

Greek and Egyptian Magical Formularies:

Text and Translation

CALIFORNIA CLASSICAL STUDIES

NUMBER 9

Editorial Board Chair: Donald Mastronarde

Editorial Board: Alessandro Barchiesi, Todd Hickey, Emily Mackil, Richard Martin, Robert Morstein-Marx, J. Theodore Peña, Kim Shelton

California Classical Studies publishes peer-reviewed long-form scholarship with online open access and print-on-demand availability. The primary aim of the series is to disseminate basic research (editing and analysis of primary materials both textual and physical), data-heavy research, and highly specialized research of the kind that is either hard to place with the leading publishers in Classics or extremely expensive for libraries and individuals when produced by a leading academic publisher. In addition to promoting archaeological publications, papyrological and epigraphic studies, technical textual studies, and the like, the series will also produce selected titles of a more general profile.

The startup phase of this project (2013–2017) was supported by a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

Also in the series:

Number 1: Leslie Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*, 2013

Number 2: Edward Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, 2013

Number 3: Mark Griffith, *Greek Satyr Play: Five Studies*, 2015

Number 4: Mirjam Kotwick, *Alexander of Aphrodisias and the Text of Aristotle's Metaphysics*, 2016

Number 5: Joey Williams, *The Archaeology of Roman Surveillance in the Central Alentejo, Portugal*, 2017

Number 6: Donald J. Mastronarde, *Preliminary Studies on the Scholia to Euripides*, 2017

Number 7: Olivier Dufault, *Early Greek Alchemy, Patronage and Innovation in Late Antiquity*, 2019

Number 8: Todd M. Hickey, James G. Keenan, *Edgar J. Goodspeed, America's First Papyrologist*, 2021

Greek and Egyptian Magical Formularies: Text and Translation

Volume I

Edited by

Christopher A. Faraone and Sofia Torallas Tovar

Editorial Board

Korshi Dosoo, Marina Escolano-Poveda, Richard Gordon, Edward Love, Franco Maltomini,
Anastasia Maravela, Raquel Martín Hernández, Alberto Nodar Domínguez, Panagiota Sarischouli,
Michael Zellmann-Rohrer



CALIFORNIA
CLASSICAL
STUDIES

Berkeley, California

© 2022 by Christopher A. Faraone and Sofia Torallas Tovar

California Classical Studies
c/o Department of Ancient Greek and Roman Studies
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720–2520
USA
<https://calclassicalstudies.org>
email: ccseditorial@berkeley.edu

ISBN 9781939926166 paperback
ISBN 9781939926173 PDF

Library of Congress Control Number: 2021952391

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

[AM] Anastasia Maravela	Universitetet i Oslo
[ATM] Agnes T. Mihálykó	Universitetet i Oslo/Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften
[AND] Alberto Nodar Domínguez	Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona
[AS] Ariel Singer	University of Chicago
[CAF] Christopher A. Faraone	University of Chicago
[DC] Daniela Colomo	Università Federico II, Napoli
[EC] Eleni Chronopoulou	Universidad de Zaragoza
[EL] Edward Love	Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg
[EST] Emilio Suárez de la Torre	Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona
[FM] Franco Maltomini	Università di Udine
[JD] Jacco Dieleman	Catholic University of America
[JJ] Janet Johnson	University of Chicago
[JLF] Jean-Luc Fournet	Collège de France
[KD] Korshi Dosoo	Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg
[MB] Miriam Blanco Cesteros	Universidad Complutense de Madrid
[MC] Matthew Cohn	University of Chicago
[MCh] Malcolm Choat	Macquarie University, Sydney
[MEP] Marina Escolano-Poveda	University of Manchester
[MG] Marius Gerhardt	Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung Staatliche Museen zu Berlin
[MZR] Michael Zellmann-Rohrer	Freie Universität Berlin
[PS] Panagiota Sarischouli	Aristotle University of Thessalonike
[RG] Richard Gordon	Universität Erfurt
[RMH] Raquel Martín Hernández	Universidad Complutense de Madrid
[STT] Sofia Torallas Tovar	University of Chicago

CONTENTS

<i>List of Individual Recipes</i>	ix		
<i>Preface</i>	xviii		
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxv		
<i>Greek Monograms and Abbreviations</i>	xxvi		
1. The Earliest Formularies (II BCE–II CE) 1			
GEMF 1 (PGM CXI; SM II 70)	CAF-STT	II BCE	3
GEMF 2 (PGM CXVII; SM II 71)	DC-MG	I BCE	5
GEMF 3 (PGM XX)	MZR	late I BCE–early I CE	12
GEMF 4 (PGM CXXII; SM II 72)	MZR	late I BCE–early I CE	15
GEMF 5 (PGM LII)	FM	late I CE	20
GEMF 6 (P.Oxy. LXV 4468)	FM	late I CE	24
GEMF 7 (PGM CIII; SM II 73)	FM	I CE	31
GEMF 8 (PGM LVII + PGM LXXII)	AM	reign of Hadrian	33
GEMF 9 (SM II 74)	FM	II CE	42
GEMF 10 (SM II 75)	FM	II CE	44
GEMF 11 (PGM LXIX)	MZR	early II CE	46
GEMF 12 (PGM LXXVII)	CAF-STT	II CE	47
GEMF 13 (PGM CX)	CAF-STT	II CE	49
GEMF 14 (BM EA10808)	EL	second half of II CE	51
2. The Bilingual Demotic-Greek Formularies of the Early Empire (II–III CE) 61			
GEMF 15 (PGM XII/PDM XII)	JD-KD-MEP-JJ-EL-PS-AS	mid- to late II CE	63
GEMF 16 (PDM XIV/PGM XIV)	JD-KD-MEP-JJ-EL-AND- PS-AS	late II CE	135
GEMF 17 (PDM Suppl.)	KD-MEP-CAF-JJ-EL-AS-STT	II CE	282
GEMF 18 (PDM LXI/PGM LXI)	KD-MEP-CAF-JJ-EL-AND- AS-STT	III CE	300
3. The Greek Formularies of the Early Empire (II–III CE) 323			
GEMF 19 (PGM XVIIb)	MZR	late II–III CE	325
GEMF 20 (P.Mich. s.n.)	MZR	II–III CE	328
GEMF 21 (P.Duke inv. 729)	CAF-STT	II–III CE	329
GEMF 22 (P.Bingen 13)	JLF	II–III CE	334
GEMF 23 (PGM XIc)	MCh	II–III CE	336
GEMF 24 (PGM XCVII; SM II 78)	FM	II–III CE	339
GEMF 25 (P.Oxy III 433)	MZR	late II–early III CE	341
GEMF 26 (GMA 32)	MZR	II–III CE	343
GEMF 27 (Kernos 23)	MZR	II–III CE	346
GEMF 28 (PGM CXXVII)	MZR	II–III CE	349
GEMF 29 (PGM LXIII)	FM	II–III CE	357
GEMF 30 (PGM VI + PGM II)	MBC-EC-AND-EST-MZR	late II–early III CE	361

GEMF 31 (PGM I)	CAF-AND-STT	second half of III CE	382
GEMF 32 (PGM XIXb)	CAF-STT	III CE	412
GEMF 33 (PGM XIb)	MCh	III CE	415
GEMF 34 (PGM LXII)	KD	mid- to late III CE	418
GEMF 35 (SM II 79)	FM	III CE	431
GEMF 36 (PGM LXXXVI; SM II 80)	FM	III CE	434
GEMF 37 (PGM CXXIX; SM II 81)	FM	III CE	435
GEMF 38 (PGM CXIXa-b; SM II 82)	FM	III CE	436
GEMF 39 (P.Oxy. LXXXII 5303)	FM	III CE	438
GEMF 40 (P.Oxy. LXXXII 5304)	FM	III CE	441
GEMF 41 (P.Oxy. LXXXII 5305)	FM	late III CE	448
GEMF 42 (P.Mich. inv. 3404)	MC	III CE	455
GEMF 43 (PGM XXI)	DC-MG	III CE	459
GEMF 44 (P.Oxy. LXVIII 4672)	DC	III CE	462
4. The Greek Formularies of the Late Empire (III–IV CE)			465
GEMF 45 (PGM XXa)	MZR	III–IV CE	467
GEMF 46 (SM II 86)	FM	III–IV CE	469
GEMF 47 (P.Oxy. LVIII 3931)	CAF-STT	III–IV CE	473
GEMF 48 (P.Mich. inv. 1560)	MZR	III–IV CE	476
GEMF 49 (PGM XLIV)	FM	III–IV CE	478
GEMF 50 (PGM LXVII)	CAF-STT	late III–early IV CE	482
GEMF 51 (P.Berl. inv. 11734)	DC-MG	late III–early IV CE	485
GEMF 52 (PGM XXIVa)	CAF-STT	III–IV CE	495
GEMF 53 (PGM LXXIX)	ATM	late III–early IV CE	498
GEMF 54 (PGM LXXX)	ATM	late III–early IV CE	500
<i>Bibliography and Abbreviations</i>			502

GEMF 23
(PGM XIc)

Provenance unknown

II–III CE

ED.PR.: PGM [Pr], from a collation by Bell [Be] of Kenyon's transcription

TRANS.: O'Neil, GMPT, 152 (English); Calvo Martínez and Sánchez Romero 1987, 251 (Spanish)

LOC.: London, British Museum, P.Lond. inv. 148

TM 63836

Two columns of instructions for erotic conquest are preserved on this single sheet of papyrus (H. 23 × W. 13.5 cm), complete at top, bottom, and left, broken at right.¹ Conserved on cardboard under glass; back presumably blank. A brown discoloration is evident over a large portion of papyrus. Col. i (19 lines) survives in full, with a written area of H. 14.6 × W. 9.1 cm, whose lower half appears to be an irregular wing-formation. An intercolumnar space of 0.3–1.5 cm separates it from the second column, which has 13 lines with only the first 3–5 letters remaining. It is assumed here that col. ii continues the formula from the string of vowels at the end of col. i, but the rationale for beginning a new column and leaving a large free space below l. 19 is not obvious. There is an oblique stroke just below and to the left of the first ε in i. 19 whose purpose is not clear. The left margin is 1.7–2 cm, wider (though variable) in ll. 1–4, with a smaller margin in following lines. The top margin is 2.1 cm; free space of 6.8 cm after text at foot of sheet. A *kollesis* is visible 1.6 cm from the left edge; the fibers appear to run vertically on this strip, opposite to the fiber orientation of the text to the right. That the right-most remains of each line of col ii are written on a lower layer of (horizontal) fibers may indicate a further sheet join at that location, or damage to the papyrus before it was written on. Fold marks are not obvious, but the damage pattern suggests possible folds at intervals of ca 2.5, ca 5.5 and ca 10 from the left. The papyrus may then have broken vertically along one such fold mark. The fold mark at about 10 cm from the left looks larger, and it is possible this is the original center of the papyrus, if it was folded in from both sides. But it could also have been rolled and squashed flat.

The text is written along the fibers in a right-leaning semi-regular script with letters mostly formed separately, with some abutting and occasional ligatures. It compares well with the writing of the latter part of P.Marm. 1 (GLH 18c), dated to the end of the second or early third century CE, where the scribe writes more rapidly and allowing for some ligatures in a more informal version of the script used for the early section, which Roberts relates to contemporary chancery hands (18a). It was also assigned by Kenyon to the second or third century. In GEMF 23, lines skew slightly upwards towards the right, becoming straighter across the page towards the foot of the text. In ll. 9–18, Preisendanz's layout is misleading: the words are not in the triangular formation as he prints it; the left margin is regular, so the lines slope in from the right. A wing-formation with disappearing letters was intended.

The extent of loss at the right of the sheet is not known. If col. ii had a similar written area to col. i, ca 19–20 letters, or about 7–7.5 cm, might be lost in each line of col. ii. If the fold mark ca 10 cm from the left was the center, this would form a neat half-way point on a ca 21 cm wide sheet (which would thus be roughly square). Preisendanz's reconstruction, however, assumes a col. ii with much shorter line lengths, which are adopted below, because there are some clear parallels among other magical papyri. Nevertheless, elements of this reconstruction remain problematic. If l. 1 contained further instructions (see n. 3), that would require more space than the relatively short lost section presumed by Preisendanz, and columns of uneven width: if the fold at about 10 cm from the left did mark the mid-point of the original sheet, one would have to assume a considerable section of vacant space to the right of col. ii (with unclear purpose), with a longer line of text in l. 1 stretching across it. The line-lengths that Preisendanz restores are also inconsistent. It is thus possible that more text may have been lost.

¹ First described in *Catalogue BM* 1894, 398: "Pap. CXLVIII. Magical incantation, to secure a woman's affections. 2nd or 3rd cent. 9 in. x 5 in. Imperfect, nearly all the second column being lost; written in two columns, in a medium-sized rough uncial hand"; reprinted in P.Lond. II, p. xiv.

recto	col. i →	col. ii →	GEMF 23/PGM XIc
1	τοῦτο γράψαις ἰς ἱερατικὸν βιβλίον κ̅ θέ[ca ca ?]		
	ἐξορκίζω σε τὸν ἰαβω θεόν· στρέψον τὴν καρδίαν τῆς Δ ἧς ἔτεκεν ἡ Δ πρὸς τὸν Δ ὄν	ξεε ο[ca ? βαρ-?] βαρη[ca ?] ορο . [ca ?]	20
5	ἔτεκεν ἡ Δ κατὰ πιτάγην τοῦ ἰαβω μασκελλει μασκελλω φαιγουκενταβαω ποιήσον ἐπει- τυχεῖν τῆς συνουσίας τοῦ Δ ἐμέ, αβλαναθαναλβα	5 Δ ἦν[ἔτεκεν ἡ Δ καὶ] φελξε[ίτω ἐμὲ τὸν Δ, ὄν] ἔτε[κεν ἡ Δ εἰς] τὸν[ἅπαντα] χρο[νόν τῆς]	25
10	βλαθαναβα[. .] ναθανδα αναθانا ναβαναει αβθωωθ	10 ζοῆς[μου ἵνα μου] ἐρά π[άντως] ἐρω[σαν μου] ἴδη[ἴδη ταχὺ ταχὺ]	30
15	βαρβαχα αβρασαξ αφαι . ρ . σερφουθει ε̅ι̅ ε̅ι̅ η̅ι̅ η̅ι̅ ι̅ ι̅ αααααααιiiii		

col. i.1 γράψαις : γράφεις Pr | 1. εἰς | 1. βιβλίον | κ(αἰ) | θέ[ca: Be : ε ut vid. || 2 l. ἐξορκίζω || 3, 4, 8; ii 5 δ(ε)ἰ(να) || 5 κατὰ πιτάγην : κατ' ἀπιτάγην : 1. ἐπιτάγην Pr || 7 l. Φνουκ- | ἐπι- || 8 τοῦ : 1. τὸν || 10 fort. vacat || 17 αφαι . ρ . : αφ[ιαμα]ρ[ι] Pr
col. ii. 2 ξεε ο[σο ? 2-3 [βαρ-]]βαραι[Pr | [ὑπ' ἐμὸν] Pr || 4 ὄροφ[ον ἐλθέτω ἡ] Pr || 5 ἦν [ἔτεκεν ἡ Δ, καὶ] Pr καὶ fort. κ̅ (vide l. 1)?
|| 6 l. φιλξε[ίτω φιλ[εἴτω ἐμὲ τὸν Δ, ὄν] Pr || 7 ἔτε[κεν ἡ Δ, εἰς] Pr || 8 τὸν [ἅπαντα] Pr || 9 χρο[νον τῆς] Pr || 10 l. ζωῆ[ca αὐτῆς] Pr
|| 11 ἐραμ[ένη μου] Pr || 12 ἔρω[τι αἰωνίῳ] Pr || 13 l. ἴδη

You will write this in a hieratic scroll² and place(?)³...I adjure you by the god Iabo:⁴ turn⁵ the heart of her, NN, whom she, NN bore, towards him, NN, whom (5) she, NN bore, according to the command⁶ of Iabo, MASKELLEI MASKELLŌ PHAINOUKENTABAŌ: Grant that I attain intercourse with her,⁷ NN: ABLANATHANALBA⁸ (10) BLATHANABA NATHANDA ANATHANA NABANAEI ABTHŌŌTH (15) BARBACHA ABRASAX AŌAI . R. (?)⁹ SERPHOUTHEI¹⁰

EI EI EI Ē I Ē I AAAAAAA IIIIIII

(20) EEE O¹¹[OO(?) BAR]BARAE[L(?)¹² ... ORO¹³ ... her, NN, whom [NN bore, and let her] love¹⁴ [me NN, whom she, NN] (25) bore for the [entire(?) time¹⁵ [of my] life [so that] she might desire [me in every way(?)]¹⁶, (30) desiring [me], now [now, quickly quickly(?)]

M. Choat

² βιβλίον is translated ‘papyrus’ by O’Neil, GMPT and ‘Papyrusblatt’ by Preisendanz. The adjective ἱερατικός is usually paired in the magical papyri with χάρτης, ‘papyrus’, and by extension ‘papyrus roll’, κόλλημα, ‘roll’ or more rarely πιττάκιον, ‘tablet’, but with βιβλίον only here (βιβλίον itself occurs elsewhere only in GEMF 74.420/PGM VII 339); but see, e.g. 55/III 424 (ἱεράς βίβ[λο]υ), 60/XIII 3 (βίβλος ἱερά). We translate ‘scroll’ here, but the word has of course a much larger semantic range.

³ L. I runs across the top above both columns and serves as a ritual instruction for the text below. Presumably, if Preisendanz’s restoration is correct, the recipe continued on to say that the scroll, after being inscribed, was to be placed somewhere to affect the target (similar procedures suggest various possibilities, but most common is in a grave); Dickie 1999, 69 suggests that “it was to be placed in the mouth and rotated.”

⁴ Grammatically speaking, “the god Iabo” could be the object of the adjuration, but the usual formula is to adjure a ghost or demon by (κατά) a powerful god, usually male and assimilated to Iaō; on this ambiguity see Kotansky 1995, 144–147. The power of Iabo is confirmed in lines 5–6.

⁵ For the use of this verb ‘to turn’ in an attraction-procedure, see, e.g. SM II 56.3–6: “Turn (στρέψον) the brain, the heart (τὴν καρδίαν) and the entire mind of Zetoun.”

⁶ For κατ’ ἐπιταγήν, see GEMF 34/PGM LXII 36. Understanding πιττάκιον, ‘papyrus strip’ seems less likely.

⁷ The text gives a male pronoun here, but the victim is previously identified as a woman in lines 2–3.

⁸ For the palindrome ABLANATHANALBA, often associated with Abrasax or AKRAMMACHAMAREI, see e.g. GEMF 55/PGM III 63–64, 79, 150; 57/IV 982; 74.476/VII 311.

⁹ For Preisendanz’s suggestion, αῶ[ιαμα]ρ[ι] (which the surviving traces do not especially recommend), see GEMF 57/PGM IV 364–365.

¹⁰ Σεφοουθ(ει), Coptic σαρισ, ‘lotus’ (Crum 356b), is common in many forms in the magical papyri, often followed by μουι ρω, i.e. Coptic μογι ρω, ‘Lion, ram’ (for the latter see Crum 354b, where most of the examples come from magical texts; cf. μογι as an archaic word for ram, Crum 161a): see e.g. GEMF 74.580, 659/PGM VII 499, 577; 15/XII 80 and XL 9.

¹¹ Preisendanz conjectured θεε̅ ό̅, in this line, but the first letter does not resemble θ. The restoration proposed here would fill the gap as indicated by the other lines, on the assumption that the string of vowel continued from col. i.

¹² Preisendanz restored βαρ||βαραι, (see GEMF 57/PGM IV 1008; PGM XIXa 9) but the final letter in l. 21 seems to have a crossbar; see perhaps Βαρβαραηλ in 57/IV 1031.

¹³ Preisendanz restores these lines to say “may she come [under my] roof,” [ὕπ’ ἐμὸν] ὄροφ[ον ἐλθέτω], but of the supposed φ of ὄροφ[ον] only a trace of the top remains, which may not even be ink; we thus confine this to the *apparatus*.

¹⁴ Preisendanz believed the papyrus read φειλ[εῖτω], but the stroke of the supposed *iota* is wider than elsewhere, and it would have to be a correction if really there.

¹⁵ For the text in ll. 26–30, see e.g. SM I 47.26–27, εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον τῆς ζωῆς μου, φιλοῦσάν με, ἐρῶς[ά]ν μου.

¹⁶ Preisendanz restored ἐραμ[ένη] while recognizing that the papyrus read εραπ[; we therefore decline to print or translate his restoration, and suggest ἐρᾶ π[; without being able to be certain what the conclusion to l. 29 might have been: π[άντω]ς is entirely *exempli gratia* and conjectural. Alternatively, εραπ[may be a word which continued from the previous line, e.g. a part of θεραπεύω.