

Sophia Alkhoury

Chapter 7

Addressing the Gods with Verse and Incense: Hymns and Offerings in GEMF 57

1 Introduction

It has been a matter of some debate as to what to call the metrical *logoi* that are addressed to a variety of deities in the *Greco-Egyptian Magical Formularies*.¹ Despite their original classification as “hymns” in the edition of Karl Preisendanz, some scholars have argued that these metrical portions ought to be excluded from the genre of “hymn,” and should be categorized instead as “magical prayers.”² In order to justify this recategorization, reference has been made to the coercive nature of some of these metrical *logoi*, as well as the definite, concrete requests that they contain. This mode is opposed by some to the submissive tone and indefinite requests for general benevolence that are more characteristic of the religious hymn. Such a view is taken by William Furley and Jan Bremer, who, in the introduction to their collected edition *Greek Hymns*, note that “since . . . the magical hymns are less hymns in the sense of religious songs than prayers spoken in private by a magical practitioner, we omit them from this collection.”³ I argue that the division between “indefinite” requests and subservient attitude as characteristic of *religious hymns* and “definite” requests and coercive stance as characteristic of *magical prayers* is untenable. In fact, many of the GEMF metrical *logoi* share essential aspects and functions with traditional cultic hymns, to such a degree that they fit naturally into the genre of “hymn.”⁴

1 See for example Szepes (1976), Furley/Bremer (2001) 47–48, Blanco Cesteros (2013), Björklund (2015), Petrovic (2015), and Blanco Cesteros (2020).

2 See for example Szepes (1976) especially 207 and 224: “*In our opinion, the verses of the PGM called hymns are prayers*, because they contain magic compelling elements, while the magic element is not the main essential quality of the hymns, even if they begin with an invocation, as a remembrance of their origin from the prayer, and they contain only aretology, promise and eventually mild request that has an *indefinite content*, and is directed only to gaining of benevolence. *The prayer turns to the deity always with a definite request*” (original emphasis).

3 Furley/Bremer (2001) 47–48. The editors cite Szepes (1976) in the explanation for their omission.

4 See Zellmann-Rohrer, chapter 6 in this volume for a discussion of the prosody of the metrical *logoi* in GEMF 57 and the similarities of these compositions in this regard to earlier Greek cultic hymns.

Note: I would like to thank Christopher Faraone and Sofia Torallas Tovar for their help with formulating various drafts of this paper. I am grateful, also, to Korshi Dosoo, Radcliffe Edmonds III, Jonathan Hall, Julia Irons, Nathan Katkin, Patrice Rankine, and Benjamin Yates for their constructive comments on my work.

One such convergence is the shared concern to create a positive reciprocal relationship with the deity addressed by means of pleasing words scaffolded by material offerings. I address this combination of ritual activity — singing hymns and making offerings to the gods — in what follows here. In order to make my case, I examine the content of the metrical *logoi* themselves, as well as the material offerings that are performed with the hymns, and offer comparanda drawn from the ritual practices of traditional Greek cult and Dionysian mystery cult.⁵ My aim is to better understand how, in coordination with a poetic performance, different types of offerings contribute to the creation of a positive or negative relationship with the divinities addressed in GEMF 57. Perceiving this underlying motive will shine a light on the characterization of the metrical *logoi* themselves, and will show how the majority of them do indeed conform to the expectations of the genre of hymn.

2 Hymns in the GEMF

It will first be helpful to clarify what is meant by “hymn” in order to establish a vocabulary for the present study. This is a much-discussed question, and perhaps one that cannot be answered in light of the difficulties inherent in establishing “emic” categories. Nevertheless, we might try to establish a conceptual framework. Building on previous scholarship, I adhere to the following working definition of the genre of hymn for my discussion of the metrical sections of the magical formularies, all too aware that such categories are never neatly delineated.⁶ A hymn, for the purposes of this

5 N.B. that the ritual practices of Egyptian, Jewish, and polytheistic Near Eastern cults are also fruitful avenues for comparison in this regard, but considerations of space preclude such a study for the present paper.

6 Bremer (1981) 193 sets up the distinction between “hymn” and “prayer” as one relating to meter: “a hymn is a sung prayer.” Furlley/Bremer (2001) 11 reject this definition as too simplistic in their edition *Greek Hymns*, drawing upon ancient evidence from Plato, Didymos, Proklos, and Alexandrian editors to form a new conceptualization of the genre: “any song celebrating or petitioning a divinity”. Szepes (1976) 224 argues for a strict differentiation between hymn and prayer, in which hymns contain invocations, aretalogies, promises, and indefinite requests for benevolence, while prayers address the deity with a definite request. Szepes shows an over-reliance on evidence from rhapsodic hymns such as the corpus of *Homeric Hymns*, and fails to account for epigraphic attestations of actual cultic hymns, an examination of which quickly problematizes the proposed distinction. Pulleyn (1997) 44–47 argues against Bremer’s earlier definition of hymn as sung prayer, maintaining that hymns are artistically elaborated and do not necessarily involve any request. Indeed, he says that prayer and hymn are two separate genres, their difference lying in their function: “the hymn is clearly seen as a gift or offering, an *agalma* for the god” (49). He argues that hymns, unlike prayers, serve the function of “negotiable commodities,” comparable to sacrifice or libation, which might be used to establish a reciprocal relationship of *charis* with the deity; Pulleyn (1997) 50–1; thus Depew (2000) 60, 62. Nevertheless, Pulleyn (1997) 46–47 says, a hymn can contain a prayer, and a hymn can be varying degrees of “prayerful”, as in the case of the prayerful cletic hymns which request the presence of a god. It seems

paper, is a poetic speech act addressed to a deity, serving as an *agalma*, or pleasing gift, with the aim of establishing a relationship of *charis*, or reciprocal good will. Indeed, ancient critics interpreted the term ὕμνος widely, including works produced for different cultic performance contexts and pursuing a variety of aims within a system of reciprocity (e.g. praise, thanksgiving, petition) — our own definitions should likewise reflect this heterogeneity.⁷

There are thirteen metrical *logoi* in GEMF 57 distributed throughout eleven procedures.⁸ In Preisendanz's edition of the magical formularies, hymns that are in a fragmentary condition are reconstructed by means of reference to similar portions better preserved elsewhere in the corpus. Preisendanz compiles the hymns, often heavily reconstructed, in an appendix to his edition, and labels them with an Arabic numeral.⁹ It should be noted that similar — but not identical — metrical *logoi* that appear in multiple locations are given the same numeric designation by Preisendanz, such as B.1a and B.1b (Hymn 19), but must be treated as separate entities.¹⁰

The hymns in GEMF 57 are addressed to gods such as Helios, Aphrodite, Typhon, Selene, Artemis, and Hekate, although they are often identified with Egyptian deities and Jewish angels.¹¹ GEMF 57 is, however, the only handbook that features metrical *logoi* ad-

to me that a problem lies within the use of the word “prayer” to describe both the genre of speech act as well as the mode of address. By this I mean that a hymn that is “prayerful” in Pulleyn’s conception does not necessarily *contain* a prayer, viz. a section which conforms to the genre of “prayer,” but uses a mode of address that is shared with the genre of prayer, viz. a petition. In this understanding, a speech act could be classified as a hymn which contains a *petition*, which brings it closer to the genre of *prayer*, while not containing a discreet *prayer* section.

7 See Furley/Bremer (2001) 8–14. On this topic, their quote from Proklos’ *Chrestomathia*, as transmitted by Photius in his *Bibliotheca*, is especially relevant: ἐκάλουν δὲ καθόλου πάντα τὰ εἰς τοὺς ὑπερέχοντας γραφόμενα ὕμνους· διὸ καὶ τὸ προσόδιον καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ προειρημένα φαίνονται ἀντιδιατέλλοντες τῷ ὕμνῳ ὡς εἶδη πρὸς γένος· καὶ γὰρ ἔστιν αὐτῶν ἀκούειν γραφόντων ὕμνος προσοδίου, ὕμνος ἐγκωμίου, ὕμνος παιάνος καὶ τὰ ὅμοια, “they (sc. previous authorities) called generically all compositions to the gods hymns. That is the reason why one finds them relating the prosodion and the other genres already mentioned to the hymn as species to genus. For one can observe them writing (sc. such expressions as): ‘prosodion–hymn’ or ‘enkomion–hymn’ or ‘paian–hymn’ and the like” (*Bibl.* 320a12–17). Text from Henry (1967) and translation from Furley/Bremer (2001).

8 See Zellmann–Rohrer, chapter 6 in this volume.

9 In this paper, I will refer to Preisendanz’s numbering system alongside Zellmann–Rohrer’s new numbering system from this volume.

10 The two iterations of this hymn are located at GEMF 57/PGM IV 2574–2610 and 2643–2674. Preisendanz (1974) includes his reconstructions of all of the distinct hymns at vol. 2, 237–266. For a tabulation of all of the hymns, their Arabic numerals, and their locations in the PGM, see Preisendanz (1974) vol. 2, 266.

11 Bortolani (2016) 14 notes that there seems to be a main division between the hymns addressed to the solar/creative/male deity, and the hymns addressed to the lunar/chthonic/female deity, with identities being intermingled throughout their respective categories — Apollo and Helios are often assimilated to each other within the same hymn, as are Hekate, Selene, and Artemis. External to these categories are the hymns addressed to Hermes, Aphrodite, and Typhon, who do not fit into the two

dressed to female deities. The last thousand or so lines — nearly one third of the handbook — are predominated by hymns dedicated to the composite lunar–chthonic goddess, named variously as Hekate, Selene, or Artemis, and one hymn, unique in the entirety of the magical formularies, to Aphrodite. The metrical *logoi* in GEMF 57 belong to procedures of three types: divination, erotic attraction (*agōgē*), and all-purpose (*omnium-gatherum*).¹² Nearly without exception, hymns sung in the course of divination procedures are addressed to solar/creative/male deities, hymns in *agōgē* procedures are addressed to lunar/chthonic/female deities, and hymns in *omnium-gatherum* procedures are addressed to both male and female deities.¹³

The vast majority of metrical *logoi* in the GEMF are composed in dactylic hexameters. However, GEMF 57 is exceptional in that it includes compositions in iambic trimeter and iambic tetrameter catalectic, as well as hexameters.¹⁴ Prosody is not a feature incidental to the composition of a *logos*, but is rather an integral characteristic of the song itself, which can tell us about the prehistory of the song as it appears in GEMF 57 and which has bearing on our analysis of the tone and content of the practitioner's words.¹⁵ The majority of the metrical *logoi* under discussion here — ten out of thirteen compositions (77%) — contain pleasing and supplicatory language. These hymns, which may be classed as *agalmata*, praise the god and either ask for a favor or support a request for one within a system of reciprocity. These hymnic compositions are most frequently composed in dactylic hexameter, a meter traditionally associated with epic, as well as both rhapsodic and cultic hymns (e.g. the Homeric Hymns and the more contemporary Orphic Hymns).¹⁶ This meter thus lent itself in earlier

predominate sub-groups — their identities remain distinct in their respective hymns; Bortolani (2016) 51–54. Having explored the characteristics of the two main categories (solar/creative/male and lunar/chthonic/female) in terms of deities addressed, language, style, and the cultural backgrounds that each evinces, Bortolani notes that the Apollonian sub-section of the solar/creative/male hymns show “a higher degree of continuity with the standard style of Greek hymnography” than others (Bortolani (2016) 354). Thus, it will be important that our evidence not be too heavily weighted towards the Apollonian metrical *logoi*.

¹² See Zellmann-Rohrer, chapter 6 in this volume.

¹³ Bortolani (2016) 337. The sole exception in GEMF 57 is Hymn 4a (= C.2a) to Helios–Horus (a solar–creator god) at lines 437–462, sung during an *agōgē* procedure.

¹⁴ See Zellmann-Rohrer, chapter 6 in this volume, who calculates that there are five *logoi* composed in iambic meters and eight composed in dactylic hexameter. He notes that verses of each kind are represented in nearly equal proportions, with 197 lines arranged in iambic verses and 208 in dactylic verses.

¹⁵ For a discussion of this topic, see Zellmann-Rohrer, chapter 6 in this volume.

¹⁶ Two exceptions are Hymn 6 (= A.1, GEMF 57/PGM IV 179–201) to Seth–Typhon and A.2 (Hymn 25, GEMF 57/PGM IV 1399–1434) to Hekate, written in iambic trimeter. Zellmann-Rohrer suggests that the choice to address such chthonic powers in an iambic meter “may draw on iambic accounts of descent to the underworld and instructions for way-finding there” (Zellmann-Rohrer, chapter 6 in this volume).

periods to the praise of humans and gods, a function that plays out in the praise-laden hexametrical compositions of GEMF 57.¹⁷

Three *logoi*, however, do not serve to please the god but either to threaten them directly or to recount slanderous sacrifices committed by other (fictive) worshippers.¹⁸ These exceptional compositions should not be understood as contributing to the maintenance of a relationship of *charis* between mortal and deity. Since they instead serve to coerce their divine addressees into action, they ought not to be considered hymns, but rather coercive speech acts in verse. These coercive *logoi* are not composed in dactylic hexameter, but instead in iambic trimeter and iambic tetrameter catalectic. From an early period, iambics were used for poetry of abuse and blame, such as that composed by Archilochos and Hipponax.¹⁹ Although the uses of iambics had expanded by the period in which GEMF 57 was composed, it is likely that these earlier functions continue to resonate in the meter selected for these slanderous and abusive compositions.²⁰

Interesting effects emerge when we take into account the placement of the metrical *logoi* within the sub-formularies, or “blocks,” identified by Lynn LiDonnici as having circulated independently before being compiled into GEMF 57 or its predecessor (see Table 1).²¹ In particular, we can note that the only blocks that include hymns to female deities are Block 3 (a hymn to Hekate in her purely chthonic aspect), Block 5 (a series of hymns and coercive *logoi* to the composite lunar-chthonic Hekate-Selene-Artemis), and Block 6 (a hymn to Aphrodite). Indeed, the hymns in these blocks are addressed exclusively to female deities. As the only blocks with hymns addressed to female deities, Blocks 3, 5, and 6 show a particular affinity for hymns used in *agōgē* and *omnium-gatherum* procedures. On the other hand, Block 2 is the only block in GEMF 57 that contains hymns attached to divination procedures, marking it out as distinct

¹⁷ See Zellmann-Rohrer, chapter 6 in this volume.

¹⁸ A.3 (Hymn 17, GEMF 57/PGM IV 2242–2346) to Hekate-Selene-Artemis threatens the goddess within the *logos*, and B.1a (Hymns 19a, 2574–2610) and B.1b (19b, 2643–2674) are two versions of a similar slanderous account, a *diabolē*, of a fictive, perverse sacrifice. Petrovic (2015) 259–260 calls such compositions “anti-hymns.” On the heterogeneity of the GEMF metrical *logoi*, see also Blanco Cesteros (2020). Note that Zellmann-Rohrer has found that the threatening portion of what Preisendanz calls Hymn 22 is actually not metrical, although it has “dactylic rhythm and epic diction” (Zellmann-Rohrer, chapter 6 in this volume). The hexametrical lines are 2915–2939, which contain a pleasing and supplicatory address to the divinity, with an enumeration of her epithets, powers, and deeds. Unusually, this type of address is here labelled as an *ἐπάναγκος*, as opposed to the more usual *λόγος*, but will be classed as a hymn for the purpose of this paper on the basis of the contents of the *logos* itself, rather than the incongruent lemma attached.

¹⁹ Cf. Zellmann-Rohrer, chapter 6 in this volume.

²⁰ See Graf (2014) 399 for the resonance of blame in late period iambic verses, discussing grave inscriptions.

²¹ These originally independent blocks have been hypothesized by Lynn LiDonnici and refined by Raquel Martín Hernández and Sofía Torallas Tovar. See LiDonnici (2003)/(2022) and Martín Hernández and Torallas Tovar, chapter 3 in this volume.

from the rest of the formulary.²² We can also observe that the coercive speech acts in verse are confined to Block 5, suggesting that the earlier redactors of this hypothesized sub-formulary had a particular interest in this mode of address. Finally, Block 5 is unique in another respect — LiDonnici suggests that this block is particularly marked out by its use of Greek imagery and verse forms “involving a Graeco–Roman constellation of goddesses.”²³

3 Material Offerings in the GEMF

Having reviewed the character of the hymns themselves, we may now turn to an investigation of the offerings prescribed in conjunction with them.²⁴ The most common label for offerings in the GEMF is ἐπίθυμα, deriving from the verb ἐπιθύω, literally, “to sacrifice upon [an altar vel sim].”²⁵ Sarah Iles Johnston has shown that the animal and vegetal offerings of the magical formularies cannot be understood as radically different from those used in religious rites, but rather as an extension of the ideology that underlies traditional cultic practices. In particular, the rites prescribed in the magical formularies are consistent with those of traditional cult in that the practitioner offers pleasant things to the deity to create a positive relationship. She notes that the opposite operation, particular to the magical handbooks — that the practitioner offers unpleasant things to create a negative, coercive relationship — also functions in accordance with the logic of traditional cultic ritual.²⁶ Fritz Graf has argued, however, that there are intentional reversals of traditional cultic practices in the offerings prescribed in the magical formularies, but he emphasizes that these offerings oppose rites performed in hon-

22 C.2a (Hymn 4a., GEMF 57/PGM IV 437–462), which features in Block 2a, shows some peculiarities: it is the only hymn in the entirety of the GEMF that addresses a solar/creative/male god in the course of an *agōgē* procedure. Hymns to male deities sung during divination and *omnia-gatherum* procedures are the norm. It is also the only hymn attached to an *agōgē* procedure in Block 2. This *agōgē* procedure, and within it Hymn 4a, may have been included in this block, as LiDonnici (2003) suggests, as a pre-formed unit with the divination procedure that came before it: “a short roll with one really good divination and one really good erotic binding spell might have been a desirable item in many households” (155). The divinatory feature of this hypothesized two-spell role would have warranted its inclusion in Block 2a of GEMF 57 or its predecessor.

23 LiDonnici (2003) 176.

24 Unfortunately, Galoppin (2025) was published while I was in the process of making final edits to this paper, and so I was unable to incorporate his findings here.

25 LSJ s.v. ἐπίθυμα and ἐπιθύω. Similarly, the imperative form of the related verb, ἐπιθύε is generally used, along with the aorist participle, ἐπιθύcas. On the vocabulary of offering in the formularies, see Zografou (2013) 25–34.

26 See Johnston (2002).

Table 1: GEMF 57 metrical *logoi* (asterisk denotes coercive speech act in verse).

LiDonnici's block and GEMF lines	Hymn # and GEMF lines	Deity Addressed	Procedure Type	Meter
1: 1–153	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
2a: 154–467	Hymn 6 (A.1): 179–201	Seth–Typhon	Divination	Iambic Trimeter
	Hymn 7 (C.1): 261–273	Seth–Typhon	Divination	Dactylic Hexameter
	Hymn 4a (C.2a): 437–462	Helios–Horus	<i>agōgē</i>	Dactylic Hexameter
2b: 467–849	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
2c: 850–1264	Hymn 3 (C.3): 939–948	Horus–Harpokrates	Divination	Dactylic Hexameter
2d: 1265–1389	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
3: 1390–1927	Hymn 25 (A.2): 1399–1434	Hekate	<i>agōgē</i>	Iambic Trimeter
4: 1928–2240	Hymn 4b (C.2b): 1956–1989	Helios–Horus	<i>omn. –gath.</i>	Dactylic Hexameter
5a: 2241–2440	Hymn 17 (A.3): 2242–2346*	Hekate–Selene–Artemis	<i>omn. –gath.</i>	Iambic Trimeter
5b: 2441–2942	Hymn 20 (C.4): 2522–2567	Hekate–Selene–Artemis	<i>agōgē</i>	Dactylic Hexameter
	Hymn 19a (B.1a): 2574–2610*	Hekate–Selene–Artemis	<i>agōgē</i>	Iambic Tetrameter
	Hymn 19b (B.1b): 2643–2674*	Hekate–Selene–Artemis	<i>omn. –gath.</i>	Iambic Tetrameter
	Hymn 21 (C.5): 2714–2783	Hekate–Selene–Artemis	<i>agōgē</i>	Dactylic Hexameter
	Hymn 18 (C.6): 2786–2870	Hekate–Selene–Artemis	<i>omn. –gath.</i>	Dactylic Hexameter
6: 2943–3274	Hymn 22 (C.7): 2915–2939	Aphrodite	<i>agōgē</i>	Dactylic Hexameter

our of the Olympian deities, not religious rites altogether.²⁷ Graf notes that “la magie utilise des formes traditionnelles, organise selon des combinaisons nouvelles.”²⁸

Previous scholarship on offerings in the magical formularies have looked at this feature separately from the act of singing hymns. I intend to show that both aspects of ritual practice functioned together primarily to create a positive reciprocal relationship between practitioner and god. A detailed investigation of the offerings attached to the GEMF hymns specifically would benefit our understanding of how the practitioners of the magical formularies conceived of and influenced their relationship to the deity addressed, a fundamental feature of the practice of hymning. Having done so, we may then compare this combined approach of the GEMF to its counterpart in traditional cultic and Orphic rites, and discuss how the act of sacrificing relates to the act of hymning. In both spheres of action — sacrificing material goods and singing songs — we will find that the practitioner offers up pleasing things (*agalmata*) to the deity in order to found a relationship based on mutual good will (*charis*).²⁹ The magical formularies present readers with limited and particular extensions of this ritual logic, which this paper will also address.

We must first familiarize ourselves with the offerings prescribed in tandem with the hymns of the magical formularies. In total, there are eleven procedures in GEMF 57 that include one or two metrical sections. Out of these eleven, nine procedures include offerings together with the verse *logoi*. This gives us a rate of 82% of GEMF 57 verse-containing procedures that have offerings prescribed as part of the praxis.³⁰ If we look at the rest of the procedures from GEMF 57 — i.e. those that do not contain verse sections — the rate at which offerings are prescribed is only 43%. Thus, I would suggest that there is a high degree of correspondence between the act of addressing the gods in verse form and the act of using offerings to influence one’s relationship to these same gods, for better or for worse. This is especially pronounced in GEMF 57, seeing as the rate at which procedures with verse sections also contain offerings drops to 50% if we look at all of the handbooks except for GEMF 57.

Only three out of the eleven procedures in GEMF 57 that include metrical sections explicitly mention the offerings within the hymn itself: Hymn 25 (= A.2), Hymn 20 (= C.4),

²⁷ See Graf (1991) 195–6. See also Graf (1994) 256–261 for the “reversals” of traditional cultic practice at work in the rites described by the GEMF.

²⁸ Graf (1994) 259. Cf. Wilburn (2012) 85.

²⁹ N.B.: the term ἄγαλμα is not used to refer to a material sacrifice or hymn in the GEMF, but I employ it here as a useful conceptual category for the various pleasing gifts (material or verbal) that may be presented to a deity.

³⁰ If we account for Petrovic’s idea of the “anti-hymn” described in Petrovic (2015) 259–260 and thus remove the threatening A.3 (Hymn 17, GEMF 57/PGM IV 2242–2346) and both iterations of the slander spell, B.1a/b (Hymn 19, 2574–2610 and 2643–2674), from our account, we would be left with a total of nine procedures that contain pleasing hymns, eight with offerings prescribed as part of the praxis (89%).

and Hymn 18 (= C.6).³¹ This has led some scholars to oust the metrical *logoi* collectively from the genre of hymn, noting that the practitioner often does not make promises to their gods, but rather compels them to action. For example, Heta Björklund argues that a key difference between the GEMF “verse–form prayers” and traditional “cultic hymns” is that the former merely request that the deity act on behalf of the practitioner, while the latter make explicit promises of gifts to the gods in the song itself and thus engage in reciprocity (the formula for such promises is *do ut des*, “I give so that you may give”).³² However, although only a few GEMF hymns explicitly mention any offerings, this does not mean that the *do ut des* agreement is not implicitly active in the magical hymns. On the one hand, the hymn *per se* serves as an *agalma*, an offering, to the deity.³³ Additionally, as we have seen above, the great majority of hymns in GEMF 57 prescribe physical offerings in addition to the song, even if they are not explicitly mentioned in the hymn itself. It therefore cannot be maintained that the singers of the hymns in the magical formularies do not uphold their side of the bargain (the “do” in *do ut des*) in their reciprocal relationship with the gods.³⁴ It should be noted, however, that the offerings prescribed as part of the procedures in GEMF 57 do have certain peculiarities with which to reckon in the following.

Out of all of the offerings that the handbook prescribes with the metrical *logoi*, none features a simple blood sacrifice of a domestic animal. The most common type of offering is a portion of aromatic vegetal matter (such pleasant-smelling vegetal offerings will be henceforth referred to as “incense”), sometimes mixed with a small portion of animal product (such as fat, hair, or brains).³⁵ Varieties of vegetal matter commonly offered in the formularies include frankincense, myrrh, storax, pinecones,

31 A.2 (Hymn 25) is found at GEMF 57/PGM IV 1399–1434, C.4 (Hymn 20) at 2522–2567, and C.6 (Hymn 18) at 2786–2870.

32 In light of a relative absence of the explicit promise to provide an offering in the GEMF hymns, Björklund (2015) comes to the conclusion that: “the most striking difference to cultic hymns is that in cultic hymns the closing part is usually a promise from the worshipper to the deity (*do ut des*), not a request to action (“perform this for me . . .”). The key element in magical verse, then, is the compelling of the deity to action on behalf of the worshipper” (42). Note that in support of this conclusion, Szepes (1976) is cited.

33 Björklund (2015) notes this, despite her argument that these magical verses compel the deity to action (42). See also Depew (2000) who argues that the performance itself of a cultic hymn fulfills the function of an offering in the *do ut des* reciprocity that underlies the act of asking for a favor from the god (62).

34 Björklund (2015) overemphasizes the importance of animal victims in order to fulfil the “*do ut des*” promise: “in classical Greek religion, the offering of fat and bones of the sacrificial animal to the gods was an essential part of any rite . . .” (44–45). We have already discussed the status of the hymn as an offering, and I will argue for the importance of non-animal offerings below.

35 For the preponderance of incense offerings in GEMF 57, see Faraone (2021a) 178–179 and Faraone (2022a) 369–371, 375.

saffron, wormwood, bdellium, costus root, malabar, cassia, cumin, sage, cinnamon, and the famous Egyptian composite incense, *kyphi*.³⁶ These substances are all characterized by strong aromatic smells, which, when burned, travel upwards to the heavens in clouds of smoke. Animal matter that is commonly offered includes both animal products and by-products. For the former, we can identify matter from species such as the rooster, goat, dove, ram, donkey, beetle, frog, wolf, coot, field mouse, crab, hamadryas baboon, dog, and ibis. For the latter, milk, especially that of a black cow, honey, the dung of various animals, and ibis eggs are attested. The preponderance of incense offerings is noted by Jonathan Z. Smith, who argues that in the GEMF, “the chief ritual is that of sacrifice, most commonly of generic incense . . . By contrast to these common vegetal offerings, sacrifices *wholly* made up of animal victims or products are rare” (his emphasis).³⁷ Keeping in mind the frequency and ritual significance

36 Dioscorides is an important source on the ancient uses of these sometimes-obscure vegetal ingredients. On frankincense (λίβανος/λιβανωτός), see Dioscorides, *Mat. Med.* 1.68, who notes the sweet smell of the aromatic gum, as well as its cleansing and healing properties; on myrrh (ζιύρνα in the formularies, also spelled κυύρνα), 1.64, where the author describes the aromatic, bitter, pungent, heating, and desiccative qualities of the substance along with its medicinal uses; on storax (στόραξ), 1.66, which describes its strong scent, warming properties, and medicinal uses; on pinecones (στρούβιλοι), see 1.69 on the pine (πίτυς), especially regarding the pine cone and the pine nuts within, described as astringent and warming, with healing properties; on saffron (κρόκος), 1.26, which describes the substance as attractive in scent and pungent, with medicinal and aphrodisiac properties; on wormwood (άρτεμισία), see 3.113–114 (there are two plants to which the same name may refer), wherein the medicinal properties and fragrance of the herbs are described; on bdellium (βδέλλιον/βδέλλα), 1.67, which notes the sweet smell of the fumes when the sap is burned and its medicinal properties; on costus root (κόστος), 1.16, where the author describes the warm and sweet properties of the plant, with its various medicinal uses; on malabar (μαλάβαθρον), 1.12, which describes the over-powering sweet smell of the plant and its medical benefits; on cassia (κασία), 1.13, where the plant is described as pungent, astringent, warming, desiccative, burning, spicy, and smelling of wine or roses, with medicinal properties; on cumin (κόμινον), see 3.59, with its warming, drying, and astringent properties and medicinal uses; on sage (σφάγγον), 3.33, where the author describes the highly aromatic nature of the herb, and its medical benefits; on cinnamon (κιννάμωμον), 1.14, which describes the sweet aroma of the plant and its warming and medicinal properties. Recipes for *kyphi* are recorded in Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 80; Dioscorides, *Mat. Med.* 1.25; Galen, *Antid.* 2.2; Paul of Aegina, 7.22.4–5. Plutarch lists the following sixteen ingredients, but accounts differ: μέλιτος καὶ οἴνου καὶ σταφίδος καὶ κυπέρου, ῥήτινης τε καὶ κυύρνης καὶ ἀσπαλάθου καὶ σεσέλευς, ἔτι δὲ σχίνου τε καὶ ἀσφάλτου καὶ θρύου καὶ λαπάθου, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἀρκευθίδων ἀμφοῖν, ὧν τὴν μὲν μείζονα τὴν δ' ἐλάττωνα καλοῦσι, καὶ καρδαμώμου καὶ καλάμου, “honey, wine, raisins, cyperus, resin, myrrh, aspalathus, seselis, mastich, bitumen, rush, sorrel, and in addition to these both the junipers, of which they call one the larger and one the smaller, cardamum, and calamus” (Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 80). Text and translation from Babbitt (1936).

37 Smith (1995) 23. On the rarity of animal offerings and the specific modes of offering animals in the GEMF, see also Zografou (2008) 7–10, (2013) 35 and 66–69, and Dosoo (2014) 441–470. For the great popularity of incense as an offering in the GEMF, see also LiDonnici (2001) 66, Zografou (2013) 35–54, Ristorto (2019) 247, and Faraone (2021a) 178–179. Faraone notes the particular abundance of offerings of incense in GEMF 57.

of pleasant-smelling incense offerings in the magical formularies, we will now take a closer look at a few examples of offerings prescribed alongside the singing of hymns.

The first offering to consider is part of the rite attached to Hymn 4b (= C.2b), addressed to Helios–Horus.³⁸ The offering is described thus: ἐπιθύσας ἄρμαρα καὶ λίβανον ἄτμητον ἀναχώραι, “burn armara and uncut frankincense and withdraw.”³⁹ This hymn is to be sung “for whatever business you may want” (ἐφ’ αἷς ἐὰν χρήζω πραγματίας), and is marked by precatory and praising language.⁴⁰ Emphasis is placed upon the supremacy of Helios who rules the heavens, the earth, Chaos, and Hades, and the practitioner requests that the god should come to him without anger. After this hymn is performed, frankincense is to be burned with ἄρμαρα. The former substance is an aromatic gum resin that is frequently burned as incense in the magical formularies. The latter substance is offered rather more rarely, mentioned only one other time in the entirety of the GEMF handbooks, earlier in this codex. The LSJ includes this as a variant spelling of ἀρμαλά, which the first-century CE Greek physician Dioscorides lists as an alternative name for πήγανον ἄγριον, a species of an evergreen shrub called “rue.”⁴¹ This offering is characterized by smells that would be pleasing to the deity, establishing a pleasant relationship between the practitioner and the supernatural forces that they address.⁴² Thus this type of sacrifice is in complete accordance with the ritual logic familiar to us from other cultic contexts: a beneficent and pleasing offering is made to accompany a beneficent and pleasing song. In five out of the eleven procedures under consideration in this paper, a pleasant offering and a pleasant hymn mutually amplify the goodwill between the practitioner and the deity addressed. With this accordance in mind, we will now turn to some cases where the ritual logic is seemingly reversed or obscured.

The most obvious case is when the rite is labelled explicitly as compulsive, usually as an alternative to a beneficent offering, to be used if the practitioner has not yet achieved the intended results of the procedure after a certain number of days. The difference between the two modes of interaction with the god is nicely illustrated in the following instructions, part of an *omnium-gatherum* ritual that includes the second iter-

³⁸ For C.2b (Hymn 4b) see GEMF 57/PGM IV 1956–1989.

³⁹ GEMF 57/PGM IV 1990–1991. All GEMF 57/PGM IV text and translations are from GEMF vol. 2 (forthcoming).

⁴⁰ GEMF 57/PGM IV 1953–1954.

⁴¹ Dioscorides, *Mat. Med.* 3.46. Dioscorides notes that the plant is “oppressive in scent” (βαρύοσμα), a word that he often uses to describe other aromatic plant matter, for example savin juniper (1.76), pine thistle (3.8), woundwort (3.48), rosemary (3.75), and the resin of sulfurtwort, said to be similar to frankincense (3.78).

⁴² For the idea that the gods find the smell of sacrifice pleasant, see Zografou (2008) 10: “si les sacrifices sanglants sont rares dans les papyri, les fumigations y abondent. Les dieux grecs aiment les parfums.” See also Dosoo/Galoppin (2022) 234.

ation of Preisendanz's Hymn 19 (= B.1b), addressed to Hekate–Selene–Artemis.⁴³ The prescription for the beneficent offering comes first:

ἔστιν οὖν τὸ ἐπίθυμα τὸ ἀγαθοποιόν, ὃ θύεις πρώτη καὶ δευτεραία ἡμέρα· τῇ δὲ τριταία μετὰ τοῦ ἐπανάγκου καὶ τὸ ἐπίθυμα τὸ ἐπαναγκαστικόν· ἔστι οὖν τὸ ἀγαθοποιόν· λίβανος ἄμμητος, δάφνη, μυρσίνη, πυρρήν, σταφίς ἀγρία, μαλάβαθρον, κόστος. κόψας ὁμοῦ πάντα ἀναλάμβανε οἶνον Μενδησίῳ καὶ μέλιτι καὶ ποίει κολλούρια κυάμοις ἴσα.

The beneficent (incense), which you burn on the first and second day. But on the third day with the coercive formula you also (burn) the coercive incense. This, then, is the beneficent one: uncut frankincense, laurel, myrtle, a fruit pit, stavesacre, leaf of cinnamon, and kostos. Pound these all together, include the wine of Mendes and honey, and make pellets the size of beans.⁴⁴

This offering features predominantly incense and other aromatic plant material. On the other hand, the second offering is described as compulsive, to be used only if the beneficent rite has failed after being performed for the first two days:

ἐπίθυμα ἀναγκαστικόν· ὅτε καὶ τὸν ἐπανάγκον τὸν προκείμενον λέγεις τῇ τριταία καὶ ἐπίθυσ. ἔστι δὲ· μυγαλός, αἰγὸς ποικίλης παρθένου στέαρ, κυνοκεφάλου οὐσία, ἴβως ὠόν, καρκίνος ποτάμιος, κάνθαρος τέλειος σεληνιακός, ἀρτεμισία μονόκλων ἡρμένη ἀνατολῇ, κυνὸς οὐσία, σκόρδον μονογενές. ἀνάλαβε ὄξει. ποιήσας κολλούρια σφράγιζε δακτυλίῳ ὀλοσιδήρῳ ὀλοστόμῳ ἔχοντι Ἑκάτην καὶ κύκλῳ τὸ ὄνομα Βαρζοῦ φερβα.

The coercive incense: when you say the foregoing coercive (formula) on the third day, also burn (it). It is (comprised of) a shrew mouse, the fat of a dappled virgin goat, the *ousia* of a hamadryas baboon, an ibis egg, a freshwater crab, a perfect moon beetle, single-stemmed wormwood, harvested at sunrise, the *ousia* of a dog, and a single garlic clove. Take it up with vinegar and after making pellets, seal them with a ring that is of completely tempered iron (and) which has (an image of) Hekate and the name BARZOU PHERBA in a circle (i.e. around her).⁴⁵

This alternative is explicitly labelled as ‘coercive’ (ἀναγκαστικόν). Elsewhere, similar offerings are comparably marked as ‘coercive’ (ἐπανάγκον), ‘contrary’ or ‘hostile’, (ἐναντίον), or ‘for actions that do evil’ (κακοποιόν).⁴⁶ The majority of ingredients here are unusual animal products, which, along with garlic and vinegar, feature in the list of offerings reported in the *diabolē* from Preisendanz's Hymn 19a/b (= B.1a/b), explicitly labelled as ‘dreadful’ (δείνον) and ‘hateful’ (ἐχθρόν).⁴⁷

In three rituals from GEMF 57, both a beneficent and a coercive offering are explicitly prescribed together with a metrical *logos*, itself either pleasing or coercive:

⁴³ For B.1b (Hymn 19), see GEMF 57/PGM IV 2643–2674.

⁴⁴ GEMF 57/PGM IV 2674–2683.

⁴⁵ GEMF 57/PGM IV 2683–2693.

⁴⁶ See GEMF 57/PGM IV 1436, 2571, 2874–2875, and 2896.

⁴⁷ The *diabolē*, or slanderous account, contained in B.1a/b (Hymn 19a/b) reports a fictitious sacrifice (supposedly performed by the target of the procedure) in order to bring the wrath of the goddess upon the perpetrator of this fictitious corrupt sacrifice.

Hymn 19b (= B.1b), Hymn 18 (= C.6), and Hymn 22 (= C.7).⁴⁸ The pleasing offerings include a form of incense (such as the frankincense prescribed above), while the compulsive offerings do not. One exception to this occurs in the prescription for Hymn 19b above, addressed to Hekate–Selene–Artemis, where ἀρτεμίσια μονόκλων (“single-stemmed wormwood” s.v. ἀρτεμίσια LSJ A2), an aromatic shrub, is burned in the coercive rite. This plant may feature here among the hostile burnt offerings due to its etymological — and thus symbolic — connection with the goddess Artemis.⁴⁹ In the composite rites that contain both a beneficent and coercive way of approaching the god, a logic familiar to traditional cult can be detected in both forms. The practitioner offers something pleasant for the god’s pleasure and (by extension) offers something offensive to draw their dangerous wrath.

The offensive matter could be something physically repulsive such as cow dung, or metaphorically hostile — once burned — such as a plant associated with the goddess or an animal that has been deified and drowned.⁵⁰ Korshi Dosoo and Thomas

⁴⁸ Hymn 19b (= B.1b) is found at GEMF 57/PGM IV 2643–2674, C.6 (Hymn 18) at 2786–2870, and C.7 (Hymn 22) at 2915–2939.

⁴⁹ For the etymological connection of the *artemisia* genus of plant to the goddess Artemis, see LiDonnici (2001) 83–89, esp. 86–87 and Pliny the Elder, *HN* 25.36.73: *sunt qui ab Artemide Ilithyia cognominata putent, quoniam privatim medeatur feminarum malis*, “there are some who think that the [name of the plant] is derived from Artemis Ilithyia, because the plant is specific for the troubles of women.” Text and translation from Jones/Andrews (1956). This is the only location in the GEMF where the composite lunar–chthonic goddess Hekate–Selene–Artemis is offered ἀρτεμίσια, a plant more often used for ink or magical apparatus. Other uses of ἀρτεμίσια in the GEMF (unburned and unconnected to Hekate–Selene–Artemis unless otherwise stated): GEMF 15.147/PGM XII 98 (a component of ink for a ritual that confers success in business), 446/398 (used for an amulet to gain favor); 30.64–65/II 17–18 (part of an ointment for a divination procedure), 82/35 (burned for use as a component of ink for the previous divination procedure); 31/I 245 (ink for a memory procedure); 55.26–27/III 307 (fragmentary text makes this section unclear, perhaps worn or held as part of the ritual accoutrements), 544/703 (fragmentary text, held as part of the ritual accoutrements seemingly as a symbol (κύμβολον) of the moon to whom the practitioner should be looking at this stage), 600/389 (fragmentary text makes this section unclear, instructions are missing), 674/332 (fragmentary text makes this section unclear, instructions are missing); 57/IV 914 (as a garland for a medium in a divinatory rite), 1089 (for a mat upon which a ritual for a direct vision occurs), 1312–1313 (a component of a burnt offering to the Bear constellation in an *omnium-gatherum* procedure, rite includes a coercive option), 2143 (a component of ink for a necromancy rite), 2237–2238 (a component of ink for an *agōgē* rite), 2394 (a component of ink for a ritual that confers success in business), 2893 (a component of a burnt offering for Aphrodite, in a rite labeled as ἐπανάγκος, coercive), 3200a–3201 (a component of ink for a dream divination rite, used on ritual apparatus including a wick); 58/V 371 (an ingredient in a dough out of which is fashioned a figurine of Hermes); 72/VIII 72 (a component of ink for a dream divination rite); 74.304/VII 223 (a component of ink for a lamp divination rite), 721/999 (a component of ink for a rite that induces divine revelation), 755/600 (to be placed around the edge of a lamp in an *agōgē* rite).

⁵⁰ Faraone has insightfully suggested in conversation that many offerings labelled as “coercive” would not smell much different once burned than a sacrifice of bones and fat, and so would not be perceived as physically repulsive by the practitioner or deity. He proposes that the hostility of these offerings is a symbolic one. See also Johnston (2002) 350 and Graf (1991) 191.

Galoppin have examined the mechanisms by which such offerings might cause offence to the deities addressed. They argue that in many cases, “the use of animals in Graeco–Egyptian magic is linked to the relationship these creatures had with the superhuman powers upon whom the rituals relied.”⁵¹ The species could be connected to the deity — through accounts of mythical metamorphoses, for example — or it could be an animal particularly sacred to them.⁵² Dosoo and Galoppin argue that the magical practitioner may make use of such ties, for example, by applying the destructive force of fire to the relevant animal parts and thereby allowing the practitioner to metonymically threaten the deity to whom the animal is connected.⁵³ In the offerings described above at GEMF 57/PGM IV 2683–2693, we saw that the practitioner is instructed to burn pills made out of material from animals associated with the Moon goddess, such as moon–beetles and baboons, and even stamped with an image of Hekate (with whom Selene is identified throughout much of GEMF 57). Dosoo and Galoppin read this as a twofold threat to the goddess: burning her sacred animals while, even more boldly, burning an image depicting one of her divine counterparts.⁵⁴

Thus, the purpose of these offensive offerings is not to disgust or repulse the deity, but to anger them, taunting them into appearing before the practitioner who could then manipulate them into action. As Graf argues, it is in these explicitly coer-

⁵¹ Dosoo/Galoppin (2022) 237–239. I apply the same logic here to plants.

⁵² Dosoo/Galoppin (2022) 214–215.

⁵³ Dosoo/Galoppin (2022) 238.

⁵⁴ Dosoo/Galoppin (2022) 238. In p. 225 they note that the Moon goddess is said at GEMF 74.913–952/PGM VII 756–794 to take on the form of many of the animals named in this composite offering, namely, a beetle, crab, dog, goat, baboon, and field mouse. We might also add that the sacrifice of a cake stamped with the image of the god to whom it is offered is a practice attested for the ancient Hebrew people by the book of Jeremiah in the Hebrew Bible. The prophet Jeremiah advises the Hebrew people to stop their worship of the “Queen of Heaven,” namely, the Babylonian goddess Ishtar, identified with the Phoenician goddess Astarte (*Jer.* 44.1–14). They refuse to follow his prophetic warning, claiming that when they had previously “made for her *cakes bearing her image* and poured libations to her” as their ancestors had done, they “had plenty of food as a result and enjoyed good fortune,” *Jer.* 44.17–19, translation from Allen (2008), my emphasis. They blamed their present hardships on the cessation of these practices. See Allen (2008) 98 for the identification of the Queen of Heaven. Nothing suggests that the burning of a cake with the goddess’ image was a coercive strategy in this context, which is admittedly much earlier than the text of GEMF 57; the book of Jeremiah began its process of composition in the late seventh century BCE according to Allen (2008) 11. However, it is possible that this more ancient practice has been adopted and overlaid with an element of coercion by the practitioners of the GEMF, seeing as the relevant pills stamped with the image of Hekate appear in an explicitly coercive context in GEMF 57. Here we can see the GEMF practitioner extending traditional ritual logic, as they do with ancient Greek traditional cult sacrifice. Further comparison with ancient Hebrew practices of sacrifice may prove fruitful, considering the prominence of purely vegetal incense offerings comparable to those of GEMF 57 discussed below, the custom of making sacrifices on rooftops in both traditions, and the appearance of IAÖ (Yahweh) in the GEMF 57 hymns. For vegetal offerings in Semitic rituals see for example Burkert (1992) 100 and Nielsen (1986) 68–88. For sacrifices on rooftops in Semitic rituals see Burkert (1992) 100 and *Jer.* 32.29, cf. GEMF 57/PGM IV 214–215, 2469, 2492, 2711.

cive rites that such strange substances, particular to magical operations and seemingly antithetical to ritual, figure most prominently as offerings.⁵⁵ The hostile offerings are parallel operations to the offensive words sung in the course of Preisendanz's Hymns 17 (= A.3) and 19a/b (= B.1a/b), a compulsive *logos* and a *diabolē* to Hekate–Selene–Artemis, composed in iambic meters associated with abuse and blame.⁵⁶ Both operations use the same form as the more traditional version, i.e., a burnt offering or a metrical address, while changing the content of the sacrifice or song in order to evoke a different response. These coercive offerings, desperate alternatives resorted to after ineffectual attempts, are exceptions that prove the rule.⁵⁷ Enough GEMF hymns, complimentary and supplicatory in tone, are associated with offerings intended to please their deity that we cannot ignore the ritual logic at work, coherent with that of traditional cult: *agalmata* — material and hymnic — are offered by mortals to deities in order to build up the former's store of *charis* with the latter.

The coercive ritual of attraction invoking the triple goddess Hekate–Selene–Artemis is an interesting case. This rite, during the course of which the beneficent Hymn 20 (= C.4) is sung, is explicitly labelled as coercive and anger–provoking by the compiler of this handbook, but nevertheless contains a sustained mixture of pleasing and offensive ingredients within the same offering:⁵⁸

λαβὼν μυγαλὸν ἐκθέωσον πηγαίῳ ὕδατι καὶ λαβὼν κανθάρους σεληνιακοὺς δύο ἐκθέωσον ὕδατι ποταμῷ καὶ καρκίνον ποτάμιον καὶ στήρ ποικίλης αἰγὸς παρθένου καὶ κυνοκεφάλου κόπρον, ἴβεως δὲ δύο, στύρακος δραχμὰς β, ζμύρνης δραχμὰς β, κρόκου δραχμὰς β, κυπέρεως Ἰταλικῆς δραχμὰς δ, λιβάνου ἀδμήτου δραχμὰς δ, μονογενὲς κρόμμυον. ταῦτα πάντα βάλε εἰς ὄλμον . . . καὶ κόψας καλίστως . . . ἀνελόμενος ὀλίγον καὶ ποιήσας ἀνθρακιὰν ἀναβὰς ἐπὶ δώματος ὑψηλοῦ ἐπίθουε.

Take a shrew–mouse and deify it in spring water, and, taking two lunar beetles deify them in river water, and (take) a freshwater crab and fat of a spotted virgin goat and dung of a hamadryas baboon, 2 ibis eggs, of storax 2 drachmas weight, of myrrh 2 drachmas weight, of saffron 2 drachmas weight, of Italian galingale 4 drachmas weight, of uncut frankincense 4 drachmas weight, a single–stemmed onion. Toss all these things into a mortar . . . and after pounding it most finely . . . take out a little and make a charcoal fire, after going up to a high roof, and burn (it).⁵⁹

The underlined group of ingredients are found in other procedures that are explicitly labelled as coercive.⁶⁰ The bolded group— the various types of incense — are found in procedures that are explicitly labelled as beneficent or unmarked as to the practi-

55 Graf (1991) 196.

56 A.3 (Hymn 17) is found at GEMF 57/PGM IV 2242–2346 and B.1a/b (Hymns 19a/b) at 2574–2610 and 2643–2674.

57 See Graf (1991) 194.

58 For C.4 (Hymn 20), see GEMF 57/PGM IV 2522–2567.

59 GEMF 57/PGM IV 2455–2469.

60 A field mouse, moon beetle, river crab, fat of a virgin dappled goat, magical material (*ousia*) of a dog–faced baboon, and ibis eggs are explicitly labelled as coercive in the offering attached to B.1b

tioners' attitude. However, "Italian galingale" (κυπέρεως Ἰταλικῆς) is harder to interpret. Named among the pleasant-smelling, positively characterized offerings of incense, this is the plant's sole appearance in the magical formularies. In addition, as far as I can tell, this is the only place in extant Greek literature in which this "Italian" species of the κύπερος plant appears. Dioscorides in his *Materia Medica* says of the κύπερος plant that its roots are pleasant-smelling (εὐώδεις).⁶¹ Its position within the list — featuring among various aromatic plant materials — likewise suggests that it would create an attractive smell when burned.⁶²

What are we to make of this mixture of beneficent and offensive offerings in a rite labelled as coercive? The mixture of offerings seems to reflect the mixture of beneficent and coercive modes of address to the deity that are included in this rite. This coercive spell of attraction (GEMF 57/PGM IV 2441–2621) includes both the beneficent C.4 (Hymn 20), as well as the first iteration of the slander *logos* to Selene labelled by Preisendanz as B.1a (Hymn 19).⁶³ Do the beneficent offerings of pleasant-smelling incense entice the goddess, who accepts them only to be disgusted by the coercive offerings? Or is it the very fact that beneficent and coercive offerings are mixed in a way inexplicable by ritual logic that forms its own sort of "reversal" of the sort described by Graf? Either option strengthens the case that the offering of incense in the rituals attached to the GEMF hymns participates in the ideology of traditional cult. Practitioners either follow the expected pattern of offering pleasing gifts to attract the pleasure of the deity, or extrapolate from that rationale and coerce the god by means of inappropriate offerings.⁶⁴

In sum, five verse-containing procedures include simply a beneficent hymn and a beneficent offering. Two procedures have no offerings included, one has a beneficent hymn and a coercive metrical *logos* supported by an offering of mixed approach, and three have either a beneficent or coercive *logos* supported by alternative options for beneficent and coercive offerings. Of these eleven procedures, seven contain a benefi-

(Hymn 19b), described at GEMF 57/PGM IV 2685–2693. This is the only instance of an onion as an offering in the rites that contain a hymn, but the *diabolē* of B.1a/b (Hymn 19a/b) has the NN woman sacrificing an onion as one of the disgusting ingredients. In addition, lines 52–85 instruct the practitioner to use an onion in a procedure for capturing an unnamed supernatural being in an effort to compel them to offer a response to a posed question.

61 Dioscorides, *Mat. Med.* 1.4.

62 However, Radcliffe Edmonds III has notified me in correspondence of a possible identification for the plant that could indicate the contrary. Dioscorides relates that the Romans call δρακοντία μεγάλη, the Dragon Lily, by the name κύπερις (Dioscorides, *Mat. Med.* 2.166). As Edmonds observes, the Dragon Lily is known for its pungent, rotting smell, and thus would fit in well among the more obviously coercive ingredients in this composite offering. In either case, this rite prescribes as an offering to Hekate–Selene–Artemis a perplexing mixture of pleasant-smelling substances and ingredients that are elsewhere marked as repulsive or used in coercive rites.

63 C.4 (Hymn 20) is found at GEMF 57/PGM IV 2522–2567 and B.1a (Hymn 19a) at 2574–2610.

64 Johnston (2002) has shown this to be the case with animal victims and vegetal offerings in the GEMF.

cent hymn in combination with a beneficent offering in some form, even if there is an alternative coercive version supplied (64%). The chart below (see Table 2) shows the distribution of pleasant and offensive offerings throughout the procedures that include hymns, and where they fall within LiDonnici's blocks. From this overview, it is possible to discern that Block 5b shows a particularly strong trend, wherein the practitioner addresses the goddess in verse and simultaneously makes an offering of incense, or as a second alternative, of negatively characterized plant and animal matter.

4 Comparisons with Dionysian Mystery Cult and Traditional Greek Cult

It has been well-established that GEMF 57 and the rest of the magical formularies were composed in a multicultural milieu. These documents consequently display influences from Greek, Egyptian, Jewish, Christian, and other traditions of the Mediterranean and Near East.⁶⁵ A longer paper would trace intersections between these cultures and the offering practices attested in the magical formularies, but for the sake of space, it is necessary to limit our discussion to two traditions: Dionysian mystery cult and traditional Greek religion.⁶⁶

The preponderance of pleasant incense offerings prescribed together with the GEMF hymns quickly calls to mind the corpus of Orphic Hymns.⁶⁷ In this collection of 87 hymns, composed for the mystery rites of Dionysian initiates in Western Anatolia, all but nine prescribe a burnt offering (*thumiama*) in their title, most commonly frankincense, aromatic herbs and spices, myrrh, and storax. Less frequent offerings include torches, saffron, poppies, grains, and libations of milk.⁶⁸ Although the motivation for the choice of substance for each deity can be obscure, the ritual function of

65 For the cultural plurality of the magical papyri, see for example the papers collected in Bortolani et al. (2019), Dieleman (2019) 383, and Zografou (2013) 11–17. See in this volume Dosoo, chapter 4; Dosoo, chapter 5; and Sarischouli, chapter 13 in this volume.

66 As a brief example of one such influence in this culturally pluralistic set of documents, we can compare the use of two mud bricks as an altar for the offering of a rooster from GEMF 57/PGM IV 26–51 to the use of mud-brick platforms as altars for domestic rites in Egypt, especially in the New Kingdom. For such domestic offering spaces in Egypt, see Stevens (2011) 732–733.

67 For the place of the Orphic Hymns within Dionysian mystery cult, see Graf (2009).

68 Morand (2001) includes an appendix at 322–325 that lists each category of offering and the hymns that prescribe it. Morand explains that the offering is prescribed in a syntactically sparse title, usually composed of the deity's name in the genitive, the nominative/accusative *θυμίαμα*, and the accusative ὕμνος upon which the genitive of the deity's name depends and leave *θυμίαμα* and the offering as unexplained accusatives, Morand argues for a new interpretation of the obscure syntax: when an offering is contained in the title, the name of the deity is in the genitive, which depends on *θυμίαμα* in

Table 2: GEMF 57 metrical *logoi* and offerings (asterisk denotes coercive speech act in verse).

LiDonnici's Block	GEMF 57 Lines of Procedure	Hymn(s) Included	Offerings
2a	154–285	Hymn 6 (A.1) to Seth–Typhon: 179–201 Hymn 7 (C.1) to Seth–Typhon: 261–273	Incense
2a	296–467	Hymn 4a (C.2a) to Helios–Horus: 437–462	Seasonal flowers
2c	930–1114	Hymn 3 (C.3) to Horus–Harpokrates: 939–948	None
3	1390–1495	Hymn 25 (A.2) to Hekate: 1399–1434	Bread
4	1928–2005	Hymn 4b (C.2b) to Helios–Horus: 1956–1989	Incense
5a	2241–2358	Hymn 17 (A.3) to Hekate–Selene–Artemis: 2242–2346*	None
5b	2441–2621	Hymn 20 (C.4) to Hekate–Selene–Artemis: 2522–2567 Hymn 19a (B.1a) to Hekate–Selene–Artemis: 2574–2610*	Mixed offering (offensive matter + incense)
5b	2622–2707	Hymn 19b (B.1b) to Hekate–Selene–Artemis: 2643–2674*	<u>Preliminary</u> : incense <u>Beneficent</u> : incense <u>Coercive</u> : offensive matter
5b	2708–2784	Hymn 21 (C.5) to Hekate–Selene–Artemis: 2714–2783	Incense/fat
5b	2785–2890	Hymn 18 (C.6) to Hekate–Selene–Artemis: 2786–2870	<u>Doing good</u> : incense <u>Doing harm</u> : offensive matter
6	2891–2942	Hymn 22 (C.7) to Aphrodite: 2915–2939	<u>Beneficent</u> : incense/fat <u>Coercive</u> : offensive matter (vulture listed in the <i>diabolē</i> , Hymn 19)

the nominative. The substance to be burned is in the accusative, which depends on an understood elided verb of offering (110). Thus, the title of Hymn 32 (Ἀθηνᾶς θυμίαμα ἀρώματα) reads “burnt offering for Athena, (burn) aromatic herbs and spices.” The title of Hymn 60 (Χαρίτων θυμίαμα στύρακα) reads “burnt offering for the Graces, (burn) storax.”

all of these offerings is much clearer cut than that of the offerings in the magical formularies. All of the Orphic offerings are pleasing substances intended to create a positive and beneficent relationship with the god addressed.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, the overlap is significant — the offerings prescribed in conjunction with the GEMF hymns include the vast majority of the burnt offerings listed in the titles of the Orphic Hymns (indeed, all except torches, poppies, and grain), plus many more in addition.⁷⁰ Of this correspondence, Graf notes: “magical ritual [contains] fumigations (ἐπιθύματα) not different from those accompanying, for instance the ‘Orphic’ hymns.” Graf cites this as just one instance in which it is impossible to distinguish between magic and religion.⁷¹ The prevalence of pleasant-smelling incense in the Orphic rites is significant. As with sacrifice in the beneficent rites containing GEMF hymns, the offering of a pleasant substance creates a positive relationship between the practitioner and the deity, which justifies the request contained within the Orphic Hymn, whether it be “indefinite” or “definite”. Thus, the incense offered compliments the pleasing language and strategies employed in the hymn itself — ritual words and action serve the same end. The shared presence of pleasant-smelling incense in the ritual action of both the GEMF hymns and Orphic Hymns (relatively contemporary with one another) allows us to better understand the relationship between pleasant smells and the singing of hymns.

The prevalence of vegetal offerings associated with the Orphic and GEMF hymns may seem surprising in light of the emphasis placed upon animal victims in many foundational works on traditional Greek sacrifice. Indeed, Marcel Detienne argues that:

Pendant près de dix siècles, balisés par les règlements culturels gravés sur la pierre, les Grecs n’ont pas cessé d’entretenir des relations avec les puissances divines en procédant à la mise à mort strictement ritualisée de victimes animales dont ils consommaient les chairs collectivement et selon des règles précises. [...] il y a là un premier trait qui justifie la place centrale du sacrifice sanglant dans la pensée sociale et religieuse des Grecs: l’alimentation carnée coïncide absolument avec la pratique sacrificielle.⁷²

Walter Burkert takes no less of a meat-centric view of sacrifice. He argues that “the essence of the sacred act, which is hence often simply termed doing or making sacred or working sacred things, is in Greek practice a straightforward and far from miracu-

⁶⁹ See Morand (2001) 115–137 for an investigation into the logic behind the choice of each offering in light of the deity addressed. Ultimately, it is concluded that “il n’est donc pas possible d’arriver à une explication de toutes les offrandes, dans le choix desquelles entre nécessairement une part d’arbitraire. En revanche, l’emploi des substances dans d’autres textes parallèles, dans lesquels la même offrande est offerte au même dieu, le contexte qui entoure la plante et des explications partielles des choix nous permettent de mieux comprendre les offrandes décrites dans les *Hymnes*” (151).

⁷⁰ Morand (2001) 116.

⁷¹ Graf (1991) 195.

⁷² Detienne (1979) 7–10.

lous process: the slaughter and consumption of a domestic animal for a god.”⁷³ Burkert goes on to enumerate the most common sacrificial animals, namely the ox, sheep, goat, and pig, as well as the less common victims such as poultry, geese, pigeons, and fish.⁷⁴

However, this emphasis on the necessity of animal sacrifice in ritual has come into question. Fred Naiden in particular argues that animal sacrifice is not the *sine qua non* of the sacrificial act, but merely one mode:

Vegetal offerings occurred every morning and every evening, at home and in shrines, before voyages and other journeys. Libations and incense-burning were far more common than animal sacrifice, if only because they accompanied most animal sacrifices yet also occurred without them.⁷⁵

In light of the difficulties of recognizing vegetal sacrifice in the archaeological record, Naiden argues that drama is our best source for understanding the relative rate of occurrence between animal and vegetal sacrifice, as, unlike other genres (including inscriptions), tragedy and comedy represent a mixture of public and domestic rites, as well as the ritual action of women and enslaved people.⁷⁶ By Naiden’s reckoning, there are 34 examples of uninterrupted acts of sacrifice in the complete works of tragedy and comedy, 17 of which include animal offerings, and 17 of which are purely vegetal offerings and libations.⁷⁷ As an example of the latter, Sophocles’ *Oedipus Tyrannus* opens with the eponymous character asking the priest of Zeus why the city is filled with the smoke of incense (θυμιάματα), together with the sound of paeans and lamentations.⁷⁸ It seems to have been believed that the gods appreciated these vegetal gifts as sufficient offerings in and of themselves. In Aristophanes’ (Athenian playwright) *Wealth*, for example, Hermes complains that mortals have turned their attentions exclusively to the god Ploutos, whose eyesight has recently been restored and is now redistributing his favor. Hermes laments in particular the loss of sacrificial offerings, as mortals no longer give incense, nor bay, nor barley cakes, nor animal victims.⁷⁹ Thus Naiden argues that the common feature of sacrificial acts was not bloodshed, but the quality of the attractiveness (κάλλος) of the offering to the god.⁸⁰

Even though only 50% of offerings in the traditional cultic rituals as represented in drama included the sacrifice of an animal, this percentage is still much higher than the corresponding rate of domestic animal sacrifice associated with the GEMF

⁷³ Burkert (1985) 55.

⁷⁴ Burkert (1985) 55.

⁷⁵ Naiden (2015) 464.

⁷⁶ Naiden (2013) 76.

⁷⁷ Naiden (2013) 77–78.

⁷⁸ Sophocles, *OT* 4–5.

⁷⁹ Aristophanes, *Plut.* 1113–1116.

⁸⁰ Naiden (2013) 80.

hymns — in fact, no GEMF hymn prescribes the traditional cultic blood sacrifice of an ox, sheep, goat, or pig. This aversion to the sacrifice of a large-scale domestic animal in the GEMF rites can perhaps be explained by the fact that this text constitutes a collection of procedures to be used by individuals with a pressing, private need. As Johnston notes, convenience and economy is thus key, and the magician selling the recipe could manufacture a large batch of composite vegetal–animal cakes and pellets (as were often called for) at one time.⁸¹ Additionally, she argues, there was of course no opportunity for a communal meal after the performance of the private ritual, and so the killing of an ox, sheep, goat, or pig would be an expensive and wasteful venture. The practitioner thus incorporated animal sacrifice in a way that would please the divinity with the alluring smell of smoke, while not requiring the expense of an entire domestic animal.⁸² In addition, as Christopher Faraone has pointed out, many of the recipes in the GEMF instruct the practitioner to perform the ritual action in an indoor space. Since the sacrifice of a domestic animal in traditional cult was usually performed on an open-air altar, pellets and cakes containing small portions of animal products better fit the pragmatic requirements of the GEMF procedures.⁸³

Despite the occurrence of large-scale animal sacrifice in traditional cultic rites, a phenomenon absent from the rites accompanying the GEMF hymns, we must not discount the importance of purely vegetal offerings in traditional cult as a peripheral, less effective mode of address.⁸⁴ Detienne notes the importance of pleasant-smelling incense in the sacrificial act, although he conceives of fragrance in ritual as merely the opening offering before a blood sacrifice.⁸⁵ Burkert too, while in general giving prominence to the blood element of sacrifice, nevertheless asserts that “to strew a granule of frankincense in the flames is the most widespread, simplest, and also cheapest act of offering.”⁸⁶ Attributing more importance to the independent vegetal offering, LiDonnici notes the universal use of incense in religious acts around the ancient Mediterranean world, arguing that it constitutes a basic component of Mediterranean religion, as fundamental to communion with the gods as animal sacrifice.⁸⁷

⁸¹ Johnston (2002) 349. Zografou (2013) argues that it is not necessary for the magical practitioner to offer a whole animal, as the horizontal axis of communication is lacking in GEMF sacrifice, and so they instead offer discrete parts of the animal as effective matter for communication on the vertical axis, between practitioner and god (68–69). See also Dosoo/Galoppin (2022) 239.

⁸² Johnston (2002) 349.

⁸³ Faraone, in conversation.

⁸⁴ See Naiden (2012) 83: “since the intercourse occurring at a sacrifice would not be missing from sacrifices that were vegetal, not animal, we should also allow for this other kind of offering. Once the Greeks came to use the word *thusia*, or “smoke-making,” for both animal and vegetal offerings, they adumbrated this conclusion. The sacrificial table held both kinds. Explanations of sacrifice should be no less accommodating.”

⁸⁵ Detienne (1972) 73.

⁸⁶ Burkert (1985) 62.

⁸⁷ LiDonnici (2001) 66.

Naiden similarly attests to the ease with which families were able to offer incense to the gods in their own homes due to the simplicity of the offering — a much more feasible gift to the gods for private individuals who could not afford to sacrifice an animal.⁸⁸ Thus pleasant-smelling incense played a key role as an offering in the rites of not only the GEMF hymns and Orphic Hymns, but also in the rites of traditional cult.⁸⁹ Vegetal offerings were not necessarily subsidiary to the offering of animal victims, but were also given to the gods independently, especially in private settings.

5 Cletic Hymns, Cletic Offerings

Whether the offering be of a large-scale domestic animal, a pellet of goat fat and cumin, or some grains of frankincense, pleasing gifts worked, in the understanding of their users, to establish a benevolent reciprocal relationship of *charis* with the deity. But how precisely did these pleasant offerings work in connection with the singing of a hymn? To answer this question, we must keep in mind that *agalmata* may be presented to the deity in the form of material offerings and/or artistically elaborated songs. Many of the hymns in GEMF 57 explicitly summon the deity to the rite in which they are embedded using imperative formulations such as *cē kalō*, “I call you,” *κλῶθι μάκαρ cē γάρ κλήζω*, “hear, oh blessed one, for I call you,” and *ἐλθέ μοι*, “come to me,” among many others.⁹⁰ By a survey of the material offerings attached to such cletic hymns in this handbook, it becomes clear that in many rituals, an offering of incense was used to support the practitioner’s entreaty for the arrival of the deity.⁹¹ Thus the practitioner makes use of a two-fold tactic of enticing the deity: a summons surrounded by pleasing language and supported by a pleasing offering of incense. This strategy immediately invites comparison to that employed in the Orphic Hymns, a collection of largely cletic hymns which, as noted above, prescribe incense as an offering nearly exclusively.⁹² The use of incense to call for the arrival of the deity in these magical and mystery texts is explicable by means of a comparison to the use of incense in more traditional cult.⁹³ With recourse to myth and ancient testimonies, Detienne asserts that incense, with its strong and diffuse fragrance, is particularly well suited to

⁸⁸ Naiden (2013) 72. See 70–71 n. 185 for a list of literary, epigraphical, and artistic evidence of the offering of incense to Olympian deities.

⁸⁹ See Van Straten (1981) 85–86 for the depiction of independent bloodless offerings on votive reliefs.

⁹⁰ For *cē kalō*, “I call you,” see GEMF 57/PGM IV 261; for *κλῶθι μάκαρ cē γάρ κλήζω*, “hear, oh blessed one, for I call you,” see 445; for *ἐλθέ μοι*, “come to me,” see 2786.

⁹¹ For the importance of incense in the GEMF rites, see Ristorto (2019) 246–247.

⁹² For the cletic function of the Orphic Hymns and their use of incense, see Faraone (2022a) 371.

⁹³ Indeed, the association of the gods with incense is a cross-cultural concept, evidence of which we can also observe in ancient Egyptian, Jewish, and Christian religious beliefs, which frequently include the burning of incense as a way to establish communication with their god(s) and to reveal the pres-

forging a connection with the gods. He argues that “jetés dans la flamme sacrificielle sous la forme de pains ou de grains finement concassés, l’encense et la myrrhe établissent une communication entre deux mondes nécessairement séparés l’un de l’autre: monde des hommes, monde des dieux.”⁹⁴

Returning to the GEMF, it is interesting to note that the use of incense to attract the god during the singing of a hymn is attested explicitly. Take, for example, a section of Hymn 18 (= C.6) to Hekate–Selene–Artemis in which the goddess is called down to the burnt offerings of the practitioner, who is instructed to burn storax, myrrh, sage, frankincense, and a fruit pit “for actions that do good” (ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγαθοποιῶν): χαίρε, θεά, καὶ καίειν ἐπωνυμίας ἐπάκουσον. | θύω σοι τόδ’ ἄρωμα, Διὸς τέκος . . . | ἐλθέ ἐπ’ ἐμαῖς θυξίαις καί μοι τόδε πρᾶγμα ποίησον, “Hail, goddess, and listen to your epithets. | I am burning for you this spice (i.e., incense), child of Zeus . . . (description of the goddess follows) | come to my burnt offerings and for me this deed perform.”⁹⁵ The cletic function of incense is easy to perceive when the offering is explicitly named in the hymn. During the singing of hymns in which the incense is not mentioned but still offered, the cletic function is nevertheless always latent. Just as Graf argues that offensive offerings meant to alienate the gods in coercive rituals should be considered as abbreviated slander procedures,⁹⁶ it appears that the offering of incense may be considered as an abbreviated cletic hymn. Thus, in tandem with the GEMF hymns, with traditional cultic hymns, and especially with the corpus of Orphic Hymns, the burning of pleasant-smelling incense serves not only to delight the deity, but also to forge a direct connection with them and to entice them to be present at the rite.

6 Conclusions

From this brief survey of offerings prescribed alongside the metrical sections of the *Greco–Egyptian Magical Formularies*, we are able to better understand the relationship that the practitioner was attempting to create with the deity addressed. The act of making pleasant vegetal and animal offerings scaffolded the practitioner’s attempt to create a positive relationship with the deity by means of pleasing words in verse. In the majority of the metrical *logoi* from GEMF 57, this ritual logic is clear and uncomplicated. In the cases where the practitioner sings a poem in an abusive iambic meter and offers offensive substances, we can nevertheless detect an extrapolation of

ence of the divine. See Haran (1960), Nielsen (1986) 3–15 and 68–88, Harvey (1998) 178–185, LiDonnici (2001) 65–66, Harvey (2006) 79–83, 92–93, and 96, Wise (2009), and Thurlkill (2016) 86.

⁹⁴ Detienne (1972) 73, with further discussion of this topic at 236. See also Zografou (2013) 47 for the efficacy with which incense establishes lines of communication with the gods.

⁹⁵ GEMF 57/PGM IV 2850–2870. For the offering, see 2871–2877.

⁹⁶ Graf (1991) 196.

this same logic. Returning to the original question — the status of these metrical *logoi* vis-à-vis the genre of hymn — the beneficent verse sections of the magical formularies are more readily classified as “hymns” once we perceive that the practitioners were singing these songs while building up their store of *charis* by means of ritual action in addition to ritual words. With the exception of the metrical *logoi* that contain hostile language, the verse sections of the magical formularies that invoke and praise a variety of deities may take their place in the hymnic genre beside the corpus of Orphic Hymns and contemporary examples of traditional cultic hymns.

Appendix: Details of Offerings Associated with GEMF Metrical *Logoi*

Table 3: Details of offerings associated with GEMF metrical *logoi*.

Hymn	GEMF 57 Location	Offering	Type of <i>logos</i>
6: Seth–Typhon (A.1)	179–201	<u>offering</u> : uncut frankincense <u>approach</u> : pleasing in nature, not stated explicitly	pleasing hymn
7: Seth–Typhon (C.1)	261–273	same as above	pleasing hymn
4a: Helios–Horus (C.2a)	437–462	<u>offering</u> : seasonal flowers <u>approach</u> : pleasing in nature, not stated explicitly	pleasing hymn
3: Horus–Harpokrates (C.3)	939–948	no offering	pleasing hymn
25: Hekate (A.2)	1399–1434	<u>offering</u> : bread <u>approach</u> : pleasing in nature, not stated explicitly	pleasing hymn
4b: Helios–Horus (C.2b)	1956–1989	<u>offering</u> : armara, uncut frankincense <u>approach</u> : pleasing in nature, not stated explicitly	pleasing hymn
17: Hekate–Selene–Artemis (A.3)	2242–2346	no offering	coercive <i>logos</i>

Table 3 (continued)

Hymn	GEMF 57 Location	Offering	Type of <i>logos</i>
20: Hekate–Selene–Artemis (C.4)	2522–2567	<u>offering</u> : shrew mouse deified in spring water, lunar beetles, freshwater crab, fat of a dappled virgin goat, dung of a hamadryas baboon, ibis eggs, storax, myrrh, saffron, galingale, uncut frankincense, single-stemmed onion <u>approach</u> : mixed in nature, not stated explicitly	pleasing hymn
19a: Hekate–Selene–Artemis (B.1a)	2574–2610	same as above	coercive <i>logos</i>
19b: Hekate–Selene–Artemis (B.1b)	2643–2674	<u>preliminary offering</u> : storax <u>approach</u> : pleasing in nature, not stated explicitly <u>second offering</u> : uncut frankincense, laurel, myrtle, fruit pit, stavesacre, cinnamon leaf, kostos, wine, honey <u>approach</u> : beneficent (ἄγαθοποιόν) <u>third offering</u> : shrew mouse, fat of a dappled virgin goat, magical material (οὐρία) of a hamadryas baboon, ibis egg, freshwater crab, lunar beetle, single-stemmed wormwood, οὐρία of a dog, garlic, vinegar <u>approach</u> : coercive (ἐπανάγκον)	missing pleasing hymn for first two attempts? coercive <i>logos</i> for third attempt
21: Hekate–Selene–Artemis (C.5)	2714–2783	<u>offering</u> : cumin and the fat of a dappled virgin goat <u>approach</u> : pleasing in nature, not stated explicitly	pleasing hymn
18: Hekate–Selene–Artemis (C.6)	2786–2870	<u>first offering</u> : storax, myrrh, sage, frankincense, a fruit pit <u>approach</u> : beneficent (ἄγαθοποιόν) <u>second offering</u> : οὐρία of a dog, of a dappled goat, and of a virgin dead before her time <u>approach</u> : malevolent (κακοποιόν)	pleasing hymn

Table 3 (continued)

Hymn	GEMF 57 Location	Offering	Type of <i>logos</i>
22: Aphrodite (C.7)	2915–2939	<u>first offering</u> : white dove's blood and fat, raw myrrh, parched wormwood <u>approach</u> : pleasing in nature, not stated explicitly but set in opposition to the coercive version that follows <u>second offering</u> : brain of a vulture <u>approach</u> : coercive (ἐπανάγκον)	pleasing hymn labelled as ἐπανάγκος