

MINIATURIZATION AND THE OPENING OF THE MOUTH IN A GREEK MAGICAL TEXT (*PGM* XII.270-350)*

IAN S. MOYER and JACCO DIELEMAN

Abstract

PGM XII.270-350, a text prescribing rituals for the creation and use of a magical ring, provides a particularly useful example through which to explore the phenomenon of miniaturized ritual in the magical papyri of late Graeco-Roman Egypt (as elucidated by Smith 1995). The ritual for creating and consecrating the ring's gemstone makes it clear that the stone is considered a miniature cult statue. The subsequent "Ouphor" invocation to be performed whenever the ring is used corresponds in name and function to the Egyptian *wḫ.t-rʿ* or Opening the Mouth ritual as used in daily temple liturgy. The nature of these ritual miniatures reveals the sophisticated discursive and conceptual level at which the traditional forms of temple ritual were adapted and redeployed for use in other contexts by members of the Egyptian priestly class in late antiquity.

Jonathan Z. Smith has observed that one of the most striking features of the corpus of Greek magical papyri is the "miniaturization" of temple rituals which have been adapted for use in a domestic context or in the repertoire of a mobile professional.¹ These heterogeneous texts, assembled from elements of Eastern Mediterranean and Near Eastern religions, abound in small-scale ritual objects, such as miniature altars consisting in some cases of only two bricks, on which equally small sacrifices are made: the largest of these a rooster, the smallest "one sesame seed and [one] black cumin seed."² Several rituals prescribe the construction of a little shrine for

* The authors would like to thank the participants in the Greek Magical Papyri seminar held at the University of Chicago in the Winter Quarter of 2002 for fruitful discussions, and the anonymous JANER readers for their helpful comments. All opinions, of course, and any remaining errors remain our own responsibility. Jacco Dieleman thanks the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) for supporting his stay at the University of Chicago in Winter 2002 with a research grant. Ian Moyer would like to thank the Franke Institute for the Humanities for supporting him in the 2002-3 academic year with a Doctoral Fellowship.

¹ Smith (1995).

² Sacrifice of sesame and cumin seeds: *PGM* IV.919; other examples in Smith (1995): 23-24.

a tiny divine image.³ The locus of such activity, moreover, is often a purified room in a house, a substitute for the sacred space of the temple.⁴ According to Smith, these efforts to reinterpret and miniaturize elements of traditional religious practice, along with the evident scribal interest in compiling ritual texts and in the ritual power of writing itself,⁵ reveal creative Late Antique transformations of religious practice, and also suggest something of the specialist, intellectual, and even theoretical milieu of the Greek magical papyri.

Among the many spells in this corpus concerned with the miniature is a Greek text (*PGM* XII.270-350) giving instructions for the creation and use of a magical ring, whose stone is engraved with the image of a solar divinity. This text provides a particularly useful example through which to develop Smith's insights into the intellectual world of the ritual experts who created spells for the magical papyri. The rite is the second of two adjacent ring spells on the verso of a 3rd century CE Greek and Demotic papyrus in the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden (*P. Leiden* J/I 384 = *PGM* XII/*PDM* xii).⁶ The compiler of this papyrus also wrote the great Demotic magical papyrus of London and Leiden (*P. Lond. demot.* 10070, *P. Leiden* J 383 = *PDM* xiv), which though predominantly Demotic contains brief Greek sections.⁷ The ring spell which this learned bilingual scribe recorded in *P. Leiden* J 384 matches its mixed cultural milieu: it was

³ In *PGM* I.21-26, for example, a small juniper wood shrine is built for a mummified falcon, to which sacrifice is then offered.

⁴ See Smith (1995): 23 for examples.

⁵ On the ritual power of writing in the *PGM*, see also Frankfurter (1994).

⁶ The Greek text was published by Preisendanz (1928, second edition 1973-4): vol. 2, pp. 76-80, while the Demotic spells were published by Johnson (1975). Betz (1992): 152-172 includes translations of both, though for the Greek portions, the translators were unable to consult the facsimile edition with diplomatic transcriptions and notes produced by Daniel (1991). Note that the 4th century CE date given in Betz (1992): xxiii is incorrect. Six columns of this ritual compendium are primarily Demotic, and thirteen columns primarily Greek, but the two languages switch and intermingle occasionally in such a way that it is clear one scribe wrote both the Greek and Demotic portions. The two Greek ring spells, for example, have the Demotic title *w' gswr* "a ring" (col. 6, line 26 = *PGM* XII.201; col. 8, line 23 = *PGM* XII.270). Though in the first case this designation appears as though it may have been added later, the second is clearly placed on a separate line as a title. The Demotic portions also use hieratic writings, a magical cipher script, and Old Coptic glosses, on which see Johnson (1975): 47-53. The recto of Leiden I 384, written about a century earlier, contains the Demotic "Myth of the Sun's Eye", published by Spiegelberg (1917).

⁷ Johnson (1975) demonstrated this connection between the two papyri. On their linguistic features, see Johnson (1975), (1992): lv-lvii, and on the socio-cultural milieu, see Dieleman (2003).

composed in Greek, but the fundamental structures at work suggest the adaptation of elements of Egyptian temple religion. The spell falls into two parts: the creation of the ring, and an invocation, identified with the name “*Ouphôr*”, to be uttered whenever the ring is used. In the first part, it becomes clear that the ring’s stone is understood not so much as an amulet or talisman (in the restricted “magical” sense), but rather as a tiny stand-in for a cult statue. This analogy is confirmed by the second part. Egyptologists have suggested that *Ouphôr* (Οὐφωρ) is a Greek transcription of the Egyptian phrase *wꜫ.t-rꜣ* “Opening the Mouth,”⁸ the title of an important type of Egyptian rite used to vivify mummies, cult statues and other images in funerary cult and temple liturgy. The *Ouphôr* does, in fact, function as a small-scale version of the temple-based ritual, and as we shall argue in what follows, the nature of this miniaturized ritual, together with the gem itself, reveals not only the revalorization of structures and elements of traditional religion, but also the meta-ritual dimension of the rites in the *PGM* and related texts.

I. The gemstone in the ring as an image of the divine

The first part of the spell (*PGM* XII.270-315) gives elaborate instructions for the creation and consecration of a ring set with an engraved gemstone. This is, of course, no ordinary ring, and the text includes advertisements for its diverse and wide-ranging uses. These make it clear that the great power of the ring resides in its carefully prepared gemstone.⁹ In many respects, this gem could be considered a typical product of the magical practice of late antiquity. Though no exact match survives, there are stones with similar engravings that have been classified as part of the corpus of “magical” gems.¹⁰ Large numbers of such gems carved with other images and names, some

⁸ Vergote (1961) and Thissen (1991). See further below.

⁹ *PGM* XII.270-282. “A little ring for success and favor and victory. It makes men distinguished and great and admirable and rich as possible, or it furnishes friendships with such men . . . The world has had nothing greater than this, for when you have it with you, whatever you ask of someone, you will assuredly get it. It even stops the anger of kings and masters. When you wear it, whatever you say to someone, you will be believed, and you will be charming to everyone.” The possessor of the ring is able to open doors, and break shackles or stones, by applying the stone (προσάγων τὸν λίθον *PGM* XII.279-280), and uttering the lengthy name discussed below.

¹⁰ See note 19 below.

set in rings or fitted to be worn as pendants, have survived in various antiquities collections.¹¹ Though secure information on the find context is available for very few of them, their visual and epigraphical content has led scholars to posit Graeco-Roman Egypt and especially Alexandria as a probable place of manufacture.¹² The corpus of magical gems, however, represents a heterogeneous array of practices and ideas, and more specific evidence of who made these stones, who used them, and for what purposes is in most cases difficult to acquire.¹³ Nevertheless, the representation of Egyptian religious ideas on some gems and even occasional hieroglyphs suggested to Delatte and Derchain that the “magician” behind such gems may at times have been an Egyptian priest.¹⁴

This is certainly the case with the ring at the center of the rites laid out in *PGM* XII.270-350. As mentioned above, the scribe who wrote or copied this text was competent not only in Greek but also in Demotic Egyptian, and was undoubtedly a member of the literate priestly class.¹⁵ The instructions for creating the ring, moreover, presume a knowledge of hieroglyphs, or at least access to such knowledge,¹⁶ and the rite clearly frames the creation of the gem in a way

¹¹ Some major collections of magical gems have been well documented, most notably by Bonner (1950), and Delatte and Derchain (1964); and now Michel (2001).

¹² Delatte and Derchain (1964): 15-16; Bonner (1950): 22 notes the predominance of Egyptian motifs in the magical gems.

¹³ For more specific knowledge of the preparation and intended use of such objects, scholars must rely on the engravings and inscriptions themselves, and on the testimony of magical handbooks, but despite general parallels in imagery and nomenclature, there are very few direct correspondences between the surviving gems and the ritual texts of the papyri. The most notable exception is the correspondence between the instructions for the so-called Sword of Dardanos (*PGM* IV.1716-1870) and several extant gemstones. On this, see Bonner (1950): 14-15, 17, 20, 120; Delatte and Derchain (1964): 233-238. A remarkable piece of evidence for the connection between ritual instruction books and the creation of magical gems is the example in the Louvre which includes instructions for engraving the image as part of its inscription. See Delatte and Derchain (1964): p. 98, no. 122.

¹⁴ Delatte and Derchain (1964): 17 “À certains indices on reconnaîtra dans la personne du magicien qui a dessiné l’intaille, un prêtre bien au courant de la doctrine égyptienne, et parfois on doit admettre qu’il savait encore les hiéroglyphes.” The latter fact definitely points to priestly status, as the authors note.

¹⁵ Fowden (1986): 166-73 situates the Theban *PGM* papyri in an Egyptian priestly milieu. See also Ritner (1995): 3353-3371; and Frankfurter (1998): 210-237. Gordon (1999): 188-191, though not as explicit, describes the authors of the *PGM* corpus in the same terms. Dieleman (2003) adduces substantial evidence for identifying the authors of the spells as native priests by studying the scribal and rhetorical techniques of the Demotic and Greek spells in detail.

¹⁶ *PGM* XII.276.

that suggests familiarity with Egyptian religious concepts and ritual patterns. Magical amulets of various kinds are, of course, a well known part of Egyptian tradition, especially in funerary practice, but in this sequence of rituals there is a clear analogy between the engraved gem and the cult statue at the center of traditional temple liturgy. Though elements of the text are drawn from a variety of cultural traditions, the stone is consistently understood as a divine statue given life and power through an elaborate set of rites, just as in the Egyptian temple context.¹⁷ A close examination of the instructions for making the image and the initial rites prescribed for its consecration will confirm that this was the operative analogy in the text.

The first step in creating the ring is to inscribe on a heliotrope stone¹⁸ an image of the sun god in the form of a sacred scarab beetle surrounded by rays and encircled by an Ouroboros serpent.¹⁹ The scarab beetle, as Egyptian symbol and hieroglyph, signifies the sun god manifested as Khepri (*Hpry*), “he who comes into being”. On the level of natural phenomena the scarab is usually understood as the morning sun, but in the more general sense of the name *Hpry*, this figure stands for the self-generative power of the sun as a supreme divinity. A brief hymn in the great Paris magical papyrus invokes

¹⁷ Bonner (1950): 14-18 discusses the consecration of magical gems and other amulets in relation to the animation of statues in Neoplatonic theurgical practice, and he does relate these rites with their Egyptian background, but he dismisses the importance of such *religious* rites for the interpretation of gems, preferring to consider their use in “practical magic”. Accordingly, he also downplays the importance of magical gems as documents in religious history. Delatte and Derchain (1964): 17, however, are much more open to the relationship of the gems to other religious ideas.

¹⁸ A form of green chalcedony with red spots of jasper; according to Pliny *NH* 37.165, this stone was believed by some to confer invisibility.

¹⁹ *PGM* XII.273-276. A few engraved gems with similar images are known. Bonner (1950): 153-4 discusses these briefly and includes an example of a scarab with wings extended in his catalogue (plate XII, no. 250). Delatte and Derchain (1964): 46-49 discuss the scarab surrounded by the Ouroboros in connection with the solar aspects of the universalistic “*dieu acéphale*”. They include four gems engraved with the scarab and Ouroboros in their catalogue (nos. 48-51, pp. 53-4). Note also the gem engraved with a four-winged scarab (no. 212, p. 163). See also Michel (2001): no. 100, a heliotrope carved with a winged scarab surrounded by an Ouroboros. On a gem in the collection of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, a scarab is among four solar figures surrounded by an Ouroboros (the others: a hawk, and Harpocrates on a lotus, who is greeted by a baboon). See Henig (1975): p. 59; plate 14, no. 244. None of these scarabs appear to have rays as described in the *PGM* text, nor is the name of the god written on the reverse in hieroglyphs.

these same qualities: “Scarab, who drive the orb of fertile fire, | O self-engendered one, . . .”²⁰ The Ouroboros serpent surrounding the scarab is also a widely used symbol in the magical papyri, and one that has ancient Egyptian antecedents. Images of the encircling snake go back perhaps as far as the pre-dynastic period, but the first certain attestations of the Ouroboros come in the netherworld books of the New Kingdom, which depict the nocturnal journey of the sun.²¹ In the *Book of Gates*, for example, the sun god is surrounded by the protective *mḥn* (enveloping serpent) in each of the hours, and in the first hour, the encircled sun in his barque is even shown as a scarab within a solar disc.²² In addition to its apparent protective functions, the Ouroboros was from its earliest appearance in Egyptian mythological representations identified with the eternal cycles of the genesis and cessation of time.²³ In the Graeco-Roman period, the Ouroboros was identified with Aîôn, or the primeval snake god Kmeph/Kneph, “He who has completed his moment” (*Km-ꜥ.t-f*), as in the amulet described in *PGM* VII.579-90.²⁴ In the image of the god on the ring’s gemstone, the Ouroboros evokes the never-ending cycles of the sun. The instructions also require the maker of the ring to write in hieroglyphs (ἱερογ<λ>υφικῶς) on the back of the

²⁰ *PGM* IV.939-949. See also the cosmogonic role of Khepri in *PGM* VII.516-521.

²¹ The best treatment of the Ouroboros snake is Stricker (1953). See also *LdÄ* s.v. “Uroboros” (vol. 6, col. 886-93). The earliest representation of the Ouroboros snake may be found on a palette of the Metropolitan Museum, New York, dating to the Late Predynastic period. It represents a coiled snake, though without its tail in its mouth. See Cialowicz (1991): 48 and Hayes (1953): 29.

²² See Hornung (1999): 59; 66 fig. 30. Piankoff (1954): pl. 37 and fig. 30 shows this scene though without the scarab in the solar disc. Note also the representation of the scarab surrounded by the *mḥn* in the papyrus of Bak-en-Mut (Piankoff (1957): 165-6, plate 20), and in the Papyrus of Djed-Amun-iuf-ankh (Piankoff (1957): 193, plate 27). A similar image is presented in the Papyrus of Her-Uben (Piankoff (1957): 22, fig. 3, plate 1) in which a Horus child within an Ouroboros rests on the lions Shu and Tefnut, and is greeted by a baboon as the rising sun. These papyrus manuscripts date to the 21st dynasty (around 1075-945 BCE).

²³ In a golden shrine of Tutankhamun (Shrine II, center of exterior left panel), the head, and feet of the mummiform divine figure are surrounded by *mḥn*-serpents. One of these serpents is referred to as “He who hides the hours” (*Imn-wn.wt*), suggesting the idea of the time-snake from whom the hours are mysteriously born and consumed in an endless cycle. See Piankoff (1955): pl. 48; Hornung (1999): 78, and (1982): 178-179.

²⁴ On the eternal aspect of Kmeph, see Plutarch, *DIO* 21 (*Moralia* 359D). *PGM* VII.579-90 is a particularly apt parallel to the gemstone described in *PGM* XII.273-6, since within the Ouroboros of the former is inscribed a name beginning with *Knēphis Khphyris*, i.e. Kmeph combined with Khepri.

gemstone a particular name of the god (e.g. *P3-R'*),²⁵ but the carved image was clearly meant to represent the sun god as much as possible in the guise of the supreme, self-generating, eternal divinity so prominent in the magical papyri and in the various cosmological schemes of late antique religions.

Carving the physical image is only a preliminary step in the lengthy ritual process required to transform a tiny gemstone into the powerful, living image of a divinity. The performer of the rite is next instructed to hold the stone, while facing the sun at dawn, and to recite a long invocation calling on the highest divinity to give "divine and supreme strength" to the image. With the accumulative verve typical of magical texts, the invocation confirms the universal, supra-celestial nature of the god whom this ring has the burden of representing. The "greatest god, who exceeds all power" is given some 95 appellations, several of which are recognizable names or epithets.²⁶ To this point the instructions have used Greek language and Egyptian images, but in its invocation the ritual becomes still more inclusive. The first four divine names come from Jewish tradition: *Iaô*, *Sabaôth*, *Adonai*, *Eilôein*.²⁷ Two lines later, the divinity is invoked with the names of the patriarchs, and one or two other names appear to have Hebrew origins.²⁸ The series also includes epithets of apparent Egyptian origin, such as "the opponent of Thoth" (τὸν κατὰ τοῦ Θωθ),²⁹ and others that are Greek, such as "King" (τὸν

²⁵ *PGM* XII.275-276. The name is not made explicit. Delatte and Derchain (1964): 16 note that hieroglyphic writing is rare on magical gems; cf. Bonner (1950): 39. The latter (p. 154) also notes that Φρη, the Greek transcription of *P3-R'*, appears on the reverse of a gem on which is inscribed a scarab beetle with a human face and "radiate nimbus", flanked by hawks; no Ouroboros surrounds this figure, however. The name Φρηθ is inscribed on the reverse of a gem engraved with a winged scarab in the British Museum (Michel (2001): no. 99).

²⁶ *PGM* XII.285-301.

²⁷ *PGM* XII.285: ἐπικαλοῦμαι σε, τὸν Ἰάω, τὸν Σαβᾶθ, τὸν Ἀδοναί, τὸν Εἰλωε-ίβ. The latter, as Morton Smith notes in Betz (1992): 164 n. 83, is a transcription of the Hebrew *elohim*. Note that in the previous ring spell, the name *Iaô Sabaôth* is written around the border of the engraving (*PGM* XII.207).

²⁸ *PGM* XII.287: τὸν Ἀβραάν, τὸν Ἰσάκ, τὸν Ἰακκωβί. *PGM* XII.289: Μαρμαριώθ, variants of which appear frequently on magical gems, may represent the Aramaic "Lord of Lords." See Bonner (1950): 154. *PGM* XII.296: τὸν Χερουβεί may be "Cherubim". Cf. Delatte and Derchain (1964): p. 316, no. 460. *PGM* XII.299: τὸν Χετταῖον may be the name of a demon from the Septuagint (*Gen.* 15: 20-21; *Ex.* 3: 8, 17). Cf. *PGM* IV.3044 and Betz (1992): 96 n. 395.

²⁹ *PGM* XII.289. Other names of possible Egyptian derivation: Μονισδρω (II.291-2) may be related to the name ΣΕΡΠΙΟΤ ΝΟΥΙΝΣΡΟ (Lotus-Lion-Ram); cf. *PGM* III.659 and note in Betz (1992) *ad loc.*; βαίνχωωχ (I. 296) = *b3 n kky* "soul of dark-

ἄναξ – sic).³⁰ There are also names and sequences (*voces magicae*) of more obscure origin, several of which are nevertheless familiar to the illocutionary and perlocutionary repertoire of the magical papyri.³¹ An unusual feature of this list is that the definite article has been placed before each of the names bringing them all into grammatical agreement with the second person pronoun at the beginning of the invocation (ἐπικαλοῦμαι σε – “I call upon you”).³² Rather than running them all together, the invocation individuates each name, emphasizing the pluralistic approach taken to invoking the divinity. This strategy, in a more explicit form, is also found in the invocation of the preceding ring spell in the same manuscript, especially in its closing section.³³ While covering all the cultural bases in a practical way, an invocation of this sort also appeals to the universalistic qualities of the god represented in the carved image.

The conclusion of the invocation lays out the purpose for which the supreme divinity has been invoked: “I have called on you, greatest god, and through you on everything, so that you may give divine

ness” (on which see Ritner’s note in Betz (1992): 333); Θεωθιου (l. 297) perhaps transcribes “*Dhuty* ‘; “Thoth the great”.

³⁰ Elements of the “Maskelli-Maskellô” formula (*PGM* XII.291-2; see below n. 31) are also linguistically Greek, as are the roots of the peculiar name Ἴπποκελεφοκλῶψ (l. 300), probably to be read Ἴπποκεφαλοκλῶψ (“Horse-head-thief”?). Δαμναμενεῦ (l. 299), a name which belongs to the so-called *Ephesia Grammata*, is one of the Idaean Dactyls (Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* 1.75.4).

³¹ In ll. 290-291 appears a version of the well-known “Maskelli-Maskellô” formula: τὸν Μασκελλει, τὸν Μασκελλῶθ, τὸν Φνου, τὸν Κενταβαθ τὸν Ὀρεοβάζαγρα, τὸν Ἰππό- | χθον, τὸν Ῥησίχθον, τὸν Πυριπηγανυξ (cf. *PGM* III.491-4; IV.1569-70, 2754, 3176; IX.10; XIc.6-7; XIXa.8-11 (*bis*); XXXVI.154-5, 342-46; LXXVIII.9-10; *PDM* xiv.1057-60). The common magical name Σεισενγφαραγγης appears at l. 295 (cf. *PGM* II.122, 174; III.80, 110, 155, 217, 436; IV.364, 982, 1025; VII.979; XII.170; XXXVI.130). At l. 296, the name Ἀκραμμαχαμαρει is found (cf. *PGM* III.508; V.62; VII.312, 648, 1021; VIII.61; X.32; 12.158, 184; LIX.3). On these names and formulae, see Betz (1992): 332, 336, 339. On a possible Hebrew etymology for Maskelli-Maskellô, see Thissen (1991) 298. Bonner (1950): 201 comments on the solar associations that these names have on magical gems. For some of these names and formulae, Preisendanz (1973-4) *ad loc.* notes possible parallels in *PDM* xiv. E.g. Σεττωρα (*PGM* XII.286) is perhaps connected to the name SETHORI (Dem.: *seth’ory*; Old Copt. ⲥⲉⲑⲟⲣⲓ) in *PDM* xiv.514, and SETHOURI in *PDM* xiv.479 (Dem. *sethury*; Old Copt. ⲥⲉⲑⲟⲩⲣⲓ).

³² There is, however, no attempt at inflection in the various names, even when the appellation is an easily declinable noun, as in τὸν ἄναξ (l. 292), and τὸν Δαμναμενεῦ noted above.

³³ *PGM* XII.263-267. The text claims to provide the practitioner with the names of the pantheistic deity according to the Egyptians, Jews, Greeks, high priests and Parthians.

and supreme power to this *statue* ...” (the invocation then enumerates the specific abilities desired).³⁴ Though previously referred to as a stone, or gem (λίθος, ψήφος),³⁵ the image of the god is here a ξόανον,³⁶ a word that surely interprets the engraved gem as a cult statue. The instructions that follow the invocation briefly outline a ritual process in which the stone is understood not simply as a functional object endowed with magical powers, but as a living image of the god similar in conception to the statues at the center of temple liturgy. These ritual instructions prescribe astrologically auspicious times at which the invocation must be repeated, and offerings which are to accompany its recitation. Elements of the rhythm and substance of these actions suggest that the aim of the rite is to enliven the image.

The instructions first say that the invocation is to be pronounced early in the morning while standing opposite the sun (l. 282), but the timing is later specified and elaborated. The practitioner is to recite the invocation three times a day at the third, sixth and ninth hours, over a period of 14 days, beginning on the third day of the moon.³⁷ Secondary instructions advise the practitioner to try to have

³⁴ *PGM* XII.301-2: ἐπεκαλεσάμην σέ, θεὲ μέγιστε, καὶ διὰ σου τὰ πάντα, ὅπως δῶς θεῖαν καὶ μεγίστην δύναμιν τοῦτω τῷ ξοάνῳ . . . The specific powers requested for the ring add to the advertised abilities discussed above, and are common among the goals of personal ritual: power over enemies, the ability to control spirits, to defeat legal opponents, to strengthen friendships, to increase profits, to bring dreams and other oracles, to cure illnesses, and to effect erotic charms.

³⁵ λίθος: *PGM* XII.273, 276, 280, 282. ψήφος: 280. In lines 282-284, adjectives of praise are heaped on the stone, some of which suggest anthropomorphic attributes. In addition to being called “divine” (θεῖος) and “holy” (ἁγνός), the stone is called (oddly enough) “economical” (φειδωλός) and “compassionate” (but with the more visceral connotations of εὖσπλανχνος).

³⁶ ξόανον is usually a word for statues or carved images, almost always of gods, and in later technical usage, e.g. in Pausanias (2nd century CE), it denoted the archaic and venerable wooden statues found in some Greek temples. On this term, see Donohue (1988): 9-174, who notes that in Hellenistic and later periods, ξόανον was most commonly used for divine images in temples. Donohue (1988): 152-3 points out the “singular usage” of the term in *PGM* XII.302 to denote a gemstone. Rather than proposing, as Donohue does, an application that “belongs to the specialized vocabulary of magic”, we would argue that the word appeals to the more usual semantic field of ξόανον. The only other use of this word in the Greek magical papyri (*PGM* III.302) clearly refers to a miniature statue of Apollo.

³⁷ *PGM* XII.307-8: ὅταν δὲ τὸν λόγον τοῦτο[ν] τελέῃς, ἐκάστης ἡμέρας μὲν λέγε τρίς, ὥρα γ', ζ', θ', τοῦτο δὲ ἐπὶ ἡμέρας ἰδ', ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς σελήνης γ'. The words σελήνης and ὥρα are represented by astrological symbols. Cf. above, n. 13. M. Smith in Betz (1992): 164, has translated the phrase ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς σελήνης γ' as “beginning when the moon begins its third quarter,” probably following the lead of Preisendanz (1973-4): vol. 2, p. 79, “beginnend mit der dritten Mondphase.” There is nothing in the text to suggest that the scribe was referring to the third

the goddess (i.e. the moon), in one of five zodiac signs—Taurus, Virgo, Scorpio, Aquarius, or Pisces—presumably at the beginning of the fourteen day period. These instructions, which include the symbols for “moon” and “hour” commonly found in horoscope papyri, prescribe the consecration of the ring during an auspicious period. The details, however, work not only within the symbolic system of astrology, but also within well-known Egyptian mythological patterns. The three daily invocations at the third, sixth, and ninth hours are in effect directed to the three primary forms of the Egyptian sun god: Khepri in the morning, Re at midday, and Atum in the afternoon. The fourteen day period, furthermore, evokes Egyptian lunar mythology. When reckoned according to the days of the Egyptian lunar month, fourteen days beginning from the third day of the moon spans the approximate period from the first appearance of the crescent to the full moon.³⁸ In Egyptian mythological representations, the full moon was identified with the *wḏꜣ.t*-eye: the left eye of Horus, fully restored after it had been lost in the struggle with Seth. This lunar symbolism is made explicit at several points in the Demotic magical papyrus of London and Leiden, compiled (as mentioned earlier) by the same scribe.³⁹ The regenerative *wḏꜣ.t*-eye was also

quarter of the moon, except perhaps the crescent shape of the astrological symbol for the moon. This symbol, however, always means simply “moon”. The numeral (γ) following τῆς + (moon symbol) is better interpreted as meaning the third *day*, just as in the standard dating formula used in documentary papyri (and in horoscopes, for that matter). In other words, the abbreviated expression when expanded would read ἀπὸ τῆς σελήνης τριταίας ἡμέρας, “from the third day of the moon.” This reading is also more satisfying for the reasons outlined below.

³⁸ The period thus begins on the third and ends on the sixteenth. Parker (1950): 9-23 demonstrated that the first day of the Egyptian lunar month (*psḏntyw*) was the day following the complete occultation of the old crescent. The first appearance of the new crescent, therefore, occurred about 70 percent of the time on the second day (*ꜥbd*), and about 30 per cent on the third day of the lunar month (*mspr* “arrival day”). The mean full moon was the 15th (called *smdt*), but also fell on the 16th (*mspr sn-nw* “second arrival day”), i.e. in both cases the 14th day from the appearance of the crescent, counting inclusively. Though there could be variability in the natural phenomenon, the fourteen days from first visibility to full moon was the regularized standard period of the waxing moon.

³⁹ In *PDM* xiv.294-5 (= col. X, l. 22), a vessel inquiry of Khonsu is to be performed “from the fourth day of the lunar month until the fifteenth day, which is the half-month day when the moon fills the sound eye” (*n pꜣ hrw n mh-4 n pꜣ wrš š pꜣ hrw n mh-15 nty 15nt* [or: *smd.t*] *pꜣy iw iꜥh mh wḏꜣ.t*). Cf. *PDM* xiv.357 (= col. XII, l. 23); *PDM* xiv.697-8 (= col. XXIII, ll. 22-3); *PDM* xi.701 (= col. XXIII, l. 27). Note that the writing of “half month day” is parallel to some hieroglyphic writings of *smdt* discussed by Parker (1950): 11-12. On the mythology of the moon and the *wḏꜣ.t*-eye more generally, see Derchain (1962):20-26.

connected to Osiris, and could be associated with the vivification of his image in temple ritual.⁴⁰ The fourteen day period of the ring ritual, therefore, seems intended to enliven the gemstone as a divine image through the regenerative, vivifying powers of the moon as *wḏꜣ.t*-eye.

The astrological instructions specify points during the course of the moon's travels through the zodiac when this procedure should be carried out, but they allow considerable flexibility. That the practitioner must merely *try* (πειρῶ) to begin the procedure with the moon in one of the five signs named suggests that this detail wasn't strictly necessary. At any rate, the five signs cover almost half the zodiac, and are thus not extraordinarily restrictive. Four of the signs (Taurus, Virgo, Scorpio, and Pisces) share a certain coherence as a set, and it seems that Aquarius was either included according to a different logic, or not originally part of the list.⁴¹ The former signs consist of two pairs in opposition to one another: Taurus with Scorpio, and Virgo with Pisces. This is significant, since during the course of a fourteen day period, the moon would travel approximately half way through the zodiac, and so move from one sign to the other in an opposed pair.⁴² These four signs, according to the conventional astrological categories of the period, also share qualities which connect them to the moon, a feminine nocturnal luminary, and also to

⁴⁰ Derchain (1963) discusses an interconnected set of scenes and texts in the Sokar chapel of the temple of Hathor at Denderah, in which the lunar *wḏꜣ.t*-eye is identified with Osiris, providing a celestial interpretation of the preparation of the mummy of Osiris and the image of Sokar. Note especially his discussion (*ibid.* pp. 24-5) of the solar-lunar symbolism of Osiris, and the representations of lunar stairs at Denderah and Edfu, usually consisting of 14 steps culminating in the full lunar *wḏꜣ.t*-eye (sometimes in the company of a representation of the sun). See also the life-giving role of the crescent moon in the texts discussed by Derchain (1962): 43, 49-50. The *wḏꜣ.t*-eye also appears in afterlife books. In the tenth hour of the *Amduat*, the regeneration of those who have drowned (like Osiris) is connected with the healing of the *wḏꜣ.t*-eye. See Hornung (1999): 40.

⁴¹ The list of signs proceeds in the direct order of the zodiac: ἤτε ἐν ταύρῳ ἢ παρθένῳ ἢ σκορπίῳ ἢ ἐν ὕδρηχῳ ἢ ἐν ιχθύσι (*PGM* XII.308-9). Note that when the list comes to Aquarius (Ὑδρηχός), the pattern changes slightly, including the preposition ἐν with the latter sign and with Pisces (Ιχθύες), perhaps suggesting that the scribe (or a previous copyist) has mentally linked these two watery-sounding signs. On the possible rationale for including Aquarius in the list, see below n. 43.

⁴² The sidereal month (the time it takes for the moon to travel once around the ecliptic) varies from 27.18 to 27.47 days, but is on average ca. 27 1/3 days, so the moon travels an average of ca. 184.4 degrees through the zodiac in 14 days. Owing to the eccentricity of the moon's orbit, the true movement can be ca. ten degrees less if the moon is at apogee or ca. 12 degrees more if the moon is at perigee. A convenient summary of lunar motion is found in Parker (1950): 2-8, esp. pp. 6-7.

the planet Venus, a similarly beneficent celestial body.⁴³ There is no obvious parallel to this pattern in the magical papyri, but it is probably safe to assume that the general purport was simply to cultivate the beneficial influences of these stars and planets during the creation or “birth” of the image.⁴⁴ Taken together, the specifications for the timing of the ritual present a striking combination of elements from traditional Egyptian mythology and the more recently arrived system of astrology.⁴⁵

The ritual actions which are to accompany this rhythm of repeated invocations seem to consist of libations and incense offerings, further confirming the status of the gemstone as a cult image. The text, however, is not entirely clear, owing to its abbreviated expression. When completing each invocation, the ritualist is to “pour libations of the aforementioned (τὰ προκείμενα) and every kind of perfume, except frankincense.”⁴⁶ There are no substances previously mentioned within the spell which could serve as the referents of τὰ προκείμενα, so either the text has become defective through the process of redaction, or the previous ring spell (*PGM* XII. 201-69) is to be consulted. The latter seems a reasonable solution, since there are several parallels between the two rites, allowing the reader to supplement the second text from the first. In the preceding text, libations of wine,

⁴³ See Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos* I.11-19. Taurus, Virgo, Scorpio, and Pisces are all feminine, nocturnal signs. The moon is in its exaltation in Taurus and its depression in Scorpio, while Venus is in its exaltation in Virgo and its depression in Pisces. Venus, moreover, is in its lunar house in Taurus. These signs are also part of two similar triangles described by Ptolemy: the second (southeastern), and the fourth (southwestern) triangles. Taurus and Virgo (along with Capricorn) make up the second triangle, which is governed by Venus in the day, and the Moon at night. Scorpio and Pisces (along with Cancer) make up the fourth triangle, which is also governed by Venus in the day and the moon at night (but also by Mars). If Aquarius, which is not paired with another sign, is truly part of this list, the visible crescent would become full in Leo, which is the house of the sun, and according to *PGM* VII.284-99, the appropriate position of the moon for ring spells.

⁴⁴ There are numerous texts in the magical papyri that specify appropriate occasions for rites on the basis of the moon's position in the zodiac (e.g. *PGM* II.80; V.47-53, 421; VII.300a-310; XIII.5-7, 1028-40; XXXVI.330-32; *PDM* xiv.1003-14, 1180-81), but none provides an exact parallel to the present text. Two texts (*PGM* III.275-81; VII.248-99) give lists of favourable lunar positions for various procedures, but aside from the reference to rings previously mentioned (above n. 39) they shed little light on the present spell.

⁴⁵ This combination of symbolism finds an interesting parallel in the zodiac ceilings of the Roman period tomb of Petosiris in Qaret El-Muzzawwqa, Dakhla oasis, in which opposing figures of the rising sun and the lunar *wḏꜥ.t* eye are situated in a curiously split zodiac. See Fakhry (1982): p. 96, 98; pl. 38-41, 43-44.

⁴⁶ *PGM* XII.309-310.

honey, milk and saffron are made, along with various burnt offerings, including incense, a goose, three roosters and three pigeons. These instructions are filled with the explicit language of sacrifice, and the focus of the rites is clearly the gemstone, which is held in the smoke of the burnt offerings while the invocation is recited. The second ring text requires only the liquids and aromatic substances during the invocation, and employs poultry somewhat differently. When the period of the invocations is complete, the practitioner puts the image (ζωδάριον) into the entrails of a white or yellow double-combed rooster. As in the previous spell, the proximity of the gemstone to the offerings is emphasized. Neither spell gives an explanation of these actions, but a third text in the same papyrus may shed light on the ritual logic or motivation behind them. A procedure for the creation of a miniature statue of Eros calls for the practitioner to throttle 7 birds, while holding them up to the image “until each of the creatures is suffocated and their breath enters him.”⁴⁷ The sacrifices in the ring spells are accomplished by different means, but are most likely directed to a similar end: endowing the gemstone with the breath of life and power. In this respect, the procedure for creating and consecrating the ring recalls the function of the Egyptian “Opening the Mouth”, to which the second part of the ritual, the *Ouphôr* invocation, makes even more direct reference.

II. *The invocation of the Ouphôr*

Once the gemstone *qua* cult image has been created through the preceding ritual process, it is to be put away in a holy place (ἐν πόπῳ ἱερῷ). Each time it is employed thereafter, the practitioner is to recite the *Ouphôr* invocation, which consists of a prologue or beginning (ἀρχή, ll. 323-333), followed by a series of 15 names or *voces magicae* (ll. 336-50) each beginning with the Greek vowels η ι ε ο υ. The title given to this main part of the rite is the ἐπίκλησις Οὐφωρος.⁴⁸ Some potential confusion has been introduced into the interpretation of this text by a recent translation of its title. Morton Smith, the translator of this spell in the *Greek Magical Papyri* volume edited by Betz, understood *Ouphôr* as the name of a divinity.⁴⁹ This interpretation, however,

⁴⁷ *PGM* XII.33-34. A similar account of sacrifice is given at *PGM* XIII.377. Cf. also *PGM* IV.1813-25, in which an inscribed lamella is given to a partridge to swallow; the partridge is killed and the lamella retrieved.

⁴⁸ Preisendanz (1973-4): vol. 2, p. 77.

⁴⁹ Preisendanz (1973-4): vol. 2, p. 79 correctly translates as though Οὐφωρος is

required him to supplement the text. The instructions at line 334 enjoin the practitioner to “hide the true *Ouphôr*” (κρύβε, κρύβε τὸ ἀληθινὸν Οὐφωρ) which Morton Smith translated as “hide the true [spell to control?] OUPHÔR.” When the name *Ouphôr* is correctly understood to be the name of the ritual, as Preisendanz did in his original publication, this supplement is unnecessary.⁵⁰ The title ἐπίκλησις Οὐφωρος (l. 335) is, therefore, better rendered “The invocation of [the] *Ouphôr*,” rather than “The invocation to *Ouphôr*”.

This *Ouphôr* is given its own brief promotional text, which outlines the powers and pedigree of the rite, and confirms the indications in the first part of the ritual that the gemstone was considered a living image of the god. Since Morton Smith’s rendering of this passage is unsatisfactory,⁵¹ we include our own fairly literal translation:

Whenever you wish to command the god, command [him] having said the greatest *Ouphôr*, and he will perform. You have the consecration of the supreme and divine action. This is the *Ouphôr* which Ourbikos used, the holy *Ouphôr*, the true one, in all brevity truly recorded, through which every sculpture and carving and statue is kindled to life. For this is the true one; the others, which are reported at length, are falsified, encompassing a useless length.

This introduction, with its interest in “brand recognition”, seems like the patter of a modern advertising script.⁵² A few short lines manage to mention the name of the ritual three times, and in the process provide it with the endorsement of a particular ritual specialist, the otherwise unknown Ourbikos.⁵³ The text also explicitly promotes

the name of the spell, and cites the opinion of Reuven: “Οὐφωρ videtur nomen cantilenae sequentis . . .”

⁵⁰ Smith also translates ll. 317-18 (ὁ δὲ Οὐφωρ|οὔτος ἐστίν, ᾧ Οὐρβικός ἐχράτο) “This OUPHÔR is the [god] whom Urbicus used.” After this phrase, however, the gender of *Ouphôr* changes from masculine to neuter, and it becomes clearer that the name refers to the rite.

⁵¹ Betz (1992): 164. The German translation in Preisendanz (1973-4): 79 is much better.

⁵² Short editorial comments, extolling the virtues of the spell occur a number of times in the magical papyri, and often attempt to add prestige to the rite by locating it in a greater tradition. On this pattern see Betz (1982), esp. p. 169. To whom and for what purpose these comments are made is a question raised by Gordon (1997) and (1999): 188-91; he suggests that, in part, they serve to construct the imagined world of the authors of the magical papyri. The standard work on this rhetorical technique in the antique world is still Speyer (1971): especially 44-84. See also Baum (2001).

⁵³ Most transliterate Οὐρβικός as the Roman name Urbicus. Urbicus was the name of a river and several figures, mostly dating from the 4th and 5th centuries CE, and so unconnected with the Ourbikos of this spell. See *RE* s.v. “Urbicus”

the *Ouphôr* as a miniature, making a virtue of its brevity, and criticizing the “useless length” of other rites.⁵⁴ This last comment is especially significant, since it assumes that the *Ouphôr* is not a unique ritual, but that *Ouphôr* rites form a type or category of which this particular instance, for all its brevity, is a true representative. The introduction also makes clear the function of this rite, and by extension the ritual type as a whole: to bring to life statues and carved images.⁵⁵ In this context, the Greek word ξόανον is again used, and the assimilation of the image to the god is further suggested in the opening words, since it is undoubtedly the sun god embodied in the gemstone who is to accomplish the commands of the practitioner.⁵⁶ This *Ouphôr*, then, is clearly understood as a small-scale rite that brings the gemstone to life as an image of the god, so that it can accomplish the will of the practitioner.

J. Vergote and H.-J. Thissen have suggested that the name Οὐφωρ transcribes into Greek characters the Egyptian *wḫ.t-rʿ*, literally “opening the mouth.”⁵⁷ This was the name given to a type of ritual performed on mummies of humans or sacred animals, as well as cult images and other inanimate objects, in order to animate or to reanimate the object of the rite. The earliest attestation of the “Opening of the Mouth” dates from the Fourth Dynasty (c. 2649-2513 BCE), and versions of the ritual were still being preserved on papyri and in

(vol. XI A, 1, col. 991-992). Alternatively, the name could have Egyptian origins, related to *bik*, “falcon,” thus *wr-bik* or *Hr-bik* / *Hr-pʿ-bik*. Erichsen (1954): 123 notes that Greek spellings of this element in names often render it -βηκς. Lüddeckens (1980-2000): 799, has the name *hr-hjk*: “Horus (the) Falcon”; he gives the following varied transcriptions into Greek: Ἀρβαιθης Ἀρβηκς Ἀρβηκς Ἀρβηκς Ἐρβηκς Ὀρβηκ. See also *ibid.* p. 802, *hr-pʿ-hjk*, and p. 786, *hr*, which is transcribed ὠρος ὠρον ὠρίω[v] Copt. 𐩪𐩠𐩢). It is possible that the name “Urbicus” is actually a variant or corrupt transcription of the name *hr-bik*.

⁵⁴ This feature of the rite is emphasized again at l. 334-5: κρύβε, κρύβε τὸ ἀληθινὸν Οὐφωρ ἐν συντομίᾳ | περιέχον τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

⁵⁵ The word used for “kindle to life” is ζωπυρεῖται, an unusual word which only occurs two other times in *PGM* at IV.795, and XIII.739. See Preisendanz (1973-4) *ad loc.*

⁵⁶ Cf. the translation of this phrase in Preisendanz (1973-4): vol. 2, p. 79. Collins (2003): 37-44 provides a suggestive discussion of the “social agency” of statues and figurines in the classical Greek context. This idea is surely at work here and is also more widely applicable in Egyptian religion.

⁵⁷ Vergote (1961): 213-214 and Thissen (1991): 299-300. Phonetically, the match is not exact. Rather than Οὐφ-ωρ, one might expect Ουπ-ρο (cf. Coptic ϣο, “mouth”) but the name may have changed in the process of transcription and transmission. An alternative possibility is that the name transcribes *wḫ.t-hr* “Opening/revealing the face”, perhaps a variant of *wn-hr*, the ritual of opening up the shrine and revealing the face of the god. See further below.

hieroglyphic inscriptions down into the Graeco-Roman period in Egypt.⁵⁸ At the temple of Hathor at Dendera, built in the 1st centuries BCE and CE⁵⁹ and at the Ptolemaic temple of Horus at Edfu, inscriptions refer to the performance of the “opening of the mouth” in order to enliven statues of the gods, and even the entire temple.⁶⁰ The opening of the mouth was also performed during the daily liturgy of the temple and at certain festival occasions, in order to revive or awaken an image of the god.⁶¹ The latter use of “Opening of the Mouth” best fits the function of the *Ouphôr* as described in the *PGM* text, since the rite is used to enliven the image of the god each time it is put into service. Though the most elaborate versions of the original Egyptian ritual include opening the eyes of the statue to see, the ears to hear, establishing the heart in its place, making offerings and purifications of all kinds, and a variety of other ritual episodes, the central purpose of the *wꜥ.t-rꜥ* was to open the mouth in order to allow the image to begin breathing and therefore come to life.⁶² Indeed, some of the latest written versions of an opening of the mouth spell are the first century CE Demotic funerary texts entitled “Liturgy of Opening the Mouth for Breathing” (*wꜥꜣ.t-rꜥ n sꜣsn*), an adapted and abridged version of the classical ritual for Opening the Mouth that claims to achieve the same results without elaborate ritual actions.⁶³ Though there is no ritual action or performative utterance in the *Ouphôr* that literally opens the mouth of the divine image on the gemstone, the language describing the function of the *Ouphôr* is appropriate to its ritual antecedents. As just mentioned, the spell is advertised as the rite “through which every sculpture and carving and statue is kindled to life.” In the preliminary invocation of the *Ouphôr*, moreover, the spirits invoked are asked to grant *breath* to the

⁵⁸ On this ritual generally, see Otto (1960), and for Roman period texts, see Mark Smith (1993). A French translation of the classical ritual is given in Goyon (1972): 87-182.

⁵⁹ At Dendera, the rite appears in inscriptions describing the creation and vivification of divine images in the *h.t-nb*, or “House of Gold.” See Derchain (1990).

⁶⁰ For the creation of a statue: Kurth (1994): 116; the consecration and animation of the temple of Edfu: Blackman and Fairman (1946): 75-91 and Kurth (1994): 153-156; according to the latter’s note on p. 355, a similar text is preserved on the temple island of Philae. An alternative version is preserved in the temple of Amun in Hibis, Dakhla oasis, see Cruz-Urbe (1999): 69-73.

⁶¹ See Moret (1902): 203-4, 208. During the first hour of Osiris at Edfu: Kurth (1994): 102; During the visit of Hathor to Edfu: Kurth (1994): 158, 178.

⁶² The full range of procedures for the Opening of the Mouth is outlined in Otto (1960).

⁶³ See Mark Smith (1993): 14-18.

image: “Give, therefore, spirit (πνεῦμα) to the mystery that has been prepared by me, O gods whom I have named and have called upon. Give breath (πνοή) to the mystery that has been prepared by me.”⁶⁴ True to one of the traditional functions of the Egyptian ritual for Opening the Mouth, the *Ouphôr* spell in this Greek text is being used literally to *animate* a carved image.

The *Ouphôr*, then, bears a close resemblance to the temple ritual in *name* and *function*. But what about the form and content? As mentioned above, this purely verbal rite is divided into two parts: a preliminary section (ἄρχή), and the invocation of *Ouphôr* (ἐπικλησις Οὐφωρος). These parts exhibit only a superficial relationship to the *wḫ.t-rʿ* as known in its more traditional Egyptian forms. The latter included recitations, but there do not appear to be any specific echoes between the *Ouphôr* and its traditional counterpart. The ἄρχή, a sort of preliminary invocation, announces the opening of gates and ways, after which the practitioner states that his spirit (πνεῦμα) has been heard by all the gods and daimones, and by various spirits: heavenly, terrestrial, marine and riverine.

Beginning

The gates of heaven were opened; the gates of the earth were opened.
 The course of the sea was opened; the course of the rivers was opened.
 My spirit (πνεῦμα) was heard by all gods and demons;
 My spirit was heard by the spirit (πνεῦμα) of heaven;
 My spirit was heard by the earthly spirit;
 My spirit was heard by the marine spirit;
 My spirit was heard by the riverine spirit;
 Give, therefore, spirit (πνεῦμα) to the mystery that has been prepared by
 me,
 [O] gods whom I have named and called upon,
 Give breath (πνοή) to the mystery that has been prepared by me.

(PGM XII.323-33)⁶⁵

Leaving aside the request that spirit and breath be granted to the “mystery” that the practitioner has prepared, the preliminary text does not appear closely related to the Opening of the Mouth. The first two phrases, however, do recall part of the daily temple liturgy,

⁶⁴ PGM XII.331-3: δότε οὖν πνεῦμα τῷ ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ κατεσκευασμένῳ μυστηρίῳ, θεοί, οὓς ὠνόμασα καὶ ἐπικέκλημαι. δότε πνοὴν τῷ ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ κατεσκευασμένῳ μυστηρίῳ.

⁶⁵ The layout of the present translation represents the actual layout of the hymn on the manuscript. For the formula “My spirit has been heard by X” see PGM VII. 591-592 (a fragment of an invocation).

one of the traditional contexts in which the Opening of the Mouth might be performed.⁶⁶ When the priest opened the naos revealing the statue of the god during the *wn-hr* (“revealing the face”) ritual, a short spell was recited, the beginning of which assimilated the doors of the shrine to the doors of heaven and the doors of earth.⁶⁷

Spell for revealing the face (*wn-hr*) of the god

Words to be spoken:

Both gates (*ʿ3.wy*) of heaven are opened (*wn*); both gates of the earth are opened (*ss*);

Geb is greeted with the speech of the gods, who are firmly established on their thrones;

Both gates of heaven are opened (*wn*); the Ennead is shining;

Lofty is Amun-Re, lord of the throne[s] of the two lands, on his great throne;

Lofty is the great Ennead on its throne;

Your beauty belongs to you, Amun-Re, lord of the throne[s] of the two lands;

O naked one, be clothed! O you who must be girded, gird yourself!

(*P. Berlin* 3055 4/3-6)⁶⁸

Perhaps the ἀρχή of the *Ouphôr* evokes the moment in the daily temple liturgy when the shrine is opened, and the officiant confronts the image of the god.⁶⁹ This shorthand reference may explain the series of invocations, the ἐπὶ κλησὶς Οὐφωρος, that follows the request for breath.

Invocation of *Ouphôr*:

ÊI	IEOU	MAREITH
ÊI	IEOU	MONTHEATHIMONGITH
ÊI	IEOU	KHAREÔTHMONKÊB
ÊI	IEOU	SÔKHOUSÔRSÔÊ
ÊI	IEOU	TIÔTIÔ OUIÊR
ÊI	IEOU	KHARÔKHSIKHARMÎÔTH
ÊI	IEOU	SATHIMÔOUÊÊOU
ÊI	IEOU	RAIRAI MOURIRAI

⁶⁶ These two phrases themselves are not completely unrelated to the Opening of the Mouth ritual. See Otto (1960): 104-5 and 172.

⁶⁷ *wn ʿ3.wy p.t ss ʿ3.wy p.t . . . wn ʿ3.wy p.t . . .* Moret (1902): 49-50. In this regard, it is perhaps significant that πύλαι, properly speaking, signify a pair of double gates, not unlike the double doors (*ʿ3.wy*) of the shrine. Given the apparent reference to the daily temple liturgy, one could also speculate that Οὐφωρ, a rather unusual transliteration of *wḫ.t-rʿ*, perhaps results from some confusion with the “revealing the face” (*wn-hr* - lit. “opening the face”) ritual in the daily temple liturgy. Though *wḫ.t-hr* is not attested, the words *wḫ* and *wn* are virtually synonymous, so it is a possible explanation of the name Οὐφωρ.

⁶⁸ Moret (1902): 49-50; Guglielmo and Buroh (1997): 122-24; the available sources are conveniently presented in synoptics *ibid.* pp. 151-55; the *Ouphôr* invocation is noted on p. 124.

⁶⁹ See also Assmann (1969): 257-61; the present passage is noted briefly on p. 260, n. 58.

ÊI	IEOU	AMOUNÊEI OUSIRI
ÊI	IEOU	PHIRIMNOUN
ÊI	IEOU	ANMORKHATHI OUÊR
ÊI	IEOU	ANKHEREPHRENEPSOUPHIRIGKH
ÊI	IEOU	ORKHIMORÔIPOUGH
ÊI	IEOU	MAKHPSAKHATHANTH
ÊI	IEOU	MOROTH

(*PGM* XII.334-50)

The sequence of vowels at the start of each line (ηι ιεου), as R. Ritner has proposed, transcribe the Egyptian *i ʾw* “O hail”, thus reproducing a repetitive Egyptian greeting formula.⁷⁰ These are followed by *voces magicae*, some of which appear to transcribe an Egyptian phrase or name. The group αμουννηι ουσιρι (l. 344) contains the names Amun and Osiris, and φριμνουν (l. 345) corresponds to the epithet *pry m nwn* “he who comes forth from Nun (the primeval waters)”. Other Egyptian names or words may lie behind the rest.⁷¹ Even if not entirely comprehensible, the outward form, a series of greetings or adorations, is highly reminiscent of the so-called litany, a list-like hymn, addressed to the sun god in particular, which enumerates the deity’s names, epithets and cult places, all arranged in a sequence of fixed opening greetings.⁷² In the temple cult, litanies were especially frequent as morning hymns recited in front of the divine statue to wake the god from his sleep.⁷³ The following litany is taken as an example from a 21st dynasty funerary manuscript.

⁷⁰ See R. Ritner’s note in Betz (1992): 165 n. 86. See also Thissen (1991): 299, who notes glosses at *PDM* xiv.210 (col. 7, line 24), and 467 (col. 16, line 9) that confirm the reading of ηι as the vocative interjection *i* “O!”. Note that the sequence *i ʾw* does not occur in any Egyptian ritual text known to date. The identification of the *i ʾw* group is therefore rather problematic. Note, however, the Coptic request for an oracle at the beginning of *PGM* IV, which includes a litany of sorts, each line beginning with εογωτϣ. Preisendanz (1973-4) ad loc. suggested that this was equivalent to *i ʾw.tw=f*, and cited *PDM* xiv. 627-630.

⁷¹ On φριμνουν, see R. Ritner’s note in Betz (1992): 165 n. 87, and Thissen (1991): 299. In ll. 340 and 346, the Greek letters ουηη and ουηη perhaps transcribe *wr* “great”. On ραιραι Μουριραι (l. 343), cf. the name μουραι μουριραι on a gem engraved with an image of Chnoubis. See Delatte and Derchain (1964): p. 66 no. 79. Αμιορχαθι (l. 346) may be a variant of the name Αμοραχθι that appears in various forms in a sequence of four names that recurs on several gems. See Delatte and Derchain (1964): pp. 321-4, nos. 472-9.

⁷² See *LdA* s.v. “Litanei” (vol. 3, cols. 1062-66). The layout of the present ἐπικλησις recalls the arrangement of litanies on manuscripts in the hieratic script. Most instructive are the well laid-out litanies to the sun god in *P. Greenfield*, a Book of the Dead manuscript of the 21st dynasty, which exhibits a peculiar redaction. See Budge (1912): plates 75-91. On these litanies, see Assmann (1969): 24 NB and Zaluskowski (1996): 45-156.

⁷³ One of the final acts of the ritual of Opening the Mouth, making fumiga-

Adoring Re-Harakhti by [titles omitted] Nesitanebtasheru:
 Hail to you (*ind-hr=k*) Re in your beautiful rising (*wbn*),
 Hail to you Re who rises (*h'y*) beautifully,
 Hail to you Re in your beautiful shining,
 Hail to you Re who is beautiful,
 Hail to you Re who is strong,
 Hail to you Re who is great,
 Hail to you Re who shines forth,
 Hail to you Re who is respected (*šfy.ti*),
 Hail to you Re who is honored (*w'š.ti*),
 Hail to you Re who is divine,
 Hail to you Re who is complete (*htmw.ti*)
 Hail to you Re who is perfect (*ip.ti*)
 Hail to you Re who is enduring (*dd.ti*)
 As a litany (*wdmw*) for Re-Harakhti,
 A litany (*wdmw*) of all his names that are in heaven and on earth.

(*P. Greenfield* sheet 66 (plate 77))

These references made by both the ἀρχή and the ἐπίκλησις of the Οὐφωρ, though evocative of the traditional liturgy and therefore consistent with the conceptualization of the gemstone as a cult statue, are nevertheless rather oblique in their formal and verbal references to the traditional *wḫ.t-rʿ*, and were it not for the name of the rite and its explicitly defined function the relationship would perhaps remain undetected.

III. Miniaturization

As we have shown above, the text recorded in *P. Leiden* I 384 evinces an explicit claim that the *Ouphôr* is a small-scale version of a particular category of ritual, and yet the specific connections between the words of the rite and its putative antecedents are not especially clear. To get past this apparent obstacle we must consider the specific nature of the *Ouphôr*—and indeed the entire ring spell—as a text concerned with miniaturization. Drawing on C. Lévi-Strauss' exploration of the miniature in the opening chapter of *La Pensée sauvage*, J. Z. Smith has proposed looking at the rituals of the magical papyri with an understanding of “the intrinsic value of a small scale model”. This value lies in the way that the miniature “compensates for the renunciation of sensible dimensions by the acquisition of intelligible dimensions.”⁷⁴

tions in front of the statue or mummy, had to be accompanied by a litany which enumerated all the names of the sun god; Otto (1960): 158.

⁷⁴ Lévi-Strauss (1966): 24.

Leaving aside the practical benefits in methods and materials, miniaturization thus had aesthetic and intellectual advantages for the ritualist as far as comprehending (and manipulating) the elements and structures of rituals when performing them or when engaging in the bricolage that produces new rites.⁷⁵ There are also advantages to the observer, especially in a case of explicit miniaturization such as the text under discussion, since as Lévi-Strauss observes, miniatures are “man-made” and therefore “not just projections or passive homologues of the object: they constitute a real experiment with it.”⁷⁶ By following the choices made in this “experimental” process of miniaturization, we can gain some access into the intellectual world of the magical papyri, and in particular the priestly milieu of late antique Egypt as represented by this particular text.

The object at the center of the rites described is, of course, the engraved gemstone set in the ring, and its treatment throughout the ritual shows that it was to be created and used as a miniature cult statue. The vivification of a miniature divine image through invocations and sacrifices represents a transposition of structures and elements of traditional religion, which as J.Z. Smith has observed, is characteristic of the mobile and entrepreneurial practice of the Late Antique ritual specialist. Elements of traditional religion are transformed and adapted in a conceptual shift from the archaic temple to the “holy man” as point of access to the power of the divine world. In this case, the gemstone, most likely created and used by a member of the priestly class, functions as a miniature statue of the sun god, no longer situated in the temple, but portable and always available for a more itinerant or domestic praxis. In traditional Egyptian cult, direct access to the divine image was normally limited to priests who carried out daily liturgies within the sacred precincts of the temple, and presided over festivals in which the god went forth from his abode. By constructing a personal divine image and offering it worship and hymns, the practitioner asserted his claim to the functions and prerogatives of an Egyptian priest, and the special relationship to the divine inherent in that status. Accordingly, the practitioner (at line 276) is instructed to carve the name of the god in hieroglyphs, “as the prophets say” (ὡς προφηται λεγουσιν). Knowledge of hieroglyphics was the preserve of the literate priestly class, and προφητής was the

⁷⁵ Lévi-Strauss primarily uses the analogy of the bricoleur to analyze the qualities of mythical thought, but owing to the parallels he notes between myths and rites (1966): 32-33, bricolage can certainly apply to the creation of rites.

⁷⁶ Lévi-Strauss (1966): 24.

Greek equivalent to the Egyptian *hm-ntr*, a high-ranking priest in Egyptian temples. The ring, moreover, is to be worn “in purity” (ll. 276-7: *καὶ τελέσας φόρει καθαρείως*), since the maintenance of purity was the requisite condition for the priest who entered into the presence of the god in the inner sanctuaries of Egyptian temples. With the relative decline of Egyptian temples under the Roman empire, however, modes of accessing the divine were just as likely to be centered on the figure of the priest, who continued to maintain and reinterpret the traditional religious ideas and practices associated with the temple.⁷⁷

In these respects, the gemstone, like all the little altars, shrines, and sacrifices of the magical papyri, is a typical phenomenon of the priestly or quasi-priestly milieu of ritual specialists in late Graeco-Roman Egypt, but its physical properties make it a somewhat atypical miniature in degree and kind. First of all, the engraved gemstone as cult statue is really quite a remarkable and imaginative reduction in scale: a living image of the god small enough to reside in a ring on one’s finger! There are certainly other miniature divine images mentioned in the magical papyri—little domesticated table-top statuettes to which worship is offered⁷⁸—but the gemstone takes the process one step further. In the process of miniaturization, the sensible relationship to the physical analogue in the temple has become attenuated. While other miniature cult images, including a mummified falcon, a small figurine of Hermes made of dough, and the statuette of Eros mentioned above retain their resemblance to a cult statue, in the engraved gemstone, the figurative element has become a two-dimensional emblem and a hieroglyphic name.⁷⁹ These moves suggest that the rite for creating the gemstone was less concerned with perceptible homology to traditional forms, and even more a conceptual experiment with the idea of the god’s statue and its possible functions in other contexts.

The miniaturization evident in the *Ouphôr* is even more remarkable. Though it appears to evoke the place and ritual context of the traditional rite (i.e. the daily temple liturgy), little besides the name and the request that the image be granted breath would specifically identify the *Ouphôr* as related to its professed Egyptian antecedent. The *Ouphôr* is almost an “Opening of the Mouth” in name alone. The name *Ouphôr*,

⁷⁷ Cf. Frankfurter (1998): 198-237.

⁷⁸ See the examples discussed in Smith (1995): 24-25.

⁷⁹ The gem itself, of course, continues to have a three-dimensional presence, especially if one considers the ring as the naos.

in fact, is peculiarly prominent in the text, occurring five times in the introductions and titles of a relatively brief spell. For the practitioner or compiler, it appears that naming the rite and classifying its function gave a relatively non-specific series of utterances their specific power. Morton Smith's mistaken understanding of *Ouphôr* as the name of a divinity thus takes on a surprising significance. The "invocation of *Ouphôr*" (ἐπίκλησις Οὐφωρος, l. 335), can be read with a double meaning, construing the genitive as both possessive and objective. On the level of ritual performance, the practitioner pronounces the invocation belonging to the *Ouphôr* spell. But on the more theoretical level and on the level of scribal practice, the author of the text defines the character and purpose of the ritual invocations by invoking the name and abstract ritual power of the traditional Egyptian "Opening of the Mouth". This is an unusual form of miniaturization, but it exemplifies well what J.Z. Smith has called the "discursive or intellectual" space in which the rituals of the *Greek Magical Papyri* exist.⁸⁰ The miniaturization of the *Ouphôr* does not occur at the palpably formal level evident in the tiny altars and shrines, and the picayune sacrifices found throughout the magical papyri. Such miniaturizations, to be sure, do imply an awareness of the abstracted qualities of ritual actions and their functions, but in the lack of a clear formal resemblance between the *Ouphôr* and the *wpt-rʿ*, the "opening of the mouth," this miniaturized magical ritual most clearly reveals itself as a second-order discourse on ritual. The perceptible dimension has virtually disappeared, and only the intelligible dimension—the classification of the rite and its function—connects ritual and miniaturized ritual. In this sense, the Late Antique creator of this spell, by miniaturizing ritual action (which is already a step removed from everyday action), has taken the ritual to another level of abstraction and devised what Smith calls a "ritual of ritual," a meta-ritual which in part derives its effectiveness from a discourse on the names and functions of traditional rituals.⁸¹

Abbreviations used

<i>LdÄ</i>	<i>Lexicon der Ägyptologie</i> , ed. by W. Helck and E. Otto (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1972-1992).
<i>PDM</i>	<i>Papyri Demoticae Magicae</i> (as cited in Betz (1992)).

⁸⁰ Smith (1995): 27.

⁸¹ Smith (1995): 27. On the discursive aspects of the *PGM* texts, see also Gordon (1997) and (1999): 189-191.

- PGM *Papyri Graecae Magicae* (as cited in Preisendanz (1973-4) and Betz (1992)).
 RE *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. by G. Wissowa
 et al. (Stuttgart : J.B. Metzler, 1894-1972).

References

- Assmann, Jan. *Liturgische Lieder an den Sonnengott. Untersuchungen zur altägyptischen Hymnik, I.* Münchner Ägyptologische Studien 19. Berlin: Verlag Bruno Hessling, 1969.
- Baum, Armin Daniel. *Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühen Christentum: mit ausgewählten Quellentexten samt deutscher Übersetzung.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe, 138. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. "The Formation of Authoritative Tradition in the Greek Magical Papyri." In *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition. Volume Three: Self-Definition in the Greco-Roman World.* Edited by B. F. Meyer and E. P. Sanders. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Betz, H. D. (ed.) *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Including the Demotic Spells.* Second Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Blackman, A.M. and Fairman, H.W. "The consecration of an Egyptian temple according to the use of Edfu" *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 32 (1946): 75-91.
- Bonner, Campbell. *Studies in Magical Amulets Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950.
- Budge, E.A. Wallis. *The Greenfield Papyrus in the British Museum.* London: 1912.
- Cialowicz, Krzysztof M. *Les palettes égyptiennes aux motifs zoomorphes et sans décoration. Études de l'art prédynastique.* Studies in Ancient Art and Civilization, 3. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1991.
- Collins, Derek. "Nature, Cause and Agency in Greek Magic." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 133 (2003): 17-49.
- Cruz-Uribe, Eugene. "Opening of the Mouth as Temple Ritual". In: E. Teeter and J.A. Larson (eds.), *Gold of Praise. Fs. E.F. Wente.* Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 58. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1999.
- Daniel, Robert W. *Two Greek Magical Papyri in the National Museum of Antiquities in Leiden. A Photographic Edition of J 384 and J 395 (= PGM XII and XIII).* Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Papyrologica Coloniensia 19. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1991.
- Delatte, A. and P. Derchain, *Les intailles magiques gréco-égyptiennes.* Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1964.
- Derchain, P. "Mythes et dieux lunaires en Égypte." In *La lune: mythes et rites.* Sources orientales 5. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1962, pp. 19-68.
- . "La pêche de l'oeil et les mystères d'Osiris à Dendara." *Revue d'égyptologie* 15 (1963): 11-25.
- . "L'Atelier des Orfèvres à Dendara et les origines de l'Alchimie." *Chronique d'Égypte* 65 (1990): 219-242.
- Dieleman, Jacco. *Reading Magic. Social and Cultural Contexts of Two Demotic-Greek Magical Handbooks* (PhD dissertation; Leiden 2003, publication forthcoming).
- Donohue, A. A. *Xoana and the Origins of Greek Sculpture.* American Classical Studies 15. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Erichsen, W. *Demotisches Glossar.* Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1954.
- Fakhry, Ahmed. *Denkmäler der Oase Dachla: aus dem Nachlass von Ahmed Fakhry.* Edited by J. Osing, M. Moursi, D. Arnold, O. Neugebauer, R. A. Parker, D. Pingree

- and M. A. Nur-el-Din. *Archäologische Veröffentlichungen* 28. Mainz am Rhein: Zabern, 1982.
- Frankfurter, David. "The Magic of Writing and the Writing of Magic. The Power of the Word in Egyptian and Greek Traditions" *Helios* 21 (1994): 189-221.
- . *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Gordon, Richard. "Reporting the Marvellous: Private Divination in the Greek Magical Papyri." In *Envisioning Magic: A Princeton Seminar and Symposium*. Edited by P. Schäfer and H.G. Kippenberg. New York: Brill, 1997.
- . "Imagining Greek and Roman Magic." In *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome*. Edited by Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999: 161-275.
- Goyon, Jean-Claude. *Rituels funéraires de l'ancienne Égypte. Le Rituel de l'Embaumement, le Rituel de l'Ouverture de la Bouche, les Livres des Respirations*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1972.
- Guglielmi, Waltraud and Buroh, Knut. "Die Eingangssprüche des täglichen Tempelrituals nach Papyrus Berlin 3055 (I,1 – VI,3)" in *Essays on Ancient Egypt in Honour of Herman te Velde*. Egyptological Memoirs 1. Edited by Jacobus van Dijk. Groningen: Styx Publications, 1997: 101-66.
- Hayes, William C. *The Scepter of Egypt. A Background for the Study of the Egyptian Antiquities in The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Part I: From the Earliest Times to the End of the Middle Kingdom*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953.
- Henig, Martin. *The Lewis Collection of Engraved Gemstones in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*. British Archeological Reports Supplementary Series 1. Oxford: B.A.R., 1975.
- Hornung, Erik. *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt. The One and the Many*. Translated by John Baines. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982.
- . *The Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife*. Translated by David Lorton. Ithaca: Cornell, 1999.
- Johnson, Janet H. "The Demotic Magical Spells of Leiden I 384." *Oudheidkundige Mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden* 56 (1975): 29-64; plates VIII-XIII.
- Kurth, Dieter. *Treffpunkt der Götter. Inschriften aus dem Tempel des Horus von Edfu*. Zürich and Munich: Artemis Verlag, 1994.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *La Pensée Sauvage*. Paris: Plon, 1962.
- . *The Savage Mind*. [translation of Lévi-Strauss (1962)] Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Lüddeckens, Erich. *Demotisches Namenbuch*. 20 fasc. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1980-2000.
- Michel, Simone. *Die magischen Gemmen im Britischen Museum*. Edited by Peter and Hilde Zazoff. London: British Museum Press, 2001.
- Moret, Alexandre. *Culte divin journalier en Égypte d'après les papyrus de Berlin et les textes du temple de Sêti Ier, à Abydos*. Bibliothèque d'études 14. Paris: Leroux, 1902.
- Neugebauer, G. and H. B. Van Hoesen. *Greek Horoscopes*. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 48. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1959.
- Otto, E. *Das ägyptische Mundöffnungsritual*. Ägyptische Abhandlungen 3. Wiesbaden, 1960.
- Parker, Richard A. *The Calendars of Ancient Egypt*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 26. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.
- Piankoff, Alexandre. *The Tomb of Ramesses VI*. Bollingen Series 40/1. New York: Pantheon, 1954.
- . *The Shrines of Tut-Ankh-Amon*. Bollingen Series 40/2. New York: Pantheon, 1955.

- . *Mythological Papyri*. Princeton: Pantheon Books, 1957.
- Preisendanz, Karl. (ed. and trans.) *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973-4.
- Ritner, Robert K. "Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire: the Demotic Spells and their Religious Context." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II.18.5. Edited by W. Haase and H. Temporini. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995): 3333-3379.
- Smith, Mark. *The Liturgy of Opening the Mouth for Breathing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Smith, J. Z. "Trading Places," in *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*. Edited by M. Meyer and P. Mirecki. Leiden: Brill, 1995: 13-27.
- Speyer, Wolfgang. *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum. Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft I.2. Munich: Beck, 1971.
- Spiegelberg, Wilhelm. *Der ägyptische Mythos vom Sonnenauge (Der Papyrus der Tierfabeln—„Kufi“) nach dem Leidener demotischen Papyrus I 384*. Strassburg, 1917.
- Stricker, B.H. *De grote zeeslang*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1953.
- Thissen, H.J. "Ägyptologische Beiträge zu den griechischen magischen Papyri." In *Religion und Philosophie im alten Ägypten. Festgabe für Philippe Derchain zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 24. Juli 1991*. Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 39. Leuven: Peeters, 1991.
- Vergote, J. "Sur les mots composés en Égyptien et en Copte." *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 18 (1961): 208-214.
- Zaluskowski, Corinna. *Texte außerhalb der Totenbuch-Tradition in Pap. Greenfield*. (unpublished PhD dissertation; Bonn 1996).