. V.35, P.Mil.Vogl.
applied artefacts – for example, binding tablets and amulets – produced in the course of rituals, formularies contain instructions for carrying out these practices, and can be expected to reflect, to some degree, the range of practices which interested the individual or communities which produced them.

This survey took into account 96 formularies, broken down by language and date as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I CE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-II CE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II CE</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-III CE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III CE</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-IV CE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demotic</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coptic</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since Coptic magical texts have not been the subject of a definitive collection along the lines of the PGM it is likely that they are under-represented here. A checklist of all Coptic magical texts in preparation by Kirsten Dzwiza of Heidelberg University, which I hope will allows me to remedy this omission.

The question of precisely what constitutes a ‘magical text’ is a difficult one which I do not take up here, in part because the assumptions to which I am responding already have a particular type of text in mind. I think that we can understand here a textual genre to which most of the texts of the PGM and SM belong; I have therefore included texts from outside the collections which seem to display similar genre markers (voces magicae, magical characters, and so on), and excluded those – such as the Sortes Astrampsychi (PGM XXVI) – which consist entirely of material which does not seem to display these markers.

2089 Magical texts are often difficult to date with precision, with editors often disagreeing by a matter of centuries. Here I rely on the dates provided either by Betz (The Greek Magical Papyri (cit. n.19), pp.xxiii-xxviii), or their principal publications, corrected where necessary by reference to more recent works. Nonetheless, the difficulties of dating, along with the uneven temporal distribution of papyri, has led me to avoid investigating more fine-grain temporal or diachronic trends.

2090 Texts containing multiple languages are counted once in each row.

2091 P BM 10808, a text written in both Demotic and Traditional Egyptian transliterated into Greek (supplemented by Demotic characters), is included in both the Demotic and Coptic categories.
The data for these formularies was not treated in the same way as that for the collections, where each spell was given equal weight. Rather, each manuscript – sheet, roll, codex, ostraca or tablet – was treated as a single data point, with the make-up of spell types it contained expressed as fractions; these were then summed and converted into percentages of the total to find the overall mixture of spell purposes. This meant that the longest texts, containing over a hundred spells, were given equal weighting with the shortest texts, containing only one or two spells, so that the larger manuscripts would not dominate the evidence; each text is equally an attestation of the practices of the individual(s) who produced it. This process can be summarised as follows:

\[
\text{representation of spell type } x \text{ in each text} = \frac{\text{total instances of spell type } x \text{ in text}}{\text{total instances of all spell types in text}}
\]

\[
\text{representation of spell type } x \text{ in overall period (unweighted)} = \frac{\text{sum of representation of spell type } x \text{ in each text for all texts}}{\text{total number of texts}}
\]

The resulting data is shown in figure 1 as “Formularies I-VI CE (unweighted)”. We can note that this selection is broadly similar to the composition of Betz. At this point, however, we should recall that among the texts gathered here are several magical libraries or archives.
The most famous of these is the Theban Magical Library, consisting of ten manuscripts dating to III-IV CE, constituting nearly 60% of Betz’s edition of the PGM, and 41% of the recipes in this survey. But we can also identify with some degree of certainty a further four archives from the period under consideration: the Fayum Magical Archive (IV CE), the Hermontis Magical Archive (III-V CE), the Kellis Magical Archive (IV CE), and the Multilingual Magical Workshop (V-VI CE). These texts, among them the largest formularies known from the period, dominate modern collections, and thus

---

2092 Consisting of PGM I, II, IV, V, P.Holm. + PGM Va, PDM/PDM XII, PGM XIII, PDM/PDM XIV, PDM Suppl., P.Leid. I 397. I include here only those which are known to have derived from the collection of Jean d’Anastasy and were assigned a Theban provenance in his catalogues. I hope to publish a full discussion of the contents of this archive at a later date; in the meantime the most useful discussions are those in K. PREISENDANZ, Papyrusfunde und Papyrusforschung, Leipzig 1933 pp.91-95 and BRASHEAR, 'The Greek Magical Papyri' (cit. n. 7), pp.3402-3404.

2093 The 1996 edition of BETZ, The Greek Magical Papyri (cit. n.19) consists of 327 pages of translation, of which 193, by my count, are devoted to texts from the Theban Magical Library, giving a rough total of 59.02%.

2094 I count 223 recipes in the Theban Library (excluding the alchemical codices), out of 548 in the formularies examined for this paper, giving a total of 40.69%.

2095 Consisting of PGM XXXVI & XXXVIII, acquired for the University of Oslo by Samson Eitrem in 1920; both have been dated to IV CE and probably originate from Theadelphia in the Fayum. Gee (J. GEE, ‘Abracadabra, Isaac and Jacob’, Review of Books on the Book of Mormon 7 (1995), p.37, fn.76) suggests that PGM XXXVII & XXXIX may also belong, but the former is quite distinct palaeographically, and the latter was acquired separately by H.I. Bell in 1923. I am very grateful to Federico Aurora for information on the acquisition history of these papyri.

2096 Consisting of PGM VII, VIII & XIa. All of these papyri were acquired by the British Library from a native Egyptian in 1888, along with three older texts. PGM VII is often assumed to be part of the Theban Magical Library due to its similarity in content and length, but there is no clear connection between this text and the more secure Theban Library texts, which all derive from the collection of Jean d’Anastasy. See the discussion in M. ZAGO, Tebe Magica e Alchemica: L’idea di biblioteca nell’Egitto romano: la Collezione Anastasi, Padova 2010 pp.37-38, 69-70), who suggests, mistakenly in my view, that they all belong to the Theban Library. PGM XIa is written on the back of an account concerning a large estate centred on Hermontis, from which I take the name of this archive. Another document relating to this same estate (P.Lips. inv. 39 + P.Bonn inv.147) contains a text of the Psalms on the verso, and may therefore belong to the same archive.

2097 I take this archive to consist of P.Kell. I 82, 83, 84, 85a+b, 86, 87, 88; P.Kell. Copt. 35. All of these texts date to IV CE, and were found in House 3 of Area A in Kellis. For a discussion of the Greek texts see Magali DE HARO SANCHEZ, ‘Les Papyrus latromagiques Grecs de Kellis’, Lucida Intervalla 37 (2008), pp.79-98. P.Kell I 88 was originally treated as an amulet, but has been reinterpreted as a handbook of liturgical prayers, and is treated here as a formulary; see K. A. WORP, R. W. DANIEL and Cornelia E. RÖMER, 'Das Gebet zur Handauflegung bei Kranken in P.Barcl. 155,9 - 156,5 und P.Kellis I 88.', Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 119 (1997), pp.128-131.

2098 This consists of PGM CXXIII & CXXIV, P.Mil.Vogl.Copt. 16, as well as numerous fragments in Greek and Aramaic. For discussions and publications of these texts see Edda Bresciani, S. Perinotti, F. Maltomini and P. Marrassini, `Nuovi papiri magici in copto, greco e aramaico’, Studi classici e orientali 29 (1973), pp.16-130; DANIEL and MALTOMINI, Supplementum Magicum (cit. n.24), vol.2 pp.231-268.
modern conceptions of Roman-era magical practice. Yet, while each of these archives gives us a great deal of information about the practices of the group that produced it, they cannot necessarily be considered representative of the period as a whole. Each collection of recipes – whether that collection has been gathered in a single manuscript, or is spread across several papyri from a single archive – is equally an attestation of a single practitioner, or group of practitioners, and can tell us directly only about the practice of the individual or group who owned it at the time of deposition. Thus, in the same way that we need to equally weight the individual manuscripts to prevent longer formularies from dominating the evidence, we must give each archive only as much weight as the texts which do not belong to archives. Each of these non-archived manuscripts is equally the representative of the practitioner(s) which produced it, yet without this adjustment the evidence they give us is overshadowed by the papyri from larger archives. This process of weighting is then as follows:

\[
\text{representation of spell type } x \text{ in archive} = \frac{\text{total instances of spell type } x \text{ in archive}}{\text{total instances of all spell types in archive}}
\]

\[
\text{representation of spell type } x \text{ in overall period (weighted)} = \left(\frac{\text{sum of representation of spell type } x \text{ in each text for all texts not part of an archive} + \text{sum of representation of spell type } x \text{ in archive for all archives}}{\text{total number of texts not in archives} + \text{total number of archives}}\right)
\]

The results of this final adjustment are represented in figure 1 as ‘Formularies I-VI CE (weighted)’. This somewhat abstract construction can be understood as approximating the attention paid to various practices by literate magical practitioners of the period: were we to possess every text produced in this period, or an ideal ‘average’ text we should expect the range of practices to approximate those given in this weighted average.

The picture that emerges of the practices of the period reverses the commonplace
descriptions summarised at the beginning of this discussion; while the practices present
are more diverse than in the selective pictures we have examined of the Pharaonic and
Coptic periods, healing emerges as the most common single concern (24.3%), almost as
common as in the Coptic collection of Meyer and Smith (32.2%). Next most frequent are
divination (13.9%) and erotic spells (9.9%). Control of others and amuletic/protection
rituals are both represented in about 5% of spells, while curses, far from being the most
common type, represent only 4.4% of material. There are some caveats to include here:
the category of spells of unclear purpose constitutes 21.3% of material, while invocations –
formulae for spells whose purpose is not stated – constitute a further 4.2%, but there is no
obvious reason to think that these would change the distribution dramatically.2100

If this picture does meaningfully describe Roman-era Egyptian magic, it is worth asking
why most authors have understood it so differently. I would argue that there are two main
reasons – first, the presence of large modern collections, which bring together material for
easy reference but tend to blur the divisions between manuscripts, and allow the longer
spells, those concerned with divination and curses, to dominate the pages. The second
reasons is the existence of several large texts – specifically those of the Theban and
Hermonthis archives – whose interests run counter to the general trend of the period.

The make-up of each of these archives is shown at the top of figure 1; since some of these
archives contain non-magical material – a copy of the Psalms in the case of the
Hermonthis Archive, and considerable alchemical material in the case of the Theban
Library – a second version of each, containing only magical content is included above. It is
immediately striking that each of these archives is quite different, not only from one other,

---

2100 While we might assume that invocations necessarily imply revelational spells where no other purpose is
specified, the evidence of Coptic texts in which invocations are followed by lists of multiple, different rituals
in which the invocations could be used implies that individual formulae were seen as being suitable for
multiple applications; instances of this format include P.Mich. 593 (IV-VII CE), London Hay 10391 (VI-VII CE),
P.Mac.I.1 (VII-VIII CE), P.Leiden F 1964/4.14 (X-XI CE), and Cairo 45060 (undated).
but from the average picture of the Roman period, and I would argue that these tendencies reflect the particular interests of the individuals which produced them. In the case of the Theban Library, we can in fact see that, by the time of its IV CE deposition, its predominant text-type was not magical, but alchemical (45.9%).

![Figure 2 Deviations of magical archives from the average of I-VI CE](image)

**Figure 2 Deviations of magical archives from the average of I-VI CE**

Figure 2 is intended to demonstrate the particular characteristics of each archive more clearly, by showing the deviations of each in percentage points from the ideal ‘average

---

2101 Although there is not sufficient space to demonstrate the point here, these same tendencies are generally present in each of the texts within each of the archives.
text' of the Roman period.\textsuperscript{2102} The Theban Library and the Hermonthis Archive show similar tendencies – a pronounced interest in divinatory spells, and to a lesser extent in erotic and curse practices, and a correspondingly lower interest in healing.\textsuperscript{2103} The Fayum Archive shows a similarly low attestation of healing practices, but a very pronounced interest in erotic magic, while the Kellis Archive focuses on healing, to the almost complete exclusion of other practices. The Multilingual Workshop’s interests are less easily characterised, given the high proportion of invocations and spells whose purposes are unclear; nonetheless, it contains a higher proportion of healing rituals than any of the other archives, with the exception of the Kellis material.

The magic of Roman period Egypt certainly displays important differences from older Pharaonic practice, not only in its predominant language – Greek rather than Egyptian – but also in the range of practices we find, and the deities invoked. As we have seen, it has also been characterised as quite different in the types of spells which predominate – aggressive curse and erotic spells, and revelational divination – and this is often linked to important social shifts associated with the Roman period. While this picture is broadly true for the corpora which the modern study of ancient magic has generated, a more thorough analysis of Roman-era texts suggests quite a different picture. By counting individual spells – giving the usually shorter healing spells the same consideration as the generally longer curses and divinatory spells – we find that it is in fact healing which predominates, while curses are rather marginal. By reducing the influence of individual archives, which reflect the interests of their particular collectors, the predominance of healing rituals becomes even more pronounced. This preliminary analysis has therefore

\textsuperscript{2102} A graph providing the divergence from the average expressed as percentages might be considered more appropriate here, using the formula $\% \text{representation in archive } x + \% \text{representation in weighted average}$; in practice this procedure exaggerates the importance of the less common practices. The method of subtraction used here makes the divergences more easily visible in a graph format without affecting their direction.

\textsuperscript{2103} This is particularly interesting in light of the fact that the group I refer to here as the Hermonthis Archive is dominated by PGM VII, a text which many have suggested may belong to the Theban Library. Its acquisition history does not provide any clear evidence for a connection, however; see n.30.
suggested that, as in earlier and later periods\textsuperscript{2104}, healing practices dominated the magical landscape of Roman Egypt; particular manuscripts or archives might exhibit a greater proportion of particular practices, presumably reflecting the areas special expertise or interest of the individual or communities which produced them. The fact that scholarly characterisations of the period are often at odds with this picture seems to be an artefact of the way in which magical texts are encountered – in modern, often selective collections, whose pages are dominated by long, and often uncharacteristic, texts from a few archives.

\textsuperscript{2104} Similar analyses of the Pharaonic and early Islamic periods would provide valuable comparative data, although each of these would pose its own challenges: in the Pharaonic period the shortcomings of the category ‘magic’ seem to me more apparent, with the line between ‘magical’, ‘medical’ and ‘ritual’ texts difficult to draw, while a full survey of the early Islamic period should include not only Coptic, but also Arabic and Hebrew material, and in all of these cases we lack an aspirationally comprehensive body of texts, such as the PGM, to serve as the basis of such an analysis.
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