

Magic and Mystery in the Greek Magical Papyri

Hans Dieter Betz

The topic of magic raises expectations and questions pertaining to *Religionswissenschaft* and *Religionsgeschichte*. One is reminded of the intense debates in the first thirty years of this century¹ centering upon the relationship between magic and religion on the one hand and between myth and ritual on the other.²

MAGIC AND MYSTERY

The topic of magic was usually treated as subordinate to the larger issues mentioned above. A key problem in this debate was the definition of magic in order to distinguish it from religion, which itself was in no way easier to define. Implied in this distinction was another question, that of the nature of ritual and ritual's relation to myth. In the course of these debates, the Greek mystery religions had become a focus of interest because there appeared to be sufficient evidence for arguing for or against various comprehensive theories concerning the fundamental problems of religion.³ Since the mystery cults consisted primarily of rituals, of first concern was the relationship to their corresponding myths.⁴ Later, similar questions were raised concerning Gnosticism. There was plenty of myth in Gnosticism; the question was whether there was any ritual and if so, what its role might be.⁵ Most of these issues are still being discussed today in one way or another, due to the dearth of evidence and problems of methodology.

One will do well to realize that behind these scholarly problems have always stood the fundamental philosophical and historical problems concerning the origins of religion in general. Was magic the beginning stage and religion a later derivative,⁶ or was it the other way around? Was the beginning marked by religion, while magic was a product of later degeneration?⁷ Confusion, as well as unrealized presuppositions, created major difficulties for answering these questions.

Religion used to be treated, without further questioning, as something intrinsically positive, while magic was from the outset stained by negative connotations. Combined with anthropological theories of evolution,⁸ sequences and hierarchies were established with some force of persuasion. Consequently, since humanity was thought to be "primitive" at the beginning of its development, an association with magic with this initial phase seemed logical. Depending upon the scholar's generos-

ity, primitive mankind's irrationality could account for this involvement with magic, or else such an involvement could be explained as either primordial stupidity ('*Urdummheit*') or mistaken science, that is, erroneous conclusions unfortunately drawn from correct observations. Consequently, religion could be presented as the opposite of magic, that is, as the result of later enlightenment and a compromise attempt to reconcile primitive irrationality with developing rationality in such a way that a rational overlay of "theology" covered up the irrationality of ritual and myth, which remained in place. Understood in this way, religion became a transitional phase between prescientific ignorance and what has been called the modern scientific worldview—which turned out to be, for the most part, agnosticism or atheism.

This view of religion is now outdated, to be sure, but it is still held by many in present society who believe it corresponds to scientific evidence. One should also realize that this viewpoint was the antithesis to another theory endorsed by ancient texts.⁹ Conforming to cosmic theories of good origins and subsequent depravity, primitive religion was for the ancients religion in its purest form: the worship of the deity by an unspoiled human race created for this very purpose. Depravity set in when, because of human foolishness, or because of the error of polytheism, or even because of seduction by evil demons, there developed the worship of images, the offering of bloody sacrifices, the building of temples, and, of course, magic. Superstition and magic thus became synonyms, social evils to be rooted out by law and force in the name of true religion.¹⁰

Both these theories were based on ideologies that may have been persuasive in their day but that can hardly be corroborated by historical evidence. Contrary to their claims, these theories about religion are not based on archeological findings, anthropological evidence, or critical evaluation of texts but on preconceived ideas and speculations often indebted—unconsciously—to old myths and prejudices.¹¹

Where are we left, then, as far as questions about magic and religion are concerned? Are these terms simply empty of content and ready to be interpreted any way one chooses? Is one person's religion simply another person's magic, and vice versa? An age such as ours, inclined to believe that realities are what the labels stuck on them say they are, tends to answer in the affirmative. Furthermore, sociologists seem to have convinced almost everyone that whatever human beings undertake, they do so in order to gain or to retain power over others. As a result, people who pursue the question of defining religion and magic tend to find in the definitions themselves nothing but another set of tools for the manipulation and control of social realities. If there is a difference between religion and magic at all, it does not really matter as long as they work in much the same way. The distinction itself is said to matter only to religious leaders because they implement and prove the old rule *Divide et impera*.

Alan Segal has recently summed what appears to be the current consensus: "Take the relationship between magic and religion: Religious leaders are often interested in strict distinctions between magic and religion so that the purity of religion can be maintained."¹² Consequently, social scientists, who by definition have no interest in religious leadership, assume a posture of freedom from any interest in power and are thus more competent "to isolate phenomena cross-culturally so that a consensus of

methodology can be reached."¹³ Where does this approach lead us? Again Alan Segal states the matter aptly:

I will argue that no definition of magic can be universally applicable because "magic" cannot and should not be construed as a properly scientific term. Its meaning changes as the context in which it is used changes. No single definition of magic can be absolute, since all definitions of magic are relative to the culture and sub-culture under discussion. Furthermore, it is my contention that we have been misled by our own cultural assumptions into making too strict a distinction between magic and religion in the Hellenistic world. As we shall see, in some places the distinction between magic and religion will depend purely on the social context.¹⁴

There is much here that one can agree with. Yet caution is in order because the assessment coincides so beautifully and conveniently with our own social context. If we adopt such a perspective, we seem to be justified in assuming a posture of objectivity to meet the scientific requirement. The problem, however, is that this sort of objectivity represents nothing but a total relativism that must not be confused with the required scientific ethos. Omitted from such consideration is also the fact that the social sciences serve in many ways as an enormously powerful instrument of social control. Far from being disinterested in the outcome of the debate about definition, the social science approach to religion is, in fact, in competition with traditional churches and synagogues and insists that ongoing debates be fought on its own terms, thereby putting those religious institutions at a disadvantage from the outset.

Another problem with this posture of objectivity is that it permits precisely the bilevel commitment found among many academics. On one level, one can, as stated, perform in a purely objective, relativistic and even agnostic manner; while on another level, that of the so-called subcultures, one can subscribe to the terms as defined by the subculture one has chosen or has been born into. If this subculture is one of the religious communities and if that community does not make any public claims but remains strictly "private," holding on to convictions of merely "particular" traditions, a marriage of convenience is all but assured. The social context in which this bilevel commitment is commended and made possible constitutes our religious pluralism. Like most marriages of convenience, however, this one is built on very fragile premises. Divorce will be inevitable once the demands of truth, which have been put on ice, as it were, in the relationship, are allowed to play their rightful role.

Juxtaposing magic and religion as such may also be misleading. Such a juxtaposition tends to obscure the fact that magical ideas and practices pertain to areas outside of religion—assuming, of course, that religion is defined in the narrower sense as the worship of deity and not in the wider sense as an attitude toward reality per se. Sigmund Mowinckel in his *Religion und Kultus* rightly emphasizes that magic is a worldview: "Magical thinking and its practical application, called 'magic,' is not a kind of religion, but a worldview, that is, a particular way to understand things and their mutual connectedness. Magic is a *Weltanschauung* which in a certain way is analogous to the view of the universe as we today attempt to formulate it on the basis of the laws of causality and the interaction between cause and effect, demonstrated by physics, chemistry, biology, and psychology."¹⁵

Another potentially misleading "opposition" is that of magic and science. Both are in fact connected historically as well as in many other ways.¹⁶ Until empiricism became dominant in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, magicians and Hermetists, as they called themselves, were leaders in the sciences, and many discoveries originated in their speculations and experimentations.¹⁷ Even Isaac Newton was deeply involved with the magical arts of alchemy and Hermetism.¹⁸

Currently there is still another "opposition" causing confusion, that of magic and "Western civilization."¹⁹ This "opposition", popular as it may be, is contradicted by the fact that within Western civilization magic is very much alive, as it has ever been.

I am not attempting to solve all these intricate problems. Rather, I am assuming that good reasons exist for the fact that no one definition appears acceptable to everyone at this time.²⁰ The primary reason seems to be that the many different complications have yet to be fully understood. In fact, at this moment research is under way in so many areas concerning magic that it would be premature to try to settle these issues before more of this research is completed. Every new study that one comes across introduces new materials and questions or exposes unjustifiable assumptions so far taken for granted. Our situation is to some extent ironic because our disagreements and uncertainties occur in a world in which we see ever more evidence of magical ideas and practices all around us. Those who believe they have control of the problem and the terminologies, not to mention the evidence, will have to ask themselves whether they are not the victims of self-delusion. Yet there are some points we can make even at this juncture. For one, no amount of evidence, analysis, and revision of conceptuality will automatically solve the problem of the relationship between magic and religion. Also, staying at the level of a social science-inspired relativism will inevitably mean that definitions of magic and religion will always turn out to be a matter of personal, subjective preference.

In order to understand what was meant by distinguishing between magic and religion, however, one will have to shift from social science to theology. The basic questions, as even pre-Christian antiquity well recognized, are theological in nature. Which words, attitudes, and practices are appropriate or inappropriate before the deity? Is forcing the gods into the service of human desires, wishes, or needs appropriate? Is the complete separation of moral issues from the practice of magic appropriate before the deity? Is it legitimate to place the greatest mysteries of divinity at the disposal of those who are willing to pay for it? Is the enormous finesse in deceiving gullible people and in exploiting their various conditions of misery religiously legitimate? These are theological questions, to be sure, but refusing to consider them amounts to deciding in advance. We will have to recognize that our dilemma of defining magic versus religion will simply remain unsolvable if we do not allow the theological questions to play their role.

I will examine a body of texts and a set of issues that at first glance seem to have little to do with these theoretical problems. This examination, however, will show how in the Greek magical papyri and in the context of Greco-Egyptian syncretism the intricate relationships between magic and religion are played out.²¹ A limited case study such as this demonstrates how careful one must be when one tries to understand the various facets of the theoretical problems outlined above.

MAGIC IN THE GREEK MAGICAL PAPYRI

"The Greek magical papyri" is a name given by scholars to a body of papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt containing a variety of magical spells and formulae, hymns, and rituals. The extant texts are mainly from the second century B.C. to the fifth century A.D. To be sure, this body of material represents only a small number of all the magical spells that once existed. Beyond these papyri we possess many other kinds of material: artifacts, symbols, and inscriptions on gemstones, on ostraka and clay bowls, and on tablets of gold, silver, lead, tin and so forth.

This opening paragraph from my introduction to *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Including the Demotic Spells*²² indicates that whatever magic may be, the magical papyri have plenty of it. Descriptive terms for magic and even definitions occur in the papyri.²³ "Holy magic" (*ἱερὰ μαγεία*) is a positive term, and the one who is initiated into the art is called "blessed initiate" (*ὁ μα[κάρι]ε μύστα*).²⁴ There are, however, different levels of cultural sophistication in the papyri, and it is in sections representing a higher cultural level that we find descriptive terms such as *μαγεία* (magic), *μαγικός* (magical), and *μάγος* (magician). These terms are used always with positive connotations so that for *Papyri Graecae Magicae* magic and religion are a single entity.

This does not mean, however, that for the magicians whose writings are included in the *Papyri Graecae Magicae* all magic is simply legitimate and acceptable. The magical handbooks that make up most of the material represent collections, that is, selections of those texts that were deemed by the collectors to constitute an authoritative tradition. By implication, other materials not judged worthy of tradition were discarded. Also at times the magician will admit his fear that his operations may be illegitimate and dangerous. He then assures the gods that he only does what they themselves have revealed and commanded him to do.²⁵ Just in case, he always has some protective charms (*φυλακτήρια*) at hand.²⁶ There is at least one passage where an inferior magic, using tools, is distinguished from a superior magic, employing magical words only.²⁷ On the whole, therefore, one can say that although magic is accepted and approved by the magicians of the *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, there are some indications that they were aware of its problematic aspects. Theologically, there was some concern about the legitimacy of "forcing the gods," a concern subdued in the *Papyri Graecae Magicae* but fully discussed by Neoplatonist philosophy and the Patristic Fathers.²⁸ For the most part, however, the concern is merely whether the magic "works." This is indicated by constantly recurring "advertising slogans" inserted by the redactors to commend the material, for example, "This really works" or "If it does not work, try this other spell."

Seen as a whole, the *Papyri Graecae Magicae* contain magical material of a syncretistic nature. The Greek and demotic bilingual texts, especially, demonstrate that "the corpus as a whole derives in a very large measure from earlier Egyptian religious and magical beliefs and practices."²⁹ The interrelationships between the Greek and the demotic spells are complicated and have not yet been determined with accuracy: "Some of the spells were written in Greek, others in Egyptian, all within the same texts and all for use by the same magician. Perhaps even more telling is the fact that even in the spells written in Greek, the religious or mythological back-

ground and the methodology to be followed to ensure success may be purely Egyptian in origin."³⁰ The linguistic phenomena of the bilinguals are truly fascinating:

Most have passages in Greek as well as in Demotic, and most have words glossed into Old Coptic (Egyptian language written with the Greek alphabet [which, unlike Egyptian scripts, indicated vowels] supplemented by extra signs taken from the Demotic for sounds not found in Greek); some contain passages written in earlier Egyptian hieratic script or words written in a special "cypher" script, which would have been an effective secret code to a Greek reader but would have been deciphered fairly simply by an Egyptian.³¹

What is true of these texts, however, is not necessarily true of others that appear to be derived from a Greek religious background, while still others come from a Jewish provenance. Not all the Greek material can be shown to be simply imposed upon an earlier Egyptian, non-Greek foundation. There are also materials of older Greek origin that became secondarily integrated with Egyptian or Greco-Egyptian spells. The way in which the materials evolved to their present stage is clear, at least in broad outlines.

In accordance with their geographical place of origin, the materials in the *Papyri Graecae Magicae* continue the older Egyptian magic. Perhaps brought in by Greek settlers in Egypt, Greek magic began to exert its influence perhaps as early as the period of classical Greece³² and certainly as part of the hellenistic religious syncretism. Jewish materials appear to derive from hellenistic syncretistic Judaism³³ rather than from Jewish religion of the time of the Old Testament. The few "Christian" elements are part of the hellenistic-Jewish syncretistic spells.³⁴ Christian magic rapidly expanded after the sixth century A.D., transforming and largely—but not totally—replacing the older material then classified as "pagan."³⁵

MYSTERY CULTS AND THE GREEK MAGICAL PAPYRI

How, then, does the magical papyri material relate to the mystery cults? We must consider several points in this regard. For the *Papyri Graecae Magicae* there is no distinction between magic and mystery cult. Magic is simply called *μυστήριον* (mystery, PGM IV.723, 746; XII.331, 333) or *μυστήρια* (mysteries, IV.476; V.110), *μέγα μυστήριον* (great mystery, I.131; IV.794), *μυστήριον μέγιστον* (greatest mystery, (IV.2592), *μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ* (mystery of God, XIII.128, 685), *θεῖον μυστήριον* (divine mystery, XIXa.52), *μεγαλομυστήριον* (supermystery, XII.322), and *τὰ ἱερὰ μυστήρια* (the holy mysteries, IV.2477). The magicians call themselves *μύστης* ("initiate," I.127; IV.474, 744; cf. *συμμύστης*, fellow-initiate, IV.732; XII.94; *παῖς μυστοδόκος* initiate child, XX.8), *μυσταγωγός* (mystagogue, IV.172, 2254); an outsider is called *ἀμυστηρίαστος* (uninitiated, XII.56, 380, 428).

Clearly, this identity of magic and mystery expresses a hermeneutical tendency on the part of the magicians. The mystery cult terms, being of Greek origin, are found only in those papyrus sections that belong to the higher cultural level within the body of texts. These papyrus sections come along with Greek deities, hymn

fragments, rituals, and bits of myth.³⁶ Obviously, in the eyes of the magicians who wrote and transmitted these texts, the mystery cult language and ritual provided religious legitimacy and cultural approval for all the other magical materials included in the spells as well. We must not misjudge this situation, however. The undeniably Greek origin of the mystery cult terminology in the *Papyri Graecae Magicae* does not decide the general question of whether the mystery cults as such were the result of peculiar developments in Greek religion or whether mystery cults existed in Egypt even prior to and apart from Greek influences.³⁷ Furthermore, the question whether the Eleusinian and perhaps other mysteries received an initial impetus from outside of Greece, perhaps Asia Minor, Crete, or Egypt, has still not been clarified.³⁸ While these questions must be answered separately, it is clear from the *Papyri Graecae Magicae* that the mystery cult material there derives from Greek sources and therefore was imported in some form from Greece into Egypt.

Another misunderstanding involves the assumption that the Greek mystery cults had originally nothing to do with magic and that only later syncretism could have combined them. Information about and relics from the Greek mystery cults definitely suggest that magic was a constituent element in the rituals of the mysteries. From Eleusis it may suffice to mention the fire ritual by which Demeter made the king's son (Demophon in the Homeric *Hymn*, Triptolemos in later tradition) immortal³⁹ and, furthermore, the purifications, processions, sacrifices, and the oath to keep it all secret.⁴⁰ The symbols (σύμβολα),⁴¹ the formulas (συνθήματα),⁴² and the quotations on the "Orphic" Gold Tablets⁴³ cannot be understood without the assumptions of magic. Consequently, one can assume that magic was a constitutive element of the mystery cults from their inception. This inherent relationship does not contradict, but rather helps to explain, the fact that in the *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, the Greek mystery cult traditions constitute a secondary interpretation imposed upon the older magic derived from different cultural origins.

To the historian of ancient religions, this secondary imposition of mystery cult terms, ideas, rituals, and traditions is not an unfamiliar phenomenon. The hellenistic period as a whole testifies, through countless pieces of evidence, to how the Greek mysteries expanded their influence. This expansion included the invasion and transformation of other cults into mystery cults, of which we have impressive examples. In his recent book, *Mithras*, Reinhold Merkelbach has shown convincingly that the transformation of the older Persian Mithra religion into the Mithras mysteries took place only in the hellenistic period and may have been the result of skillful planning and organization by religious "founder-figures" or "reformers."⁴⁴

Hellenistic Judaism soon appropriated mystery cult terms and ideas. Especially, the term *μυστήριον* (mystery) appears to be irresistible. Hellenistic Jewish wisdom literature,⁴⁵ apocalypticism,⁴⁶ the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,⁴⁷ Qumran,⁴⁸ and especially Philo of Alexandria⁴⁹ employ the terminology. For Philo, the Jewish religion is the true mystery religion,⁵⁰ with Moses serving as the great *μυσταγωγός* (mystagogue),⁵¹ while the Greek mysteries are to be regarded as false mysteries: "Certainly you may see these hybrids of man and woman continually strutting about through the thick of the market, heading the processions at the feasts, appointed to serve as unholy ministers of holy things, leading the mysteries and initiations and celebrating the rites of Demeter" (*Spec. Leg.* III. 40). Philo points up

the absurdity that "we often find that no person of good character is admitted to the mysteries, while robbers and pirates and associations of abominable and licentious women, when they offer money to those who conduct the initiatory rites, are sometimes accepted" (*Spec. Leg.* I.323; cf. also *Cherub.* 94).

Expansion of mystery cult terms and ideas is evidenced also by the early Christian literature.⁵² Paul frequently employs *μυστήριον* (mystery) as a term designating the revelation of the transcendental realities of the divine world and of wisdom, prophecy, history, the afterlife and, by implication, the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist as well.⁵³ Ephesians extends the usage, calling the Gospel itself *μυστήριον* (mystery), something Paul himself did not do. The *agapē* relationship between the heavenly Christ and his church on earth is called *τὸ μυστήριον μέγα* (the great mystery).⁵⁴ In all probability, Ephesians received this language from Colossians, which more closely reflects Paul's usage.⁵⁵ I Timothy (3:9,16) speaks of *τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως* (the mystery of faith) and *τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον* (the mystery of religion).

Another contributor of the terminology to the New Testament was apocalypticism. 2 Thessalonians 2:7 speaks of the Antichrist and his antimysteries as *τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας* (the mystery of lawlessness),⁵⁶ while Revelation uses it to describe the seven stars in Christ's right hand and the seven golden lamps of the Christophany, the seven stars being the angels of the seven churches and the seven lamps being those churches (Rev. 1:20). The great eschatological event envisioned in 10:7 is called completion of *τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ* (the mystery of God).

Revelation also knows of antimysteries: the great whore has written her name, Babylon the Great, on her forehead, a *μυστήριον* (mystery, 17:5, 7). Mark's Gospel, when explaining the meaning of Jesus' parables (4:11), takes them to reveal *τὸ μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ* (the mystery of the Kingdom of God), a concept appropriated also by Matthew (13:11, *τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν*, "the mysteries of the Kingdom of the heavens") and Luke (8:10, *τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ*, "the mysteries of the Kingdom of God"). Didache (11:11) and Ignatius of Antioch (*Eph.* 19:1; *Mag.* 9:1; *Trall.* 2:3) provide further evidence for the influence of the term in early Christianity. All this is, however, only a beginning of the enormous expansion of mystery cult terms and ideas in the patristic period, including Gnosticism, Manicheism, and Mandaeism. If we look at the *Papyri Graecae Magicae* again with this perspective in mind, then, the nature of the syncretistic transformation of the magical material into mystery cult rituals becomes clear. It is important to realize, however, that such mystery cult transformation is limited to a few highly conspicuous texts of the *Papyri Graecae Magicae*.

The *Spell of Pnouthis* (PGM I.42–195) is a magical letter of the famous scribe, Pnouthis, to a certain man named Keryx, a name that by itself refers to the "herald" of a procession. The (pseudepigraphical) letter contains instructions for acquiring an "assistant daemon" (*πάρεδρος δαίμων*).⁵⁷ The whole ritual is to be treated as "the great mystery" and must be kept secret (I.130), and its recipient is addressed enthusiastically as "O [blessed] initiate of the sacred magic" (I.127). Most prominent are mystery cult terms and ideas in the famous *Mithras Liturgy* (IV.479–829),⁵⁸ which as a whole is called "mysteries handed down [not] for gain but for

instruction" (IV.476), that is, for the initiation of a young adept into the magical arts. As the initial prayer states, the ritual was revealed by "the great god Helios Mithras" (IV.482) so that "I alone may ascend into heaven as an inquirer and behold the universe" (IV.484–85). This purpose is confirmed by the remarkable self-definitory statement in the prayer (IV.718–24): "O lord, while being born again, I am passing away; while grown and having grown, I am dying; while being born from a life-generating birth, I am passing on, released to death—as you have founded, as you have decreed, and have established the mystery."

While the whole ritual is called *μυστήριον* (mystery), its core appears to be an ointment to be prepared according to the recipe in IV.750–811. This ointment is called "the great mystery of the scarab" (*τὸ μέγα μυστήριον τοῦ κανθάρου*) and must be applied to the face of the initiate ("anointing his face with mystery," IV.746); the ointment ritual conveys immortality (IV.747, 771).

The fact that the *Mithras Liturgy* is a product of syncretism should not be used to deny that it has genuine connections with the mysteries of Mithras. The long-standing debate principally between Albrecht Dieterich and Franz Cumont appears to have been finally decided in favor of the former.⁵⁹ While Dieterich had always taken the *Mithras Liturgy* as belonging to the Mithras cult, Cumont and those who followed him argued that the name of Mithras was inserted into the text by the magician who copied the text but that it had nothing to do substantially with the rest of the material. Because of Cumont, scholars until now have been reluctant to assign the text to the Mithras cult. Even Merkelbach, in his book *Mithras* mentioned above, does not include a discussion of this text. His evaluation of the wide range of new archaeological evidence, however, has in fact prepared the ground for a reevaluation of the *Mithras Liturgy*. As he points out, the Mithras mysteries were a creation of the syncretism of the hellenistic era, not the continuation of the older Persian cult, as Cumont had believed. There is, furthermore, a wealth of material demonstrating magical elements.⁶⁰ Since the Mithras mysteries developed differently in different countries, there is really no reason to exclude the possibility of an Egyptian version. Whether the *Mithras Liturgy* is the product of just one magician's efforts or whether there were connections with a Mithraic cultic community cannot be determined on the basis of this one text alone; but even if the former holds true, the author of the *Mithras Liturgy* may still be a serious devotee of the god. The text itself refers only to the magical operator and one apprentice who is to be initiated (see esp. IV.484–85, 732–50).⁶¹

Other *Papyri Graecae Magicae* texts show a mystery cult terminology that reveals Jewish influences.⁶² *PGM V.96–172*, entitled *Stele of Jeu the hieroglyphist in his letter*, includes a summons of the Headless One in the name of Moses: "I am Moses your prophet to whom you have transmitted your mysteries celebrated by Israel" (V.108–11).⁶³ The so-called *Eighth Book of Moses* refers to "the mystery of the god, which is [called?] 'Scarab'" (XIII.128; cf. IV.794). In another place, the same text orders, "Now begin to recite the stele and the mystery of the god," again referring to the scarab (XIII.685). In *PGM XII.331* and 333 a magical ring with an engraved gemstone is called *μυστήριον* (mystery). Perhaps the name results from the image of the scarab engraved in the gemstone (XII. 275–76). While

these texts reveal Egyptian, Greek, and Jewish religious ingredients, a love spell (XXXVI.295–311), in an invocation of the Jewish god, refers to the sex act as "the mystery rite of Aphrodite" (306).⁶⁴

Finally there are two passages in the great magical papyrus of Paris that use the strange concept of religious slander.⁶⁵ Both belong to the "slander spell" (*διαβολή*) in *PGM IV.2441–2621*, about which Sam Eitrem published a penetrating study.⁶⁶ The invocation addresses the goddess Aktiophis⁶⁷ and then presents the following denunciation of the women sought by the spell:

For I come announcing the slander of NN, a defiled and unholy woman, for she has slanderously brought your holy mysteries to the knowledge of men. She, NN, is the one, [not] I, who says, "I have seen the greatest goddess, after leaving the heavenly vault, on earth without sandals, sword in hand, and [speaking] a foul name." It is she, NN, who said, "I saw [the goddess] drinking blood. She, NN, said it, not I, AKTIOPHIS ERESCHIGAL NEBOU-TOSOUALÉTH PHORPHORBA SATRAPAMMŌN CHOIRIXIÉ, flesh eater. Go to her NN and take away her sleep and put a burning heat in her soul, punishment and frenzied passion in her thoughts, and banish her from every place and from every house, and attract her to me, NN." (IV.2474–90)⁶⁸

Betrayal of the mysteries to the uninitiated was, of course, a notorious scandal in Athens; prominent figures such as Alcibiades, Andocides and their noble friends got themselves in trouble for doing this very thing.⁶⁹ A third coercive spell (IV.2474–2621) contains another slander reporting sacrilegious sacrifices, among them, "For you, a vulture and a mouse, your greatest myst'ry, goddess" (IV.2592).⁷⁰ Such sacrifice was, of course, sheer blasphemy, and the charge was designed to arouse the wrath of the goddess against the alleged perpetrator.

The interesting phenomenon that the divinely beneficial mystery can be turned into its opposite is paralleled in Judaism and Christianity, when in those contexts the Greek mysteries are declared to be a daemonic mimicry of the true mystery of God.⁷¹ In Christianity, this juxtaposition begins in Paul (1 Cor. 10:18–22)⁷² and finds clear expressions as well in *τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας* (the mystery of lawlessness, 2 Thess. 2:7) and the mystery of the great whore Babylon (Rev. 17:5, 7).

CONCLUSION

The passages discussed in the preceding pages show that the growing influence of Greek mystery cult terminology and ideas in the hellenistic era had a profound impact on the Greek magical papyri. Under this impact the earlier Egyptian magic was transformed, enriched, brought up to date, and thus legitimated. By presenting themselves as mystagogues, the magicians doubtless added to their prestige. This transformation shows that the older Egyptian magic, which at one time functioned as highly valued "religion," had now sunk to the lower level of mere "magic" as a result of the encounter with the Greek religious world, in particular the mystery

cults. The mystagogue-magicians of the Greek mystery cults transformed the older magic into a new and higher "religion." For the mystagogue-magicians, the syncretistic amalgam was indeed "religion."

By the same token, however, the mystery cult materials that the magicians were able to obtain were also transformed. The magicians treated the mystery cult traditions in the same way as they treated other religious traditions: they appropriated, adopted, and subsumed. Taking advantage of the intrinsic relationship between magic and mystery, they took the tradition apart and reconstituted it as something new: magical spells and rituals of a seemingly greater appeal and force.

There is scarcely any doubt that the work of the author of the *Mithras Liturgy* would have horrified conscientious cult officials of the mysteries of Mithras. To them, the *Mithras Liturgy* would have meant dragging the great tradition down into the muddy waters of "magic." Their horror would have been more than a matter of subjective preference. They would have pointed to the absence in the *Mithras Liturgy* of such essentials as the moral ethos, the oaths, the fellowship, and the loyalty among members of the cult, not to speak of the concerns for the welfare of the imperial government and the world community. For them, in other words, the author of the *Mithras Liturgy* had betrayed the Mithraic "religion" for "magic."

Introducing the mysteries into the magical tradition in this way and making them into magic destroyed the internal coherence and integrity that the individual mystery cults had possessed. It was, of course, easier to have a magician bring the mysteries of Eleusis into the small towns of Egypt in order to let those who would never be able to travel to Eleusis become beneficiaries and partakers. Yet if one intended to become initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries in the "real" sense, one *had to* travel to Eleusis, and one had to absolve the long preparations, spend the necessary time to live through the rituals, and, most important, celebrate the Eleusinian festivals with awe, caution, and full preparation of the soul. Similarly, the mysteries of Mithras were not just for everyone. It took hard work, rigorous training, and serious trials and examinations before one could move from the lower to the higher grades of the Mithraic hierarchy. Being a Mithraist meant to be a member in a sacred covenant with the god Mithras, a covenant that involved one's entire life.

We find, then, real differences between magic and religion even within this body of highly syncretistic material. Certainly, even greater differences existed between the Greek magical papyri in their entirety and the official religions from which the traditions were derived. What determined the distinctions between, and the resultant definitions of, magic and religion were theological issues internal to the religious traditions and cults involved. These issues differed from one cult to another, but they were not arbitrary. In order to evaluate religious phenomena concerning the problems of magic and religion, one must have a high degree of sensitivity to the inner life and thought of the cults in question. What characterized the magicians of the Greek magical papyri was that they unashamedly lacked a full comprehension or appreciation of the inner integrity of the cults whose materials they appropriated. That is why they were right in calling themselves "magicians," and their art, "magic." They lacked what we would call "religion." They themselves no doubt believed that they possessed a "religion that worked," but what they in fact had produced was magic.

Notes

1. The literature on magic in general is immense. For surveys of the earlier debates, see Karl Beth, *Religion und Magie: Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur psychologischen Grundlegung der religiösen Prinzipienlehre* 2d ed. (Leipzig, 1927); Ludwig Deubner's "Magie und Religion," in his *Kleine Schriften zur klassischen Altertumskunde* (Königstein 1982), 275–98; several articles by Albrecht Dietrich, *Kleine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1911), especially "Der Untergang der antiken Religion," pp. 448–539; Carl Heinz Ratschow, *Magie und Religion* 2d ed. (Gütersloh, 1955); Geo Widengren, *Religionsphänomenologie* (New York, 1969), 1–19; John Middleton, "Theories of Magic," in *Encyclopedia of Religion* 9 (1987): 82–89; see also Betz, "Magic in Graeco-Roman Antiquity," in *Encyclopedia of Religion* 9 (1987): 93–97.
2. See Widengren, *Religionsphänomenologie*, 150–257.
3. For the older discussion, see Sam. Eitrem, "Eleusinia—les mystères et l'agriculture," *SO* 20 (1940): 133–51; for the present state of research, see Walter Burkert, "Homo Necans," *The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, trans. Peter Bing (Berkeley, 1983); idem, *Greek Religion*, trans. John Raffan (Cambridge, Mass., 1985), esp. 276–304; idem, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*, Sather Classical Lectures 47 (Berkeley, 1979), 123–42.
4. For this point, see especially Burkert, *Structure and History* (see n. 3).
5. For discussion, see William C. Grese, *Corpus Hermeticum XIII and Early Christian Literature*, SCHNT 5 (Leiden, 1979), 40–43; Kurt Rudolph, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism*, trans. Robert McLachlan Wilson (San Francisco, 1983), 204–52.
6. I have discussed this problem in my earlier book, *Nachfolge und Nachahmung Jesu Christi im Neuen Testament*, BHTh 37 (Tübingen, 1967), 101–7.
7. This view was held by the great expert on magic, Alphonse A. Barb. See his "The Survival of Magic Arts," in *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, ed. Arnaldo Momigliano (Oxford, 1963), 100–25; idem, "Mystery, Myth, and Magic," in *The Legacy of Egypt*, 2d ed., ed. J. R. Harris (Oxford, 1971), 138–69. Similarly, of course, Dietrich, *Kleine Schriften* (see n. 1), 512–13.
8. See on this problem Geo Widengren, "Evolutionism and the Problem of the Origin of Religion," *Ethnos* 10 (1945): 57–96. Widengren's conclusions were negative and put an end to the speculations: "The origin of religion is beyond scientific research; we can only get some idea of the oldest conceivable forms of religion. The attempt to find the origin of religion must be annulled as well as the old evolutionistic method" (p. 96).
9. The fact is that magic has been treated as decadent and pagan since the Old Testament. See, e.g., Exod 7:11, 8:18–19, 9:11, 22:18, Deut. 18:10–11; 1 Sam. 28; 2 Kgs. 9:22; 2 Chron. 33:6; Ps. 58:5; Jer. 27:9; Dan. 2:2; Mic. 5:12; Nah. 3:4; Mal. 3:5; also Wisd. of Sol. 12:4, 17:7; Jub. 48:9–10; 1 Enoch 64–65, 94; Test. XII, Judah 23; Ps.-Philo, *Lib. Ant. Bibl.* 34, 64. The New Testament continues the polemics: Acts 8:9–24, 13:6–12; Gal. 5:20; Rev. 9:21; 18:23, 21:8, 22:15, etc.
10. For the notion of superstition and related literatures, see Dieter Harmening, *Superstition: Überlieferungs- und theoriengeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur kirchlich-theologischen Aberglaubensliteratur des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1979).
11. Ground-breaking was the work by Marcel Mauss's "Esquisse d'une théorie générale de la magie," in her *Sociologie et Anthropologie* (Paris, 1950), 1–141; English edition: Mauss, *A General Theory of Magic*, trans. Robert Brain (New York, 1972). For the recent discussion, see Hans G. Kippenberg and Brigitte Luchesi, eds., *Magie: Die sozialwissenschaftliche Kontroverse über das Verstehen fremden Denkens* (Frankfurt, 1978); Leander Petzoldt, ed.,

Magie und Religion: Beiträge zu einer Theorie der Magie, WdF 337 (Darmstadt, 1978); Richard A. Horsely, "Further Reflections on Witchcraft and European Folk-religion," *HR* 19 (1979): 71–95.

12. Alan F. Segal, "Hellenistic Magic: Some Questions of Definition," in *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions*, ed. R. van den Broek and Maarten J. Vermaseren, EPRO 91 (Leiden, 1982), 349–75; the quotation is from p. 349.

13. *Ibid.*, 349–50.

14. *Ibid.*, 351.

15. Sigmund Mowinckel, *Religion und Kultus* (Göttingen, 1953), 15: "Das magische Denken und dessen Umsetzung in die Praxis, die 'Magie,' ist nicht eine Art Religion, sondern ein Weltbild, eine bestimmte Weise, die Dinge und deren gegenseitige Zusammenhänge aufzufassen; es ist eine 'Weltanschauung,' die etwa dem Weltbild entspricht, das wir heutzutage auf der Grundlage des Kausalgesetzes und der Zusammenhänge zwischen Ursache und Wirkung zu formulieren versuchen, so wie es die Physik und Chemie, die Biologie und die Psychologie herauszubringen bemüht sind." The problem with this description, however, is that it juxtaposes religion and *Weltanschauung* without clarifying their relationship; it also confuses *Weltanschauung* and *Weltbild*, two notions that may not be synonyms: *Weltanschauung* carries the connotation of unscientific propaganda, while *Weltbild* can be that of science or prescientific mentalities.

16. Recent studies have pointed out the connections between magic and the beginnings of science. See G. E. R. Lloyd, *Magic, Reason, and Experience: Studies in the Origins and Development of Greek Science* (Cambridge, 1979).

17. For a collection of important articles covering a wide area of issues, see Brian Vickers, ed., *Occult and Scientific Mentalities in the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1984).

18. See, e.g., Betty Jo Dobbs, *The Foundations of Newton's Alchemy* (Cambridge, 1975); Peter J. French, *John Dee: The World of an Elizabethan Magus* (London, 1972); furthermore, the papers in *Magia naturalis und die Entstehung der modernen Naturwissenschaften, Symposium der Leibniz-Gesellschaft, Hannover, 14. und 15. November 1975*, *Studia Leibnitiana* 7 (Wiesbaden, 1978); Antoine Faivre and Rolf C. Zimmerman, eds., *Epochen der Naturmystik: Hermetische Tradition im wissenschaftlichen Fortschritt* (Berlin, 1979); Wolf-Dieter Müller-Jahncke, *Astrologisch-magische Theorie und Praxis in der Heilkunde der frühen Neuzeit*, *Sudhoffs Archiv* 25 (Wiesbaden, 1985); Walter Pagel, *Religion and Neoplatonism in Renaissance Medicine*, ed. Marianne Winder (London, 1985).

19. This view has been advocated by Murray and Rosalie Wax, "The Magical World View," *JSSR* 1 (1962): 179–88; also by the same authors, "The Notion of Magic," *Current Anthropology* 4 (1963): 495–513.

20. The difficulties for even a working definition can be seen from the one attempted by Kurt Goldammer, "Magie," *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie* 5 (1980): 631: "M.[agie] meint Zauber, abergläubische Handlung, Geheimritual und ist eine durch die Resultate ethnologischer und religionsgeschichtlicher Forschung sehr komplex gewordene, teils wertende, teils wertungsindifferente Bezeichnung für vorwissenschaftliches und 'ausser-rationales' zweckhaftes Handeln des Menschen auf der Grundlage bestimmter Kausalvorstellungen, für eine damit zusammenhängende Weltanschauung, ferner für niedere Religionsformen oder für Religionsderivate und -surrogate, die durch derartiges Verhalten geprägt sind. Die irrationale Komponente und theoretische Grundlage der M. und das oft dahinterstehende metaphysische System sowie ein mit ihr nicht selten verbundenes kompliziertes Ritual schlagen jedenfalls eine Brücke zur Religion."

21. For a very useful collection of magical texts from antiquity in translation, see Georg Luck, "Arcana Mundi": *Magic and Occult in the Greek and Roman Worlds* (Baltimore, 1985).

22. (Chicago, 1986), xli [=GMPT].

23. Hans Dieter Betz, "The Formation of Authoritative Tradition in the Greek Magical Papyri," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 3, *Self-Definition in Greco-Roman World*, ed. Ben F. Meyer and E. P. Sanders (Philadelphia, 1982), 161–70, esp. 163–64.

24. PGM I.127. The Greek texts are quoted by papyrus numbers and lines according to the edition of Karl Preisendanz, ed., *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*, 2 vols., 2d ed. rev. Albert Henrichs (Stuttgart, 1973–74).

25. For references, see Betz, "Formation" (see n. 23), 165–66.

26. See Betz, *GMPT*, 338, s. v. *phylactery*.

27. PGM IV.2081–87: "Most of the magicians, who carried their instruments with them, even put them aside and used him [i.e., the daimon] as an assistant. And they accomplished the preceding things with all dispatch. For [the spell] is free of excessive verbiage, immediately carrying out as it does the preceding things with all ease." The translation is by Edward N. O'Neil in *GMPT*, 74.

28. For a detailed survey, see Francis C. R. Thee, *Julius Africanus and the Early Christian View of Magic*, *HUTH* 19 (Tübingen, 1984), 316–448.

29. Janet H. Johnson, "Introduction to the Demotic Magical Papyri," in *GMPT*, lv.

30. *Ibid.*

31. *Ibid.*

32. Greek inscriptions and influences on Egyptian art begin in the sixth century B.C. See Olivier Masson, with contributions by Geoffrey Thorndike Martin and Richard Vaughan Nicholls, *Carian Inscriptions from North Saqqara and Buhen* (London, 1978).

33. The most conspicuous specimens are the *Stele of Jeu the hieroglyphist*, PGM V.96–172; the prayer in V.459–89—see on this passage the commentary by Marc Philonenko, "Une prière magique au dieu créateur (PGM 5, 459–89)," *CRAI* (1985), 433–52; the love charm in PGM VII.593–619; the *Eighth Book of Moses*, PGM XIII.1–1077; the *Prayer of Jacob*, PGM XXIIIb.1–26 (cf. also James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2 [Garden City, N.Y., 1985], 715–23); an invocation to "the god of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," PGM XXXV.1–42.

34. See PGM IV.1233, 3019; XII.192, 391–92; XIII.289; XLIV.18.

35. Evidence from Christian magic is widely dispersed. For collections of some of the materials, see Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, vol. 2, 209–32; Angelicus M. Kropp, *Ausgewählte koptische Zaubertexte*, 3 vols. (Brussels, 1930–31); idem, *Der Lobpreis des Erzengels Michael (vormals P. Heidelberg Inv. Nr. 1686)* (Brussels, 1966). For surveys and bibliography, see also David E. Aune, "Magic in Early Christianity," in *ANRW* vol. II, pt. 23, sec. 2 (Berlin, 1980), 1507–57.

36. In an earlier paper, I have tried to identify liturgical fragments from the mysteries of the Idaean Dactyls: Betz, "Fragments from a Catabasis Ritual in a Greek Magical Papyrus," *HR* 19 (1980): 287–95; also idem, "The Delphic Maxim 'Know Yourself' in the Greek Magical Papyri," *HR* 21 (1981): 156–71. On the liturgical fragments in PGM LXX see D. Jordan, "A Love Charm with Verses," *ZPE* 72 (1988): 245–59.

37. See on this question, with further bibliography, John G. Griffiths, "Mysterien," *LdÄ* 4 (1982): 276–77; Joris F. Borghouts, "Magie," *LdÄ* 3 (1980): 1137–51; Hartwig Altenmüller, "Magische Literatur," *LdÄ* 3 (1980): 1151–62.

38. Burkert's, "From Telepinus to Thelpusa: In Search of Demeter" (in his *Structure and History* [see n. 3] 123–42), shows that the nature and variety of earlier influences may be rather complicated.

39. *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 226–91. For the interpretation, see N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford, 1979), 228–56; Burkert, "Homo Necans" (see n. 3), 280–81.

40. Ibid. 248, 251–53, 256, 293. In *PGM* the order is frequently given to keep the magic secret; see, e.g., I.41, 146; IV.75, 255–56, 745, 850–51, 923, 1115, 1251, 1870, 2512, etc.

41. See Burkert, "Homo Necans" (see n. 3), 41, n. 29; 269, n. 19. Cf. *σύμβολα μυστικά* at *PGM* III.701; IV. 945. For further references, see Betz, (see n. 36), 291.

42. See Burkert, "Homo Necans" (see n. 3), 265–74: "Myesis and Synthema". For *PGM* see Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, ed. Otto Weinreich (Darmstadt, 1966), 213–18, 256–58; Betz, "Fragments" (see n. 36), 292–93; idem, "Delphic Maxim" (see n. 36), 165–70.

43. The basic edition is by Günther Zuntz, *Persephone* (Oxford, 1971), 277–393. Since then, more gold tablets have been discovered; see the references in Burkert, *Greek Religion* (see n. 3), 293, n. 1; Martin West, *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford, 1983), 22–23, 25–26, 171.

44. Reinhold Merkelbach, *Mithras* (Königstein, 1984), 64–70, 75–77, especially concerning the royal cult at Commagene.

45. For the terminology of *μυστήριον*, *μύστης* (mystery, initiate), see Septuagint Tobit 12:7, 11; Judith 2:2; Wisd. 2:22, 6:22, 8:4, 12:6, 14:15 and 23; Sir. 3:19, 22:22, 27:16–17 and 21; Dan. 2:18–19, 27–30, and 47.

46. See especially 1 Enoch 16:3; 3 Enoch 11:1; Test. Sol., passim. The *Hymn of Orpheus* tells of an initiation and apotheosis of Moses, who is celebrated as the great mystagogue of Israel. *Joseph and Aseneth* contains an elaborate conversion ritual, real or fictitious, that imitates mystery cult initiation ceremonies. For all these texts in English translation and with introductions and notes, see J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vols. 1 and 2 (Garden City, N.Y., 1983 and 1985).

47. Test. XII, *Judah* 12–16 calls Judah's wine-drunkenness his being "in mystery" (*ἐν μυστηρίῳ*), i.e., possessed by Dionysos.

48. The term *raz* (mystery) frequently occurs in the Qumran texts; see Eric Vogt, "Mysteria" in Textibus Qumran, *Bib* 37 (1956): 247–57; Raymond E. Brown, "The Semitic Background of the New Testament *mysterion*," *Bib* 39 (1958): 426–48; *Bib* 40 (1959): 70–87. For the Iranian background, see also Geo Widengren, *Iranisch-semitische Kulturbegegnung in parthischer Zeit* (Köln, 1960), 55, 100.

49. Philo of Alexandria employs the full range of mystery cult terminology. His writings are as yet an unexhausted source for terms and ideas derived from the Greek mysteries. See the study of Joseph Pascher, H ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ ΟΔΟΣ: *Der Königsweg zu Wiedergeburt and Vergottung bei Philon von Alexandria*, Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums vol.17, pts. 3–4 (Paderborn, 1931). See also Betz, *Nachfolge* (see n. 6), 130–36.

50. Philo's mystery cult terminology is mixed with traditions of middle-Platonic philosophy. See especially *Sacr.* 62; *Leg. All.* 3.27, 71, 100; *Quod Deus* 61; *Vita Cont.* 27. Remarkable are also the addresses beginning with *ὦ μύστης* (O initiates); see *Cherub.* 48; *Fuga* 85; *Spec. Leg.* 1. 320.

51. See, e.g., *Virt.* 185; *Vita Mos.* 1.71; *Cherub* 49; *Spec. Leg.* 1.319.

52. See Günther Bornkamm, "μυστήριον, μύστω," *TDNT* 4 (1967): 802–28.

53. Rom. 11:25, 16:25; 1 Cor. 2:1 and 7, 4:1, 13:2, 14:2, 15:51.

54. Eph. 1:9; 3:3, 4, and 9; 5:32; 6:19.

55. Col. 1:26 and 27; 2:2; 4:3.

56. This expression is unique in the New Testament, but cf. 1 Enoch 16:3; Test. XII, *Judah* 12–16; Test. of Sol., passim; Sibyll. Or. 8:56 and 58; IQM 14:9; IQH 5:36; Joseph. *BJ* 1.470; Matt. 24:12; Did. 16:4; Hermas, *Mand.* 8:3; Barn. 14:5, 15:7, 18:2.

57. For the translation and notes, see Edward N. O'Neil, in *GMPT* 4–8 and the glossary, 332–33, s.v. assistant daimon (*paredros*).

58. The translation is that of Marvin W. Meyer, in *GMPT*, 48–54; for commentary, see Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (see n. 42), which is still indispensable; furthermore, Roger Beck, "Mithraism since Franz Cumont," *ANRW* Vol. II, pt. 17, sec. 4 (1984): 2002–2115.

59. See, for this debate, Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, (see n. 42), 29–30, 230–32, 234–40, 250; also Marvin W. Meyer, *The "Mithras Liturgy"* (Missoula, Mont., 1976) vii–viii; Hans-Josef Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief*, (Münster, 1982), 156–58; 301, n. 97; 339, n. 31; Maarten J. Vermaseren, "La soteriologia dans les Papyrus Graecae Magicae," in *La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell' impero romano*, ed. U. Bianchi and M. J. Vermaseren, *EPRO* 93 (Leiden, 1982), 17–30, esp. 25.

60. See also Reinhold Merkelbach, *Weihegrade und Seelenlehre der Mithras-mysterien* (Opladen, 1982); idem, *Mithras* (see n. 44), 77–146.

61. Phenomenologically, this situation corresponds to the phenotype of the magician, working as an individual craftsman with, perhaps, one apprentice. There appears to be no trace in *PGM* of connections with larger religious communities or institutions. See Walter Burkert, "Craft versus Sect: The Problem of Orphics and Pythagoreans," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 3 (see n. 23), 1–22.

62. The origins and precise nature of Jewish influences in *PGM* constitute an unresolved problem. See Ludwig Blau, *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen* (Strasbourg, 1898); Michael Morgan, "Sepher Ha-Razim": *The Book of Mysteries* (Chico, Calif., 1983).

63. For Moses as a mystagogue of Israel, see the *Hymn of Orpheus* mentioned above (n. 46) and the passages from Philo noted above (nn. 49–51). On the whole subject, see John G. Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*, SBL Monograph Series 16 (Nashville, Tenn., 1972), 134–61; furthermore, Raphael Patai, "Biblical Figures As Alchemists," *HUCA* 54 (1983): 195–229, esp. 213–29 ("Moses the Alchemist").

64. For the mysteries of Aphrodite, see Martin P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, vol.1, 3d ed., (Munich, 1967), 524.

65. For literature and references, see Betz *GMPT*, 83, n. 314.

66. Sam. Eitrem, "Die rituelle ΔΙΑΒΟΛΗ," *SO* 2 (1924): 43–61.

67. Probably an epithet of Selene; see, *GMPT* Betz, 322, s.v. *Aktiophis*.

68. Translated by Edward N. O'Neil, in *GMPT*, 83.

69. See, on the mystery scandals, Burkert, *Greek Religion* (see n. 3), 316–17, also 296, 299; idem, "Homo Necans" (see n. 3), 252–53; Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, vol. 2, 2d ed. (Munich 1961), 90–91; George E. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton, 1961), 298–99.

70. Translated by Edward N. O'Neil, in *GMPT*, 85.

71. See Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 1.66.4; also 1.54, 56, and 62.1–2; *Dial.* 70.5; furthermore, *Apol.* 1.57–58, 2.5–6 and 8. On the whole subject, see Klauck, *Herrenmahl* (see n. 59), 139–41.

72. See Klauck, *Herrenmahl* (see n. 59), 264–72.

Magika Hiera

Ancient Greek Magic and Religion

EDITED BY

Christopher A. Faraone

Dirk Obbink

New York Oxford

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1991

Magika Hiera

Ancient Greek Magic and Religion

EDITED BY

Christopher A. Faraone

Dirk Obbink

New York Oxford

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1991