

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

In the Beginnings:

The Apotropaic Use of Scriptural *Incipits* in Late Antique Egypt

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the  
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
in History

by

Joseph Emanuel Sanzo

2012

© Copyright by  
Joseph Emanuel Sanzo  
2012

## ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

In the Beginnings:

The Apotropaic Use of Scriptural *Incipits* in Late Antique Egypt

by

Joseph Emanuel Sanzo

Doctor of Philosophy in History

University of California, Los Angeles, 2012

Professor S. Scott Bartchy, Co-chair

Professor Ra'anan S. Boustan, Co-chair

This dissertation examines the ritual use of scriptural *incipits* (i.e., opening lines of biblical books and texts) on apotropaic devices (e.g., amulets) from late antique Egypt. There are three primary objectives of this study. First, I develop a typology of the scriptural *incipits*. Through analyses of metonymy, scriptural usage in apotropaic contexts more generally, and ancient *historiolae* (i.e., narratives used for ritual power), I demonstrate that the scriptures were invoked in ritual practice as individual thematic units. Accordingly, I divide the scriptural *incipits* into two types: *incipits* of multiunit corpora (e.g., the Gospel *incipits*) and *incipits* of single-unit texts (e.g., LXX Ps 90:1). This two-fold distinction not only challenges the dominant assumption in scholarship that scriptural *incipits* should be treated as a uniform phenomenon, but it also orients the remaining two objectives.

Second, I provide the first extensive survey of potential *incipits* from late antique Egypt. I divide this survey into two major parts, corresponding to the two types of *incipits*: *incipits* of multiunit corpora and *incipits* of single-unit texts. In addition to providing a preliminary corpus of scriptural *incipits* to assist with future work, this survey also highlights the diverse forms of scriptural *incipits*, exposes the difficulty in identifying an *incipit*, and offers a unique challenge to the assumed relationship between faithfulness to established protocols and ritual efficacy.

Third, I propose the first sustained theory of scriptural *incipits*. I challenge the assumption that *incipits* operated uniformly according to the metonymic transfer *pars pro toto* (“part for whole”). Rather, *incipits* of multiunit corpora operated solely according to the metonymic transfer *pars pro parte/partibus* (“part for part/parts”), attaining the power associated with select narratives and sayings from their respective corpora (and possibly beyond). By contrast, *incipits* of single-unit texts invoked material either *pars pro parte/partibus*, focusing attention on particular words, phrases, or lines of the unit, or *pars pro toto*, attaining the power of the whole unit.

A concluding analysis highlights the possible implications of the apotropaic use of scriptural *incipits* for two other areas of study: *incipits* as classificatory rubrics in late antique book culture and late antique relics.

The dissertation of Joseph Emanuel Sanzo is approved.

Jacco Dieleman

Ronald Mellor

Claudia Rapp

S. Scott Bartchy, Committee Co-chair

Ra'anan S. Boustan, Committee Co-chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2012

To Lex and Zack

## Table of Contents

<b>List of Tables</b>	x
<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	xi
<b>Curriculum Vita</b>	xv
<b>Introduction</b>	1
<b>I. Survey of Scholarship</b>	4
<b>II. Toward a New Approach to the Scriptural <i>Incipits</i></b>	11
<b>III. Section and Chapter Summaries</b>	12
<b>SECTION ONE:</b>	
<b>METONYMY, THE APOTROPAIC USE OF SCRIPTURE, <i>HISTORIOLAE</i>,</b>	
<b>AND THE PRIORITY OF INDIVIDUAL THEMATIC UNITS</b>	
<b>Chapter One</b>	19
<b>I. <i>Pars pro toto</i>, Metonymy, and Synecdoche</b>	20
<b>II. Meronymic Relations</b>	24
<b>II. 1. Meronymy and the Scriptures</b>	25
<b>II. 2. Larger Scriptural Units</b>	28
<b>II. 2. a. The Meronymic Status of the “Bible”</b>	28
<b>II. 2. b. The Meronymic Status of the Gospels</b>	33
<b>II. 2. c. Conclusions: The “Bible” and Its Sub-Corpora</b>	40

<b>II. 3. Smaller Scriptural Units</b>	40
<b>II. 3. a. The Meronymic Status of Biblical Psalms</b>	41
<b>II. 3. b. The Meronymic Status of the Lord’s Prayer</b>	50
<b>II. 3. c. Conclusions: Smaller Scriptural Units</b>	54
<b>III. Conclusions</b>	55
<b>Chapter Two</b>	58
<b>I. The Hierarchical Approach to the Scriptures for Apotropaic Concerns</b>	59
<b>I. 1. “Relevance” and Scriptural Passages in Demonic Struggle</b>	59
<b>I. 2. The Hierarchical Approach to Literature</b>	
<b>and the Late Antique Miscellany</b>	66
<b>II. Hierarchy and <i>Historiolae</i>: The Power of Precedent and Paradigm</b>	70
<b>III. Conclusions</b>	75
<b>Excursus: The Hierarchical View of Scripture and Ritual Authority</b>	76

**SECTION TWO:**

**A PRELIMINARY SURVEY OF SCRIPTURAL *INCIPITS*  
FROM LATE ANTIQUE EGYPT**

<b>Chapter Three</b>	80
<b>I. The Gospel <i>Incipits</i></b>	81
<b>I. 1. Ritual Artifacts with at least the Four Gospel <i>Incipits</i></b>	83

<b>I. 2. Ritual Artifacts with Two or Three Gospel <i>Incipits</i></b>	103
<b>I. 3. Ritual Artifacts with One Gospel <i>Incipit</i></b>	105
<b>II. Other Possible <i>Incipits</i> of Multiunit Corpora</b>	113
<b>III. Patterns and Trends</b>	116
<b>IV. Conclusions</b>	119
<b>Chapter Four</b>	120
<b>I. Psalmic <i>Incipits</i></b>	121
<b>I. 1. <i>Incipits</i> of LXX Ps 90</b>	122
<b>I. 2. Other Psalmic <i>Incipits</i></b>	139
<b>II. <i>Incipits</i> of Other Single-Unit Texts</b>	152
<b>II. 1. <i>Incipits</i> of the Lord's Prayer</b>	152
<b>II. 2. Other <i>Incipits</i></b>	154
<b>III. Single-Unit or Multiunit <i>Incipits</i>?</b>	155
<b>IV. Patterns and Trends</b>	158
<b>V. Conclusions</b>	158
<b>Chapter Five</b>	159
<b>I. <i>Incipits</i> in the Extant Apotropaic Record</b>	159
<b>II. Implications</b>	168
<b>II. 1. The Limited Selection of <i>Incipits</i> in the Extant Record</b>	169
<b>II. 2. <i>Incipits</i>, Faithfulness to Protocols, and Ritual Efficacy</b>	170
<b>III. Conclusions</b>	172

**SECTION THREE:**  
**TOWARD A THEORY OF THE SCRIPTURAL *INCIPITS***  
**FROM LATE ANTIQUE EGYPT**

<b>Chapter Six</b>		175
	<b>I. Toward a Theory of the Gospel <i>Incipits</i>: A Representative Case of <i>Incipits</i> of Multiunit Corpora</b>	176
	<b>I. 1. The Scope of Material Invoked by the Gospel <i>Incipits</i></b>	176
	<b>I. 2. Metonymy and <i>Incipits</i> of Multiunit Corpora: Not <i>pars pro toto</i>, but <i>pars pro partibus</i></b>	184
	<b>I. 3. The Gospel <i>Incipits</i> and the Ritual Use of “Gospels” in the Literary Record</b>	187
	<b>II. Toward a Metonymic Theory of <i>Incipits</i> of Single-Unit Texts</b>	193
	<b>III. The Distinction between <i>Incipits</i> of Multiunit Corpora and <i>Incipits</i> of Single-Unit Texts: The <i>Incipits</i> on PSI VI 719 as a Test Case</b>	197
	<b>IV. The <i>Incipits</i> and Continuity and Innovation in the Ancient Mediterranean</b>	201
	<b>V. Conclusions</b>	207
<b>Conclusions</b>		208
<b>Bibliography</b>		215
	<b>I. Primary Sources and Major Corpora of Ritual Artifacts</b>	215
	<b>II. Secondary Literature</b>	217

## List of Tables

<b>Table 1: “Biblical” Passages on Greek Amulets</b>	57
<b>Table 2: Chart of Potential <i>Incipits</i></b>	173

## List of Abbreviations

<i>AAT</i>	<i>Atti della Reale Accademia delle scienze di Torino</i>
<i>ACM</i>	Meyer, Marvin W. and Richard Smith, eds. <i>Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power</i> . San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1994.
<i>Aland, Repertorium 1</i>	Aland, Kurt, ed. <i>Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri im namen der Patristischen Arbeitsstelle Münster</i> . Vol. 1. Berlin, New York: W. de Gruyter, 1976.
<i>AnPap</i>	<i>Analecta Papyrologica</i>
<i>APF</i>	<i>Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete</i>
<i>APIS</i>	<i>Advanced Papyrological Information System</i> . An online database of papyri, hosted by Columbia University. <a href="http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/projects/digital/apis/">http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/projects/digital/apis/</a>
<i>ASAE</i>	<i>Annales du service des antiquités de l’Égypte</i>
<i>BASP</i>	<i>The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>
<i>BIFAO</i>	<i>Bulletin de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale</i>
<i>BN</i>	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
<i>CP</i>	<i>Classical Philology</i>
<i>DGRG</i>	Smith, W. ed. <i>A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography</i> . London: AMS, 1873.
<i>DOP</i>	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
<i>EEFAR</i>	<i>Egypt Exploration Fund, Archaeological Report</i>

- GMPT* Betz, Hans D., ed., *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Including the Demotic Spells*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- HTR* *Harvard Theological Review*
- JNES* *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
- JSNT* *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
- LAAA* *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*
- LDAB* *Leuven Database of Ancient Books*. An online database of Greek, Latin, Coptic, and Demotic literary texts.  
<http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/index.php>
- MDAIA* *Mitteilungen des kaiserlich deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts. Athenische Abtheilung*
- NETS* The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- NKGW* *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*
- PGM* Preisendanz, Karl, ed. *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechen Zauberpapyri*. 2 vols. Rev. ed. A. Henrichs. Stuttgart: K G Saur Verlag Gmbh & Co, 1973.

- Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis* Rahlfs, Alfred and Detlef Fraenkel. *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*. Vol. 1.1: *Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- Sahidica* *Sahidica.org: The Egyptian New Testament*. An online database of the Greek and Sahidic Coptic New Testaments: <http://sahidica.warpc.com/>
- Septuaginta* Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.
- Stud.Pap.* *Studia Papyrologica*
- Suppl.Mag.* Daniel, Robert W. and Franco Maltomini, eds. *Supplementum Magicum*. 2 vols. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1990-92.
- TM *Trismegistos*. An online database of papyrological and epigraphical resources dealing with Egypt and the Nile valley between roughly 800 BC and AD 800. <http://www.trismegistos.org/index.html>
- ThR* *Theologische Rundschau*
- van Haelst, *Catalogue* van Haelst, J. *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1976.
- VC* *Vigiliae Christianae*

Wessely, “Monuments”

Wessely, C. “Les plus anciens monuments du  
Christianisme écrits sur papyrus (II).” In *Patrologia  
Orientalis*. Vol. 18. Ed. R. Graffin and F. Nau. Paris:  
Firmin-Didot et C<sup>ie</sup>, Imprimeurs-Éditeurs, 1924, 399-512.

ZAC

*Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum*

ZNW

*Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die  
Kunde des Urchristentums*

ZPE

*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

ZTK

*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

## Curriculum Vita

### EDUCATION

- 2010 C.Phil., History, UCLA
- 2008 M.A., History, UCLA
- 2003 M.A., New Testament Languages and Literature, Biola University
- 2001 B.A., Religious Studies (Minor: Music), Concordia University, Irvine

### ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

- 2013– Lecturer, Study of Religion Program, UCLA
- 2011–12 Teaching Fellow, Study of Religion Program, UCLA
- 2004–06 Adjunct Professor, Department of Theological Studies, Concordia University, Irvine

### PUBLICATIONS

#### Articles, Book Chapters, and Reference Works

- (with Ra‘anan Boustan) “Jewish Culture and Society in a Christianizing Empire,” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Attila*, ed. Michael Maas (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), under contract.
- “Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2): An Unpublished Coptic Amulet in the British Library,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, in press.
- “Ernest Renan,” in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Modernism* (London: Routledge, online publication), in press.
- “Sir James Frazer,” in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Modernism* (London: Routledge,

online publication), in press.

“Canonical Power: A ‘Tactical’ Approach to the Use of the Christian Canon in P. Berlin 954,”

*Saint Shenouda Coptic Quarterly* 4.3-4 (2008): 28-45.

## **Reviews**

(Review of) Gideon Bohak, Yuval Harari, and Shaul Shaked, eds., *Continuity and Innovation in the Magical Tradition* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), in *Preternature*, in press.

“Review of *The Secret Gospel of Mark: Find or Forgery?* Panel Discussion,” *Saint Shenouda Coptic Quarterly* 4.1-2 (2008): 8-14.

## **SELECT PRESENTATIONS**

“Towards the Identification of the Model of Scripture in the Apotropaic Record of Late Antique Egypt” (Society of Biblical Literature: Chicago, IL, November 2012)

“Beyond the Label: A New Approach to the Relationship Between ‘Christian’ Traditions and Ritual Power in Late Antiquity” (“Authoritative Traditions and Ritual Power in the Ancient World: UCLA, October 2012)

“Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2): Some Observations” (UCLA-St. Shenouda Conference of Coptic Studies: UCLA, July 2012)

“Your Impurity is My Purity: The ‘Jewish’ Persecution of Christ in P. Heidelberg, inv. G 1101” (Studies in Second Temple Judaism and Christian Origins [Enoch Graduate Seminar]: Notre Dame, IN, June 2012; Western Commission for the Study of Religion: Whittier College, March 2011)

## Introduction

Late antique Egypt was a dangerous place. Its inhabitants not only regularly confronted hazards of nature (e.g., snakes, crocodiles, scorpions), but also combated numerous physical ailments (e.g., fevers, eye problems, insomnia, swelling, teeth problems). In addition, the growth of various traditions, which for convenience might be labeled collectively as “Christian,” appropriated, modified, and expanded ancient Egyptian demonology into a robust system that permeated the landscape; various categories of unruly demonic forces were often associated with (and blamed for) the calamities of life.<sup>1</sup> As a result, late antique Egyptians faced a bleak plight, one that conflated visible suffering with an underlying invisible realm that was highly complex and intimidating.

In order to deal with this dire situation, many Egyptians turned to local ritual specialists, who were entrusted with providing the desired healing and/or protection on account of their specialized knowledge of the arcane. These experts not only mastered—or better yet, helped to construct—taxonomies of the demonic, but they also manufactured various apotropaic devices (e.g., tokens, amulets) to thwart the attacks of such otherworldly foes.

Scholars of late antique Egypt are the fortunate inheritors of many of these ritual artifacts, which have survived from antiquity to the present. This material has allowed for the construction of a more complete (and more complex) portrait of the religious landscape of late antique Egypt than painted by ancient literary sources. Moreover, the multiplicity of extant papyri, parchment,

---

<sup>1</sup> David Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), esp. 273-77. For the prominence of demons in the broader Byzantine world (with an emphasis on Egypt), see Anastasia D. Vakaloudi, “ΔΕΙΣΙΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΑ and the Role of the Apotropaic Magic Amulets in the Early Byzantine Empire,” *Byzantion* 70 (2000): 182-210.

and other media has made the study of these ritual artifacts (and the texts contained therein) a vibrant field of inquiry in its own right.

Ritual specialists in late antiquity utilized a variety of tactics to assist with the apotropaic concerns of their clients. One of these tactics—the one at the forefront of this study—was the use of initial phrases/titles (typically called *incipits*) from books, psalms, or famous sections of the scriptures.<sup>2</sup> Among the more common of these alleged *incipits* in the extant record are the initial phrases and/or titles of one or more of the four Gospels, Septuagint Ps 90 (MT Ps 91; hereafter LXX Ps 90), and the Lord’s Prayer (Mt 6:9). BKT VI 7.1 (**nos. 2 and 25**), a sixth–or seventh–century CE amulet from the Fayum, offers a clear example of this ritual tactic:<sup>3</sup>

In the name of the F(athe)r a(nd) of the S(o)n and of the Holy S(piri)t; (**LXX Ps 90:1**) The one who dwells in the help of the Most High <will> abide in the shelter of the L(or)d of Heaven; (**Jn 1:1-2**) In the beginning was the Word and the Word was wi(th) <God> and the Word was G(o)d; he was in the beginning with G(o)d; (**Mt 1:1**) (The) book of the generation of J(esu)s C(hris)t, S(o)n of D(avi)d, S(o)n of Abr(aham); (**Mk 1:1**) (The) beginning of the Gospel of Jesus C(hris)t S(o)n of G(o)d; (**Lk 1:1**) Inasmuch as many have undertaken to arrange a narrative; (**LXX Ps 117:6-7**) The L(or)d is my helper a(nd) I will not fear. What will a h(uma)n do to me? The L(or)d is my helper, and I will look upon my enemies; (**LXX Ps 17:2**) The L(or)d is my foundation, a(nd) m[y] protection, a(nd) my deliverer; (**Mt 4:23**) The L(or)d J(esu)s went around all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues a(nd) preaching the gospel of the kingdom a(nd) healing every sickness and every malady; The body and blood of C(hris)t spare your slave (δούλου), the one who wears this phylactery; Amen; Alleluia; † A † O †<sup>4</sup>

The ritual specialist here has utilized several *incipits* (LXX Ps 90:1, Jn 1:1-2, Mt 1:1, Mk 1:1, Lk 1:1) along with an invocation of the Trinity, citations of three other scriptural passages (LXX Ps

---

<sup>2</sup> Despite standard scholarly practice, I avoid using the label “Christian” to designate apotropaic artifacts that contain passages from the “Bible” and other theological language typically associated with “Christianity.” I think that this label carries little heuristic utility. Indeed, what constituted a “Christian” text or practice was a matter of much contention in late antiquity. Moreover, the texts and practices that scholars of ancient magic use to identify “Christian” apotropaic artifacts tend to privilege certain (“orthodox”) types of ancient Christianity over against others. See, most recently, Walter M. Shandruk, “Christian Use of Magic in Late Antique Egypt,” *J ECS* 20 (2012): 31-57. I plan on addressing this matter at length in a future publication.

<sup>3</sup> The bolded numbers refer to the survey of scriptural *incipits* in Chapters Three (**nos. 1-24**) and Four (**nos. 25-61**).

<sup>4</sup> Translation adapted from Meyer in *ACM*, 34-35, no. 9.

117:6-7, LXX Ps 17:2, Mt 4:23), a request for protection through the “body and blood of Christ,” and ritual symbols.

But the use of *incipits* in the ritual world of late antique Egypt was by no means uniform. On artifacts, such as P. Anastasy 9 (**no. 5**), the *incipits* are embedded within a long and complex ritual. In other cases, they are the only recognizable written element on the ritual device. For example, the text on P. Mich. 1559 (**no. 7**) consists solely of the opening lines of the four Gospels in the “canonical order” and unknown ritual symbols.

Further complicating matters is the wide range of textual boundaries, which have been or could be classified as *incipits*. Indeed, in the extant apotropaic record, possible candidates for an *incipit* designation include citations that range from a single word to an incomplete phrase to an extended passage. Unfortunately, the lack of a substantial and exclusive collection of scriptural *incipits* has obscured their diversity. One of the objectives of this project, therefore, is to provide a preliminary survey of the ritual artifacts with scriptural *incipits*, including the texts of the *incipits*.

In light of this diversity, various questions follow: what is the best way to think about the category *incipit*? What are the functions of these *incipits*? Do *incipits* from different texts function in different ways? Do these *incipits* make reference to material beyond the “words on the page”? If so, how vast is this implied corpus? It is an additional aim of this investigation to explore such questions, as they have not been addressed in sufficient detail in previous scholarship.

To be sure, the ritual use of *incipits* has not gone unnoticed in analyses of ancient apotropaic practices. In fact, many scholars have observed the utilization of *incipits* in apotropaic contexts. Yet discussions of this phenomenon have been confined to passing references within

analyses of other aspects of late antique ritual texts and practices. In other words, while it has been mentioned several times, the ritual use of *incipits* has not been subjected to a sustained and extensive study.

This lacuna is unfortunate on account of the abundance of artifacts that made use of opening lines as part of their rituals. There are over fifty ritual artifacts, which I have identified, that contain or may contain *incipits*. This profusion of *incipits* on apotropaic devices demonstrates that they were a well-established tactic in the arsenal of late antique ritual specialists. Analysis of the ritual use of *incipits*, therefore, is crucial for understanding ritual practice in late antiquity more broadly.

To illustrate the lack of sustained reflection on this ritual tactic and to highlight the need for the present investigation, I now synthesize the references to *incipits* within scholarship. I then isolate a few formative presuppositions that I believe need to be reconsidered. This brief survey will set the stage for the remainder of the project.

## **I. Survey of Scholarship**

Theories on the ritual use of the *incipits* have generally fallen into one of the following categories: (1) the view that the *incipits* have protective power, generally conceived, and (2) the view that the *incipits* functioned *pars pro toto* (though various terms have been used). Within the latter category, there are two general views: (a) those who have argued that the *incipits* referred to the “scriptures,” more generally, and (b) those who think that through the *incipits* the ritual specialist had in mind a particular biblical corpus (e.g., the Gospels), biblical book (e.g., the Gospel of John), or smaller biblical unit (e.g., a psalm).

The first approach to the *incipits* in ritual contexts has been simply to assert that the initial words and/or titles possess (an undefined) ritual power. For instance, pointing to the use of the Gospel *incipits* in P. Mich. 1559 (**no. 7**) as an example of the “many talismanic φυλακτήρια containing only the titles and first words of biblical texts,” David Frankfurter asserts that these *incipits*, originally used as classificatory rubrics, eventually were imbued with independent ritual power.<sup>5</sup> Though speaking of both the *incipit* of LXX Ps 90 and the Gospel *incipits*, Marvin Meyer seems to presuppose a similar perspective in the introduction to his English translation of the Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet (**no. 13**): “[t]he opening portion of Psalm 91 [=LXX Ps 90] and the incipits of Matthew, John, Luke, and Mark are quoted for their protective power.”<sup>6</sup> In this reading, the *incipits* do not reference a larger body of material (whether textual or not), as is the case with other theories (see below), but possess power in and of themselves.<sup>7</sup>

Attempting to provide a more explanatory account of the ritual use of the *incipits*, a handful of scholars have looked to the *pars pro toto* model, a phenomenon that I will situate

---

<sup>5</sup> *Elijah in Upper Egypt: The Apocalypse of Elijah and Early Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 40 n. 27. These words on the Gospel *incipits* nuance Frankfurter’s thesis in this section that the title, “The Apocalypse of Elijah,” did not serve as an indicator of the genre of apocalypse. It should be noted that despite Frankfurter’s claim of the prevalence of apotropaic devices with only *incipits* of “biblical texts,” P. Mich. 1559 and P. Berol. 22 235 (**no. 6**) represent the *only* examples of such artifacts. While the Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls (**no. 14**) have the *incipits* of the Gospels and of various psalms (LXX 31, 90, 111, 118, 127), this artifact also contains two lists of names, the latter being a list of “Jewish” prophets. What is more, it is misleading to assert that P. Mich. 1559 consists solely of Gospel *incipits*. As the editor of P. Mich. 1559 notes, there are ritual symbols in the lower margin of the artifact (Gerald Browne, *Michigan Coptic Texts* [Barcelona: Papyrologica Castroctaviana, 1979], 44). For a reiteration of this approach to the Gospel *incipits* in a more general discussion of ritual power, see Frankfurter’s introduction to “Protective Spells” in *ACM*, 105.

<sup>6</sup> *ACM*, 115.

<sup>7</sup> For other examples of scholars who have either stated or implied that the Gospel *incipits* possess an inherent protective power, see: Walter E. Crum, “La magie copte: Nouveaux textes,” in *Recueil d’études égyptologiques dédiées à la mémoire de Jean-François Champollion à l’occasion du centenaire de la lettre à M. Dacier* (Paris: Librairie Ancienne H & E. Champion, 1922), 537-44, at 544; Angelicus Kropp, *Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte*, 3 vols. (Bruxelles: Édition de la Fondation Égyptologique reine Élisabeth, 1930-31), 3: 210; Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 238. In various contexts Robert Daniel and Franco Maltomini have stressed the ubiquity of the *incipits* in ritual contexts without further comment. For instance, see Robert Daniel, “A Christian Amulet on Papyrus,” *VC* 37 (1983): 400-404, at 400; Robert Daniel and Franco Maltomini, “From the African Psalter and Liturgy,” *ZPE* 74 (1988): 253-65, at 262; idem, *Suppl. Mag.* 1: 108; Franco Maltomini, “340. Amuleto con NT Ev. Jo. 1, 1-11,” in *Kölner Papyri (P. Köln)*, vol. 8, ed. Michael Gronewald, Klaus Maresch, and Cornelia Römer (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1997), 82-95, at 87.

within the semantic domain of metonymy in Chapter One. Once again, David Frankfurter’s name comes to the fore. As part of an essay that has now become the classic synthetic treatment of *historiolae* (i.e., the use of [short] narratives for ritual power), Frankfurter explicates the use of the “scriptures” for ritual power as follows: “...the ‘power’ inherent in sacred scripture could be tapped simply by writing gospel *incipits*.”<sup>8</sup> In this expression of Frankfurter’s thoughts on the Gospel *incipits*, he seems to suggest that they provide a means for attaining an “inherent” power, one which is associated with the “scriptures” as an entire entity. Thus, implicit in his words is a part-for-whole relationship between the Gospel *incipits* and the “scriptures” (=Bible?).<sup>9</sup>

Not all scholars identify the implied reference behind the *incipits* in such broad terms. As part of his analysis of P<sup>78</sup>, an amulet that makes use of Jude 4-8, Tommy Wasserman has offered a brief analysis (in a footnote) of the ritual function of the Gospel *incipits*.<sup>10</sup> He writes, “...the incipit represented *the whole Gospel in question*, which in turn was perceived as having a special power for protection, exorcism or healing.”<sup>11</sup> As evidence for this “special power” associated with the Gospels, Wasserman points to the lacunose opening line of P. Rain. 1 (= PGM 2: 198-99, no. 10), which has been reconstructed to read: “[ὀκίζω ὑμᾶς κατὰ τῶν τεσσάρων

<sup>8</sup> “Narrating Power: The Theory and Practice of the Magical *Historiola* in Ritual Spells,” in *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, ed. Marvin W. Meyer and Paul A. Mirecki (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 457-76, at 465.

<sup>9</sup> Close to Frankfurter’s position here is that of Claudia Rapp, who explicitly states that the use of scriptural “extracts” (=incipits?) in the archaeological record operates “*pars pro toto*,” capturing the power of the entire “Word of God” (“Holy Texts, Holy Men, and Holy Scribes: Aspects of Scriptural Holiness in Late Antiquity,” in *The Early Christian Book*, ed. W. E. Klingshirn and L. Safran [Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007], 194-224). Rapp writes, “We see the use of extracts from scripture, *pars pro toto*, to evoke the power of the entire Word of God in the recommendation to write psalm verses on storage jars to prevent wine from turning sour, and in the Bible verses written on the walls of monks’ cells in Egypt in order to preserve the holiness of the space and its inhabitant” (idem, 202). Likewise, Don C. Skemer seems to allude to the use of Gospel *incipits* when he writes, “*Brief quotations embodying the word of God and the promise of divine protection could function as life-saving textual shields and powerful weapons against demons*” (*Binding Words: Textual Amulets in the Middle Ages* [University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006], 84 [emphasis mine]).

<sup>10</sup> T. Wasserman, “P<sup>76</sup> (P. Oxy. Xxxiv 2684): The Epistle of Jude on an Amulet?” in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*, ed. Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 137-60.

<sup>11</sup> “P<sup>76</sup> (P. Oxy. Xxxiv 2684),” 150 n. 44 (emphasis mine). The “power” associated with the Gospels is also highlighted by E. von Dobschütz, “Charms and Amulets (Christian),” in *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, ed. Shailer Mathews and Gerald Birney Smith (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1923), 3:413-30, at 425.

εὐαγγ]ελίων τοῦ υἱοῦ[...]" (“[I adjure you according to the four Gosp]els of the so[n...]).<sup>12</sup> In Wasserman’s view, one should not look beyond the particular Gospel, from which the *incipit* is taken, or the entire Gospel corpus (if all four Gospel are present) for the “whole” that was intended.

Multiple scholars have taken a similar position with reference to LXX Ps 90:1. For instance, as part of his analysis of the *incipit* of LXX Ps 90 in PSI VI 719 (**no. 31** [see also **nos. 10 and 56**]), E. A. Judge asks, “Is the writer reminding Christ (or the devil?—who is supposed to read these things?) that the opening words are to do duty for the lot?”<sup>13</sup> Likewise, in his commentary on MT Ps 91 (=LXX Ps 90), Erich Zenger observes that “entweder Teile aus Ps 91 (meist Ps 91,5-6 oder 91,10-13) oder der Anfang (Incipit) des Psalms (*als Substitution für den ganzen Psalm*) geschrieben standen.”<sup>14</sup>

It is not surprising that some scholars have drawn a connection between the conceptual referent of the Gospel *incipits* and that of an *incipit* of a psalm (esp. LXX Ps 90:1). For instance, in a very helpful survey of amulets that utilize “biblical” citations, Theodore de Bruyn not only echoes the position of Wasserman on the Gospel *incipits*, but also ties this restrictive part-for-whole usage to the ritual use of psalmic *incipits*: “...biblical texts [can be] cited *in abbreviated form as a cipher for an entire text*, such as the *incipits* of the gospels or the opening words of the

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid. It should be highlighted that Wasserman does not provide any mention or indication that this opening line has been reconstructed on the basis of only a few letters.

<sup>13</sup> “The Magical Use of Scripture in the Papyri,” in *Perspectives on Language and Text: Essays and Poems in Honor of Francis I. Andersen’s Sixtieth Birthday July 28, 1985*, ed. Edgar W. Conrad and Edward G. Newing (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 339-49, at 341.

<sup>14</sup> “Psalm 91,” in *Psalmen 51-100*, ed. F.-L. Hossfeld and E. Zenger (Freiburg: Herder, 2000), 626 (emphasis mine). In his analysis of the “magical” use of the Psalms in the *Sefer Shimmush Tehillim*, Bill Rebigier utilizes the *pars pro toto* model to explain the use of the first or second verse from a Psalm for the ritual (“Die magische Verwendung von Psalmen im Judentum,” in *Ritual und Poesie: Formen und Orte religiöser Dichtung im alten Orient, im Judentum und im Christentum*, ed. Erich Zenger [Freiburg: Herder, 2003], 265-81, at 270).

verses of a psalm.”<sup>15</sup> In his analysis of the use of LXX Ps 90:1 in the so-called “Bous-amulets,” Thomas J. Kraus also suggests a similarity in ritual practice between LXX Ps 90:1 and the Gospel *incipits*.<sup>16</sup> In this view, both the *incipits* of Gospels and the *incipits* of individual psalms are expressions of a more general ritual practice, *pars pro toto*.

At least four larger issues follow from this brief survey of scholarship. First, one must note the brevity of these treatments of the ritual operation of the *incipits*. These comments were made *en passant* and are merely ancillary to the primary concerns of their authors. Even so, it is surprising that the ritual use of the *incipits* is routinely confined to a one-clause “analysis.” I do not think that such simple statements concerning the *incipits* are sufficient to describe accurately this ritual tactic. To be sure, as will become evident in the analysis to come, many of the ritual artifacts that utilize the *incipits* are lacunose, thus leaving this material with little context. Furthermore, the other elements preserved on these artifacts are often difficult to interpret. That said, while these limitations may preclude definitive solutions to the *incipits*, they should not inhibit sustained and focused analysis, especially as these are generally characteristic of many ritual practices and artifacts from antiquity. In light of the frequent use of scriptural *incipits* in the extant apotropaic record, a detailed analysis of this phenomenon is a paramount desideratum.

Second, though the brief statements made by various scholars give the illusion of cautious observation, such accounts are not without undefended presuppositions. While the

---

<sup>15</sup> “Papyri, Parchments, Ostraca, and Tablets Written with Biblical Texts in Greek and Used as Amulets: A Preliminary List,” in *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach*, ed. Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 145-90, at 149 (emphasis mine). More recently, de Bruyn (with Jitse H. F. Dijkstra) has reiterated this view of the Gospel *incipits* in similar wording (“Greek Amulets and Formularies from Egypt Containing Christian Elements: A Checklist of Papyri, Parchments, Ostraka, and Tablets,” *BASP* 48 [2011]: 163-216, at 172).

<sup>16</sup> “Βουσ, Βαινχωωχ und Septuaginta-Psalms 90? Überlegungen zu den sogenannten ‘Bous’-Amuletten und dem beliebtesten Bibeltext für apotropäische Zwecke,” *ZAC* 11 (2007): 479-91. Kraus writes, “...analog zu den Evangelienanfängen auch der Psalmenanfang den kompletten Text impliziert” (idem, 487); cf. idem, “Septuaginta-Psalms 90 in apotropäischer Verwendung: Vorüberlegungen für eine kritische Edition und (bisheriges) Datenmaterial,” *BN* 125 (2005): 39-73, at 44 n. 18.

approach taken by Frankfurter and Meyer has a certain appeal on account of its simplicity, upon closer consideration I find it unhelpful for understanding the ritual use of the *incipits*. To claim, as does Meyer, that a ritual tactic on a protective charm has protective power has little explanatory value. What item on a protective charm does *not* have protective power?

Frankfurter's claim that the Gospel *incipits* were classificatory rubrics that eventually carried ritual power may have interest as an example of different uses of the titles/opening phrases of the Gospels in late antiquity, but it hardly explains what ritual specialists sought to gain from citing Gospel *incipits*. These claims bypass the central question: why were these words believed to have a protective/ritual power? In other words, what are these *incipits* "doing" on the ritual artifact?

What is more, this position ignores the referential quality inherent in an *incipit*. An *incipit* is the *beginning of a textual unit*. Thus, implicit in the notion of an *incipit* is the *intentional connection* between the "words on the page" and the contiguous unit. In this vein, it is imperative to distinguish between two phenomena that are frequently conflated: (1) the intentional use of the beginning of a textual unit *as the beginning of a textual unit* and (2) the use of a relevant passage for an apotropaic situation, which happens to correspond to the beginning of a textual unit. As will become evident over the course of this project, the identification of an *incipit* (at least from the vantage point of the ancient ritual specialist) is not always a simple task, especially when only one opening line is present and that opening line could have apotropaic relevancy as an independent scriptural unit (e.g., LXX Ps 90:1).

Although the *pars pro toto* position, whether asserted or assumed, represents a step forward in addressing this problem, adherents to this position have ignored the relation(s) between the "parts" and their "whole(s)." The reader is confronted with explicit or implicit

evocations of the adjectives “whole” or “entire” without any justification or explanation. In fact, such assertions involve assumptions that require extended commentary. Are all part/whole relationships the same? What is the relationship between the “Bible,” the “Gospels,” or a given psalm and their respective constituent parts? Is it legitimate to assume that an *incipit* of a psalm or of the Lord’s Prayer would have the same kind of relation to its “whole” as the *incipits* of the Gospels?

Third, and perhaps even more basic, is the question concerning whether the scriptures (or individual sub-corpora) were approached or thought of as “wholes” within apotropaic and adjacent contexts; this question has not been addressed sufficiently. What do passages from scripture look like on ritual artifacts? While scholars have noted the ubiquity of the use of individual units of scripture in apotropaic situations, a connection between this unit-based mode of scriptural citation and the ritual use of *incipits* has not been explored.

Fourth, some scholars maintain that the *incipits* allow ritual specialists to tap into a “power” inherent to the “Bible,” the “Word of God,” or the “Gospels.” This view of power, however, leaves several questions unaddressed. What is the nature of this biblical “power”? In other words, what kind of “power” does the “Bible” and its respective corpora possess without reference to a particular artifact or to some biblical content (e.g., a particular story, saying, or character)? Moreover, does the extant apotropaic record support the assumption that ritual specialists employed undifferentiated power for particular apotropaic situations? I will demonstrate that, in addition to carrying little descriptive utility, the view that the “Bible” or its sub-corpora possess an inherent and undefined power conflicts with the preference for particular precedent or paradigm in the deployment of myths for apotropaic purposes.

## II. Toward a New Approach to the Scriptural *Incipits*

In a previous venue, I adopted a somewhat different approach to the *incipits*, in general, and to the Gospel *incipits*, in particular.<sup>17</sup> Focusing my attention on P. Berlin 954 (=BGU III 954), a text I will discuss in the survey to follow (**no. 15**), and taking into consideration the nature of *historiolae* (see discussion in Chapter Two), I argued that it was individual elements from the Gospels (especially healing and exorcistic elements) that were the intended conceptual antecedent of the two *incipits* on that artifact (i.e., Jn 1:1 and Mt 1:1).<sup>18</sup>

The present investigation will expand and develop my prior thesis along three fronts. First, I will examine a broader corpus of artifacts, taking into consideration all *incipits*, not only the Gospel *incipits* on P. Berlin 954/BGU III 954 (**no. 15**). Second, I will draw upon linguistic theory in order to challenge the *pars pro toto* model as a general scheme for understanding the ritual semantics of the *incipits* and to offer a more helpful model for understanding this phenomenon. Third, I will situate my analysis of the ritual use of *incipits* within the broader context of ancient scriptural usage in apotropaic and related contexts.

In this study, I contend that the *incipits* on the apotropaic materials from late antique Egypt do not reflect a single and homogenous form of metonymy. Instead, the *incipits* reflect at least two different kinds of metonymic transfers, *pars pro toto* (“part for whole”) and *pars pro parte/partibus* (“part for part/s”). These two designations correspond roughly to two types of contiguous scriptural items, *single-unit texts* and *multiunit corpora*. These technical terms refer to the complexity of the likely scriptural object that the *incipit* indexes. Thus, the *incipit* of a single-unit text is the first line/title of a single discrete saying, narrative, or psalm; the *incipit* of a

---

<sup>17</sup> “Canonical Power: A ‘Tactical’ Approach to the Use of the Christian Canon in P. Berlin 954,” *Saint Shenouda Coptic Quarterly* 4 (2008): 28-45, at 44.

<sup>18</sup> I must concede that in this article I assumed a *pars pro toto* model without sufficient grounding in metonymic theory and without reference to broader trends in biblical usage within the late antique Egyptian ritual world.

multiunit corpus is the first line/title of a scriptural item or items that consist of multiple narrative and/or apophthegmatic parts.

Thus, in the specific case of the apotropaic artifacts from late antique Egypt, the single-unit texts correspond to individual psalms, the Lord's Prayer, and to other individual sections from the scriptures. Multiunit corpora, on the other hand, are represented in the present investigation by the "Bible" (or "Word of God"), the Gospels, and larger biblical "books" (e.g., the New Testament letter to the Hebrews). In short, my thesis is that the complexity of the scriptural unit, which is contiguous with a given *incipit*, played an important role in determining the nature of the metonymic transfer and, consequently, in shaping the conceptual material(s) that the *incipit* invoked.

This is a study of a common ritual tactic in late antiquity that has received little attention in scholarship. Accordingly, this project hopes to build upon and to expand our understanding of the relationship between authoritative traditions and ancient ritual language. It also supports and contributes to other domains of inquiry concerning the ancient world, including the reception of scripture in antiquity, textual criticism of the scriptures, and relic theory, to name a few.

### **III. Section and Chapter Summaries**

The structure of *In the Beginnings* supports the three primary objectives of this project: to develop a useful typology of scriptural *incipits*; to create a corpus of scriptural *incipits*; and to develop a preliminary theory of the ritual use of *incipits*. The six chapters of this study are divided unevenly into three sections, each of which focuses on one of these objectives. I now summarize each section and present a chapter-by-chapter synopsis of my argument.

Section One, “Metonymy, the Apotropaic Use of Scripture, *Historiolae*, and the Priority of Individual Thematic Units,” establishes the basic typology that frames the remainder of the project and grounds it within metonymic theory, late antique scribal culture, and ritual theory. The first two chapters are part of this section. In Chapter One, I problematize the *pars pro toto* model as generally applicable to the scriptural *incipits*. I begin by establishing the proper terminology for my analysis. I maintain that the *pars pro toto* relation (as represented in the biblical apotropaic devices) is properly classified under metonymy. I then critique the usefulness of the *pars pro toto* model for understanding all of the scriptural *incipits*. Through an analysis of the use of scripture in the extant apotropaic record, I show that ritual specialists preferred individual thematic units from the scriptures (e.g., narratives and sayings) for apotropaic situations. It is, therefore, unlikely that complex corpora (e.g., the “Bible,” the Gospels), which consist of multiple narrative and apophthegmatic units, would have been invoked *in toto*. On the other hand, individual psalms and pericopae (e.g., the Lord’s Prayer) were frequently cited *in toto* in apotropaic contexts. With this distinction in mind, I establish the two-fold typology that I will use to organize the remainder of my project: *incipits* of multiunit corpora and *incipits* of single-unit texts.

In Chapter Two, I attempt to explain the reasons for and importance of the preference for individual narrative and apophthegmatic units. This chapter is divided into three sections. First, I examine the centrality of selecting and citing relevant material from the scriptures in demonic struggle in late antiquity. I show that biblical texts were situated on a hierarchy of relevance or appropriateness, the bottom of which included passages that could be used by “heretics” and “demons.” Second, I situate this hierarchical approach to the scriptures within late antique book culture. I argue that, rather than a Bible as a unitary book, ritual specialists operated with a model

of the scriptures more akin to the late antique miscellany. Third, I examine the ritual phenomenon of the *historiola*. Utilizing scholarship on *historiolae* across Mediterranean religious traditions during late antiquity, I argue that specific precedent from prior acts of the divine imbued the ritual with power. Thus, I argue that unspecific items like the “Bible” or the “Gospels” were not likely in mind when ritual specialist cited the *incipits*.

This section closes with an excursus in which I examine the implications of a hierarchical approach to the scriptures for the social positioning of ritual specialists. I maintain that their perceived expertise in the scriptures was contingent in part on a hierarchical approach to the scriptures.

In Section Two, “A Preliminary Survey of Scriptural *Incipits* from Late Antique Egypt,” I survey the potential *incipits* in the extant apotropaic record of late antique Egypt in accordance with the two-fold typology of *incipits* developed in Section One. Chapters Three, Four, and Five are part of this section.

In Chapter Three, I examine the opening phrases/titles of multiunit corpora, providing basic information and the text in its original language. I divide this survey into four sections, the first three of which deal with the potential Gospel *incipits*. In the first section, I survey instances in which at least all four Gospel *incipits* are present. In section two, I provide information on two ritual artifacts, which provide either two or three Gospel *incipits*. In the third section, I address cases in which only one Gospel *incipit* is present. Finally, in section four, I treat two artifacts, one of which has the opening lines of the New Testament book of Hebrews, the other citing the opening words of Genesis in two versions. This survey will begin to show the formal diversity of the extant *incipits*.

I continue this preliminary survey in Chapter Four, where I list and describe the *incipits* of single-unit scriptural items. These *incipits* represent a wider range of scriptural materials than those of multiunit corpora. I have divided this survey into three sections. In the first section, I examine the potential *incipits* of the biblical psalms. I begin with a survey of the *incipits* of LXX Ps 90, the most common of the single-unit texts. This is followed by a survey of potential *incipits* of other biblical psalms. In the second section, I survey the *incipits* of single-unit items that are not psalms (e.g., the Lord's Prayer, Jesus' letter to Abgar). In the third section, I examine two *incipits* in which it is difficult to determine whether a single-unit or multiunit item was intended. This survey demonstrates the great formal diversity among the potential *incipits* of single-unit texts.

With the survey of potential *incipits* completed, I turn in Chapter Five to the task of identifying the opening lines that were most likely used as *incipits* and those that were deployed as independent thematic units. I then discuss the implications of this analysis for two aspects of late antique ritual culture. First, I highlight the limited range of the *incipits* from the psalms in the extant record. This limitation should thus qualify claims that psalmic *incipits*, as a general category, were a common ritual phenomenon. Second, I contend that the diversity among the scriptural *incipits* challenges the assumption of an intrinsic relationship between ritual efficacy and faithful adherence to inherited ritual traditions and protocols in late antiquity. Stated in reverse, the extant evidence suggests that ritual specialists could modify existing standards in apotropaic practice without sacrificing perceived ritual efficacy.

In Section Three, "Toward a Theory of the Scriptural *Incipits* from Late Antique Egypt," I propose a preliminary theory of the apotropaic use of scriptural *incipits*. Chapter Six is the only chapter in this section. I organize my discussion in this chapter according to the distinction

between *incipits* of multiunit corpora and those of single-unit texts. Focusing my attention on the Gospel *incipits*, I contend that *incipits* of multiunit corpora invoked only select items from known traditions about Jesus (“canonical” and likely “non-canonical”). In other words, the relationship between the *incipits* and their multiunit referents is characterized by the metonymic transfer *pars pro parte/partibus*. With insights derived from my analysis of the Gospel *incipits*, I treat several literary accounts that refer to the ritual use of the “Gospels.” I then turn my attention to *incipits* of single-unit texts. In dialogue with the ritual use of the scriptures more generally, I maintain that, in certain cases, the *pars pro toto* model may correctly reflect the intentions of the ritual specialists for single-unit texts. In other cases, however, the evidence suggests that *incipits* of single-unit texts were used *pars pro partibus*. I conclude my theoretical analysis by situating the scriptural *incipits* of late antique Egypt within the broader context of the ritual uses of sacred texts in the late antique Mediterranean world. I demonstrate that, while there are continuities between the ritual uses of the Bible and other sacred texts (e.g., Homeric poetry), the *incipits* were primarily a biblical phenomenon. Furthermore, although *incipits* of single-unit texts may have been used in other parts of the Mediterranean, the extant evidence suggests that *incipits* of multiunit corpora were unique to the Greek and Coptic communities of Egypt in late antiquity.

In the conclusion, I draw out implications of the scriptural *incipits* for other fields of inquiry and specify areas that require further research. I focus my attention on two such areas: (1) the relationship between *incipits* in ritual contexts and *incipits* as classificatory rubrics in late antique book culture and (2) the relationship between the metonymic use of *incipits* and late antique relics.

The *incipits* were one of the most frequently deployed ritual tactics in late antique Egypt. Yet they remain an untapped resource for scholars of late antique ritual culture. It is my hope that *In the Beginnings* will start a conversation on this interesting ritual practice.

**SECTION ONE**  
**METONYMY, THE APOTROPAIC USE OF SCRIPTURE, *HISTORIOLOAE*,**  
**AND THE PRIORITY OF INDIVIDUAL THEMATIC UNITS**

## Chapter One

The assumption that the *incipits* and their contiguous scriptural items reflect a *pars pro toto* relationship represents the consensus position in scholarship. To be sure, the “whole” in this relationship has not been approached uniformly; some scholars have envisioned an all-encompassing item (e.g., “the scriptures,” the “Word of God”), while others have proposed a more restricted item (e.g., a particular Gospel, the Gospels as a corpus, a particular psalm). Nevertheless, an assumed and undifferentiated *pars pro toto* model has dominated the little discussion that has taken place.

In this chapter, I problematize the *pars pro toto* model as a general rubric for understanding the *incipits* of scriptural items in the apotropaic world of late antique Egypt. I begin by establishing more precise and, I think, more useful terminology for the task of interpreting the *incipits*. I argue that the most helpful linguistic term for discussing relationship between the apotropaic *incipits* and their referents is metonymy. I then focus my attention on the *pars pro toto* model itself. With the help of theoretical insights on “meronymy” (i.e., part-whole relations), I demonstrate that ritual specialists focused on individual thematic units in their uses of the scriptures. Accordingly, I distinguish between the part-whole relations of multiunit items, such as the “Bible” and its larger sub-corpora (e.g., the Gospels), on the one hand, and the part-whole relations of single-unit biblical items (e.g., a particular psalm, the Lord’s Prayer), on the other hand. This distinction, I maintain, is necessary for parsing the conceptual items behind the *incipits* in the apotropaic artifacts from late antique Egypt. This terminology will also be used to organize the remainder of this project.

## I. *Pars pro toto*, Metonymy, and Synecdoche

Potential examples of *pars pro toto* transcend time, language, and geography. One could point to various instances of the part-for-whole relation in the social world in which I am writing, the United States of America (USA). For instance, a perennial concern for citizens of the USA is the violation of the distinction between “church” (=“religion”) and “state” (=“politics” or governmental institutions).<sup>1</sup> Or, to use an example that resonates more closely with the concerns of this project, one may find at an American political rally a sign proclaiming the opening words of the *Preamble to the United States Constitution* (“We the people...”), a phrase which is meant to evoke the “Constitution”—even if these are the only words the protestor knows (!)—and, in some cases, the general sentiment of the “founding fathers.”

Linguists, anthropologists, literary theorists, and other commentators have primarily used two different terms to describe the part-for-whole linguistic transfer: synecdoche and metonymy. In what follows, I will provide a brief survey of the ways the *pars pro toto* model has been classified in relation to these two lexemes. I conclude by specifying my preference for the use of metonymy and its cognates to discuss the use of apotropaic *incipits*. This sketch, which could be expanded *ad infinitum*, not only demonstrates the diverse ways the part-for-whole relation has been labeled within cognitive linguistics, but also highlights a distinction between two different kinds of part-for-whole relations.

The relationships between *pars pro toto*, metonymy, and synecdoche have been understood and used according to various taxonomies and typologies. For instance, in their classic monograph on metaphor, George Lackoff and Mark Johnson write, “[w]e are including as

---

<sup>1</sup> On this particular metonymic relationship, see Ian Bartrum, “The Constitutional Canon as Argumentative Metonymy,” *Faculty Scholarship Series*, Paper 21 (2009): 1-71. Though the subject transcends the concerns of this project, it should be noted that this distinction rests on the (problematic) discreteness of the second-order categories religion and politics.

a special case of metonymy what traditional rhetoricians have called *synecdoche*, where the part stands for the whole...”<sup>2</sup> In this “traditional” scheme, metonymy is the genus, of which *synecdoche*—understood as *pars pro toto*—is a species.<sup>3</sup> For Lackoff and Johnson, metonymy carries a more general referential quality, which simply “allows us to use one entity to *stand for* another.”<sup>4</sup>

As part of his attempt to bridge René Thom’s mathematical concept of “catastrophe” (i.e., a discontinuous event, rupture, or sudden change in form) with tropical theory, Donald Rice provides a different way of distinguishing between *synecdoche* and metonymy.<sup>5</sup> For Rice, although both *synecdoche* and metonymy involve contiguous relationships between their respective triggers and targets, the nature of the contiguous relationship varies spatially. In the case of *synecdoche*, argues Rice, the two items are spatially contiguous with one another on a (semi-) permanent basis (e.g., bill-duck).<sup>6</sup> In the case of metonymy, however, two spatially separate entities are juxtaposed (e.g., smoke-fire).<sup>7</sup> The part-for-whole relation, which he assumes involves a (semi-) permanent spatial connection between items, belongs for Rice within the semantic domain of *synecdoche*, not metonymy.

As was the case with Lackoff and Johnson, Rice aligns the *pars pro toto* phenomenon with *synecdoche*. Yet, he does not classify *synecdoche* as a species of metonymy; instead, he

---

<sup>2</sup> *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980), 36 (emphasis in original).

<sup>3</sup> For a similar taxonomy, see Anne Pankhurst, “Recontextualization of Metonymy in Narrative and the Case of Morrison’s *Song of Solomon*,” in *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, ed. Klaus-Uwe Panther and Günter Radden (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999), 385-99, at 389.

<sup>4</sup> *Metaphors*, 36.

<sup>5</sup> “Catastroph(h)es: The Morphogenesis of Metaphor, Metonymy, *Synecdoche* and Irony,” *Sub-Stance* 26 (1980): 3-18.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* Anticipating a critique of his notion of smoke and fire (as well as the relationship between the items in the phrase, “the tracks of the gazelle”) as existing in distinct spatial spheres, Rice invokes Thom’s idea of catastrophe. Accordingly, Rice contends that the “contiguity [in cases of metonymy] is provisional...and limited to the duration of the catastrophe which produces the index. This separation is translated semantically by the fact that *track* and *gazelle* (as well as *smoke* and *fire*) belong to different substratum spaces” (*idem*). In cases of *synecdoche*, however, the “semi-permanent contiguity [is] not limited to the duration of the catastrophe” (*idem*).

presumes that synecdoche and metonymy occur at the same taxonomic rank, both of which are classified under the general phenomenon of contiguity.

In yet another taxonomic scheme, Ken-ichi Seto has recently proposed that metonymy and synecdoche are two species of the *pars pro toto* genus.<sup>8</sup> As part of his analysis, Seto observes that the *pars pro toto* model can encompass two different kinds of phenomena. He aligns these two different part-for-whole relationships with metonymy and synecdoche respectively. In Seto's scheme, although both metonymy and synecdoche involve a transfer from one item to the other, the nature of the transfer and the kinds of items transferred are dissimilar. He argues that metonymy deals with a "referential transfer" of "entities."<sup>9</sup> Synecdoche, on the other hand, deals with a "conceptual transfer" of "categories."<sup>10</sup>

Central to Seto's construction of this difference is the distinction between two classification systems: "partonomy," which he associates with metonymy, and "taxonomy," which he aligns with synecdoche. Seto nuances these systems as follows:

"...taxonomy is a 'kind-of' relation while partonomy is a 'part-of' relation. In other words, taxonomy is the relation between a more comprehensive category and a less comprehensive one, while partonomy is the relation between an entity and its parts, such as the relation between a table and its legs."<sup>11</sup>

A pair of examples, taken from Seto's analysis, should help to clarify this distinction:

### **Metonymy**

1. PART-FOR-WHOLE: "Those are nice wheels!" (with reference to a car) (the wheels are only part of the car)

---

<sup>8</sup> Ken-ichi Seto, "Distinguishing Metonymy from Synecdoche," in *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, ed. Klaus-Uwe Panther and Günter Radden (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999), 91-120.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, 91.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, 92.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, 93.

## Synecdoche

1. SPECIES-FOR-GENUS: “Give me a *Coke* (with reference to soda more generally)!” (*Coke* is a species/kind of soda)<sup>12</sup>

In light of this diversity, we must determine the most helpful way to designate and discuss the relationship between the scriptural *incipits* and their conceptual referents. Since the apotropaic *incipits* have been either explicitly or implicitly aligned with the part-for-whole relation in scholarship, I find Seto’s taxonomy the most helpful because of his emphasis on the potential ambiguity in the *pars pro toto* designation. In this vein, what Seto calls metonymy better expresses the relationship that has been posited by most scholars between the scriptural *incipit* and its implied corpus than does his notion of synecdoche.<sup>13</sup> In this account, the relationship, for instance, between Mt 1:1 and the Gospel of Matthew is not a “kind-of” relation (*Coke*–soda), but a “part-of” relation (wheels–car). I will, therefore, use metonymy (and its cognates)—understood within the partonomic system of Seto—in this analysis as the semantic domain for discussing the relationship between apotropaic *incipits* and their referents.

But the insufficiency of the generic use of the *pars pro toto* lexeme is not limited to semantic or classificatory matters. Intrinsicly connected to a particular part-for-whole transfer is the nature of the relationship between the whole and its parts. In the section to follow, I will appropriate a particular criterion that has been used to classify different part-whole relations: the

---

<sup>12</sup> Both metonymy and synecdoche have the capacity for *totum pro parte* transfers, though these are also framed by the taxonomic and partonomic distinctions. An example of a metonymic whole-for-part transfer would include the phrase, “He picked up the *telephone*,” where telephone is the whole, of which the “receiver” (i.e., what is used to communicate) is a part. An example of the genus-for-species transfer within the domain of synecdoche would be the following: “The policeman gave me a *ticket*,” where ticket is the genus of “traffic ticket”.

<sup>13</sup> For others who have found it helpful to categorize the part-for-whole relation under metonymy, see especially Roman Jakobsen, “Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbance,” in *Fundamentals of Language*, ed. R. Jakobsen and M. Halle (The Hague: Mouton), 67-96; Stanley Tambiah, “The Magical Power of Words,” *Man* 3 (1968): 175-208, at 189; John Miles Foley, *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991); Richard Gordon, “‘What’s in a List?’ Listing in Greek and Graeco-Roman Malign Magical Texts,” in *The World of Ancient Magic: Papers from the First International Samson Eitrem Seminar at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 4-8 May 1997*, ed. David R. Jordan, Hugo Montgomery, and Einar Thomassen (Bergen: The Norwegian Institute at Athens, 1999), 239-77.

criterion of separability. Consideration of this criterion will contribute to a better understanding of what the ritual specialists had in mind—and did not have in mind (!)—when they utilized *incipits* within apotropaic contexts.

## II. Meronymic Relations

As I have already highlighted, it is typically assumed by scholars of late antique Egypt that an *incipit* makes reference to its contiguous corpus metonymically, in particular, in a part-for-whole relation. As we have just seen, this designation is imprecise, since there are different kinds of *pars pro toto* constructions. I will now disrupt this model further.

In order to assess the utility of the *pars pro toto* model, it is necessary to examine the relationship between the potential wholes and their respective parts, a relationship that has frequently been labeled “meronymy” in linguistic theory.<sup>14</sup> In this chapter, I will focus my attention on a particular criterion that has been used for classifying meronymic relations, namely: the ability of the parts to be separated from their wholes. In short, I will be concerned with the following questions: among the possible imagined referents behind the *incipits* (e.g., the “Bible,” the Gospels, the Psalter, a psalm, a particular pericope), are the parts separable or not from their wholes? Are larger corpora (e.g., the “Bible,” the Gospels) separable in the same way that smaller units (e.g., a psalm, a particular pericope) are? I will assess this question from the perspectives of literary structure and actual usage in late antique scribal culture.

As I hope to demonstrate, there are at least two different kinds of items among the likely imagined referents of the apotropaic *incipits*. These different items are distinguished on the basis

---

<sup>14</sup> The term was developed by D. A. Cruse, who defined it as, “[t]he semantic relation between a lexical item denoting a part and that denoting the corresponding whole...” (*Lexical Semantics* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986], 159); idem, “On the Transitivity of the Part-Whole Relation,” *Journal of Linguistics* 15 (1979): 29-38.

of complexity and are represented by my neologisms: multiunit corpora and single-unit texts. These distinctions not only structure my surveys of the artifacts with apotropaic *incipits* in Chapters Three and Four, but they are of paramount importance for understanding what the ritual specialist had in mind when citing a particular scriptural *incipit*.

## II. 1. Meronymy and the Scriptures

Morton E. Winston, Roger Chaffin, and Douglas Herrmann have developed a taxonomy of meronymic relations.<sup>15</sup> As the authors relate, such a taxonomy was necessary because the lexeme "... 'part' is used to express a variety of quite distinct semantic relations."<sup>16</sup> They, therefore, established three criteria for distinguishing among the various part-whole relations: (1) whether the relation of part to whole is functional or not; (2) whether or not the parts are "homeomerous" [sic] (i.e., of the same kind) with respect to the whole; and (3) whether or not the parts can be separable from the whole.<sup>17</sup>

Of particular interest for my immediate concerns is the separation criterion. Simply put, "[s]eparable parts can, in principle, be separated from the whole, for example, (handle-cup), while inseparable parts cannot, for example (steel-bike)."<sup>18</sup> Winston, Chaffin, and Herrmann provide numerous examples of separable meronymies, including those that also serve a particular function with respect to their wholes (e.g., chapter-book) and those that do not (e.g., tree-forest).

---

<sup>15</sup> "A Taxonomy of Part-Whole Relations," *Cognitive Science* 11 (1987): 417-44. Winston, Chaffin, and Herrmann have identified six different kinds of meronymies: (1) component-integral object (e.g., pedal-bike); (2) member-collection (e.g., ship-fleet); (3) portion-mass (e.g., slice-pie); (4) stuff-object (e.g., steel-car); (5) feature-activity (e.g., paying-shopping); (6) place-area (e.g., Everglades-Florida). This article represents a more developed and nuanced approach to part-whole relations than the prior work of D. A. Cruse (e.g., "Transitivity," and *Lexical Semantics*).

<sup>16</sup> Winston, Chaffin, and Herrmann, "A Taxonomy of Part-Whole Relations," 430.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 420.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

An important question remains: what if one continues to divide these objects along a partonomy? To use the example of a book, a book could be divided into chapters, which could be divided into sections, which could be divided into paragraphs, which could be divided into sentences, which could be divided into clauses, which could be divided into words, which could be divided into syllables. How do these respective part-whole relations change as one moves down these levels? More importantly, how is separability transformed at these different levels?

Here it is helpful to situate the respective part-whole relations of biblical corpora/texts along a partonomy, moving from the general to the specific. We can place the “Bible” or “Word of God” at the most general point of the partonomy, the equivalent to the *summum genus* in taxonomic nomenclature. The Gospels, Psalter, Prophets, *inter alia*, as particular sub-corpora of the “Bible,” would occur at a lower level than the “Bible,” with each of their respective “books” occurring at yet a lower level. This would be followed by the sections (e.g., a particular psalm or narrative and apophthegmatic item) of each book. This movement down the hierarchy would continue until we reached the lowest point, the functional equivalent of what taxonomic theorists call the *infirma species*, where we can imagine a sentence from a narrative of the “Bible” or, perhaps, even a single word or syllable.

What I would like to emphasize with the help of this partonomic exercise is that the further one moves down the levels, the closer the relationship between the whole and its parts and, hence, the less likely the parts would be conceptualized as separate from their wholes. Building upon this insight, I would argue that the undifferentiated *pars pro toto* model is unhelpful precisely because it does not distinguish between the various levels on which the corpora/texts contiguous with the *incipits* are placed. It is, therefore, necessary to examine the

relationship between the parts and wholes among these different corpora/texts with the criterion of separation in mind.

I structure my examination of the potential implied material(s) of the apotropaic *incipits* in dialogue with this partonomy, progressing from the “Bible” to the Gospels<sup>19</sup> (as representative of other corpora as this level) to particular items within these corpora (i.e., LXX Ps 90 and the Lord’s Prayer). I contend that in late antique Egypt the scriptural “wholes” containing ritual power were limited to individual thematic units. These units could range partonomically from entire psalms or narrative/apophthegmatic items to single verses or phrases and could be “tapped” in various ways, from direct citation to visual depiction to creed-like summaries. Larger corpora (e.g., the “Bible,” the Gospels), therefore, were typically not experienced as “wholes,” but as collections of multiple independent thematic units.

This analysis will provide the basis for the separation of *incipits* in my survey into (a) potential *incipits* of multiunit corpora and (b) potential *incipits* of single-unit texts. This division will ultimately support my conclusion that individual psalms or pericopae were much more likely to be conceptualized as “wholes” vis-à-vis their *incipits* than corpora, which are at a higher level of the partonomy (e.g., the “Bible,” the Gospels, the Psalter). In my estimation, therefore, the *pars pro toto* model does not accurately reflect the metonymic relationship between multiunit corpora and their *incipits* and may not accurately reflect the metonymic relationship between single-unit items and their *incipits*.

The meronymic status of the different scriptural corpora/texts (with particular emphasis on separability) can be charted on at least two levels. On the one hand, one can view the part-whole relation vis-à-vis the literary structure of the corpus/texts itself. Thus, for instance, one can

---

<sup>19</sup> In this chapter, I examine the “Gospels” as four distinct items, each of which has multiple narrative and apophthegmatic units. In Chapter Six, I will discuss the utility of conceptualizing the “Gospels” as a corpus (i.e., a single unit, consisting of four parts) in apotropaic settings.

assess the relationship between the whole and the parts of the Gospels as a literary unit. On the other hand—though not necessarily in tension with the first level—one can examine the meronymic status of the various scriptural units in practice. I will utilize both vantage points in the following analysis.

## **II. 2. Larger Scriptural Units**

### **II. 2. a. The Meronymic Status of the “Bible”**

At a very early age, most westerners in a Protestant tradition learn that the Bible consists of sixty-six books (thirty-nine in the “Old Testament” or “Hebrew Bible” and twenty-seven in the “New Testament” or “Christian Bible”). This conception of the “Bible” is, of course, anachronistic. It is obvious from a survey of the apotropaic devices from late antique Egypt that a very different conception of the scriptures was at play.<sup>20</sup> In fact, the notion of a universal (and fixed) “canon” (at least through the fourth century CE) was probably more akin to a wish or desire among certain ecclesiastical leaders—a desperate attempt to bring a sense of stability to the church and its doctrine.<sup>21</sup> As a result, it would be quite difficult to describe accurately the parameters of a given ritual specialist’s “Bible” (or “Word of God”), if indeed this was implied by an *incipit*.

Nevertheless, certain deductions can be made with respect to a part-whole analysis of the “Bible.” Despite the variety of “canons” or “scriptures” in late antiquity—some of which possessed a wider range of influence than others—a consistent trait that inhered in all of them

---

<sup>20</sup> As the survey of ritual artifacts in Chapters Three and Four will make clear, “non-canonical” texts (e.g., *The Letter of Jesus to Abgar*) were often juxtaposed with “canonical” texts on the same artifact.

<sup>21</sup> David Brakke, “Canon Formation and Social Conflict in Fourth-Century Egypt: Athanasius of Alexandria’s Thirty-Ninth *Festal Letter*,” *HTR* 87 (1994): 395-419.

was the ability of their parts to be separated.<sup>22</sup> The “Bible” (variously imagined) was not a single “book,” but a corpus of individual books/units that could be further divided into narratives, sayings, etc. Thus, late antique Egyptians—though the same could probably be said of inhabitants of other regions of the Mediterranean—often (if not typically) encountered the “Word of God” as individual units, not as a whole.

When we examine the apotropaic devices from late antique Egypt, a unit-based approach to the “Bible” suggests itself. Even a cursory glance at the apotropaic use of the scriptures will show that ritual specialists had a preference for individual thematic units of holy writ (often in short bite-sized bits).<sup>23</sup> In Theodore de Bruyn’s magisterial survey of Greek amulets on various media from late antique Egypt that make use of the scriptures, one is continually confronted with the use of *incipits* and other small units from the “Bible” (see Table 1).<sup>24</sup> In fact, the extended

---

<sup>22</sup> On the various ancient scriptural lists, see Lee Martin McDonald, *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007), 364-83; Geoffrey Mark Hahneman, “The Muratorian Fragment and the Origins of the New Testament Canon,” in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), 405-15, at 412-15. On the knowledge and use of “canonical” and “non-canonical” (or apocryphal) Gospels at an early stage in the Jesus movement, see Helmut Koester, *From Jesus to the Gospels: Interpreting the New Testament in Its Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 1-7. Koester concludes, “The attestations do not support a distinction between canonical and apocryphal gospels” (idem, 7).

<sup>23</sup> Judge, “Magical Use of Scripture,” 346-49.

<sup>24</sup> “Papyri, Parchment.” For an understanding of the ritual use of the scriptures, de Bruyn’s analysis was a much-needed improvement over Alessandro Biondi’s text-critical discussion of the use of the scriptures in apotropaic settings (“Le citazioni bibliche nei papiri magici cristiani greci,” *Stud.Pap.* 20 [1979]: 93-127). Indeed, the utility of Biondi’s approach to the concept of “citation” lacks a ritual studies perspective, as incidental correspondences in wording are treated the same as intentional allusions/citations. His treatment of BGU III 954 (**no. 15**) is particularly unhelpful in this regard. For this artifact, Biondi references under the phrase “θεὸς ἀληθινός” the following passages: 2 Chron 15:3; Ps 85: 15; Is 65:16; 1 Thes 1:9; and 1 Jn 5:20. All of these passages are then carried over to his list of biblical “citations” and included (without nuance) among Mt 4:23, Jn 1:1, and Mt 1:1 (idem, 113). Needless to say, this approach to referencing “biblical citations” undermines the utility of his analysis for parsing the use of the scriptures in apotropaic situations. For strategies of distinguishing “citation” from other kinds of biblical reference (e.g., “echo,” “reminiscence,”), see B. F. Harris, “Biblical Echoes and Reminiscences in Christian Papyri,” in *Proceedings of 14th International Congress of Papyrologists, Oxford, 1974* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1975), 155-60 and Malcolm Choat, “Citation and Echo of the New Testament in Letters on Papyrus,” in *New Testament Manuscripts and Their World*, ed. Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas (Brill, Leiden, 2006), 267-92. For a discussion of how “biblical” language permeated the late antique Egyptian world, as manifested in the so-called “documentary papyri,” see Leslie S. B. MacCoull, “Coptic Documentary Papyri as a Historical Source for Egyptian Christianity,” in *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, ed. Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 42-50. For a taxonomy of different tactics of biblical citation in an apotropaic world of the Cairo Genizah, see Dorothea M. Salzer, “Biblische Anspielungen als Konstitutionsmerkmal jüdischer magischer

passages that occur are almost entirely confined either to a particular Psalm (usually LXX Ps 90), the Lord's Prayer, or to the Abgar correspondence, a point that I will discuss further below.<sup>25</sup>

As a sub-corpus of these apotropaic devices, the artifacts with *incipits* do not deviate from this unit-based approach to scripture. For example, in the fourteen extant artifacts with at least all four Gospel *incipits* from late antique Egypt (**nos. 1-14**), the use of other scriptural elements is as follows:

1. two are without any other scriptural elements;<sup>26</sup>
2. eight utilize only smaller scriptural units, whether additional *incipits* or other short passages;<sup>27</sup>
3. four include citations of scriptural units *in toto*, all of which could be classified as texts with a single theme.<sup>28</sup>

This unit-based approach to the "Bible," however, is not restricted to the apotropaic devices. A wide range of artifacts from late antique Egypt testifies to the use of individual portions from biblical books in various contexts. In light of the modern scholarly preference for

---

Texte aus der Kairoer Geniza," in *Was ist ein Text? Alttestamentliche, ägyptologische und altorientalistische Perspektiven*, ed. Ludwig Morenz and Stefan Schorch (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 337-52.

<sup>25</sup> The situation is no different among the Coptic apotropaic devices. Though a Coptic equivalent to de Bruyn's survey of the Greek materials is a desideratum, one can get a sense of this fragmentary approach to the scriptures from an analysis of the following collections: *ACM*; Kropp, *Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte*; Victor Stegemann, *Die koptischen Zaubertexte der Sammlung Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer in Wien* (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1934). An exception to this general pattern is P. Köln VIII 340 (**no. 19**), a Greek amulet that cites Jn 1:1-11 as part of its ritual.

<sup>26</sup> P. Berol. 22 235 (**no. 6**) and P. Mich. 1559 (**no. 7**). P. Rylands 104 (**no. 9**) is an interstitial case, as the only other "scriptural" element is a reference to "Jesus has come and called his disciples" (section 7). I have considered this a summary reference to the calling of the disciples in the Gospels on account of its presence elsewhere in the apotropaic world (e.g., BCI 426 [**no. 3**]).

<sup>27</sup> BKT VI 7.1 (**no. 2**), BCI 426 (**no. 3**), Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (**no. 4**), P. Rylands 104 (**no. 9**), PSI VI 719 (**no. 10**), The Pushkin Museum Coptic Amulet (**no. 11**), Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet (**no. 13**), Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls (**no. 14**).

<sup>28</sup> Anchorite's Grotto in Nubia (**no. 1**), P. Anastasy 9 (**no. 5**), P. Oxy. XVI 1928 (**no. 8**), P. Vindob. inv. G 348 (**no. 12**). As I will show below, the texts cited in these artifacts *in toto* differ from the Gospel corpus (or individual Gospels) in that they represent discrete units rather than collections of several individual units.

“entire” manuscripts, however, much of this material has, until fairly recently, been ignored and thus not brought to bear on ancient textual culture.

S. R. Pickering has highlighted this neglect by textual critics of “non-continuous” texts (including amulets!) that contain citations and allusions of New Testament literature.<sup>29</sup> In his analysis of the text-critical value of such manuscripts, Pickering contends that these artifacts may actually help clarify the transmission of continuous manuscripts.<sup>30</sup> Because of the value of this material for text-critical purposes, Pickering insists that a comprehensive catalogue that would include such “non-continuous” manuscripts should be created.<sup>31</sup> He has begun such a catalogue, listing twenty-one non-continuous citations and allusions to New Testament material, including but not limited to apotropaic devices.<sup>32</sup>

Pickering’s analysis, which represents a significant step forward in New Testament textual criticism, has value for the present study as well.<sup>33</sup> His observations and cataloging efforts makes clear how pervasive a unit-based approach to the Bible was in late antiquity. His list of non-continuous artifacts shows that writers in a variety of situations in Egypt felt free to

---

<sup>29</sup> “The Significance of Non-Continuous New Testament Textual Materials in Papyri,” in *Studies in the Early Texts of the Gospels and Acts: The Papers of the First Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. David G. K. Taylor (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 121-41. Pickering’s analysis includes a variety of contexts other than amulets and, hence, represents a broader investigation than that of Biondi, who focused only on the text-critical value of biblical amulets (“Le citazioni bibliche”). Concerning the neglect of the Greek lectionaries, see Carroll D. Osburn, “The Greek Lectionaries of the New Testament,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995), 61-74.

<sup>30</sup> “Significance,” 125.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 129-36.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 133-36.

<sup>33</sup> More recently, Stanley Porter has continued on this front, arguing for a new taxonomy of New Testament manuscripts based on the fundamental distinction between “continuous” and “non-continuous” manuscripts, the latter including various sub-taxa (“Textual Criticism in the Light of Diverse Textual Evidence for the Greek New Testament: An Expanded Proposal,” in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*, ed. Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas [Leiden: Brill, 2006], 305-37). For his discussion of “miniature codices and magical papyri/amulets,” see *idem*, 319-22. For the use of amuletic materials in reconstructing the text of the Septuagint, see A. Leonas, “The Septuagint and the Magical Papyri: Some Preliminary Notes,” *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 32 (1999): 51-64. For the text-critical value of an amulet (P. Taur. inv. 27) in reconstructing the original Greek text of Ps 1:1, see Igino Cecchetti, “Un interessante documento dei primi tempi del cristianesimo in Egitto: I papiro ‘T. Gr. 1’ del Museo Egizio di Torino,” in *Miscellanea Giulio Belvederi* (Rome: Città del Vaticano, 1954-5), 557-78, at 561-65.

extract small units from the “Bible”: commentaries (e.g., P. Egerton 2 [inv. 3] + PSI inv. 2101; MPER N.S. IV 51, 54); theological tractates (e.g., P. Lit. Palau Rib. 13 [P. Palau Rib. inv. 68 + 207]); homilies (e.g., P. Bour. 3 + P. Achm. 1); festal letters (e.g., BKT VI 5); letters (e.g., P. Abinn. 19).

Another likely context in which late antique Egyptians would have encountered the scriptures in this manner was the lectionary.<sup>34</sup> Along with select portions from the Gospels (see below), congregants would hear individual psalms, passages from the “Old Testament,” and elements from the “Apostolos,” typically organized around a common theme. The earliest Coptic lectionary manuscript may date as early as the seventh century CE,<sup>35</sup> while the earliest Greek lectionary from Egypt dates from the eighth century CE.<sup>36</sup> It is likely, however, that church attendants in Egypt would have encountered a lectionary—though perhaps not in as organized a form as appears in the later manuscripts—at a much earlier date, probably at least by the time of Cyril of Alexandria.<sup>37</sup> Evidence from neighboring regions suggest as much. John Chrysostom, for instance, draws a connection between his commentary and the daily readings (see *Hom. 7 ad Antioch*; *Hom 63.47 in Act.*) and lectionaries from other parts of the Mediterranean date to as early as the fourth century CE (e.g., *ℓ1604*).

Much of the scholarship on such lectionaries has centered on their relationship with the lectionary system in the “Orthodox Church.”<sup>38</sup> These manuscripts, however, also provide

---

<sup>34</sup> On the importance of the scriptures in the weekly lectionary for monastic holiness, see Douglas Burton-Christie, *The Word in the Desert: Scripture and the Quest for Holiness in Early Christian Monasticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 117-22.

<sup>35</sup> Karlheinz Schüssler ed., *Das sahidische Alte und Neue Testament: Vollständiges Verzeichnis mit Standorten sa 621-672* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009), 31-50, no. sa 626.

<sup>36</sup> C. E. Hammond, *Outlines of Textual Criticism Applied to the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1884), 29.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid*; Osburn, “The Greek Lectionaries,” 63.

<sup>38</sup> E.g., Bruce M. Metzger, “Greek Lectionaries and a Critical Edition of the Greek New Testament,” in *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*, ed. Kurt Aland (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), 479-97, at 483; Kurt Aland, “Das Problem des neutestamentlichen Kanons,” in *Studien zur Überlieferung des*

evidence for the division of the scriptures into multiple units for liturgical usage at the very time that the amulets with scriptural passages were being created.<sup>39</sup>

## II. 2. b. The Meronymic Status of the Gospels

The portrait of a “Bible” divided by both literary structure and scribal practice also extends to biblical sub-corpora. I will restrict my analysis to the structure and usage of the four Gospels in late antiquity. With respect to the criterion of separation, however, the results of this meronymic analysis can be extended to other sub-corpora (e.g., the Psalter and the Pentateuch).

Ever since the emergence of Formgeschichte in Gospel studies, scholars have emphasized that individual Gospel elements (pericopae) likely circulated independently (or within clusters) in various *Sitze im Leben* within the nascent Jesus movement before finding their places in the connected narratives of the Gospels.<sup>40</sup> While Redaktionsgeschichte highlighted more forcefully the intentional arrangement of pericopae among the Gospel redactors,<sup>41</sup> the basic idea that the Gospels comprise collections of individual elements that originally circulated independently (or within clusters) has continued to be a mainstay in Gospel scholarship.<sup>42</sup>

---

*Neuen Testaments und seines Textes*, ed. Kurt Aland (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967), 1-23; idem and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 167-68.

<sup>39</sup> Later Coptic lectionaries formally divided scriptural units for the weekly readings into units, sometimes using *kephalaia* to identify and differentiate these units. For instance, Oxford, BL, Huntington no. 3 (=sa 636<sup>L</sup>), a tenth-century CE Coptic parchment codex that provides the scriptural readings for Saturdays and Sundays for the entire Church year, lists a *kephalaion* for each reading, specifying such categories as catholic epistle (ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΟΝ ΤΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ...), Psalter (ΠΕΨΑΛΤΗΡΙΟΝ), and Gospel (ΠΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΝΚΑΤΑ...). For a discussion of this manuscript, see Schüssler, *Das sahidische Alte und Neue Testament*, 81-93, no. sa 636<sup>L</sup>.

<sup>40</sup> The use of Formgeschichte as it relates to the study of the NT Gospels is typically attributed to three early twentieth century works: Martin Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1919); Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung* (Berlin: Trowitzsch, 1919); Rudolf Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921).

<sup>41</sup> E.g., Günther Bornkamm, “Die Sturmstillung im Matthäusevangelium,” *Wort und Dienst. Jahrbuch der Theologischen Schule Bethel* 1 (1948): 49-54, Hans Conzelmann, “Zur Lukasanalyse,” *ZTK* 49 (1952): 16-33, idem, *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1954); Willi Marxsen, *Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956).

<sup>42</sup> E.g., Larry Hurtado, “Gospels (Genre),” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, I. Howard Marshall (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 276-82, esp. 279, James M. Robinson,

More than simply an observation with relevance for scholars interested in origins, this characteristic of the Gospels accommodated the extraction and deployment of individual pericopae for various ritual, pedagogical, or homiletical-exegetical purposes in later periods as well. Indeed, that the “Gospels” continued to be viewed as collections of individual elements beyond the “New Testament era” is evident from their fragmentation in a host of different contexts.

The individual thematic unit (of various lengths) represented the standard form in which the Gospels were cited in apotropaic devices. For instance, as we will see, the Lord’s Prayer (Matthean version) occurs in multiple apotropaic devices from late antique Egypt. Most likely because this pericope was a staple of the liturgy from an early period of the Jesus movement, these “words of Jesus” represented a stand-alone unit within the ritual world of late antique Egypt.

Another Gospel unit that occurs in various apotropaic media is Mt 4:23:

And he [Jesus] went around the whole of Galilee, teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom and healing every sickness and every malady (πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν) among the people.

This passage, which was sometimes reduced to a reference to “every sickness and every malady” (e.g., P. Oxy. VIII 1151 [no. 21]) and sometimes extended through v. 24 (e.g., P. Oxy. VIII 1077 [no. 20]), was probably used because it summed up so well Jesus’ exorcistic ministry.<sup>43</sup> Though I will discuss the implications of “relevancy” and “appropriateness” in Chapter Two, suffice it to say at this point that such a summary statement would be a particularly meaningful aspect of

---

*The Gospel of Jesus: A Historical Search for the Original Good News* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005), esp. 3f; Koester, *From Jesus to the Gospels*.

<sup>43</sup> Theodore De Bruyn, “Appeals to Jesus as the one ‘who Heals every Illness and every Infirmity’ (Matt 4:23, 9:35) in Amulets in Late Antiquity,” in *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Montréal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser, 11-13 October 2006*, ed. Lorenzo DiTommaso and Lucian Turcescu (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 65-81, at 80.

Jesus' life and ministry for individuals concerned with demonic threats.<sup>44</sup> This passage also played a part in the Markan liturgy for this same reason, being recited in intercessions for the sick.<sup>45</sup>

The common engagement with creedal formulae—probably within the context of the liturgy—also focused attention on portions of the Gospels as sources of apotropaic power. For instance, a series of apotropaic artifacts draw upon significant aspects from the life of Jesus, organizing them into a creedal-like structure.<sup>46</sup> Typical of the basic pattern of these texts is P. Haun. III 51, lines 1-9, which read:

Christ was born, amen. Christ was crucified, amen. Christ was buried, amen.  
Christ rose, ame[n]. He has woken to judge the living and the dead. Flee also you,  
fever with shivering, from Kale, who wears this phyl[a]ctery.<sup>47</sup>

In this representative text, the ritual specialist links the birth, crucifixion, burial, resurrection, and future judgment of Christ to the ailment of Kale. I discuss in Chapter Two the importance of such *similia similibus* formulae for understanding the apotropaic *incipits*. It is significant for the

---

<sup>44</sup> I will discuss further the implications of relevancy for understanding the metonymic relationship between *incipits* and their referents in Chapter Two.

<sup>45</sup> The reference to Mt 4:23 is reduced to the phrase, “πάσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.” For the Markan liturgy, see F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western: The Texts Original or Translated of the Principal Liturgies of the Church*, vol. 1, *Eastern Liturgies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1896), 126; Geoffrey J. Cuming, *The Liturgy of St Mark: Edited from the Manuscripts with a Commentary* (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 23. There are late antique fragments of the Markan liturgy, the earliest being the fourth—or fifth—century CE Strasbourg PGr 254 (M. Andrieu and P. Collomp, “Fragments sur papyrus de l’Anaphore de saint Marc,” *Revue des sciences religieuses* 8 [1928]: 489-515). For a fragment of the intercessory prayers in the Markan liturgy (O. Tait-Petrie 415), which probably dates from the fifth century, see J. van Haelst, “Une ancienne prière d’intercession de la liturgie de Saint Marc (O. Tait-Petrie 415),” *Ancient Society* 1 (1970): 95-114. The intertextual relationship between Mt 4:23, its use in apotropaic devices, and its use in the intercession for the sick in the Markan liturgy is too complex to analyze at length in this study. For an analysis of the various literary and documentary sources that utilize Mt 4:23, see de Bruyn, “Appeals to Jesus.”

<sup>46</sup> See A. Vassiliev, ed., *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*, pt. 1 (Mosquae: University of Caesarea, 1893), 339, no. 18 and Armand Delatte, *Anecdota Atheniensa*, vol. 1, *Texts grecs inédits relatifs à l’histoire des religions* (Liège: University of Liège, 1927), 146, 616. See also P. Berol. inv. 21230 (William Brashear, “49. Christian Amulet,” in *Papyri Greek & Egyptian Edited by Various Hands in Honour of Eric Gardner Turner on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday [P. Turner]* [London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1981], 192-93).

<sup>47</sup> Χριστὸς ἐγεννήθη, ἀμήν. Χριστὸς ἐσταυρώθη, ἀμήν. Χριστὸς ἐτάφη, ἀμήν. Χριστὸς ἀνέστη, ἀμή[n]. γεγένθη κρίνε ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. φύγε καὶ σοί, ῥιγοπυρέτιν, ἀπὸ Καλῆς τῆς φορούσης τὸ φυλ[α]κτῆριον τοῦτο. Translation mine (based on the *editio princeps*). For the *editio princeps*, see T. Larsen and A. Bülow-Jacobsen, *Papyri Graecae Haunienses*, vol. 3, *Subliterary Texts and Byzantine Documents from Egypt* (Bonn: R. Habelt, 1985), 31-37, no. 51.

present discussion, however, to note that only select elements from the life of Jesus were invoked in this ritual.

In addition, select scenes from the life of Jesus were depicted visually in apotropaic contexts. For example, four apotropaic armbands survive from late antique Egypt (SB I 1572, SB I 1574a, SB I 1574b, and SB I 1576).<sup>48</sup> The first three of these were uncovered near Saqqara. All of these artifacts carry an inscription of LXX Ps 90:1 and pictorial representations of select scenes from the life of Jesus as well as other visual depictions:

1. SB I 1572 (**no. 36**): the annunciation of Mary; the birth of Jesus; the baptism of Jesus; the crucifixion; the women at the tomb; the ascension of Jesus;
2. SB I 1574a (**no. 37**): annunciation of Mary; birth of Jesus; baptism of Jesus; crucifixion; women at the grave;
3. SB I 1575 (**no. 38**): annunciation of Mary; birth of Jesus; baptism of Jesus; crucifixion; women at the grave;<sup>49</sup>
4. SB I 1576 (**no. 39**): according to one editor of this poorly preserved armband, it is likely that it originally portrayed the following images from the life of Jesus: the women at the tomb; the resurrection of Lazarus.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> SB I 1676 can only be identified with Egypt more generally. These artifacts form a larger corpus of apotropaic armbands (mostly from Syria). Jean Maspero was particularly influential in bringing amuletic armbands to bear on the study of ancient ritual (“Bracelets-amulettes d’époque byzantine,” *ASAE* 9 [1908]: 246-58). Subsequent work has been taken up by several scholars, prominent among which are Gary Vikan (“Art, Medicine, and Magic in Byzantium,” *DOP* 38 [1984]: 65-86; “Two Byzantine Amuletic Armbands and the Group to which they belong,” *The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 49/50 [1991/1992]: 33-51) and Thomas J. Kraus, who has treated this material as part of a larger project of identifying apotropaic artifacts with LXX Ps 90 (e.g., “Fragmente eines Amulett-armbands im *British Museum* [London] mit Septuaginta-Psalms 90 und der Huldigung der Magier,” *JAC* 48/49 [2005/2006]: 114-27; “Septuaginta-Psalms 90,” 39-73; “Psalm 90 der Septuaginta in apotropäischer Funktion,” in *Proceedings of the 24<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Papyrology, Helsinki, 1<sup>st</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> of August 2004*, vol. 1, ed. J. Frösén, T. Puroola, and E. Salmenkivi [Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 2007], 497-514; “Septuagint Psalm 90 and the Iconographic Program on Byzantine Armbands,” in *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon*, ed. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias [New York: T&T Clark, 2009], 137-47).

<sup>49</sup> Given the similarities between SB I 1574a and SB I 1574b, including, but not limited to the same scenes from the life of Jesus, it is likely that these two armbands were the product of the same artisan (see Maspero, “Bracelets-amulettes,” 250).

While it is interesting to note that some of these scenes are highlighted in textual form in the apotropaic artifacts on papyrus and parchment,<sup>51</sup> what is significant about these objects for the concerns of this chapter is that they employ *select* scenes from the Gospels as sources of ritual power.<sup>52</sup> These armbands, therefore, resemble the phylacteries that Nicephorus of Byzantium would later describe:

We Christians wear [phylacteries] suspended from the neck and hanging down over the breast for the protection and safeguarding of our lives and for the salvation of our souls and our bodies; for which reason they have received their name [phylactery], for curing our misfortunes and for averting attack by unclean daemons; [we therefore wear phylacteries] believing [them] to possess these [properties], *especially those on which the passion and miracles of Christ and his life-giving resurrection is often shown in images*. And there is an infinite multitude of these among Christians.<sup>53</sup>

Earlier literary figures also testify to the use of select items from the Gospels for apotropaic situations. For instance, in his response to Celsus' claim that Christians invoked demons for ritual power, Origen writes:

<sup>50</sup> Kraus, "Fragmente eines Amulett-Armbands," 123.

<sup>51</sup> For the birth of Jesus, see e.g., PGM 2: 234, no. O 3. It is also possible that the use of the Greek letters ΧΜΓ, which can be found on several artifacts (e.g., P. Oslo I 5 [=PGM 2: 210, no. 3], P. Oxy. XVI 1926 [=PGM 2: 216, no. 8a]), was an acronym for "Jesus born of Mary." For the more significant discussions of ΧΜΓ, see Jan-Olof Tjäder, "Christ, Our Lord, Born of the Virgin Mary (ΧΜΓ and VDN)," *Eranos* 68 (1970): 148-90; G. Robinson, "ΚΜΓ and ΘΜΓ for ΧΜΓ," *Tyche* 1 (1986) 175-77; S. R. Llewelyn, "The Christian Symbol ΧΜΓ, an Acrostic or an Isosephism?" in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vol. 8, *A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published 1984-85*, ed. S. R. Llewelyn (Grand Rapids: William E. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 156-68 (§14); B. Nongbri, "The Lord's Prayer and XMG: Two Christian Papyrus Amulets in Yale's Beinecke Library," *HTR* 104, no. 1 (2011): 59-68, esp. 66ff. For the raising of Lazarus from the dead, see e.g., "G. Vitelli" PSI inv. 365 (=PGM 2: 227, no. 18). For the crucifixion narrative (with an emphasis upon Jesus' words on the cross), see Brit. Lib. Or. 6796(4), 6796, Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet (**no. 13**), P. Heid. 1359 (=PGM 2: 202-203, no. 14).

<sup>52</sup> To these one might add an amulet edited by G. Schlumberger, which can be dated to the sixth or seventh century CE ("Quelques monuments byzantins inédits: Amulettes, méreaux, etc.," *Mélanges d'Archéologie Byzantine* 1 [1895]: 163-70, at 163-64, no 1; cf. H. Leclercq, "Amulettes," in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, vol. 1.2 [Paris: Le R<sup>m</sup> dom Fernand Cabrol, 1907], cols. 1784-1860, at 1819, 1821). In the upper part of the amulet, there is a depiction of the crucified Christ with the two thieves on either side. In between Christ and the thieves (on both sides) is written, "Εμμωνουλ." Immediately below this scene, occurs the following phrase, "σταυρε βοηθι Αβαμου" ("Cross, help Abamoun [son of Ammon]"). The bottom scene depicts two women towards the left (identified on the left of the images as "Μαρια σ [= καί] Μαρθα" ["Mary and Martha"]) and an angel with a nimbus toward the right (identified on the right of the image as "ἀγγ[γ]ελος κ[κ]ριου" ["an(g)el of the L(or)d"]).

<sup>53</sup> *Third Antirrheticus* (PG 100.433 C-D). Translation taken from Anna Kartsonis, "Protection Against All Evil: Function, Use and Operation of Byzantine Historiated Phylacteries," in *Presence of Byzantium: Studies Presented to Milton V. Anastos in Honor of his Eighty-fifth Birthday*, ed. A. R. Dyck and S. A. Takacs (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1994), 73-102, at 84.

...it is not by incantations that Christians seem to prevail [over evil spirits], but by the name of Jesus, *accompanied by the announcement of the narratives which relate to Him; for the repetition of these has frequently been the means of driving demons out of men.*<sup>54</sup>

In light of the ubiquity of amulets that utilize invocations for ritual power from late antique Egypt, Origen's words may seem a bit naïve.<sup>55</sup> Yet, his assertion that the recitation of narratives about Jesus can thwart demonic attack is significant and requires further comment. First, Origen has tied ritual efficacy to specific material from the life of Jesus—and not to the Gospels as a corpus of literature. This view of ritual efficacy corroborates the idea that it was specific material from the Gospels, not the Gospels themselves, which was being invoked through the Gospel *incipits*. I will return to this point in Chapter Six. Furthermore, since the Jesus tradition consisted of both sayings and narratives, Origen has already narrowed the scope of this Jesus tradition, omitting the apothegmatic elements associated with Jesus. What is more, though not stated explicitly, I think it is fair to assume that Origen had in mind a context in which only select narratives were recited. Pragmatically speaking, it is unlikely that Origen envisioned a scenario in which a specialist stood adjacent from a possessed man or woman and referenced every known narrative about Jesus. Indeed, the phrase, “the announcement of the narratives which relate to Him (τῆς ἀπαγγελίας τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν ἱστοριῶν),” need not necessarily imply comprehensiveness; its primary function in this context was to refute the claim that “Christians” invoke demons. I believe it is more likely that Origen meant references to select narratives from the life of Jesus.

This unit-based approach to the Gospels was by no means limited to apotropaic concerns. As we have already seen, selections from the Gospels were likely read from the weekly

---

<sup>54</sup> *Contra Celsus*, 1.6 (translation taken from Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *Ante-Nicene Christian Library: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, vol. 10, *The Writings of Origen* [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1869], 402).

<sup>55</sup> See Shandruk, “Christian Use of Magic,” 32.

lectionaries in late antique Egypt. While the length of the reading from the Gospels could range from a few verses to three or four chapters, the typical Gospel lection was approximately ten verses in length.<sup>56</sup> Furthermore, a given Gospel lection could combine similar content from different parts of the Gospels or even material from different Gospels.<sup>57</sup> Moreover, in a Coptic lectionary manuscript from around the seventh century CE, the text of the Gospels is divided into discrete units, with *kephalaia* identifying the content of each pericope.<sup>58</sup>

It is appropriate at this point to discuss the evidence that Tommy Wasserman used to show the apotropaic power inherent in the Gospels (as a corpus). In P. Rain 1 (= PGM 2: 198-99, no. 10), we read: “[ὀκίζω ὑμᾶς κατὰ τῶν τεσσάρων εὐαγγ]ελίων τοῦ υἱοῦ[υ]...” (“[I adjure you according to the four Gosp]els of the so[n...]”). A couple of comments are in order. First, the lacunose state of this portion of the amulet ought to qualify any and all conclusions derived from it. Second, even if the present reconstruction is correct, the addition of τοῦ υἱοῦ (“of the son”) immediately following the reference to the four Gospels qualifies the entire clause. If we interpret this genitive as an objective genitive (i.e., “I adjure you according to the four Gospels *about* the Son”), then the Gospels are no longer understood as an entity carrying generic power; rather, the phrase in P. Rain. 1 selects, evokes, and invokes narrative material about Jesus.<sup>59</sup> In support of the objective genitive in the invocation of the four Gospels is the clear use of the objective genitive with εὐαγγέλιον in ll. 34-35 of the same amulet: “the gospel of/about the Lord, who suffered for us humans (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ κυρίου, ὃς ἔπαθεν δι’ ὑμᾶς τοὺς

---

<sup>56</sup> Ernest Cadman Colwell, “The Contents of the Gospel Lectionary,” in *Studies in the Lectionary Text of the Greek New Testament*, vol. 1, *Prolegomena to the Study of the Lectionary Text of the Gospels* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1933), 1-5, at 2.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>58</sup> See n. 35 above.

<sup>59</sup> On the objective genitive with εὐαγγέλιον, see Mt 4:23. Cf. F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and Revision of the Ninth–Tenth German Edition Incorporating Supplementary Notes of A. Debrunner*, ed. and trans. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), 90, §163.

ἀνθρώπους).” In this case, the objective genitive limits the scope of the singular εὐαγγέλιον to the salvific passion of Jesus, which figures prominently in the apotropaic record.<sup>60</sup> In short, P. Rain. 1 does not deviate from the pattern of a unit-based Bible in apotropaic settings.

## II. 2. c. Conclusions: The “Bible” and Its Sub-Corpora

In conclusion, the “Bible” and its sub-corpora represented such large masses of narrative and apophthegmatic material that individuals and groups in late antiquity tended to focus their attention on discrete units. This selective approach to large bodies of biblical material was especially prevalent in the manufacturing of apotropaic devices, where the limitations of the artifact did not allow for the quotation of lengthy texts. Thus, not only *could* the “Bible” and multiunit corpora at lower paratonic levels (e.g., the Gospels, the Psalter) be separated from their wholes, they also frequently *were* in scribal usage. This approach to the scriptures needs to be kept in mind when assessing the imagined targets of the *incipits* of larger corpora.

## II. 3. Smaller Scriptural Units

We have seen that, in late ancient scribal culture, individual units from the “Bible” and its sub-corpora represent a very common mode in which Egyptians encountered scriptural materials, in general, a situation that also held true in apotropaic contexts. Matters become more complicated, however, when we seek to understand the conceptual item that stood “behind” the *incipit* of an individual psalm or short scriptural passage.<sup>61</sup> What was the relationship between a particular psalm, saying, or pericope and its respective parts?

---

<sup>60</sup> E.g., Brit. Lib. Or. 6796(4), 6796, Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet (no. 13), P. Heid. 1359 (=PGM 2: 202-3, no. 14).

<sup>61</sup> I would also place the pseudepigraphical letter of Christ to Abgar in this category.

In this section, I argue that, in general, individual psalms and pericopae were more frequently used in apotropaic and other situations *in toto* than was the case with larger corpora. In other words, such items were often considered by ancient authors (whether ritual specialists or others) to be independent thematic units. This, as I will show in Chapter Six, has significant implications for understanding the relationship between metonymic trigger (*incipit*) and its target (implied textual unit). I will focus my analysis on the two sets of data that most frequently occur in the apotropaic world of late antique Egypt, namely, the biblical Psalms (taking LXX Ps 90 as exemplary) and the Lord's Prayer.

### II. 3. a. The Meronymic Status of Biblical Psalms

The psalms were an essential element in the religious life of late antiquity.<sup>62</sup> In at least some monasteries, for example, prospective monks were required to memorize psalms as part of the process of proving their worthiness. In *The Rules of Saint Pachomius*, we read the following:

If someone arrives at the doors to the monastery wishing to renounce the world and be accepted as a monk, he is not immediately free to enter. The father of the monastery has to be informed first. The applicant remains outside, in front of the door for a number of days; *he is taught the Lord's Prayer and as many psalms as he can learn* and has to diligently prove himself...<sup>63</sup>

The words here testify to the centrality of the psalms (and the Lord's Prayer) in the spiritual life of the Pachomian monasteries. The ubiquity of citations from the psalms in other monastic

---

<sup>62</sup> Siegfried Richter, "Verwendung von Psalmen, im koptischen Christentum," in *Ritual und Poesie: Formen und Orte religiöser Dichtung im alten Orient, im Judentum und im Christentum*, ed. Erich Zenger (Freiburg: Herder, 2003), 283-92.

<sup>63</sup> *Pachomiana Latina: Règle et épîtres de St. Pachôme, épîtres de St. Théodore et "Liber" de St. Orsiesius; texte latin de St. Jérôme*, ed. A. Boon (Louvain: Bureaux de la Revue, 1932), *Praecepta* 49. The translation has been taken from Mariachiara Giorda, "Monastic Property in Late Antique Egypt," *Coptica* 8 (2009): 1-19, at 1-2 (emphasis mine). As Armand Veilleux notes, the phrase "as many as" does not occur in the Greek *Excerpta* and may, therefore, be a gloss of St. Jerome (*Pachomian Koinonia*, vol. 2, *Pachomian Chronicles and Rules* [Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1981], 187 n. 1).

literature, however, suggests that the elevated status of the psalms was by no means limited to the Pachomian monks.

It should not, therefore, come as a surprise that individual psalms played a prominent role in the ritual world of late antique Egypt.<sup>64</sup> While it is outside the scope of this project to conduct a literary analysis of every “biblical” psalm that occurs in an apotropaic device, I will analyze the literary structure of LXX Ps 90, the *incipit* of which is ubiquitous in the extant apotropaic record of late antique Egypt.<sup>65</sup>

Beyond its importance in apotropaic contexts, LXX Ps 90 also provides an exemplary case of a psalm that could either be viewed as a thematic whole or as a series of units, whether fragmentary or in larger sections.<sup>66</sup> This analysis will set the stage for a brief survey of the documentary evidence (with an emphasis on the apotropaic record) and literary evidence concerning perceptions of the psalms. As I hope to demonstrate, a given psalm could be viewed either as a thematic whole or as a series of discrete units.

The text of LXX Ps 90 reads as follows:

(1) He who lives by the help of the Most High, in a shelter of the God of the sky he will lodge. (2) He will say to the Lord, “My supporter you are and my refuge; my God, I will hope in him,” (3) because it is he who will rescue me from a trap of hunters and from a troublesome word; (4) with the broad of his back he will shade you, and under his wings you will find hope; with a shield his truth will

---

<sup>64</sup> This observation is by no means unique to me. For example, in two important and frequently cited articles for the study late antique biblical apotropeia, Paul Collart devoted his attention to the prophylactic use of psalms (“Un papyrus Reinach inédit: Psaume 140 sur une amulette,” *Aegyptus* 13 [1933]: 208-12; idem, “Psaumes et amulettes,” *Aegyptus* 14 [1934]: 463-67). See also S. Eitrem, *Die Versuchung Christi* (Kristiania: Grøndahl & Søns Boktrykkeri, 1924), 11-13, 36; Kraus, “Septuaginta-Psalms,” esp. 42-45. For the apotropaic use of the Psalter in Arabic, see Nessim Henry Henein and Thierry Bianquis, *La magie par les psaumes: Édition et traduction d’un manuscrit arabe chrétien d’Égypte* (Cairo: Institut français d’archéologie orientale Du Caire, 1975).

<sup>65</sup> For the popularity of this psalm in the apotropaic world of late antique Egypt, see e.g., Kraus, “Septuaginta-Psalms 90,” 40; Leiv Amundsen, “Christian Papyri from the Oslo Collection,” *Symbolae Osloenses* 24 (1945): 121-47, at 144-45; Juan Chapa, “Su demoni e angeli: Il Salmo 90 nel suo contesto,” in *I Papiri letterari cristiani: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi in memoria di Mario Naldini, Firenze, 10-11 giugno 2010*, ed. Guido Bastianini and Angelo Casanova (Firenze: Istituto Papirologico “G. Vitelli,” 2011), 59-90, at 68-69.

<sup>66</sup> To be sure, each psalm has its own literary structure and content; however, the quality of LXX Ps 90 to be either divided into discrete units/fragments or, more importantly, to be viewed as a whole is applicable to most (if not all) of the psalms.

surround you. (5) You will not be afraid of nocturnal fright, of an arrow that flies by day, (6) of a deed that travels in darkness, of mishap and noonday demon. (7) At your side a thousand will fall, and ten thousand at your right, but it will not come near you. (8) Only with your eyes will you perceive, and the requital of sinners you will see. (9) Because you, O Lord, are my hope, the Most High you made your refuge. (10) No evil shall come before you, and no scourge shall come near your covert, (11) because he will command his angels concerning you to guard you in all your ways; (12) upon hands they will bear you up so that you will not dash your foot against a stone. (13) On asp and cobra you will tread, and you will trample lion and dragon under foot. (14) Because in me he hoped, I will also rescue him; I will protect him, because he knew my name. (15) He will call to me, and I will listen to him; I am with him in trouble; I will deliver and glorify him. (16) With length of days I will satisfy him and show him my deliverance.<sup>67</sup>

(1) ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν βοηθείᾳ τοῦ ὑψίστου ἐν σκέπη τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀύλισθήσεται· (2) ἔρει τῶ κυρίῳ, Ἀντιλήπτωρ μου εἶ καὶ καταφυγή μου ὁ θεός μου, ἐλπῶ ἐπ’ αὐτόν (3) ὅτι αὐτὸς ῥύσεται με ἐκ παγίδος θηρευτῶν καὶ ἀπὸ λόγου ταραχῶδους (4) ἐν τοῖς μεταφρένοις αὐτοῦ ἐπισκιάσει σοὶ καὶ ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας αὐτοῦ ἐλπείεις ὄπλῳ κυκλώσει σε ἡ ἀλήθεια αὐτοῦ (5) οὐ φοβηθήσῃ ἀπὸ φόβου νυκτερινοῦ ἀπὸ βέλους πετομένου ἡμέρας (6) ἀπὸ πράγματος διαπορευομένου ἐν σκότει ἀπὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ (7) πεσεῖται ἐκ τοῦ κλίτους σου χιλιάς καὶ μυριάς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου πρὸς σὲ δὲ οὐκ ἐγγιεῖ (8) πλὴν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου κατανοήσεις καὶ ἀνταπόδοσιν ἀμαρτωλῶν ὄψῃ (9) ὅτι σύ, κύριε, ἡ ἐλπίς μου τὸν ὑψίστον ἔθου καταφυγὴν σου (10) οὐ προσελεύσεται πρὸς σὲ κακά καὶ μάστιξ οὐκ ἐγγιεῖ τῶ σκηνώματί σου (11) ὅτι τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς σου (12) ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀρούσιν σε, μήποτε προσκόψῃς πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου (13) ἐπ’ ἀσπίδα καὶ βασιλίσκον ἐπιβήσῃ καὶ καταπατήσεις λέοντα καὶ δράκοντα (14) ὅτι ἐπ’ ἐμὲ ἤλπισεν, καὶ ῥύσομαι αὐτόν σκεπάσω αὐτόν, ὅτι ἔγνω τὸ ὄνομά μου (15) ἐπικαλέσεται με, καὶ εἰσακούσομαι αὐτοῦ μετ’ αὐτοῦ εἶμι ἐν θλίψει καὶ ἐξελοῦμαι καὶ δοξάσω αὐτόν (16) μακρότητα ἡμερῶν ἐμπλήσω αὐτόν καὶ δείξω αὐτῶ τὸ σωτήριόν μου.

In short, LXX Ps 90 is a psalm about divine protection.<sup>68</sup> The author of the psalm highlights this theme from various vantage points. The text begins from a third-person narrative perspective with a summary description of the shelter that God provides (v. 1). This unidentified speaker then offers a prayer in which he proclaims his hope that God will deliver him from

<sup>67</sup> Translation by Albert Pietersma in *NETS*, 593.

<sup>68</sup> Commenting on the value of this psalm (in the MT) for a petitioner in a cultic ritual, Erich Zenger writes, “In reciting the psalm, the petitioner constitutes the saving counter-world, as projected in the psalm, against the threatening world in which he lives” (“Psalm 91,” in *Psalms 2: A Commentary on Psalms 51-100*, ed. Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger, trans. Linda M. Maloney [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005], 429).

various dangers (vv. 2-3). The vantage point shifts, however, in vv. 4-8, where the narrator directly addresses the reader.<sup>69</sup> In this section, the reader receives promise of protection and triumph over his enemies. This section is followed by a shift in both speaker and audience in vv. 9-13, where a second-person prayer to God reiterates the promise of God's protection. Through this prayer, the reader is invited to enter into the world of the text's original author and talk to God as the author. Finally, the perspective shifts yet once again in vv. 14-16, where God speaks in the first person. Now the reader speaks *as God* and *creates* the promise of protection and long life for himself from this exalted position of authority.

Although this psalm represents a thematic whole dealing with divine protection, it can also be divided into discrete units. We have already seen the “natural” division of this psalm into a range of voices or perspectives. For a reader interested in divine protection, the third-person narrative (see v. 1) finds parallels in the apotropaic world of late antiquity. The use of (short) narratives in ritual contexts was a well-established tactic among specialists of late antique Egypt, as is illustrated by the ubiquity of so-called *historiolae*.<sup>70</sup>

Moreover, the prayer to God for protection in vv. 9-13 (from the vantage point of the psalmic author) also has precedent in apotropaic settings. This tactic is likely behind the ritual use of the Lord's Prayer (see discussion below), where the client can speak to God *as Jesus* and claim the promises of daily sustenance, forgiveness, and deliverance on the basis of the Savior's authoritative words.

---

<sup>69</sup> For the MT, it is more helpful to divide this psalm after v. 2, as there is a shift to the second-person object in the phrase, “כי הוא יצילך” (cf. Zenger, “Psalm 91,” 427-28); however, in the LXX version the second person object does not appear until v. 4 with the phrase, “ἐν τοῖς μεταφρένοις αὐτοῦ ἐπισκιάσει σοι.”

<sup>70</sup> See my discussion of *historiolae* in Chapter Two.

Finally, the positioning of oneself *as the divine* (LXX Ps 90: 14-16) was a well-established ritual tactic in antiquity.<sup>71</sup> For instance, in PGM I.250, a spell for invisibility, we find the following prescription: "...say the spell as follows: 'I am Anubis, I am Osir-phere, I am Osot Soronouier, I am Osiris whom Seth destroyed.'" <sup>72</sup> Rylands 104.4, a Coptic spell for protection against reptiles, emphatically proclaims twice, "it is the mouth of the lord Sabaoth that said this."<sup>73</sup> Indeed, among the ritual specialists of late antique Egypt, speaking for the divine was a particularly effective means of acquiring healing and protection.

Beyond this formal division, several even smaller units of LXX Ps 90 would be particularly apt for invoking the protection of God, especially in cases of perceived demonic conflict. References to the shelter (LXX Ps 90:1, 4), deliverance (LXX Ps 90:3), and general protection that God provides his people (esp. LXX Ps 90:1, 2, 10, 14, 16) would certainly have held an attraction. What is more, the explicit references to the "midday demon" (δαίμονίου μεσημβρινού) in the LXX version of v. 5 would appeal to someone in need of God's protection from demonic attack.<sup>74</sup>

This dual nature of particular psalms finds confirmation in actual apotropaic practice in late antique Egypt. Typical of this diversity is the range of uses to which LXX Ps 90 could be put. Several artifacts cite all of LXX Ps 90. For instance, the entirety of LXX Ps 90 can be found

---

<sup>71</sup> See also Brit. Lib. Or. 5987, where the speaker states, "I am Mary." For the *editio princeps*, see Walter E. Crum, *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1905), 418-20. Paul Mirecki has labeled such tactics "ego-proclamations" ("Manichaeism Allusions to Ritual Magic: Spells for Invisibility in the Coptic *Kephalaia*," in *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World*, ed. Paul A. Mirecki and Jason Beduhn [Leiden: Brill, 2001], 173-80, at 176). See also Joachim Friedrich Quack, "From Ritual to Magic: Ancient Egyptian Precursors of the Charitesion and Their Social Setting," in *Continuity and Innovation in the Magical Tradition*, ed. Gideon Bohak, Yuval Harari, and Shaul Shaked (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 43-84, at 75.

<sup>72</sup> Translations by E. N. O'Neil in *GMPT*, 9.

<sup>73</sup> Translation by James E. Goehring in *ACM*, 128, no. 68.

<sup>74</sup> For the significance of "midday demon" in LXX Ps 90 for the apotropaic world, see Kraus, "Septuaginta-Psalm 90," 43.

on P. Oxy. XVI 1928 (no. 8)<sup>75</sup> and P. Duk. Inv. 778.<sup>76</sup> Likewise, on P. Vindob. G 348 (no. 12), a Greek apotropaic device that dates to the sixth or seventh century CE, all but verses 7c-8 of LXX Ps 90 are cited.<sup>77</sup> It is difficult to determine whether the ritual specialist meant to exclude these portions of LXX Ps 90 or mistakenly left them out. I am inclined toward the latter explanation, in which case P. Vindob. G 348 should be placed among those artifacts that *intended* to provide the entire psalm. On P. Duk. inv. 448, a Coptic papyrus fragment that has been dated between the sixth and eighth centuries CE, only LXX Ps 90:6-14 is extant;<sup>78</sup> however, the editor notes that the original text may have included the entire psalm.<sup>79</sup>

In addition to the entirety of LXX Ps 90, large portions of this psalm can be found on several artifacts. For example, P. Schøyen I 6, a fifth-century CE amulet, provides the first thirteen verses of that psalm.<sup>80</sup> On P. Gen. I 6, which dates from the sixth century CE, LXX Ps 90:1-7b, 10-13a is provided as part of the ritual.<sup>81</sup> Similarly, BKT VIII 13, a Greek parchment fragment from the seventh or eighth century CE, cites LXX Ps 90:1-7, 10-13.<sup>82</sup> On P. Oxy. XVII 2065, a fifth- or sixth-century parchment fragment, LXX Ps 90:1-5 is cited in Greek.<sup>83</sup> P. Heid. Kopt. 184, a Coptic amulet written in the Fayumic dialect, cites LXX Ps 90:11-16 as part of its

---

<sup>75</sup> Bernard P. Grenfell, Arthur S. Hunt, and Harold I. Bell, “1928. Amulet (Psalm XC): Protocol,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 16, ed. Bernard P. Grenfell, Arthur S. Hunt, and Harold I. Bell [London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1924], 208-11, no. 1928.

<sup>76</sup> C. A. La’da and A. Papatomas, “A Greek Papyrus Amulet from the Duke Collection with Biblical Excerpts,” *BASP* 41 (2004): 93-113.

<sup>77</sup> Daniel, “A Christian Amulet on Papyrus.”

<sup>78</sup> Alain Delattre, “Un extrait du Psaume 90 en copte Édition de P.Duk. inv. 448,” *BASP* 43 (2006): 59-61.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 59.

<sup>80</sup> Amundsen, “Christian Papyri from the Oslo Collection,” 141-47.

<sup>81</sup> Jules Nicole, ed., *Texte grecs inédits de la Collection papyrologique de Genève* (Genève: Georg & cie, 1909), 43-49, no. VI.

<sup>82</sup> Otto Stegmüller, *Berliner Septuagintafragmente*, Berliner Klassikertexte aus den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, vol. VIII (Berlin: Weidmann, 1939), 34-36, no. 13.

<sup>83</sup> Arthur S. Hunt, “2065. Psalm xc,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 17, ed. Arthur S. Hunt (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1927), 1-2, no. 2065.

ritual.<sup>84</sup> On P. Leid. Inst. 10, LXX Ps 90:1-4c, 7b-9 is provided as part of the ritual.<sup>85</sup> On P. Oxy. LXXV 5021, LXX Ps 90:12-16 is juxtaposed with excerpts from the Odes.<sup>86</sup> Finally, BKT VIII 12 (no. 26)<sup>87</sup> and P. Laur. IV 141 (no. 29)<sup>88</sup> offer the first six verses of LXX Ps 90, while the verso of PSI VII 759 (no. 32) cites the first four.<sup>89</sup>

Fragmentary references to LXX Ps 90 were also thought to contain ritual power. In addition to the several potential *incipits* of LXX Ps 90, which I will discuss in Chapter Four, P. Iand. I 6 (no. 18), a papyrus amulet that intermingles several sacred texts into what Marvin Meyer has called a “verbal montage,”<sup>90</sup> restricts its usage of LXX Ps 90 to verse 13.<sup>91</sup>

This brief selection of ritual artifacts testifies to the range of options available to ritual specialists who wanted to utilize LXX Ps 90. Its meronymic structure (at least with respect to the “separability” criterion) allowed for—even encouraged—this variety. This range of options would also have extended to other psalms, though the popularity of LXX Ps 90 in the ritual world of late antiquity makes it the most well-attested and thus analytically useful example.<sup>92</sup>

Just as with the extant apotropaic devices, the literary record presents a heterogeneous picture of psalmic usage. First, the approach to individual psalms as wholes can be seen in

---

<sup>84</sup> Hans Quecke, “Ein faijumisches Fragment aus Ps 90 (91) (pHeid. Kopt. 184),” in *Festschrift Elmar Edel*, 12. März 1979, ed. Manfred Görg and Edgar Pusch (Bamberg: Manfred Görg, 1979), 332-37.

<sup>85</sup> F. A. J. Hoogendijk and P. van Minnen, *Papyri, Ostraca, Parchments and Waxed Tablets in the Leiden Papyrological Institute (P. L. Bat. 25)* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 26-29, no. 10.

<sup>86</sup> Cornelia Römer, “Psalm XC 12-16 and Excerpts from Odes 7 and 8,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 75, ed. H. Maehler, C. E. Römer, and R. Hatzilambrou (London: The Egypt Exploration Society, 2010), 2-5, no. 5021.

<sup>87</sup> Stegmüller, *Berliner Septuagintafragmente*, 33-34, no. 12.

<sup>88</sup> R. Pintaudi, *Dai papyri della Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana* (Firenze: Gonnelli, 1979), 33-35; idem, “PL III/501,” *ZPE* 35 (1979): 50-54.

<sup>89</sup> G. D. Kilpatrick, “Ps 90: 1-4 (LXX),” *ZAW* 78 (1966): 224.

<sup>90</sup> *ACM*, 46.

<sup>91</sup> Ernest Schaefer, *Papyri Iandani*, vol. I, *Voluminum codicumque fragmenta graeca cum amuleto christiano* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1912), 18-32, no. 6.

<sup>92</sup> For instance, the entirety of LXX Pss 140 and 150 are found on P. Ryl. III 462 and the entirety of LXX Ps 132 occurs in P. Lond. Lit. 239. For large sections of psalms, see e.g., P. Ross.-Georg. I 1 (LXX Ps 49:1-7) (no. 47) and P. Rein. II 61 (LXX Ps 140:1-6, 8, 10). And finally, for short snips from the psalms, see e.g., BKT VI 7.1 (LXX Ps 117:6-7, LXX Ps 17:3). It should be emphasized that the examples given are illustrative and represent only a small fraction of Greek and Coptic artifacts, which utilize all, large sections, or short fragments of various psalms.

numerous contexts. For instance, the individual psalms were read in their entirety in the weekly lectionary, often being accompanied by readings from the Gospels and the “Apostolos.”<sup>93</sup>

Furthermore, the psalms were often treated as individual units with a coherent message.

In his *Epistle of Marcellinus* (*Ep. Marc.*), Athanasius epitomizes this conception of the Psalter.<sup>94</sup>

Athanasius opens his letter by complementing Marcellinus as follows:

I marvel at your conduct in Christ, dear Marcellinus. Indeed you are successfully enduring the present trial, although you have suffered many tribulations in it, and you do not neglect the discipline. For when I inquired from your letter-bearer how you fare in your continuing illness, I learned that you maintain a studious attitude toward all the holy Scripture, but that you read most frequently the Book of Psalms, and *strive to comprehend the meaning contained in each psalm* (καὶ φιλονεικεῖν τὸν ἐν ἐκάστῳ ψαλμῶ νοῦν ἐγκείμενον καταλαμβάνειν). On the basis of this, then, I commend you...<sup>95</sup>

For Athanasius, individual psalms have a coherent theme that can be used in particular situations.

In fact, as part of this epistle, the Alexandrian patriarch prescribes the appropriate psalm(s) for various situations:

And if you wish...to bless someone, you learn how you ought to do so, and in whose name, what is necessary to say, in Psalms 1, 31, 40, 111, 118, and 127. Should you wish to censure the treachery of the Jews against the Savior, you have the second psalm. If you are being persecuted by your own people, and you have many who rise up against you, say the third psalm. And if, being afflicted in this

---

<sup>93</sup> On the Pachomian rules relating to the use of psalms in the Sunday liturgy, see Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia*, vol. 2, 147-48; idem, *La liturgie dans le cénobitisme pachômien au quatrième siècle* (Rome: Herder, 1968), 313-15. Cf. William A. Graham, *Beyond the Written Word: Oral Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 138. For the use of verses from the psalms in the Coptic tradition, see Hans Quecke, “Psalmverse als ‘Hymnen’ in der koptischen Liturgie?” in *Christianisme d’Égypte: Hommages à René-Georges Coquin*, ed. René-Georges Coquin and Jean-Marc Rosenstiehl (Louvain: Éditions Peeters, 1995), 101-14.

<sup>94</sup> Paul Kolbet has shown that Athanasius viewed the Psalter (refracted through the lens of “Nicene Christology”) as the embodiment of all of the scriptures (“Athanasius, the Psalms, and the Reformation of the Self,” *HTR* 99 [2006]: 85-101).

<sup>95</sup> *Ep. Marc.* 1. Translation taken from Robert C. Gregg, *Athanasius: The Life of Antony and The Letter to Marcellinus* (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1980), 101. All translations of the *The Life of Antony* and *The Letter to Marcellinus* have been taken from this edition unless otherwise stated. Marie-Josèphe Rondeau has argued that Marcellinus was a monk (“L’Épître à Marcellinus sur les psaumes,” *VC* 22 [1968]: 176-97; idem, *Les commentaires patristiques du psautier [III<sup>e</sup>-V<sup>e</sup> siècles]*, vol. 1 [Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1982], 79-80). While acknowledging a “monastic flavor,” Joseph Dyer has shown that it is more likely that Marcellinus was a layperson or cleric (“The Desert, the City and Psalmody in the Late Fourth Century,” in *Western Plainchant in the First Millennium: Studies in the Medieval Liturgy and Its Music*, ed. Sean Gallagher, James Haar, John Nádas, and Timothy Striplin [Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2003], 11-43, at 28-30).

manner, you begged the Lord for help, and having been heeded, you desire to give thanks, sing the fourth, as well as Psalms 74 and 114. And whenever, spying the evildoers who want to set a trap for you, you want the Lord to hearken to your prayer, sing the fifth, rising early in the morning. And when you perceive a threatening from the Lord, should you see that you are disturbed for this reason, it is possible to say Psalms 6 and 37. And even if some people take counsel against you, as Achitophel did against David, and someone reports this to you, sing Psalm 7 and place your confidence in the God who defends you.<sup>96</sup>

Though many aspects of this passage are worthy of further study, what interests me for present purposes is Athanasius' insistence that entire psalms are applicable to different situations and that they should only be cited (or sung) *in toto*.<sup>97</sup> Restated, Athanasius presupposes in his direction to Marcellinus that entire psalms are discrete thematic units of thought.

The literary record also provides evidence that individual psalms could be broken up into smaller units and applied accordingly. Taking a more atomistic approach to the Psalter than Athanasius, Evagrius of Pontus utilizes short fragments from the psalms as part of his ascetic use of the scriptures.<sup>98</sup> For example, reflecting on the internal conflicts that could plague an ascetic, Evagrius directs his reader to recite LXX Ps 48:10: "And he labored forever, and he will live to the end, so that he will not see corruption when he sees sages dying."<sup>99</sup> Against thoughts of returning to the comfort associated with one's parents' house, ascetics are to recite LXX Ps 83:11: "I would rather be a castoff in the house of God than dwell in the tents of sinners."<sup>100</sup> Although such uses could be multiplied, they are sufficient to show that the literary record allows for conceiving of psalms as both thematic wholes and separable parts.

---

<sup>96</sup> *Ep. Marc.* 15.

<sup>97</sup> Though an issue worthy of inquiry, it is beyond the scope of this study to analyze Athanasius' hermeneutical presuppositions in the selection of these psalms.

<sup>98</sup> I will return to the subject of Evagrius' use of scriptures in *Talking Back* in Chapter Two.

<sup>99</sup> *Talking Back*, 1. 14. Translation taken from *Evagrius of Pontus: Talking Back, Antirrhêtikos; A Monastic Handbook for Combating Demons*, trans. and ed. David Brakke, CSS 229 (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2009), 56. All translations have been taken from this text unless otherwise stated.

<sup>100</sup> *Talking Back* 3. 22.

### II. 3. b. The Meronymic Status of the Lord's Prayer<sup>101</sup>

The Lord's Prayer became a staple in the communal practices of the Jesus movement at an early period. For instance, in the *Didache* (8:2), which may date to as early as the first century CE,<sup>102</sup> we find a version of the Lord's Prayer—with similarities to the Matthean version, but with a doxological ending—<sup>103</sup>that served as a means of constructing a religious identity in contrast to the “hypocrites” (ὑποκριτῶν).<sup>104</sup> One also finds in the *Didache* the instruction to recite the Lord's Prayer three times per day (8:3).<sup>105</sup>

The Matthean version of the Lord's Prayer (Mt 6:9-13) reads:

Our Father in heaven, let your name be hallowed. Let your kingdom come, let your will happen, as in heaven, (so) also on earth. Our bread for tomorrow give us today; and forgive us our debts as we also have forgiven our debtors; and bring us not into temptation, but preserve us from evil.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> There are no extant versions of the Lukan version of the Lord's Prayer in the apotropaic record—at least, of which I am aware. This is not surprising in light of the popularity of the Matthean version in general. I will, therefore, focus my attention on the Matthean version in the following brief analysis.

<sup>102</sup> For the middle of the first century CE, see e.g., J.-P. Audet, *La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1958), 187-210; J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), 96-100, 322-27. For a late first-century CE date, see e.g., Ph. Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Väter* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 735-37; W. Rordorf and A. Tuilier, *La Doctrine des douze Apôtres (Didachè)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1998), 91-99.

<sup>103</sup> For the view that the Lord's Prayer of the *Didache* reflects a non-Matthean tradition, see Helmut Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), 203-207.

<sup>104</sup> It is likely that ὑποκριτῶν referred to “Jews” (Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary*, trans. Linda M. Maloney [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998], 131; Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002], 292). While the “Jews,” understood as a constructed “other,” were probably in mind, this should not be taken as evidence for a “parting of the ways” between “Christians” and “Jews” (cf. James Dunn, *The Parting of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* [London: SCM, 1991]); rather, this is likely an early instance of a religious leader artificially constructing group boundaries in light of the permeability between these entities in social reality (van de Sandt and Flusser, *The Didache*, 291-96). For this broader strategy within the early Jesus movement, see Judith Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996); Paula Fredriksen, “What Parting of the Ways? Jews and Gentiles in the Ancient Mediterranean City,” in *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Adam Becker and Annette Reed (Tübingen: Mohr, 2003), 35-63.

<sup>105</sup> In *De oratione liber 1*, Tertullian referred to the Lord's Prayer as “*breviarum totius Evangelii*” (“the summary of the entire Gospel”). Likewise, Cyprian of Carthage (*De dominica oratione* 9) called the prayer “*coelestis doctrinae compendium*” (“[a] compendium of heavenly doctrine”).

<sup>106</sup> Translation taken from Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, trans. James E. Crouch (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 309. For the view that τοῦ πονηροῦ in the final petition originally referred to Satan (“deliver us from the Evil One”), see e.g., Donald Hagner, *Word Biblical Commentary 33a: Matthew 1-13* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000), 151.

Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου· γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς· τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον· καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν· καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

As was the case with LXX Ps 90, the Lord’s Prayer can be seen as a unified literary unit or as a collection of distinguishable parts. As a unified unit, these “words of Jesus” represent the model prayer for his followers. Furthermore, the prayer not only teaches the believer how to invoke and praise the Father, but also provides precedent (on the lips of the Lord himself!) for requesting assistance for the necessities of daily sustenance, including protection from “evil” (Mt 6:13).

The prayer could also be divided into discrete sections. As Ulrich Luz has noted, the petitions of the Matthean version of the Lord’s Prayer can be divided into two groups, which are distinguished on the basis of person.<sup>107</sup> The first group (Mt 6:9c-10)—the “you” section—includes the initial three petitions (i.e., “let your name be hallowed,” “let your kingdom come,” “let your will happen”). The second group (Mt 6:11-13)—the “we” section—includes the final three petitions (i.e., “our bread for tomorrow give us today,” “forgive us our debts as we also have forgiven our debtors,” “bring us not into temptation, but preserve us from evil”).<sup>108</sup>

Several ritual artifacts provide the Matthean version of Lord’s Prayer in its entirety: P. Schøyen I 6;<sup>109</sup> P. Oxy. LX 4010;<sup>110</sup> BGU III 954 (**no. 15**);<sup>111</sup> P. Duk. inv. 778;<sup>112</sup> Athens Nat.

---

<sup>107</sup> *Matthew 1-7*, 309.

<sup>108</sup> Rather than six petitions, Donald Hagner divides the Lord’s Prayer into seven petitions, separating “do not lead us into temptation” and “deliver us from evil” (*Word Biblical Commentary 33a: Matthew 1-13* [Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000], 145-52).

<sup>109</sup> See n. 80 in this chapter.

<sup>110</sup> Kurt Treu, “4010. Pater with Introductory Prayer,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 60, ed. R. A. Coles, M. W. Haslam, P. J. Parsons et al. (London: The Egypt Exploration Society, 1994), 5-7, no. 4010. Treu thinks that an amuletic function is unlikely, as there are no traces of folds (idem, 5). It should be highlighted, however, that the final petition is repeated on P. Oxy. LX 4010. This makes an apotropaic function likely, as the final petition carried special significance against demonic threat (see discussion below).

<sup>111</sup> Ulrich Wilcken, “Heidnisches und Christliches aus Ägypten,” *APF* 1 (1901): 396-436, at 431.

<sup>112</sup> See n. 76 in this chapter.

Mus. nr. 12 227 (=PGM 2: 211, no. O4).<sup>113</sup> It is interesting to note that in three of these texts (BGU III 954 [no. 15], P. Duk. inv. 778, Athens Nat. Mus. nr. 12 227), the ritual specialists attached the vocative κύριε to the final petition of the Lord's Prayer. On BGU III 954 (no. 15) and P. Duk. 778, the vocative occurs immediately before the final petition, while it occurs after the final petition on Athens Nat. Mus. nr. 12 227. This addition is probably reflective of the special apotropaic power associated with the reference to protection from evil in the final petition.<sup>114</sup> Furthermore, on BGU III 954 (no. 15), the ritual specialist changes the gender of the adjective "evil" from masculine/neuter (τοῦ πονηροῦ) to feminine (τῆς πονηρ[...]). Unfortunately, the lacuna in the manuscript prevents one from determining whether the feminine item was originally a noun (τῆς πονηρίας) or an adjective (τῆς πονηρᾶς).<sup>115</sup>

Select portions of the Lord's Prayer were also used in apotropaic rituals. In addition to artifacts that provide only the *incipit*, several artifacts select certain other aspects of this prayer. P. Köln IV 171 provides Mt 6:12-13 with a doxological ending that corresponds to a tradition associated with the *Euchologium* of Sarapion of Thmuis.<sup>116</sup> In addition, P. Köln VIII 336 makes reference to Mt 6:11-13,<sup>117</sup> P. Ant. II 54 cites Mt 6:10-12,<sup>118</sup> and P. Vindob. L. 91 includes Mt 6:11-12 (written in Latin).<sup>119</sup>

<sup>113</sup> Rudolf Knopf, "Eine Thonscherbe mit dem Texte des Vaterunser," *MDAIA* 25 (1900): 313-24.

<sup>114</sup> De Bruyn, "Papyri," 160-61.

<sup>115</sup> Most editors and commentators have assumed that the original was a noun (e.g., Wilcken, "Heidnisches und Christliches," 435; Wessely, "Monuments," 421; PGM 2: 197). It should be noted, however, that the Matthean original has a masculine or neuter adjective, a point that may suggest that the lacunose τῆς πονηρ[... ] should be reconstructed as an adjective; see Sanzo, "Canonical Power," 32 n. 17.

<sup>116</sup> Cornelia Römer, "171. Christliches Amulett," in *Kölner Papyri (P. Köln)*, vol. 4, ed. Bärbel Kramer, Cornelia Römer, Dieter Hagedorn, et al. (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1982), 31-34. The doxology reads, "...διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς <σ>ου Ἰ(ησοῦ) Χ(ριστοῦ) ἀμήν." It should also be noted that immediately following the aforementioned phrase, ἀμήν is repeated three times, which in turn is followed by three instances of ἅγιος. For the prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis, see Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis* (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1995); John Wordsworth, *Bishop Sarapion's Prayer-Book: An Egyptian Sacramentary Dated Probably about A.D. 350-356* (Hamden: Archon Books, 1964).

<sup>117</sup> Michael Gronewald, "336. Vaterunser," in *Kölner Papyri (P. Köln)*, vol. 8, ed. Michael Gronewald, Klaus Maresch, and Cornelia Römer (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1997), 48-49.

P. Princ. II 107 (**no. 55** [see also **no. 30**]) represents a challenging case and requires a somewhat more extended discussion.<sup>120</sup> On this fifth–or sixth–century CE artifact, the ritual specialist makes use of LXX Ps 90:1-2 and Mt 6:9, 11a in successive order as part of a larger ritual, which some have labeled “Gnostic”<sup>121</sup> or “syncretistic.”<sup>122</sup> The Lord’s Prayer on P. Princ. II 107 reads, “πατήρ ὑμῶν <ὁ> ἐν τῆς οὐρανῆς, ἁγιασθήτω τω θέλημά σου, των ἄρτων ὑμῶν των ἐπιούσιων.”<sup>123</sup> The attentive reader will observe not only that Mt 6:10 is missing, but also that “ἁγιασθήτω τῶ θέλημά σου” (“let your will be holy”) has replaced “ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου” (“let your name be hallowed”).”

On account of these “mistakes,” Roy Kotansky has written that “...the incoherent manner by which the verses are quoted suggests that the writer was ignorant of their context and

<sup>118</sup> J. W. B. Barns, H. Zilliagus, and C. H. Roberts ed., *The Antinoopolis Papyri*, pt. 2 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1960), 6-7, no. 54.

<sup>119</sup> Alain Martin, “P. Vindob. L.91, un fragment du *Pater* Latin,” *Latomus* 42 (1983): 412-18.

<sup>120</sup> E. H. Kase Jr. ed., *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*, vol. II (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936), 102-103, no. 107.

<sup>121</sup> Kase, *Papyri*, 102. Daniel and Maltomini question the appropriateness of this designation, as “there is no typically Gnostic element in it” (*Suppl.Mag.* 1: 78). Daniel and Maltomini, however, do not specify what constitutes a “Gnostic element.” With respect to the problems associated with the designation “Gnostic” and its cognates, see Michael A. Williams, *Rethinking “Gnosticism”: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996); Karen L. King, *What is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003). For a recent endeavor to resurrect the term (with nuance), see David Brakke, *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010). For the use of the designation “Gnostic” as a means of classifying apotropaic media, see especially E. A. Wallis Budge, *Amulets and Superstitions* (London: Oxford University Press, 1930), 200-11.

<sup>122</sup> Kotansky writes, “Despite the writer’s use of these [biblical] citations, the character of the spell shows it is syncretistic rather than distinctively Christian” (*GMPT*, 300). Kraus is certainly correct in criticizing Kotansky’s notion of “syncretism,” as the lexeme is contingent upon fluctuating notions of “orthodoxy” (“Manuscripts,” 266). Kraus’ insistence upon the appropriateness of a “Christian” label for this amulet (or for any other apotropaic artifact for that matter), however, is problematic. He maintains that whether or not the client or ritual specialist behind P. Princ. II 107 would consider himself/herself “Christian,” the use of “Christian” texts (e.g., LXX Ps 90; Matthean Lord’s Prayer; Liturgy of St. Mark) warrants this classification. Tacitly presupposed in his use of “Christian” is the notion that the “essence” of “Christianity” is associated with only certain textual elements that have been approved by (“orthodox”) ecclesiastical authorities. Thus, while Kraus contends that references to Michael the Archangel and *voces magicae* do not disturb the label “Christian” (idem), it is the use of LXX Ps 90:1-2, Mt 6:9-11, and (possibly) fragments from the Liturgy of St. Mark that *make this artifact “Christian.”* It remains to be shown, however, that LXX Ps 90:1-2, Mt 6:9-11, and the Liturgy of St. Mark were more integral to the formation of religious identity for the individuals behind the apotropeia than other “heterodox” texts.

<sup>123</sup> For my editorial notes, see **no. 55** in Chapter Four.

meaning.”<sup>124</sup> Though Kotansky’s condescending tone is unnecessary, I would agree with his assessment that the deviations from the original text were probably unintentional and based on a lack of familiarity with the precise wording of the Lord’s Prayer (and of LXX Ps 90:1-2). This explanation is more convincing than the suggestion that the wording is based on a different manuscript tradition<sup>125</sup> or reflects the desire of the ritual specialist to change the meaning of the text—though, to be sure, the modifications certainly alter the meaning.<sup>126</sup> I would likewise argue that the ritual specialist behind P. Princ. II 107 probably intended these words to act as the *incipit* of the Lord’s Prayer and, coupling them with the opening words of LXX Ps 90, wanted them to function metonymically. I have, therefore, included this instance of the Lord’s Prayer under potential *incipits* in Chapter Four (no. 55 [see also no. 30]).

### II. 3. c. Conclusions: Smaller Scriptural Units

What can we conclude from these data? While individuals Psalms and passages like the Lord’s Prayer could be fragmented into smaller parts/pieces in the same way that other (larger) sections of scripture could, there was an additional and common way of engaging with these texts within apotropaic discourse: using/viewing them as thematic “wholes.” This latter characteristic sets these passages apart from the larger corpora (e.g., Bible, Gospels) and likely would have had an impact on their metonymic relationship with their contiguous *incipits*.

---

<sup>124</sup> *GMPT*, 300. Likewise Kase writes, “The Lord’s Prayer is commonly quoted in Christian magical papyri, either in whole or in part, but nowhere, it seems, as incoherently as here” (*Papyri*, 103).

<sup>125</sup> NA<sup>27</sup> and UBS<sup>4</sup> provide no witnesses that follow P. Princ. II 107 with respect to the phrase “ἀγιασθήτω τῶ θελήμαί σου.” Likewise, Bruce Metzger provides no variants, which correspond to the version of the Lord’s Prayer in P. Princ. II 107 (*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1998], 12-14).

<sup>126</sup> Thomas J. Kraus argues that this modification “alters the meaning of the first and second request [sic] completely, as then it is the father’s ‘will’ that should be ‘hallowed’” (“Manuscripts with the *Lord’s Prayer*--They Are More Than Simply Witnesses to That Text Itself,” in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their Worlds*, ed. Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas [Leiden: Brill, 2006], 227-66, at 262). He remains uncertain, however, if such a modification was intentional (*idem*).

### III. Conclusions

In this chapter, I have argued that an undifferentiated *pars pro toto* model is insufficient for analyzing the apotropaic *incipits* from late antique Egypt. Not only can the part-for-whole model stand for different kinds of linguistic transfers, but its use for the apotropaic *incipits* occludes the fact that different meronymic relations are represented in the likely implied corpora/texts for these initial words.

I would now like to reiterate the distinction that I drew when discussing the metonymic relationship between the triggers and targets among the apotropaic *incipits*. In my foregoing analysis, I organized my discussion of the likely implied corpora along a partonomy, moving from the general to the specific. Since the individual thematic unit was primary, I argued that there is a crucial difference between larger corpora (e.g., the “Bible,” the “Gospels”), which are comprised of multiple narrative and apophthegmatic units, and smaller biblical items (e.g., a particular psalm, the Lord’s Prayer), which are confined to a single psalm, narrative, or other sub-unit. Because their parts are more closely integrated into their wholes, smaller units were more often used and conceived of as entire thematic units than their larger counterparts, both within the contexts of apotropaic usage, in particular, and of scribal activity, in general.

With this distinction in mind, I will divide my survey and analysis of the *incipits* into two categories related to their contiguous scriptural units: multiunit corpora and single unit texts. I will argue in Chapter Six that this distinction has implications for the metonymic transfer, implied by the apotropaic *incipits*. While the *pars pro toto* model in certain instances may appropriately describe the metonymic transfer between an *incipit* of a single unit text and its implied target, this model is unhelpful for understanding the *incipits* of multiunit corpora.

Instead, I will argue that the model *pars pro parte/partibus* better characterizes the implied metonymic transfer when *incipits* of multiunit corpora were used.

Before I begin my survey and analysis of the apotropaic *incipits*, I offer in the next chapter a few additional words concerning the use of non-continuous scriptural texts in late antique Egyptian apotropaic rituals. I will argue that beyond the physical limitations of the ritual artifact, two additional factors contributed to the unit-based approach to the scriptures in apotropaic settings: apotropaic relevance and the importance of particular precedent. As a result of these two factors, passages from the Bible were organized hierarchically according to relevance for apotropaic contexts.

**Table 1: “Biblical” Passages on Greek Amulets<sup>127</sup>**

Amulets	“Biblical” passage	Amulets (continued)	“Biblical” Passages (continued)	Amulets (continued)	“Biblical” Passages (continued)
BGU III 954	Mt 6:9-13; Jn 1:1; Mt 1:1	P. Vindob. G 2312	LXX Ps 90:1-2; Rom 12:1-2; Jn 2:1-2	P. Oxy. XVII 2065	LXX Ps 90:5-10
BKT VI 7.1	LXX Ps 90:1; Jn 1:1-2; Mt 1:1; Mk 1:1; Lk 1:1; Ps 117:6-7; Ps 17:3; Mt 4:23	P. Vindob. G 29831	Jn 1:5-6	P. Oxy. XXXIV	Jude 4-5, 7-8
BKT IX 206	LXX Ps 90:1	SB I 790	LXX Ps 90:1	P. Oxy. LXIV 4406	Mt 27:62-64; Mt 28:2-5
P. Cair. 10696	Lk 1:1; Mt 1:1; Jn 1:1; see LXX Ps 21:20-23	SB I 2021	LXX Ps 90:1	P. Rain. II 61	LXX Ps 140:1-6, 8, 10
P. Duk. Inv. 778	LXX Ps 90; LXX Ps 91 (heading); Mt 6:9-13	SB I 3573	LXX Ps 90:1	P. Ross.-Georg. I 1	LXX Ps 49:1-7
P. Gen. 1.6	LXX Ps 90:1-7b, 10-13a	MPER N.S. XVIII 196	LXX Ps 117:19-20; LXX Ps 118:10-11 (Coptic)	P. Ryl. III 461	Ps 3:4-5, 7-8b, 9, 6; LXX Ps 62:2, 4-5a
P. Heid. Inv. L 5	LXX Ps 15:10; LXX Ps 20:2-7	BKT VIII 12	LXX Ps 90:1-6	P. Ryl. III 462	LXX Ps 148:9-14; LXX Ps 149; LXX Ps 150
P. land. 1.6	Mt 1:1 (title); LXX Ps 90:13; Mt 6:9-13; Lk 11:1-2	BKT VIII 13	LXX Ps 90:1-7, 10-13	PSI Inv. 533	Ps 1:1-2
P. Köln VIII 340	Jn 1:1-11	O. Ath. Inv. 12227	Mt 6:11-13	P. Vindob. G 14289	LXX Ps 40:3-6
P. Leid. Inst. 10	LXX Ps 90:1-4c, 7b-9	P. Berl. Inv. 13977	1 Tim 1:15-16	P. Vindob. G 26034 +30453	2 Cor 10:4; 1 Thes 5:8; Eph 6:16
P. Oxy. VIII	Mt 4:23-24	P. Berl. Inv. 16158	Ex 15:1-2 = Ode 1:1-2	P. Vindob. G 26166	LXX Ps 62:2-3; Ps 3:5-6
P. Oxy. VIII 1551	Jn 1:1, 3	P. Col. XI 293	Mt 6:4-6, 8-12	P. Vindob. G 26786	LXX Ps 118:155-160; Ps 3:2-4
P. Oxy. LXV 4469	LXX Ps 28:7; Letter of Abgar to Jesus	P. Giss. Univ. IV 34	LXX Ps 111:1; LXX Ps 73:2	P. Vindob. G 27290 A	Ps 2:7; LXX Ps 109:3; LXX Ps 86:2; LXX Ps 86:5; LXX Ps 64:2
P. Princ. II 107	Ps 90:1-2; Mt 6:9, 11a	P. Grenf. II 112 (a)	Ps 1:3	P. Vindob. G 36114	Hab 3:8-10 = Ode 4
P. Schoyen I 16	Mt 6:9-13; 2 Cor 13:13; LXX Ps 90:1-13	P. Köln VIII 336	Mt 6:11-13	P. Vindob. G 38624 + 41738	LXX Ps 53
PSI VI 719	Jn 1:1; Mt 1:1; Mk 1:1; Lk 1:1; LXX Ps 90:1; Mt 6:9	P. Mich. XV 685	LXX Ps 106:35	P. Vindob. G 40580	LXX Ps 30:3d-4a
G. Vindob. G 348	Mt 1:1; Mk 1:1; Lk 1:1; Jn 1:1; LXX Ps 90 (except vv. 7c, 8)	P. Oxy. XVI 1928	LXX Ps 90:1-16; (titles of four Gospels)		

<sup>127</sup> This table is based on the tables provided by de Bruyn, “Papyri, Parchment,” 166-83. The white background indicates artifacts that de Bruyn has confidently identified as amulets, while the grey background indicates artifacts that de Bruyn contends were “probably amulets” (idem).

## Chapter Two

In Chapter One, I challenged the *pars pro toto* model, often applied to the apotropaic *incipits*, as insufficiently nuanced. Instead, I argued that the part-for-whole relation encompasses different types of conceptual transfers. I then proposed that the relationship between *incipit* and target depends upon the part-whole relation of a given entity. Focusing on the meronymic criterion of separability, I argued that, for the purposes of interpreting the apotropaic *incipits*, it is helpful to imagine two different kinds of part-whole relations among the corpora associated with the *incipits*. This distinction is related to the preference for individual thematic units of scripture in apotropaic settings: on the one hand, the “Bible” and other multiunit biblical corpora (e.g., the Gospels) were not typically encountered *in toto*; on the other hand, single-unit items (e.g., particular psalms, the Lord’s Prayer) were frequently invoked in their entirety as discrete entities.

In this chapter, I attempt to explain the reasons for and the importance of individual thematic units of the scriptures in the apotropaic world of late antique Egypt. I begin by highlighting that this citational practice was conditioned by more than just the physical limitations of the medium used and the prevalence of small units of scriptural text in other contexts (see Chapter One), though these are certainly contributing factors. But, in addition, I maintain that this preference is related to ancient notions of scriptural relevance (and irrelevance); in apotropaic contexts, the Bible was viewed as a collection of passages, organized hierarchically in terms of appropriateness for demonic battle. I then situate this hierarchical approach to scriptures within the context of late antique book culture, arguing that something akin to the late antique miscellany was the operative scriptural model. Finally, I draw upon insights from ancient *historiolae* for understanding the citational practices in the extant

apotropaic record, focusing on the relationship between ritual power and the particular precedent of a paradigmatic event.

## **I. The Hierarchical Approach to the Scriptures for Apotropaic Concerns**

### **I. 1. “Relevance” and Scriptural Passages in Demonic Struggle**

The apotropaic record testifies to the idea that only certain passages from the “Bible” were considered relevant for an apotropaic ritual. This is suggested by the ubiquity of scriptural fragmentation among the extant ritual devices. This record also provides explicit evidence for the priority of certain scriptural items over others. For instance, in a manner reminiscent of Jn 20:30,<sup>1</sup> lines 9-12 of “G. Vitelli” PSI inv. 365 (= PGM 2: 207, no. 18) read, “ὁ ποιήσας καὶ πολλὰς καὶ ἀφάτους ἰάσεις, πρὸς ἅ[ς] λέγουσιν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εἰ[ὺ]αγγελῖος” (“the one who did both the many and ineffable healings, beyond those that are discussed in the sacred Gospels”).<sup>2</sup> Two of Jesus’ miracles from the Gospels immediately precede these words (ll. 6-9): (1) the raising of Lazarus (Jn 11:1-46) and (2) the healing of Peter’s mother-in-law (Mt 8:14-15; Mk 1:29-31; Lk 4:38-39). The sequence of these healing narratives in the ritual of “G. Vitelli” PSI inv. 365 thus suggests that “the many and ineffable healings, beyond those that are discussed in the sacred Gospels” were linked with the ministry of Jesus. While this text is helpful in

---

<sup>1</sup> Jn 20:30 reads: “There are many other signs (σημεῖα) that Jesus did before his disciples, which are not written in this book.”

<sup>2</sup> For the *editio princeps*, see G. Vitelli, “Noterelle papirologiche,” *Bulletin de la Société Archéologique d’Alexandrie* 23 (1928): 287-302, at 300-301, no. 22. For subsequent literature on “G. Vitelli” PSI 365, see especially the following: M. Naldini, “Due papyri cristiani della collezione Fiorentina,” *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 33 (1961): 212-18, at 216-18; Franco Maltomini, “Osservazioni al testo di alcuni papyri magici greci, III,” *Studi Classici e Orientali* 32 (1982): 235-40, at 239; Theodore de Bruyn, “The Use of the Sanctus in Christian Greek Papyrus Amulets,” in *Papers Presented at the Fourteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 2003: Liturgia et cultus, theologica et philosophica, critica et philologica; Nachleben, First Two Centuries*, ed. M. Edwards, F. Young, and P. Parvis (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 15-20, at 17; LDAB 6104; TM 64866; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 271, no. 754. For an English translation of this artifact, see *ACM* no. 13.

complicating the meaning of “Gospels,” it also sheds light on the way that the Gospels were viewed within a ritual context.

What is interesting about “G. Vitelli” PSI inv. 365 is that it explicitly invokes particular elements (i.e., healing events) from the Gospels (and beyond), referencing two such events (i.e., the raising of Lazarus from the dead and the healing of Peter’s mother-in-law).<sup>3</sup> As is indicated by this text, this association with the Gospels is not conceived in a general sense or as indexing every individual element from that corpus; rather, the ritual specialist invokes a specific set of narrative elements (i.e., healing stories) from the Gospels (and beyond) that he or she believed were particularly efficacious for his or her client’s healing.

Another amulet, P. Oxy. VIII 1077 (**no. 20**), utilizes the Matthean *incipit* with a particularly interesting modification. The *incipit* reads, “The Healing Gospel according to Matthew.” These words are followed by a quotation from Mt 4:23-24, arranged into a series of crosses. It is important to note that the ritual utility of the Gospel of Matthew in this amulet seems to be restricted to the healing ministry of Jesus, as is evident both from the modified title and from the content of the text of Mt 4:23-24 on this artifact.<sup>4</sup> Once again, only certain elements from a textual body (this time the Gospel of Matthew) are presented as relevant for the concerns of the client, most likely because of the precedent established (i.e., Jesus healed many people during his earthly ministry; thus, he can heal the client now).

---

<sup>3</sup> The Markan version of the healing of Peter’s mother-in-law (1:29-31) is part of the ritual of the Pushkin Museum Coptic Amulet (**no. 11**).

<sup>4</sup> Mt 4:23-24 on P. Oxy. VIII 1077 reads: “καὶ περιῆγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλέαν, διδάσκων καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον [καὶ πᾶσαν νόσον] καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν ἐν τῷ λαῷ καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν Συρίαν, καὶ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας καὶ ἔθεράπευσεν αὐτούς ὁ Ἰησοῦς” (“and Jesus went around all of Galilee, teaching and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, healing every sickness [and every sickness] and every malady among the people and the report about him went out into all of Syria, and they brought to him those who were ill and Jesus healed them).”

The “literary” record concerning late antique ascetics and monks sheds additional light on the issue of scriptural relevancy in apotropaic and similar contexts.<sup>5</sup> In addition to the conviction that only certain passages from holy writ were relevant for a given apotropaic situation, this evidence highlights that other passages were either irrelevant or inappropriate. In fact, the literary record even points to a textual culture in which certain passages were believed to be among the repertoire of enemies of the faithful, whether “heretics” or demons.

The use of select scriptural units within the context of demonic struggle goes back in the literary sources to an early period in the Jesus movement. In the Gospels of Matthew (4:1-11) and Luke (4:1-13), Jesus himself is depicted as participating in a scriptural war with Satan.<sup>6</sup> As an entity apparently well versed in the sacred textual tradition of the Judeans, Satan cites a passage from that tradition (LXX Ps 90:11-12) in order to tempt Jesus to show off his power as the Son of God by jumping off the Jerusalem temple. Conversely, in response to each of Satan’s three temptations, Jesus provides a refutation derived from Deuteronomy (8:3, 6:16, 6:13/10:20), which allows him to thwart successfully the temptations of his satanic enemy.<sup>7</sup>

This confrontational approach to sacred scripture had a long after-life throughout late antiquity. In *Reading Renunciation*, Elizabeth A. Clark discusses a particular strategy of reading

---

<sup>5</sup> There is strong evidence connecting apotropaic devices from late antique Egypt with Egyptian monasteries. See especially David Frankfurter, “Ritual Expertise in Roman Egypt and the Problem of the Category ‘Magician,’” in *Envisioning Magic: A Princeton Seminar and Symposium*, ed. Peter Schäfer and Hans G. Kippenberg (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 115-35, at 125-30; idem, “Dynamics of Ritual Expertise in Antiquity and Beyond: Towards a New Taxonomy of ‘Magicians,’” in *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, ed. Paul A. Mirecki and Marvin W. Meyer (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 159-78, at 167-70; David Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 226ff.

<sup>6</sup> The Gospel of Mark (1:12-13) provides a summary reference to Jesus’ temptation, but does mention that a scriptural debate was part of this confrontation. It is very likely that the Gospel writers’ presentations of Jesus’ struggle with Satan in the Temptation narratives were influenced by the “Combat Myth” (Luigi Schiavo, “The Temptation of Jesus: The Eschatological Battle and the New Ethic of the First Followers of Jesus in Q,” *JSNT* 25 [2002]: 141-64). For the applicability of this myth for the book of Revelation, see Adela Yarbro Collins, *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976).

<sup>7</sup> The scriptures are also prescribed against demonic threat in the “armor of God” section of Ephesians (6:10-17). In Ephesians 6:17, we read: “Take the helmet of salvation and the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God (ῥῆμα θεοῦ).” The context makes it difficult to tell whether whole texts, large sections, or smaller units from the Judean textual tradition were meant here.

the scriptures among ascetics, which she deems “Talking Back.”<sup>8</sup> In her discussion, Clark shows how scriptural passages could be used by ascetics and non-ascetics alike to justify their respective positions against one another.<sup>9</sup> Accordingly, certain scriptural passages would be used to *refute* other passages from scripture (even by the same biblical author). For instance, both the author of *De castitate* (16) and John Chrysostom (*Hom. 7 Matt. 7*)<sup>10</sup> utilize the (supposed) sexual renunciation of 1 Cor 7 in order to refute (or recontextualize) the anti-renunciation of 1 Tim 4:1-4.<sup>11</sup>

Clark notes that ascetics also engaged in scriptural debates with demons.<sup>12</sup> In dialogues reminiscent of the aforementioned temptation narratives from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, ascetics would wield their arsenal of scriptural passages in favor of sexual renunciation against demons, who, in turn, cited pro-marriage passages against the ascetics.<sup>13</sup> Evagrius of Pontus prefaces a citation from Jer 20:12 with the following message: “To the Lord concerning the demons of fornication that take for themselves pretexts from the Scriptures and from the topics that are written in them...”<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 128-32. Heike Behlmer has instructively utilized Clark’s thesis to interpret St. Shenouda of Atripe’s use of scripture in Codex XM 181-185 (“De iudico Dei”) (“Do Not Believe Every Word like the Fool...!): Rhetorical Strategies in Shenoute, *Canon 6*,” in *Christianity and Monasticism in Upper Egypt*, ed. Gawdat Gabra and Hany N. Takla [Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 2008], 1-12).

<sup>9</sup> Clark, *Reading Renunciation*, 129-30.

<sup>10</sup> PG 57, 80-81.

<sup>11</sup> Clark, *Reading Renunciation*, 130.

<sup>12</sup> As David Brakke notes, bodily harm was the second wave of attack in the typical three-stage demonic assault on monks: “...the devil first attacks with thoughts, then turns to the body, and appears visually as a kind of last resort” (*Demons*, 29). On the relationship between the ascetic life and demonic encounter, see *Hist. mon. Aegypt.* 15:2-3.

<sup>13</sup> Athanasius draws an explicit connection between Jesus’ response to Satan and Antony’s approach to the demons (*Vit. Ant.* 37 =PG 26, 897).

<sup>14</sup> E.g., Evagrius, *Talking Back*, 2.50; see discussion in Clark, *Reading Renunciation*, 131-32. Antony also notes that the demons are able to engage with scripture: “Frequently, without becoming visible, they [demons] pretend to chant with sacred songs, and they recite sayings from the Scriptures. And even when we are reading, they are able to say right away and repeatedly, as if in echo, the same things we have read” (*Vit. Ant.* 25). Athanasius writes, “...the devil, the author of heresies, because of the ill favor which attaches to heresies, borrows Scriptural language, as a cloak wherewith to sow the ground with his own position also, and to seduce the simple” (*Ar.* 3.8, translation taken from Daniel Boyarin and Virginia Burrus, “Hybridity as Subversion of Orthodoxy? Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity,” *Social Compass* 52 [2005]: 431-44, at 436).

One result of such contests was that ascetics developed collections of passages, some of which, as stand alone units, were inherently able to refute the scriptural citations of the demons. Other passages required reapplication, either by being linked to still other passages or through de-/re-contextualization.<sup>15</sup> In demonic contests, the fact that a passage was found in the Bible was not sufficient; rather, one needed to mine the pages of the scriptures for precisely those passages that were both relevant and appropriate for its application.

Evagrius articulates this imperative to separate scriptural wheat from chaff in demonic conflicts, and to do so with great care. He writes:

Now, the words that are required for speaking against our enemies, that is, the cruel demons, cannot be found quickly in the hour of conflict, because they are scattered throughout the Scriptures and so are difficult to find. We have, therefore, carefully selected words from the Holy Scriptures, so that we may equip ourselves with them and drive out the Philistines forcefully, standing firm in the battle, as warriors and soldiers of our victorious King, Jesus Christ.<sup>16</sup>

As is evident from this passage, a text's inclusion in the "Bible" did not ensure its efficacy in an encounter with a demon. One ought to be prepared in advance with the proper texts for battle.

Indeed, Evagrius puts these words into practice in *Talking Back*, extracting bite-sized units of scripture for various concerns.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Clark, *Reading Renunciation*, 132.

<sup>16</sup> *Prologue to Talking Back*, 3, translation from Brakke, *Evagrius of Pontus*, 50. As we have seen, this same posture was taken by Athanasius in his *Ep. Marc.*, where he employs specific Psalms for specific situation (see discussion in Chapter One).

<sup>17</sup> *Talking Back* is divided into eight books, each focusing on a particular struggle: (1) against the thoughts of gluttony; (2) against the thoughts of fornication; (3) concerning the love of money; (4) concerning the thoughts of the demon of sadness; (5) against the demon of anger; (6) against the thoughts of the demon of listlessness; (7) against the thoughts from the demon of vainglory; (8) against the cursed thoughts of pride. In his introduction to this text, Brakke writes, "*Talking Back*, then, resembles other ancient anthologies of biblical excerpts not only in its literary form, but also in its functions of arming the Christian for spiritual struggle with Satan or polemical conflict with opponents, exhorting the Christian to a higher moral life, and providing an alternative means of reading the Scriptures" (*Evagrius of Pontus*, 9). For ancient testimony on Evagrius of Pontus' discernment, see *Hist. mon. Aegypt.* 20:15-16. The writings of other monastic figures followed this same approach to the scriptures (e.g., *Vit. Ant.* 2, 3, 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 24, 27, 28, 29, 37, 38, 40, 44, 45, 55, 65, 66, 67, 69, 83; *Apoph. Pat.* 5:1, 2, 4, 15, 17; 6:4; 7:16, 43, 44; 10:12, 22, 33, 47, 58, 60, 66, 69, 73, 84, 101; 11:16, 24, 34, 42, 54; 12:4, 9; 13:1, 2; 15:10, 23, 30, 55, 71; 16:2; 17:1, 13, 15; 18:14, 18, 19, 20; *Hist. mon. Aegypt.* Prol. 1, 6; 1:27, 29, 30, 31, 35, 44, 57, 59, 61; 8:19, 20, 33, 35, 56; 9:1; 10:12, 14, 16, 23, 24; 12:2, 14:15; 21:3; *Epil.* 6, 7, 13). Of particular significance is the

Evagrius's approach to the deployment of scripture as a response to demonic threat was largely based on a tradition going back to Athanasius' *Vit. Ant.*<sup>18</sup> Summarizing Athanasius' presentation of St. Antony in this text, Clark writes:

In Athanasius' rendition, not only did Scripture provide the motivation for Antony to renounce his property and adopt the ascetic life in the first place, it also armed him with a battery of quotations with which to do battle against his demonic opponents. When the devil tempts him with sex, Ant[h]ony responds with "The Lord is my helper and I shall look upon my enemies" (Ps 118:7). When demons whip him, he recites Psalm 27:3, "Though an army should set itself in array against me, my heart shall not be afraid."<sup>19</sup>

As Clark highlights, Athanasius presents Antony as a specialist who knows precisely which passages are appropriate for a particular demonic encounter. Once again, the "Bible" as such or the random selection of passages from it are both deemed to be ineffective.

The belief that only certain passages were efficacious in apotropaic contexts transcended the work of these famous ascetics. In one of the narrative passages on the walls of an Anchorite's Grotto in Nubia (**no. 1**), we find an instance that disrupts the boundaries between "literary" and "documentary" evidence. An inscription on the wall of the grotto recounts the following story:

It was said of [Apa.....] that, as he was walking one d[ay] upon the mountain to go into the cave of [the] holy old man Apa Hatre, he was repeating by heart from the (Book of) Numbers, and put his foot on a cerastes. She bit him; (but) he did not move his foot from her and when he had tormented himself greatly, he repeated the psalm of the desert (?). And when (he) reached this passage, "thou shalt tread on a serpent and an adder" (LXX Ps 90:13), he lifted up his foot from her and found that she had died, and he gave glory to God for his power.<sup>20</sup>

---

*Testament of Horsiesios (Hors. Test.)*, where citations from the scriptures make up a substantial portion of the document (*Pachomian Koinonia*, vol. 3, trans. Armand Veilleux. CSS 47 [Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications Inc., 1982], 171-224).

<sup>18</sup> Brakke, *Demons*, 29.

<sup>19</sup> *Reading Renunciation*, 131.

<sup>20</sup> Translation by F. L. Griffith, "Oxford Excavations in Nubia," *LAAA* 14 (1927): 57-116, at 87, no. 17.

Though this story does not specify a demonic threat in particular, it is illustrative of the usage of scripture in a combative situation, where bodily harm is in view.<sup>21</sup> It is unclear from this tale whether or not the monk continued to recite Numbers after being bitten by the cerastes. What is clear is that it was only after the recitation of LXX Ps 90:13<sup>22</sup>—a passage that had analogical connections to his particular situation—that the snake died. In other words, this brief narrative, which itself likely functioned as a *historiola* for the anchorite in the grotto, reinforces the view that only certain portions from the scriptures had the power to generate the desired result in a given situation.

In my view, the late antique (Egyptian) world of demonic struggle must be brought to bear on our understanding of the ritual use of scriptural *incipits*.<sup>23</sup> This tradition of “Talking Back” is predicated on a conception of the “Bible” as divided into individual thematic units, the length of which could vary considerably. Furthermore, this evidence reflects the fact that individual passages of holy writ were ordered in a hierarchical fashion. While relevant texts were efficacious for healing and other positive aims, biblical items at the bottom of this hierarchy could support the interests of “heretics” or even “demons.”<sup>24</sup> This hierarchical ordering of the

---

<sup>21</sup> Several factors (both internal and external to this story) suggest that a demonic conflict may be present in the background. First of all, a serpent plays the foil in this story. The serpent is not only identified with Satan in scriptural material (cf. Gen 3), but also in monastic material (e.g., the *Vit. Ant.* 9, 30). What is more, the serpent is tied to temptation in monastic literature. For instance, in the same grotto as the aforementioned story, a saying of Apa Ezaias equates the temptations of a woman with the bite of a serpent: “Prolong not discourse with a woman, O monk, but flee from her like one who flees from before a serpent lest it bite thee with its poisonous tooth; for it is written that the beginning of sin came into the world because of this sort, the woman” (translation by Griffith, “Oxford Excavations in Nubia,” 87-8, no. 21). Secondly, the serpent disrupts the voyage of the monk to cave of Apa Hatre. The trope of demonic interference in the spiritual tasks of monks is ubiquitous in monastic literature. Thirdly, the narrative structure of this tale more generally is reminiscent of monastic stories of demonic conflict: the monk is performing a spiritual task, which is disrupted by a demon; the monk cites scripture or performs some other ritual; the demon departs; the monk gives thanks to God. Finally, as David Brakke has shown, the demonic world played (and continues to play until the present day!) such an important role in the construction of monastic identity that it is likely to be in the background in monastic situations of bodily affliction (*Demons*).

<sup>22</sup> It is unclear if the anchorite (and/or his source) thought that this passage came from the Book of Numbers.

<sup>23</sup> Indeed, David Brakke notes that Evagrius’ *Talking Back*, where this scriptural dialectic is perhaps most explicit, was very popular in antiquity (*Evagrius of Pontus*, 1).

<sup>24</sup> This concern over the use of the scriptures by heretics was not confined to ascetic contexts. For instance, concerning the doctrine of so-called “Arians,” Athanasius writes, “[The Arian heresy] in her craft and cunning,

scriptures helps to explain the unit-based presentation of the scriptures in the extant apotropaic record: not every passage from the “Bible” was equally appropriate and, hence, efficacious for healing and/or in a demonic struggle. In other words, ritual specialists would not have approached the “Gospels” (or the “Bible,” more generally) as “whole” entities in such contexts.

## **I. 2. The Hierarchical Approach to Literature and the Late Antique Miscellany**

We have seen that ritual specialists preferred to utilize individual units of holy writ against demonic threat. Accordingly, the scriptures were organized hierarchically in terms of perceived relevance for an apotropaic ritual. It is now appropriate to situate this hierarchical approach to the scriptures within the material context of late antique Egypt. What textual model informed, accommodated, and supported this hierarchical approach to the scriptures? I suggest that the “book model” that informed the apotropaic use of scriptures, was not a unitary text (e.g., the Bible, the Gospels), but something akin to the late antique miscellany. This discussion further supports my contention that *incipits* of multiunit corpora would not have invoked their contiguous units *in toto*, but would have invoked only select items from those units.

Any attempt to understand the implied book model behind the apotropaic use of scriptures must take into account the form in which the scriptures appear on ritual artifacts and in other apotropaic contexts. Indeed, scholars of the “History of the Book” have noted the close relationship between textual modes, reading habits, and conceptions of “text.” As Roger Chartier and Guglielmo Cavallo note:

Readers are never faced with an abstract, ideal text detached from everything material: they manipulate objects; they listen to words whose modalities govern

---

affects to array herself in Scriptural language...that with the pretense of Christianity, her smooth sophistry (for reason she has done) may deceive men into wrong thoughts of Christ” (*Ar.* 1.1; translation taken from Boyarin and Burrus, “Hybridity as Subversion of Orthodoxy?” 434). For the use of the scriptures by Satan or demons, see *Vit. Ant.* 25, 26, 39, 41.

the way they read or listen, but in the process also govern ways of comprehending the text...a text is invested with a new meaning and a different status with every change in the support that makes it available to reading. Any history of the practices of reading is thus necessarily a history of both written objects and the testimonies left by their readers.<sup>25</sup>

Accordingly, the presentation of a text on a physical artifact shapes and/or reinforces how that text is interpreted and conceptualized. I would argue that this relationship between physical encounter and conceptual model of text is strengthened when a given text was presented consistently in a particular context. In this vein, the reoccurring pattern of deploying individual scriptural units for apotropaic situations, which is evident in the extant record, is significant.

In determining the textual model operative in apotropaic contexts, we must also pay attention to broader trends in late antique Egyptian book culture. Armando Petrucci has shown that between the third and fourth centuries CE Egypt witnessed the emergence of a new kind of book, the miscellany.<sup>26</sup> With the help of this new book form, which may have had its origins in the ecclesiastical lectionary,<sup>27</sup> scribes provided their readers access to a collection of texts and/or textual excerpts from multiple compositions and authors, a kind of library in miniature.<sup>28</sup> In most cases, the disparate texts were collected and arranged on the basis of a shared theme or the type

---

<sup>25</sup> "Introduction," in *A History of Reading in the West*, ed. G. Cavallo and R. Chartier, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), 1-36, at 2. A similar sentiment is shared by Harry Y. Gamble: "By observing precisely how the text was laid out, how it was written, and what it was written on or in one has access not only to the technical means of its production but also, since these are the signs of intended and actual uses, to the social attitudes, motives, and contexts that sustained its life and shaped its meaning. From this perspective a clean distinction between textual history and history of literature is neither possible nor desirable" (*Books and Readers*, 42). See also D. R. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, The Panizzi Lectures 1985 (London: The British Library, 1986) and R. Chartier, "Texts, Forms, and Interpretations," in *On the Edge of the Cliff: History, Language, and Practices*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 81-89.

<sup>26</sup> "From the Unitary Book to the Miscellany," in *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy: Studies in the History of Written Culture* by A. Petrucci, ed. and trans. C. M. Radding (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 1-18. As Petrucci notes, this book form was probably not confined to Egypt, but was likely used throughout the late antique Mediterranean (idem, 9).

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, 9.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, 8.

of text cited.<sup>29</sup> It should be emphasized that, as the product of selection and redaction, the miscellany as a book form also presupposed a hierarchical way of viewing literature; for one reason or another, only certain texts or excerpts were included in the compilation.<sup>30</sup>

Though admittedly falling outside of the temporal and geographical parameters of this study, the *Vita* of St. Nilus the Younger (d. 1004 CE) provides literary evidence for the use of something like a scriptural miscellany in an apotropaic setting. In the *Vita*, we read that when the saint was approaching death, “He [St. Nilus] pulled out of his bosom a phylactery (φυλακτήριον) which he always kept there. And this was a small and compact book (κυκτίον) that was a New Testament anthology (θησαύρισμα).”<sup>31</sup>

While the *Vita* does not specify which New Testament passages were written in his κυκτίον, it is likely that, if it existed at all, it contained narratives from the life and ministry of Jesus.<sup>32</sup> What is significant about this account is that it confirms the portrait of the scriptures that is implicit in the apotropaic record: the “Word of God”—or, in this instance, the New

---

<sup>29</sup> For a discussion of such biblical collections (under the designation “anthologies”), see Brakke, *Evagrius of Pontus*, 6-12. Brakke draws a connection between ancient anthologies and notebooks (*hupomnēmata*), on the one hand, and ancient *grimoires*, on the other (*idem*, 12f.). Unfortunately, however, he does not draw a parallel between these ancient genres of collection and the use of the scriptures on apotropaic devices.

<sup>30</sup> The author of the so-called “scribal note” between Nag Hammadi codex VI.7 and VI.8 provides the following reasons for his or her selections: “I have copied this one discourse of his. Indeed, very many have come to me. I have not copied them because I thought that they had come to you. Also, I hesitated to copy these for you because, perhaps, they have (already) come to you, and the matter may burden you. Since the discourses of that one, which have come to me, are numerous” (translation from Douglas M. Parrott, “The Scribal Note: VI,7a: 65,8-14,” in *Nag Hammadi Codices V,2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502,1 and 4*, ed. Douglas M. Parrot [Leiden: Brill, 1979], 389-93, at 393).

<sup>31</sup> *Vit. S. Nili Junioris* (PG 120.109C). Translation from Kartsonis, “Protection Against All Evil,” 91. Cf. Brigitte Pitarakis, “Objects of Devotion and Protection,” in *A People’s History of Christianity*, vol. 3, *Byzantine Christianity*, ed. D. Krueger (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 164-81, at 169. I disagree with Kartsonis, who writes the following concerning this passage: “By embracing the New Testament anthology...St. Nilus materially confessed his belief in the word and story of the ‘book’” (*idem*). Thus, for Kartsonis, the anthology functions metonymically to reference a general entity, the ‘book’ (presumably the “New Testament”). Based on the evidence that I have discussed above, I would argue to the contrary that St. Nilus (according to his *Vita*) probably selected the appropriate elements out of the New Testament for an apotropaic context and it is the paradigmatic power associated with those elements that he believed would protect him. I would agree with Kartsonis’ thesis, however, that the historiated phylacteries after 787 CE drew a close connection between visual depictions of scriptural narratives and the written word of holy writ (*idem*, 92).

<sup>32</sup> This is not only suggested by the apotropaic record, but also by one of St. Nilus’ near-contemporaries, Nicephorus, who discusses the ubiquity of phylacteries with depictions from the life of Jesus (*Third Antirrheticus* [PG 100.433 C-D]). See the citation of this passage in Chapter One.

Testament—was thought of as a repository of independent units, the relevant among which could be extracted and compiled in a *θησαύρισμα* (literally, “a store”) to be used against a demonic threat.<sup>33</sup> Indeed, several ritual artifacts resemble Petrucci’s examples of late antique miscellanies and, hence, suggest a link on some level between the miscellany and the apotropaic record.<sup>34</sup> In fact, Petrucci uses P. Anastasy 9 (**no. 5**) to show the existence of the miscellany in the sixth century CE.<sup>35</sup>

Nevertheless, the exact relationship between the miscellany and the apotropaic devices from late antique Egypt requires further research. Did ritual specialists utilize scriptural miscellanies in a manner reminiscent of the use of “magical” *grimoires*? Was the apotropaic use of scripture modeled in part on the miscellany? Conversely, was the miscellany modeled in part after the use of scripture or other sacred literature in the apotropaic settings? Do both depend on a broader shift in ways of conceptualizing “texts” in late antiquity? Do they reflect a shared institutional context?

The relationship between the apotropaic use of scripture and the miscellany is likely more complicated than a simple one-to-one correspondence. Yet, it is highly probable that something akin to the miscellany stands behind the use of the scriptures in demonic conflict.

---

<sup>33</sup> This view of the scriptures also seems to be behind Alcuin of York’s words against scriptural amulets: “...it is better to hold the written teachings of the Gospels in one’s mind, than to carry them, written on strips of parchment, around one’s neck” (*Ep.* 290, cited in Rapp, “Holy Books,” 201). For a discussion of this passage, see the Conclusions.

<sup>34</sup> E.g., BKT VI 7.1 (**nos. 2 and 25**), P. Anastasy 9 (**no. 5**), P. Duk. Inv. 778, PSI VI 719 (**nos. 10, 31, 56**), P. Vindob. G 2312 (**nos. 33 and 59**). The same applies to much of the literary evidence discussed above. Concerning Evagrius’ *Talking Back*, David Brakke provides an appropriate summary: “[a]lthough each of the eight books of *Talking Back* presents its passages in canonical order, the overall effect is to atomize the scriptural text into a series of powerful sayings” (*Demons*, 233).

<sup>35</sup> “From Unitary Book to Miscellany,” 10.

## II. Hierarchy and *Historiolae*: The Power of Precedent and Paradigm

I have argued throughout this study that, rather than invoking the generic power of the Bible or its sub-corpora as wholes, ritual specialists preferred to use individual items from the “Bible” that they felt were appropriate. In other words, the Bible was approached as a repository of independent units, only some of which were efficacious for a given ritual. I will further explain this unit-based approach to the scriptures through an analysis of how ancient *historiolae* were thought to convey ritual power. Rather than appealing to a generic power, research on *historiolae* has shown that ritual narratives invoked the power associated with the precedent or paradigm of specific events and/or actions. I maintain that, as a sub-class of ancient *historiolae*, the scriptures were thought to have “worked” in apotropaic contexts because of the precedent or paradigm established by specific prior actions of the divine. In other words, particular episodes from the scriptures provided assurance for healing in the present context. I then comment on the significance of this observation for the *pars pro toto* model.

David Frankfurter’s far-reaching synthesis of the uses of *historiolae* has had a tremendous influence on scholars of ancient ritual.<sup>36</sup> In Frankfurter’s estimation, one of the central features of the *historiola* is the role of specific precedent or paradigm. In contrast to Mircea Eliade and Gerardus van der Leeuw, Frankfurter argues that “...it is not simply undifferentiated power that is unleashed through *historiolae*, but precedence or paradigm.”<sup>37</sup>

Though some *historiolae* make explicit their connection with paradigmatic events, for instance,

---

<sup>36</sup> Frankfurter, “Narrating Power.” Among those that have used Frankfurter’s approach to *historiola* are the following: Richard Gordon, “‘What’s in a list?’” esp. 265f; Skemer, *Binding Words*, 84ff., 105ff.; Versnel, “Poetics,” esp. 122ff., 151ff.

<sup>37</sup> “Narrating Power,” 465. See also William Brashear, “The Greek Magical Papyri: An Introduction and Survey; Annotated Bibliography,” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang im der römischen Welt*, Bd. 18.5 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 3380-684. Brashear writes, “[t]he precedent having been cited, the god is obliged to act the same way now as then, this time to the benefit of the conjuror/suppliant action” (idem, 3439).

through a *similia similibus* formula (“just as...so also”),<sup>38</sup> “...few *historiolae* remain entirely aloof from the human, performative context—entirely implicit in their analogy to the present problem.”<sup>39</sup>

We have already seen the use in apotropaic devices of creedal-like formulae, derived from the Jesus tradition. To return to the first nine lines of P. Haun. III 51, the reader should recall that the ritual specialist tied the narrative elements from the life of Jesus into the contemporary world via a *similia similibus* formula. For the reader’s convenience, I will repeat my translation of this portion of the amulet:

Christ was born, amen. Christ was crucified, amen. Christ was buried, amen.  
Christ rose, ame[n]. He has woken to judge the living and the dead. Flee also you  
(φύγε καὶ σοι), fever with shivering, from Kale, who wears this phyl[a]ctery.

---

<sup>38</sup> Frankfurter distinguishes between what he calls “*historiola* proper,” where the narrative itself performs the ritual function, and “clausal *historiola*,” in which the narrative plays a subordinate role to a directive utterance (“Narrating Power,” 469).

<sup>39</sup> Ibid. Using the lexeme “epic formula,” Jørgen Podemann Sørensen argued that ritual narratives establish a connection with the ordered universe by drawing attention to a parallel mythical situation (“The Argument in Ancient Egyptian Magical Formulae,” *Acta Orientalia* 45 [1984]: 5-19). The purpose of this “rhetorical” device was to show that the harmful present situation stands outside of the ordered universe. As such, the “epic formula” seeks to convince a transcendent entity that the present circumstance must be renegotiated back into harmony with the cosmos. The parallel, according to Sørensen, could be established with any one of the various elements of the ritual situation: “the magician (i.e. the person who recites the formula), the formula itself, the recitation of it, the object of the rite (the ‘patient’), a medicine or some other ritual instrument, or even the very trouble or mischief against which the rite is directed” (idem, 9). More recently, Thomas Schneider has provided a helpful taxonomy of the different types of analogies that are used in Egyptian “magic” (“Die Waffe der Analogie: Altägyptische Magie als System,” in *Analogiedenke: Vorstöße in ein neues Gebiet der Rationalitätsforschung*, ed. M. Bachmann and K. Gloy [Freiburg and München: Verlag K. Alber, 2000], 37-85, esp. 73ff.). Following Sørensen, Schneider argues that analogy is a particular “weapon” (*Waffe*) of Egyptian “magic” that is wielded in order to reintegrate chaotic areas of the world (e.g., war, sickness, etc.) back into harmony with the ordered universe through a mythic precedent. Schneider has identified six different ways that the present can be analogically linked with a mythical precedent toward a ritual goal: (1) *Analogie des Aktanten* (i.e., a link is made by a magician or participant identifying himself/herself [usually in the first person] with an appropriate deity for the concerns of the ritual); (2) *Analogie des Zielobjektes* (i.e., the “patient” is connected to an analogous mythical and/or divine character through an analogous mythical event [e.g., the suffering of the Horus-child is related to the suffering of the client]); (3) *Analogie der Handlung* (i.e., a connection is made with the mythical world by means of a symbolic ritual *action* [e.g., the breaking of a figurine]); (4) *Analogie des Sprechaktes* (i.e., the ‘patient’ or magician draws a connection between himself/herself and a deity or mythical character by using language attributed to the figure); (5) *Analogie der Bezeichnung* (i.e., a connection is drawn by use of a name or title of a divinity or mythical character); and (6) *Analogie des Hilfsmittels* (i.e., a connection is made by virtue of a sacred or cosmic element/object, usually one which has functioned as a protective device in a paradigmatic myth). Schneider properly emphasizes the fact that rituals often utilize multiple analogies simultaneously and in conjunction with one another.

As Robert Daniel and Franco Maltomini have noted, the use of καὶ σοί (cf. φύγε καὶ σοί) often reinforces an analogical link between the command and the preceding contents.<sup>40</sup> In other words, these aspects from the earthly and post-earthly existence of Jesus provide authoritative precedent for the speaker's command to set to flight the "fever with shivering."

The two amulets mentioned at the beginning of this chapter ("G. Vitelli" PSI inv. 365 and P. Oxy. VIII 1077 [no. 20]) also seem to have operated on this same basis. Although the ritual specialists did not use the *similia similibus* formula (or equivalent), it is clear that the power associated with particular elements from the ministry of Jesus (i.e., his healings and exorcisms) was what brought about the desired result.

Bearing in mind this insight concerning *historiolae*, I think it instructive to discuss another aspect of the *pars pro toto* model. Some scholars argue or assume that the *incipits* were meant to invoke metonymically the generic power associated with the Bible.<sup>41</sup> To the contrary, we have seen that ritual specialists sought the power associated with particular events/stories, not generic power.<sup>42</sup> It is therefore surprising that Frankfurter suggested as much in the very essay in which he deconstructs the idea of generic ritual power:

The "power" inherent in sacred scripture could be tapped simply by writing gospel *incipits*. However, more often there was an analogical relationship between the contents of, say, a psalm or a saying of Jesus, and the apotropaic or curative function for which the amulet was intended. The psalm or scriptural quotation, therefore, worked not only by its magical writing, but also as a *historiola*, invoking a specific power that was performed and guaranteed in *illo tempore*. So not only through *historiolae* but also through talismanic iconography and scripture quotations a 'myth' might convey power to present human situations.

A couple of comments are in order concerning Frankfurter's approach to the Gospel *incipits*. First of all, his bifurcation of "scripture quotations" and "myth" requires extended

---

<sup>40</sup> *Suppl. Mag.* 1: 95.

<sup>41</sup> Frankfurter, "Narrating Power," 465; Rapp, "Holy Texts," 202; Wasserman, "P<sup>76</sup> (P. Oxy. Xxxiv 2684)," 150 n. 44.

<sup>42</sup> Sanzo, "Canonical Power," 38-41.

reflection. This distinction relates to Frankfurter's larger thesis on the nature of "myth" in *historiola*.

In order to account for the synthetic nature of *historiolae*, which blend elements from the traditional world (e.g., symbols and motifs) with both the immediate concerns of the client and more abstract concepts (e.g., power, cosmology, identity, etc.),<sup>43</sup> Frankfurter developed a three-tiered definition of myth based upon the work of Mary Mills:

(1) the abstract set of concepts and relations that might crystallize around or into  
(2) certain figures, names, places, or folklore motifs according to a culture's current circumstances, and then come into being within (3) a variety of performative settings according to a variety of forms that range from priestly liturgy...to scribal mythography...to *historiolae*, drama, sculpture, or painting.<sup>44</sup>

For Frankfurter, the *historiola* (tier three) is one of many performative settings that articulate the abstract "myth" (tier one), which is expressed through certain symbols, characters, etc. (tier two). In this formation, the myth, as an aggregate of abstract socially contingent ideas and desires, remains at the "pre-articulate level."<sup>45</sup> The narrative manifestation or cause of these abstract ideas (corresponding to Frankfurter's tier two), while not the myth itself, comprises an "authoritative discourse of precedent."<sup>46</sup> An example taken from Frankfurter's essay will help illustrate his scheme.

PGM CXXIII reads, "Come out of your tomb, Christ is calling you." According to this three-tiered model, though biblical references or certain Christological ideas provide an "authoritative discourse" within the local environment (tier two), the *historiola* is articulating a more generally-conceived myth: "... [the] concept of divine power over human death."<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> "Narrating Power," 473-74.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid, 474.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid, 475. See also Frankfurter's analysis of P. Yale 1792 ("Christ was born on the 29<sup>th</sup> of Choiak. He came descending upon the earth. He passed judgment on all the poisonous serpents"), where he does not find an amalgam

While this approach to “myth” constructively moves the discussion away from purely source-critical interests, it also makes it difficult to account for a second aspect of Frankfurter’s analysis of the Gospel *incipits*: his dichotomy between the generic scriptural “power” that comes through the ritual use of Gospel *incipits* and the (particular) analogical nature of the ritual use of other scriptural passages (especially, the Psalms). If *historiolae* (tier three) utilize a particular “authoritative discourse of precedents” (tier two), where do we place his claim of the “inherent power of the sacred scriptures,” as is mediated through the Gospel *incipits*, in this three-tiered scheme? Tier one? Certainly “sacred scripture” is a very different kind of “mythic” entity than the principle that the divine has power over death. Tier two? What is the precedent associated with “sacred scripture”? In fact, when framed within a discussion of precedent, the lexemes “sacred scriptures” (or “Bible”) and “Gospels” prove to be rather elusive entities. What would be the ritual value of the “Bible” or the “Gospels” as abstract items and hence, without reference to a particular artifact, social context, or element(s) from those corpora? Frankfurter’s dichotomy disappears entirely if we recognize that it was not generic scriptural “power” that was invoked through the Gospel *incipits*. Rather, it was the precedent or paradigm established by particular episodes from Jesus’ ministry being invoked (e.g., healing and exorcism events). In other words, the Gospel *incipits* operated on the same analogical basis as citations from the psalms. Thus, Frankfurter’s proper emphasis on precedent and paradigm in *historiolae* should also be applied to the conceptual materials behind the Gospel *incipits*.<sup>48</sup>

---

of gospel narratives or Horus cycles, “...but the *author’s creation* of a prototype of divine power over serpents (the myth) out of the symbols and motifs of contemporaneous Christian folklore...” (idem, [emphasis mine]).

<sup>48</sup> Sanzo, “Canonical Power,” 38-39.

#### **IV. Conclusions**

In this chapter, I have attempted to establish why ancient ritual specialist preferred independent units of scripture to some putative conception of the “Bible” or “Gospels” as abstract wholes. I have argued that, in addition to the physical limitations of the apotropaic artifacts themselves (esp. size), the specialist operated within a context in which certain passages from the biblical tradition were considered more “relevant” than others. Moreover, in this same social milieu, enemies of the faith, such as demons or heretics, were able to wield passages against the faithful. Thus, the scriptures had to be mined for a contextually appropriate passage, selected according to various thematic or associative schemes. Furthermore, the need for specific precedent in ancient *historiolae* ensured that the independent thematic unit would be preferred. This manifest preference, then, problematizes the claim that ritual specialists invoked generic scriptural “power” through the *incipits*.

## Excursus:

### The Hierarchical View of Scripture and Ritual Authority

We have seen that, rather than approaching the scriptures as a whole, ancient ritual specialists most likely conceptualized and utilized the scriptures hierarchically. This model was not only grounded in the broader milieu of scriptural usage in demonic conflicts in late antiquity, but also based in late antique book culture. I will now situate this scriptural model within its social context. Was late antique ritual expertise contingent in part on a hierarchical model of scripture? I maintain that this hierarchical model of scripture played an important role in the social positioning of ritual specialists as perceived experts because it necessitated skilled selection of “appropriate” passages for particular apotropaic concerns.

Classificatory hierarchies are central to the creation and maintenance of ritual authority. In a recent cross-cultural study, David Frankfurter has illuminated the impulse to classify and to organize the demonic in local and in more global spheres of social existence.<sup>1</sup> At the local level, lists and simple taxonomies of maladies and misfortunes, often personified as sinister spirits, are created in dialogue with basic and quotidian domains of lived experience, whether zoological, astrological, etc.<sup>2</sup> When a larger more global tradition appears on the scene, discursive elements from various local traditions are appropriated and/or modified, the aggregate of which reflects a more abstract and “totalizing” system, a coherent “demonology.”<sup>3</sup> In either case, taxonomies not only allow for control over the otherwise uncontrollable situation, but they also endow the specialist and his or her contiguous institution or tradition with ritual authority and influence.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Evil Incarnate: Rumors of Demonic Conspiracy and Satanic Abuse in History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 14-19.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 19-26.

The specialists, as the “literati” of their institutions/traditions, are the ones who understand the otherworldly foes and *only* they know how to prevail in this war.<sup>4</sup>

I maintain that the hierarchical model of scripture also supported the social authority of the ritual specialist in late antique Egypt. If it were assumed that the scriptures were organized hierarchically in terms of apotropaic efficacy, expert knowledge of which passage(s) “worked” against demonic attack would have been absolutely essential.

We have already seen evidence for this social dimension to the hierarchical view of the scriptures in Evagrius of Pontus’s description of scriptural usage in apotropaic contexts. For the reader’s convenience, I will repeat his words:

Now, the words that are required for speaking against our enemies, that is, the cruel demons, cannot be found quickly in the hour of conflict, because they are scattered throughout the Scriptures and so are difficult to find. We have, therefore, carefully selected words from the Holy Scriptures, so that we may equip ourselves with them and drive out the Philistines forcefully, standing firm in the battle, as warriors and soldiers of our victorious King, Jesus Christ.<sup>5</sup>

In addition to providing explicit evidence for a hierarchical approach to the scriptures (i.e., only certain passages will “work”), Evagrius assumes to possess a special ability for selecting the relevant passages to combat demons. In other words, implicit in his argument is that only the skilled specialist can navigate successfully through the scriptures and identify the proper passages; they are “difficult to find” and thus must be selected “carefully.”<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, 31-72; idem, “Dynamics of Ritual Expertise,” 169. Frankfurter writes, “As he [i.e., the ritual expert] lays out the nomenclature and intentions of the demonic, as he projects order onto incomprehensible current events, he himself gains a preternatural power” (*Evil Incarnate*, 32). Likewise, David Brakke notes that “[m]onks, like other ritual experts, knew how to communicate with and persuade beings that most people could neither hear nor see: they knew the right words to say and invested power over the demonic in those words” (*Demons*, 231).

<sup>5</sup> *Prologue to Talking Back*, 3. Translation from Brakke, *Evagrius of Pontus*, 50.

<sup>6</sup> As I do not know Syriac, I am reliant on Brakke’s translation.

I think that this social dimension of the hierarchical model likely stands behind the assumed efficacy of apotropaic devices that consist solely or primarily of scriptural citations.<sup>7</sup> These devices were perceived to be effective against demons and/or illness because it was assumed that an expert selected the scriptural passages with care and insight and, perhaps in some instances, even under divine guidance.<sup>8</sup>

Thus, the use of scripture in the apotropaic world of late antiquity presupposes a situation in which a ritual specialist's social power and influence was partially contingent upon a hierarchical view of the "Bible"; the governing assumption—which the specialist had a vested interest in maintaining—was that only the expert knew which passages would thwart demonic attack and/or heal the ailment. To state the matter in reverse, a non-hierarchical "Bible" would have made all citations from it equally efficacious; therefore, anyone with any scriptural knowledge at all could have thwarted demonic attack. In sum, a hierarchical view of the Bible was integrally related to the charisma of ritual specialists.

---

<sup>7</sup> E.g., BKT VI 7.1 (nos. 2 and 25), P. Anastasy 9 (no. 5), PSI VI 719 (nos. 10, 31, 56), P. Vindob. G 2312 (nos. 33 and 59).

<sup>8</sup> Brakke, *Demons*, 231-33.

**SECTION TWO:**  
**A PRELIMINARY SURVEY OF SCRIPTURAL *INCIPITS***  
**FROM LATE ANTIQUE EGYPT**

### Chapter Three

In this chapter, I survey the relevant apotropaic artifacts from late antique Egypt that may have included *incipits* of multiunit corpora. The items in this survey are divided into two disproportionate categories based on the specific corpus or segment of literature to which these *incipits* likely refer. The majority of the artifacts (twenty-two in total) cluster around the four “canonical” Gospels. Some of these make use of the opening words and/or titles of all four Gospels while others only include a selection from this corpus. The second group is confined to two passages on the same artifact, one of which perhaps envisioned the “New Testament” letter to the Hebrews, while the other may have either Genesis or the entire biblical tradition as its “target” corpus.

Several comments are in order at the outset to explain (or justify) the format I have used. First, I have included the following information for each artifact (whenever possible): date; provenance; material; language; physical description; contents; *editio princeps*; bibliography; and the text of the possible *incipit*. Second, because many of the transcriptions of these texts were created before standardization in papyrology, I have formatted the critical signs for all of the texts in accordance with the Leiden meeting of papyrologists in 1931 (the “Leiden System”).<sup>1</sup> Of necessity, this system has required me to make interpretive decisions concerning the intentions of the ritual specialist and the text of the autograph—sometimes in disagreement with the editors of a given artifact. Third, for the benefit of the reader, I have included a list of orthographical “corrections” of unusually spelled words in a footnote at the end of the text of the

---

<sup>1</sup> For more recent discussions on this system, see e.g., P. W. Pestman, *The New Papyrological Primer* (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 15-16; Paul Schubert, “Editing a Papyrus,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, ed. Roger S. Bagnall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 197-215, at 202-203.

*incipit* (if applicable).<sup>2</sup> For ease of reference, I have (1) bolded the appropriate words in the main body of the text, (2) left them unaccented, and (3) arranged the “corrected” versions of them in the footnote in the order in which they appear in the text. I have kept such orthographical comments to a minimum. Finally, in order to avoid unnecessary repetition, I have not included translations of the *incipits*.

## I. The Gospel *Incipits*

The most extensive survey of the Gospel *incipits* has heretofore been offered by Paul Mirecki, who listed seventeen artifacts (without text or translation) and provided a short description of each artifact along with a few key bibliographical references.<sup>3</sup> As the basis for compiling his list, Mirecki defined an “evangelion-incipit”—a term he evidently prefers over “Gospel *incipit*”—as follows: “I call the type of text under consideration an evangelion-incipit because the defining feature is the seriatim listing of the titles and/or opening phrases of the four canonical gospels.”<sup>4</sup> Mirecki divided these texts along a two-fold typology: (1) “non-  
invocational type” (i.e., ritual media that make use of the Gospel *incipits* without any other ritual

---

<sup>2</sup> For the Greek artifacts, I have measured the New Testament texts against NA<sup>27</sup>. For the Coptic artifacts, I have measured them against George William Horner’s edition of the Coptic New Testament (*The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect: Otherwise Called Sahidic and Thebaic; With Critical Apparatus, Literal English Translation, Register of Fragments and Estimate of the Version*, 7 vols. [Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1911-24]) and the online edition of J. Warren Wells (*Sahidica: The Sahidic Coptic New Testament with Parallel Greek* [<http://www.warpc.com/sahidica/files/00index.htm>]).

<sup>3</sup> “Evangelion-Incipits Amulets in Greek and Coptic: Toward a Typology,” in *Proceedings of the Central States Regional Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and the American Schools of Oriental Research*, vol. 4, ed. J. J. Johnson Leese (Kirkwood: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 143-53.

<sup>4</sup> Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipits,” 143. Mirecki was certainly justified in including titles along with opening lines; by late antiquity, titles had become a fixture on Gospel manuscripts and played a major role in their usage in general (e.g., worship). For an analysis of the practical considerations that led to the Gospel titles becoming linked with the “text” of the Gospels, see M. Hengel, *Die Evangelienüberschriften* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1984), esp. 28-47; G. H. R. Horsley, “Reconstructing a Biblical Codex: The Prehistory of MPER *n.s.* XVII.10 (*P. Vindob. G 29 831*),” in *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses Berlin, 13-19.8.1995*, ed. Bärbel Kramer, Herwig Maehler, et al. (Stuttgart and Leipzig: B.G. Teubner Stuttgart und Leipzig, 1997), 473-79, esp. 475f. That these titles were considered an integral part of the “text” of the Gospels, at least for some of the ritual experts in late antique Egypt, is suggested by the juxtaposition of both titles and Gospel *incipits* in sequence on the same artifacts (e.g., BCI 426 [no. 3], P. Michigan 1559 [no. 7]).

tactic) and (2) “invocational type” (i.e., artifacts that juxtapose the Gospel *incipits* with other ritual tactics).

Though I generally follow the list of ritual artifacts in Mirecki’s survey, there are some notable divergences. First, I have included six artifacts that were missing from his survey: (1) The Anchorite’s Grotto in Nubia (**no. 1**), which includes the *incipits* of the four “canonical” Gospels; (2) Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (**no. 4**), an unedited Coptic amulet that also includes all four Gospel *incipits*; (3) P. Heid. inv. L 5 (**no. 17**), which may have originally included a form of the beginning of John’s Gospel; (4) P. Iand. I 6 (**no. 18**), which utilizes a version of the Matthean title; (5) P. Köln VIII 340 (**no. 19**), which cites Jn 1:1-11; and (6) P. Oxy. VIII 1077 (**no. 20**), which includes the Matthean title.<sup>5</sup> Second, I have excluded an artifact that was part of his survey, Chicago ms. 125 (Mirecki, 152-53, no. 16), as it dates to the twelfth or thirteenth century CE, and thus falls outside the temporal boundaries of my study.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> It should be highlighted that Mirecki includes artifacts that have the opening lines of only one Gospel (i.e., P. Oxy. VIII 1151 and P. Rylands 101), but does not take into consideration two texts that make use of only one title (i.e., P. Oxy. VIII 1077 and P. Iand. I 6, both of which make use of the Matthean title).

<sup>6</sup> Although not in Mirecki’s analysis, I have also excluded the *incipits* of all four Gospels on the walls of Tombs no. 366 (T12) and no. 369 from Qasr Ibrim on chronological grounds, as they likely date from the tenth through twelfth centuries CE. For the *editio princeps* of the texts in Tomb no. 366 (T12), see J. M. Plumley, “Nubian Christian Numerical Cryptograms: Some Elucidations,” in *New Discoveries in Nubia*, ed. P. van Moorsel (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1982), 91-97. For a more recent and improved edition of this tomb, see Adam Łajtar and Jacques van der Vliet, *Qasr Ibrim: The Greek and Coptic Inscriptions Published on Behalf of the Egypt Exploration Society* (Warsaw: Faculty of Law and Administration of the University of Warsaw et al., 2010), 261-76, no. 91. For the *editio princeps* of Tomb no. 369, see idem, 276-80 (based on the transcriptions of Joost L. Hagen, November 2008). Also excluded on account of date are the *incipits* (and endings) of the four Gospels in the burial chamber of Archbishop Georgios in Old Dongola and the *incipits* (and endings) of the four Gospels (graffiti) at the temple of Seti in Abydos. For a description of the Gospel *incipits* and endings in this burial chamber, see Stefan Jakobielski, “Das Kloster der Heiligen Dreifaltigkeit: Bauphasen des nordwestlichen Anbaus,” in *Dongola-Studien: 35 Jahre polnischer Forschungen im Zentrum des makuritischen Reiches*, ed. Stefan Jakobielski and Piotr O. Scholz (Warsaw: ZAS-PAN, 2001), 141-68, at 164-65. For the graffiti at Abydos, see W. E. Crum, “41.—Coptic Graffiti &c. (Plates XXV-XXXVII),” in *The Osireion at Abydos*, ed. M. A. Murray (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1904), 39-43, no. 41. Finally, on the same grounds, I have not included the opening and closing words of the Gospel of John on an inscription above a painting, which portrays Jesus as trampling reptiles (cf. LXX Ps 90:13), at “House A” in Old Dongola (see Magdalena Ńaptaś, “Comments on wall paintings from ‘House A’ in Old Dongola,” in *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit: Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses, Münster, 20.-26. Juli 1996*, vol. 1, ed. S. Emmel et al. [Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 1999], 230-37). Of particular interest among these latter witnesses to the apotropaic use of Gospel *incipits*, is the pairing of the beginnings and endings of the Gospels. What is also interesting is the presence of the longer ending of Mark in Tomb no. 369 at Qasr Ibrim and in the burial chamber of Archbishop Georgios.

I have divided the apotropaic artifacts that make use of the opening words and/or titles of the Gospels into three categories. The first category includes apotropaic devices that make use of the opening words and/or titles of at least the four “canonical” Gospels. The second category is reserved for two artifacts, one of which makes use of the initial words of two Gospels, the other three Gospels. Finally, the last category contains artifacts that make use of the opening words or titles of only one Gospel. As I will discuss in Chapter Five, this division highlights the relative certainty of a metonymic function, and thus the status of a citation of an opening line as an “incipit”: the utilization of numerous seriatim opening words/lines (from our vantage point) is more likely indicative of the function of those words as the beginning of “scriptural” books (from the vantage point of ancient ritual specialists).

## **I. 1. Ritual Artifacts with at least the Four Gospel *Incipits***

### **1. Anchorite’s Grotto in Nubia**

- a. Date: VIII CE.<sup>7</sup>
- b. Provenance: Nubia (Faras).
- c. Material: stone (unidentified); plaster.
- d. Language: Coptic.
- e. Physical Description: 4 m (back to front) x c. 5 m (along the front wall) x 6 m (along the back wall); the roof is c. 2 m. above the floor; a raised *mastaba* in the rock at the northeast corner; Gospels *incipits* written in the inside of four linked circles (dimensions unknown).

---

<sup>7</sup> A more specific date can be found on the west wall of the grotto. According to Griffith, the inscription reads, “Choiach 8, of the 7<sup>th</sup> indiction year 45[5?] of Diocletian” [=739 CE].” Griffith notes that Sayce and Mahaffy reconstructed the date on this inscription as 10<sup>th</sup> indiction, which would correspond to 742 CE (“unpublished notes,” discussed in Griffith, “Oxford Excavations,” 88 n. 3).

- f. Contents: lacunose texts; unidentified text; a tale of Apa Arsenius; a tale of a “brother” and Apa Marcarius (?); a tale of a “brother” and Apa Antonius; a saying of Apa A[mun?]; a tale of an monk (the name is lost) and a magician-turned-monk; Nicene Creed; lost and fragmentary texts; a tale of a monk (the name is lost); cross; a saying of [Apa?] Palladius; a tale of a monk’s battle with a serpent;<sup>8</sup> a narrative about the daily life of a monk; a saying of Apa Ezaias on humility; crosses; a saying of Apa Pachom; a saying of Apa Ezaias on the temptation of women; a saying of Apa Euagrios; a lacunose saying of Apa Ezaias the exegete; another saying; a date; Matthean title; Mt 2:1;<sup>9</sup> cross; cross; Markan title; Mk 1:1-2; cross; Lukan title; Lk 1:1; cross; Johannine title; Jn 1:1; Letter of Jesus to Abgar; Forty Martyrs of Sebaste; other names; Sator palindrome; other names; introduction and names of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus.
- g. *Editio princeps* (facsimile): Griffith, “Oxford Excavations in Nubia,” 57-116 (and plates XL-LXXX).
- h. Bibliography: W. E. Crum, “Coptic Studies,” *EEFAR* (1897-98): 55-70, at 63; Łajtar and van der Vliet, *Qasr Ibrim*, 275; Richard Pietschmann, “Les inscriptions coptes de Faras,” *Rec. de Trav.* 21 (1899): 133-36; A. H. Sayce, “Gleanings from the Land of Egypt,” *Rev. de Trav.* 20 (1898): 169-76, at 174-76; Sir John Gardner Wilkinson, *Topography of Thebes, and General View of Egypt: Being a Short Account of the Principal Objects Worthy of Notice in the Valley of the Nile to the Second Cataract and Wadee Samneh, with the Fyoom, Oases, and Eastern*

---

<sup>8</sup> For the text and discussion of this tale, see the discussion in Chapter Two.

<sup>9</sup> The occurrence of the opening words from the second chapter of Mt after the Matthean title here is unprecedented. Griffith’s description of this portion of the grotto as containing “the first words of the four gospels” is, therefore, misleading (“Oxford Excavations in Nubia,” 88, no. 25).

*Desert, from Sooez to Berenice; with Remarks on the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians and the Productions of the Country, Etc.* (London: John Murray, 1835), 498.

- i. *Incipits of the Gospels*:<sup>10</sup> (Mt) ΠΕ<Υ>ΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΝΚΔ<ΤΔ> ΜΔΘΘΕΥ<Ι ΟC>  
 Τ(ΗCΟΥ)C ΔΕ ΝΤΕΡΟΥΧΠΟϢ ρΡΔΙ 2N ΒΕΘΛΕ<Ε>Μ ΝΤΕ [†Ο]ΥΤΔΙΔ 2N  
 [NΕ2]Ο[Ο]Υ Ν2Υ[Ρ]ΟΤΗC ΠΡΡΟ (Mk) ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΝΚΔΤΔ ΜΔΡ<ΚΟC> ΤΔΡΧΗ  
 ΜΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΡ'Λ'ΙΟΝ<sup>11</sup> ΝΤ(ΗCΟΥ)C ΠΕΧ(ΡΙCΤΟ)C ΠΩΗΡΕ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΚΑΤΔ ΘΕ {ΕΤ}  
 ΕΤCΗ2<sup>12</sup> 2N [H]ΖΔΙΔC <ΠΕ>ΠΡΟ[Φ]ΗΤΗC (Lk) ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΡΙΟ[N N]ΚΑΤΔ  
 ΛΟΥ[Κ]ΔC ΕΠ<Ε>ΙΔ[Η]ΠΕΡ Δ2[Δ]2 ΖΙΤΟΤΟΥ ΕC2ΔΙ ΝΝΩΔΧΕ ΕΤΒΕ ΝΕ2ΒΗΥΕ  
 ΝΤΔΥ[Τ]Ω<Τ> ΠΕ2ΗΤ (Jn) ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΡΙΟΝ ΝΚΔΤΔ ΤΩ(2ΔΝΝΗC) 2N  
 ΤΕ2<ΟΥΕ>ΤΤΕ ΝΕ4ΩΟΟΠ Ν6Ι ΠΩΔΧΕ ΔΥΩ ΠΩΔΧΕ ΝΕ4 [ΩΟ]ΟΠ ΝΝ[Δ]2[ΡΜ]  
 ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΔΥΩ ΝΕΥΝΟΥΤΕ ΠΕ ΠΩΔΧΕ.<sup>13</sup>

## 2. BKT VI 7.1 (=P. Berol. 6069)

- Date: VI-VII CE.<sup>14</sup>
- Provenance: Egypt (Fayum).
- Material: parchment.

<sup>10</sup> The following edition is based on the facsimile provided by Griffith (“Oxford Excavations in Nubia,” plate LXX, no. 25).

<sup>11</sup> Evidently, a later inscriber recognized the misspelling of ΜΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΡ'Λ'ΙΟΝ here. What is interesting is that this (presumably) later writer did not alter the same spelling in the titles of Lk and Jn.

<sup>12</sup> With the exception of the extra ΕΤ, this reading agrees with Horner’s edition. *Sahidica* reads ΚΑΤΔ ΠΕΤCΗ2.

<sup>13</sup> ΜΔΘΘΕΥ<Ι ΟC> (read ΜΔΘΘΔΙΟC); ΒΕΘΛΕ<Ε>Μ (read ΒΗΘΛΕΕΜ); [†Ο]ΥΤΔΙΔ (read †ΟΥΔΔΙΔ); Ν2Υ[Ρ]ΟΤΗC (read Ν2ΗΡΩΔΗC); [H]ΖΔΙΔC (read ΗCΔΙΔC); ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΡΙΟ[N] (read ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ); ΠΕ2ΗΤ (read Ν2ΗΤ); ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΡΙΟΝ (read ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ).

<sup>14</sup> Fritz Krebs argued for a sixth-century CE date at the earliest (“Altchristliche Texte im Berliner Museum,” *NKGW* 4 [1892]: 114-20, at 114). Carl Schmidt and Wilhelm Schubart suggested that this artifact was a “späte Schrift” (*Altchristliche Texte*, Berliner Klassikertexte 6 [Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1910], 129-30, at 129). Wessely followed suit (“Monuments,” 412). More recently, D. Limongi (“La diffusione dei Vangeli in Egitto [secc. I-VIII]: Osservazioni sul *Vangelo secondo Marco*,” *AnPap* 7 [1995]: 49-62 [esp. 57]) dated BKT VI. 7.1 to the first half of the sixth century CE, Paul Mirecki (“Evangelion-Incipits,” 147) provided a mid-seventh-century CE date (based on a private conversation with W. Brashear in 1998), and Rahlfs and Fraekel date it to somewhere in the sixth or seventh centuries CE (*Verzeichnis*, 21). As I am not qualified to settle this matter, I simply provide a chronological range that reflects the various positions above.

- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 8.5 x 13.6 cm;<sup>15</sup> writing on one side (flesh side?); evidence of folding.
- f. Contents: cross; Trinitarian invocation; LXX Ps 90:1 (**no. 25**); cross; Jn 1:1-2; cross; Mt 1:1; cross; Mk 1:1; cross; Lk 1:1; cross; LXX Ps 117:6-7; cross; psalm-like invocation (κ[ύριος] ἔμοι βοηθὸς κἀγὼ ἐπόψομαι τοὺς **εκθρους** μου);<sup>16</sup> cross; cross; LXX Ps 17:2; cross; Mt 4:23; cross; a request for protection for the wearer of the phylactery through the power of the “body and blood of Christ”; cross; alpha; cross; omega; cross.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Krebs, “Altchristliche Texte im Berliner Museum,” 118-20, no. IV.
- h. Bibliography: *ACM*, 34, no. 9; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 166; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 184, no. 4; LDAB 6091; Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipits,” 147, no. 6; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 21, no. 2131; Schmidt and Schubart, *Altchristliche Texte*, 129-30, no. VII 1; TM 64853; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 266 (no. 731); Wessely, “Monuments,” 412-13, no. K.<sup>17</sup>
- i. *Incipits* of the Gospels: (**Jn**) ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρ<ὸς> τὸν <θεόν> κ(αὶ) θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος. οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. (**Mt**) βίβλος **ΓΕΝΝΕΣΕΥΣ** Ἰ(ησοῦ) Χ(ριστοῦ) υ(ίοῦ) Δα(υιδ) υ(ίοῦ) Ἀβρ(αάμ).

<sup>15</sup> Rahlfs and Fraenkel provide the dimensions 8 x 14 cm for BKT VI.7.1 (*Verzeichnis*, 21).

<sup>16</sup> εκθρους (read ἐχθρούς).

<sup>17</sup> Unfortunately, this artifact has been the object of much confusion in later editions and catalogues. C. Wessely (“Monuments,” 412) provided the incorrect catalogue number (9096 instead of 6096) and was followed by Marvin Meyer (*ACM*, 34, no. 9). Also, the bibliographical information for the original edition of Krebs is incorrect in the *Leuven Database of Ancient Books* and *Trismegistos*, both of which juxtapose the page numbers from a different article of the same author in the same periodical (“Griechische Steininschriften aus Ägypten,” *NKGW* 15 [1892]: 533-38) with the correct volume (4) and artifact (no. IV) numbers.

(Mk) ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χ(ριστο)ῦ υ(ίο)ῦ τοῦ θ(εο)ῦ. (Lk)

ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχειρισαν ἀναδεξασθαι διηγισιν.<sup>18</sup>

### 3. BCI 426 (=Bodleian Coptic Inscription 426)

- a. Date: c. 650 CE.<sup>19</sup>
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Thebes).
- c. Material: limestone.
- d. Language: Coptic.
- e. Physical Description: 24.2 x 24.2 cm;<sup>20</sup> there is a small hole (3.5 mm diameter), which may have been drilled before inscription;<sup>21</sup> writing on both sides.
- f. Contents: (side A) Mt 1:1; Mk 1:1-2; Lk 1:1; Jn 1:1; Matthean title; Markan title; Lukan title; Johannine title; the letter combination  $\overline{\text{M}\overline{\text{X}}\overline{\text{T}}}$ ; an adulation of Jesus; 3 crosses (staurograms); (side B) a listing of the disciples that resembles Luke 6:14-16 (though Matthias replaces Judas Iscariot); “an expanded liturgical invocation”<sup>22</sup> (“the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and all the prophets and all the righteous, forever. Amen”); 2 (or 3) crosses (staurograms).

---

<sup>18</sup> γεννεσευς (read γενέσεως); Ἰησοῦ (read Ἰησοῦ); ἐπεχειρισαν (read ἐπεχειρήσαν); ἀναδεξασθαι (read ἀνατάξασθαι); διηγισιν (read διήγησιν).

<sup>19</sup> The limestone was acquired in Thebes by Norman de Garis Davies, who dated it sometime between the 10th and 11th centuries CE. In his description of this artifact, W. E. Crum preferred a seventh-century CE date (“La magie copte,” 544). Angelicus Kropp repeated the information from Crum’s description (*Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte* 3: 210-11). Paul Mirecki was able to date BCI 426 more precisely to the middle of the seventh century (“A Seventh-Century Coptic Limestone in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford [Bodl. Copt. Inscr. 426],” in *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, ed. Marvin W. Meyer and Paul A. Mirecki [Leiden: Brill, 2002], 47-69).

<sup>20</sup> These measurements have been taken from the *editio princeps* (Mirecki, “A Seventh-Century Coptic Limestone,” 48). Crum provides the measurements 24 x 26 cm (“La magie copte,” 544). Concerning this discrepancy, Mirecki writes, “I cannot account for the differences in our measurements, except to say that my measurements in the summer of 1993 were made with these differences in mind. I find the greatest height to be 24.2 cm, and the greatest breadth to be (coincidentally) 24.2 cm. I suppose that Crum’s measurements were meant to be approximates, and this is further suggested by the cursory, though insightful nature of his discussion” (Mirecki, “A Seventh-Century Coptic Limestone,” 48 n. 4).

<sup>21</sup> Mirecki, “A Seventh-Century Coptic Limestone,” 48.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 54.



#### 4. Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (=P. Lond. Copt. 317)

- a. Date: VI-VII CE.<sup>28</sup>
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: parchment.
- d. Language: Coptic.
- e. Physical Description: 1.6 x 7 cm 6.7 cm;<sup>29</sup> writing on one side (hair side); folds.
- f. Contents: initial words of the Letter of Christ to Abgar (**no. 57**); Mt 1:1; Lk 1:1; Jn 1:1; Mk 1:1.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Sanzo, “Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2),” forthcoming.
- h. Bibliography: E. A. W. Budge, *Amulets and Talismans* (New York: University Books, 1961), 132; Crum, *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts*, 141, no. 317 (entry by B. Grenfell); LDAB 112657; Glenn Peers, “Magic, the Mandylion and the Letter of Abgar: A Fourteenth-Century Amulet Roll in Chicago and New York,” in *Intorno al sacro volto: Genova, Bisanzio e il Mediterraneo (XI-XIV secolo)*, ed. C. Dufour Bozzo, A. R. Calderoni Masetti, and G. Wolf (Venezia: Marsilio, 2007), 163-75, at 167f.; TM 112657.
- i. *Incipits* of the Gospels:<sup>30</sup> (**Mt**) ⲡⲬⲠⲟⲙⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲭⲡⲟ ⲛⲓⲧⲥ̅ ⲡⲉⲬⲭⲥ̅ (**Lk**) ⲉⲡⲉⲓ ⲁⲛⲡⲉⲣ  
ⲗⲁⲗⲁ ⲁⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧ̅[ⲟⲮ̅] (**Jn**) ⲁⲛⲧⲉⲗⲟⲮ̅[ⲉⲓ]ⲧⲉⲛⲉⲩⲟⲟⲡ̅ ⲛ̅ⲥ̅ⲓ ⲡⲟⲗⲗⲁⲭⲉ (**Mk**) ⲧ̅ⲗⲣⲭ[ⲛ]  
ⲙⲡⲉⲮⲗⲂⲂⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ [ⲛ̅]ⲓⲧⲥ̅ ⲡⲉⲬⲭⲥ̅.

<sup>28</sup> The *Leuven Database of Ancient Books* (112657) and *Trismegistos* (112657) provide a broad temporal range for the composition of Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2), dating it between 500-999 CE. In the *editio princeps*, I tentatively dated this artifact to an early phase of the Coptic *incipit* tradition on account of the unprecedented order of the Gospel *incipits* and the use of the *incipit* of Jesus’ letter to Abgar *before* the Gospel *incipits* (“Brit. Lib. Or. 4919[2]: An Unpublished Coptic Amulet in the British Library,” *ZPE* [forthcoming]).

<sup>29</sup> Grenfell provided the measurements 2 3/4 x 5/8 in. (= 7 x 1.6 cm) (*Catalogue*, 141). When I performed the manuscript autopsy of Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) on 12 January, 2012, I measured the dimensions listed above. I am unsure how to account for this discrepancy, other than Grenfell used approximate measurements.

## 5. P. Anastasy 9

- a. Date: VI CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: papyrus (codex).
- d. Language: Coptic.
- e. Physical Description: 17 leaves in the codex; 14 cm x 21.7 cm; writing on recto and verso.
- f. Contents: Prayer and Exorcism of Gregory the Great; Prayer of Saint Gregory; Letter of Abgar to Jesus; Letter of Jesus to Abgar; additional Letter of Jesus to Abgar; list of the names of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus; list of the names of the 40 Martyrs of Sebaste; Matthean title; Mt 1:1; Markan title; Mk 1:1; Lukan title; Lk 1:1; Johannine title; Jn 1:1; LXX Ps 90:1-2 (**no. 28**).
- g. *Editio princeps*: Willem Pleyte and Pieter Adrian Art Boeser, *Manuscripts coptes du Musée d'antiquités des Pays-Bas à Leide* (Leiden: Brill, 1897), 441-79, at 477-78 (for the Gospel *incipits*).
- h. Bibliography:<sup>31</sup> *ACM*, 314-22, no. 134; E. Drioton, "Un apocryphe anti-arien: Le version copte de la correspondance d'Abgar, roi d'Edesse, avec Notre Seigneur," *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* 20 (1915-17): 306-26, at 311-26; M. Geerard, *Clavis Apocryphorum Novi Testamenti* (Brepols: Turnhout, 1992), 67, no. 88.1; Kropp, *Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte* 3: 210, § 359; idem, *Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte* 2: 73-5, no. xxii, 76, no. xxiii, 81-5, no. xxvii, 161-71, no. xlv, 171-5,

---

<sup>30</sup> I would like to thank Ilana Tahan for her assistance at the British Library in January 2012 when I examined Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2).

<sup>31</sup> Since P. Anastasy 9 has been treated as a collection of eight sections in scholarship, many of the following works discuss, translate, and/or analyze sections of this artifact.

no. xlvi, 220-1, no. lxiii<sup>b</sup>, 221, no. lxiv<sup>a</sup>; LDAB 100023; Mirecki, “Evangelion-  
Incipits,” 150, no. 12; S. Pernigotti, “La magia copta: I Testi,” *Aufstieg und  
Niedergang der römischen Welt*. II. 18.5 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995),  
3380-684, at 3700, no. 4, 3701, no. 5, 3702-704, no. 7; idem, ed., *Testi della  
magia copta* (Imola: La Mandragora, 2000), 67-69, no. 37, 69, no. 38; TM  
100023.

- i. *Incipits of the Gospels*: ΠΑΙ ΠΕ ΠΤΩΨ ΝΤΑΡΧΗ ΜΠΕΤΟΟΥ ΝΕΥΔΓΓ[Ε]ΛΙΟΝ. (**Mt**)  
ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΣ ΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙ'ΟΥ' ΠΧΩΨΜΕ ΜΠΕΧΠΟ ΝΤ(ΗCOY)C ΠΕΧ(ΡΙCΤO)C  
ΠΩΗΡΕ ΝΔΔΥΕΙΔ ΠΩΗΡΕ ΝΔΒΡΔΔΔΜ (**Mk**) ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΝΚΑΤΔ ΜΔΡΚΟC ΤΔΡΧΗ  
ΜΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΝΤ(ΗCOY)C ΠΕΧ(ΡΙCΤO)C ΠΩΗΡΕ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΤΟΝ2.<sup>32</sup> ΚΑΤΔ ΘΕ<sup>33</sup>  
ΕΤCΗ2<sup>34</sup> 2Ν ΗCΔΙΔC ΠΕΠΡΟΦΗΤΗC. (**Lk**) ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΝΚΑΤΔ ΛΟΥΚΑC  
ΕΠ<Ε>ΙΔΗΠΕΡ Ε2Δ2 2ΙΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΕC2ΔΙ ΝΕΝΨΔΧΕ ΕΤΒΕ ΝΕ2ΒΗΥΕ ΝΤΔ<Υ>ΤΨΤ  
Ν2ΗΤ Ε2ΡΔΙ<sup>35</sup> Ν2ΗΤΝ. (**Jn**) ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΝΚΑΤΔ ΙΨΔΝΝΗC 2Ν ΤΕ2ΟΥΕΙΤΕ  
ΕΝΕΨΨΟΟΠ ΝCΙ ΠΨΔΧΕ ΔΥΨ ΠΨΔΧΕ ΕΝΕΨΨΟΟΠ ΝΝΔ2ΡΜ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΔΥΨ  
ΕΝΕΥΝΟΥΤΕ ΠΕ ΠΨΔΧΕ.<sup>36</sup>

## 6. P. Berol. 22 235

- Date: III-VII CE.
- Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- Material: papyrus.

<sup>32</sup> The addition of ΕΤΟΝ2 (“living”) is, to the best of my knowledge, unique to P. Anastasy 9. There are at least two likely explanations for this addendum, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive. First, the emphasis upon life may be occasioned by the apotropaic setting of P. Anastasy 9. Second, the expression “ΝΤ(ΗCOY)C ΠΕΧ(ΡΙCΤO)C ΠΩΗΡΕ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΤΟΝ2” is also present in the *Letter of Jesus to Abgar*, which is part of the compilation of texts that make up P. Anastasy 9. Thus, in perhaps an instance of “traditional referentiality” (see discussion in Chapter Six), the ritual specialist may have conflated the titles for Christ from these two texts.

<sup>33</sup> Horner includes ΘΕ (cf. P. Rylands 101 [no. 22]). *Sahidica* omits ΘΕ.

<sup>34</sup> This reading agrees with Horner. *Sahidica* reads ΠΕΤCΗ2.

<sup>35</sup> Horner reads 2ΡΔΙ. *Sahidica* reads 2ΡΔΕΙ.

<sup>36</sup> ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΣ ΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙ'ΟΥ' (read ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΝΚΑΤΔ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΣ); Ε2Δ2 (read Δ2Δ2);

- d. Language: Coptic and Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 4.8 x 17.5 cm; writing on both sides; evidence of multiple folds.
- f. Contents: (verso) Mt 1:1; space; Mk 1:1; space; Lk 1:1; space; Jn 1:1; space; Mt 1:1 (repeated); (recto) an unrelated Greek document.<sup>37</sup>
- g. *Editio princeps*: unpublished.
- h. Bibliography: Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipits,” 145, no. 2; idem, “A Seventh-Century Coptic Limestone,” 53 n. 23.<sup>38</sup>
- i. *Incipits* of the Gospels:<sup>39</sup> (Mt) ΠΧΩΩΜΕ ΜΠΕΧΠΟ ΝΠ(ΗСОУ)С ΠΕΧ(ΡΙ СТО)С (Mk) ΤΑΡΧΗ ΜΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΝΠ(ΗСОУ)С ΠΕΧ(ΡΙ СТО)С (Lk) ΕΠΕΙ ΔΗΠΕΡ Δ2Δ2 ΖΙ ΤΟΟΤΟΥ (Jn) ϷΝ ΤΕ2ΟΥΕΙ ΤΕ ΝϳΩΟΟΠ Ν[ϷΙ] ΠΩΔΧΕ (Mt) [Π]ΧΩΩΜ[Ε] ΜΠΕΧΠΟ [ΝΠС] ΠΕΧ[С].

## 7. P. Mich. 1559

- a. Date: VII-VIII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: parchment.
- d. Language: Coptic.
- e. Physical Description: 5.9 x 10.8 cm; (flesh side) writing; (hair side) blank.
- f. Contents: Matthean title; Mt 1:1; Markan title; Mk 1:1; Lukan title; Lk 1:1; Johannine title; Jn 1:1; ritual symbols; (hair side) blank.

<sup>37</sup> Mirecki is incorrect in labeling the text on the recto an “unrelated portion of a Coptic document” (Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipits,” 145).

<sup>38</sup> In both of these venues, Mirecki has stated his intention to publish this artifact. It remains, however, unpublished.

<sup>39</sup> This edition is based on photographs provided by the Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. I would like to extend my gratitude to Verena Lepper for her assistance in attaining the photographs as well as to Jacco Dieleman for functioning as a liaison.

- g. *Editio princeps*: Browne, *Michigan Coptic Texts*, 43-44.
- h. Bibliography: APIS michigan.apis.1466; Frankfurter, *Elijah in Upper Egypt*, 40 n. 27; LDAB 102263; Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipients,” 145, no. 1; Pernigotti, “La magia copta,” 3727, no. 37; idem, *Testi*, 64, no. 33; TM 102263; William Worrell, *Coptic Texts in the University of Michigan Collection* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1942), 18.
- i. *Incipits* of the Gospels: (Mt)<sup>40</sup> ΠΕΥΔΝΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΕΤΟΥΔΔΒ ΝΚΑΤΔ  
 ΜΔΘ<Θ>Δ<Ι ΟΣ> ΠΧΩΦΜΕ ΝΠΕΧΠΟ ΝΤ(ΗСОУ)С ΠΕΧ(ΡΙ СТО)С [Π]ΦΗΡΕ  
 ΝΔΔ(ΥΕΙ)Δ (Mk) ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΝΚΑΤΔ ΜΔΡΚ<ΟС><sup>41</sup> ΤΔΡΧ[Η] ΝΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ  
 Ν[Τ(ΗСОУ)С] ΠΕΧ(ΡΙ СТО)С (Lk) ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΕΚΑΤΔ<sup>42</sup> ΛΟΥΚ<ΔС>  
 ΕΠ<Ε>Ι ΔΗΠΕΡ Ε2Δ2 ΖΙ ΤΟΟΤ<Ο>Υ ΕС2ΔΙ ΕΝΕΝΨΔΧΕ (Jn) ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ  
 ΕΚΑΤΔ ΤΩ(2ΔΝΝΗС) 2Ν ΤΕ2ΟΥ<Ε>Ι ΤΕ ΝΕΒΨΟΟΠ ΕСΙ ΠΨΔΧΕ ΔΥΨ ΠΨΔΧΕ  
 ΝΕΒΨΟΟΠ ΕΝΔ2ΡΝ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ.<sup>43</sup>

## 8. P. Oxy. XVI 1928

- Date: V/VI CE.
- Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- Material: papyrus.
- Language: Greek.

<sup>40</sup> The ritual specialist maintains a Ν in several places, where we would expect Μ (e.g., ΝΠΕΧΠΟ, ΝΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ, ΕΝΔ2ΡΝ).

<sup>41</sup> For the titles of Mark and Luke, the names are abbreviated with the addition of a symbol, which resembles the Greek circumflex.

<sup>42</sup> Browne notes the tendency in this artifact to substitute Ε for Ν, a tendency which he notes is reflective of “vulgar Sahidic texts with Fayumic influence” (*Michigan Coptic Texts*, 44). See also “ΕΚΑΤΔ ΤΩ(2ΔΝΝΗС),” “Ε2Δ2,” and “ΕСΙ.”

<sup>43</sup> ΠΕΥΔΝΓΕΛΙΟΝ (read ΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ); ΝΕΒΨΟΟΠ (read ΝΕΨΨΟΟΠ); Ε2Δ2 (read Δ2Δ2); ΝΕΒΨΟΟΠ (read ΝΕΨΨΟΟΠ); ΕСΙ (read ΝСΙ).

- e. Physical Description: 30 x 21.5 cm; sheet detached from a roll; writing on both sides; (recto) writing is parallel with fibers manuscript; (verso) writing is perpendicular to the fibers; manuscript was folded to make two leaves.
- f. Contents: (recto) unrelated Byzantine protocol: Φλ(αουίου) Στρατηγίου ἐνδοξ(οτάτου) ἀπὸ [ύ]πάτ(ων) καὶ στρ(ατηλάτου) δ(ιὰ) Ἀρηστομάχ(ου) τ(οῦ) ἐνδ(οξοτάτου) ἀπὸ σκρ(ινιαρίων) κ(αὶ) ταβουλ(αρίου) Φαῶφ(ι) η ἰνδ(ικτίονος) ἰβς(?);<sup>44</sup> (verso) cross; LXX Ps 90: 1-16; Johannine title; Lukan title; Markan title; Matthean title.<sup>45</sup>
- g. *Editio princeps*: Grenfell, Hunt, and Bell, “Amulet (Psalm XC): Protocol,” 208-11, no. 1928.
- h. Bibliography: Aland, *Repertorium* 1: 338, var. 14; Paul Collart, “Un Papyrus Reinach inédit,” 208-12;<sup>46</sup> de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 171; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 200, no. 119; LDAB 3284; Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipients,” 146, no. 4; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 301-302, no. 2106; TM 62124; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 80, no. 183.
- i. *Incipits* of the Gospels: κατὰ **Ἰωαννης** καὶ τὰ Λουκᾶ<v> κατὰ **Μαρκος** κατὰ **Μαθθεας**.<sup>47</sup>

## 9. P. Rylands 104

- a. Date: IV-XI CE.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>44</sup> The symbol after ἰβ resembles a sigma, but differs significantly from the sigmas throughout the rest of the protocol.

<sup>45</sup> Mirecki has appropriately deemed this order, “reverse canonical order” (“Evangelion-Incipients,” 146).

<sup>46</sup> Collart discusses the amulet as part of his typology (according to formal characteristics) of ritual artifacts that make use of the psalmic tradition. In his scheme, P. Oxy. XVI 1928 is classed with those psalms that are “mixed” with Gospel fragments.

<sup>47</sup> Ἰωαννης (read Ἰωάννην); Μαρκος (read Μάρκος); Μαθθεας (read Μαθθαίου). Grenfell, Hunt, and Bell did not provide any accents for the *incipits* (“Amulet [Psalm XC]: Protocol,” 210). For the reader’s convenience, I have added the accents.

- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: paper.
- d. Language: Coptic.
- e. Physical Description: 14 x 19 cm; writing on one side; several folds.
- f. Contents: “signs or letters”;<sup>49</sup> a ritual prescription requiring oil; a ritual prescription requiring cumin; a prayer of Jesus; a lacunose section; Matthean title; Markan title; Lukan title; Johannine title; another lacunose section, which includes a reference to Jesus calling his disciples.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Crum, *John Rylands*, 53-55, no. 104.
- h. Bibliography: *ACM*, 128, no. 68 (partial translation); Kropp, *Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte 2*: 68-69, no. XIX, 212-13, no. LI, 213, no. LII; Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipients,” 151, no. 14; Pernigotti, *Testi*, 64-65, no. 34 (partial translation); TM 98059.
- i. *Incipits* of the Gospels: ΤΑΡΧΗ ΜΠΕϞ ΔΝΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΕΤΟΥΔΔΒ <N>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΔΘΕΟΟ <N>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΔΡΚΟΟ <N>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΟ <N>ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩ<2>ΔΝΝΗΟ.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>48</sup> This wide date range reflects the lack of agreement on the dating of P. Rylands 104. Mirecki prefers the range VII-VIII CE (“Evangelion-Incipients,” 151). The John Rylands Library website (Rylands Papyri Collection), however, dates P. Rylands 104 to the eleventh century CE ([http://enriqueta.man.ac.uk/luna/servlet/detail/ManchesterDev~93~3~52921~100563:Charms-&-recipes?sort=Contributor%2CImage\\_sequence\\_number%2CContributor\\_role%2CFolio&qvq=q:Coptic%2BMs%2B104;sort:Contributor%2CImage\\_sequence\\_number%2CContributor\\_role%2CFolio;lc:ManchesterDev~93~3&mi=0&trs=2](http://enriqueta.man.ac.uk/luna/servlet/detail/ManchesterDev~93~3~52921~100563:Charms-&-recipes?sort=Contributor%2CImage_sequence_number%2CContributor_role%2CFolio&qvq=q:Coptic%2BMs%2B104;sort:Contributor%2CImage_sequence_number%2CContributor_role%2CFolio;lc:ManchesterDev~93~3&mi=0&trs=2)). Trismegistos provides yet another date range, “AD 300 – 699” (98059). Unfortunately, Walter Crum did not provide a date in the *editio princeps* (*Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in Collection of the John Rylands Library Manchester* [Manchester: At the University Press, 1909], 53-55, no. 104). A more precise dating for this manuscript is a significant desideratum.

<sup>49</sup> Crum does not provide the material for this part of the ritual, but simply writes, “The text is divided into sections. The first is filled chiefly with magical signs or letters” (*John Rylands*, 54).

<sup>50</sup> ΜΠΕϞΔΝΓΕΛΙΟΝ (read ΜΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ); ΜΔΘΕΟΟ (read ΜΔΘΘΔΙΟΟ).

## 10. PSI VI 719 (=PGM 2: 207-208, no. 19)

- a. Date: VI CE.<sup>51</sup>
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Oxyrhynchus).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 25 x 5.5 cm; sheet detached from a roll; writing on both sides; (recto) writing is parallel to the fibers; (verso) writing is perpendicular to the fibers; evidence of folding.
- f. Contents: (recto) cross; letters of unidentified Greek text (Χ[.]ΕΡ); Jn 1:1; Mt 1:1; Jn 1:23 or Mk 1:2?;<sup>52</sup> Mk 1:1; Lk 1:1; LXX Ps 90:1 (**no. 31**); Mt 6:9 (**no. 56**); Trinitarian doxology; crosses; (verso) unrelated document.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Vitelli, *Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana*, vol. VI, 151-52, no. 719.
- h. Bibliography: Aland, *Repertorium* 1: 355, var. 31; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 168; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 188, no. 38; Kraus, “Manuscripts with the *Lord’s Prayer*, 244 (and figure 4); La’da and Papatthomas, “A Greek Papyrus Amulet,” 109, 112; LDAB 2767; Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipits,” 148, no. 9; Naldini, *Documenti*, 32-33, no. 40; Pintaudi, “Per la datazione di PSI VI 719,” 27-28;

---

<sup>51</sup> Although all of the earlier editions of this artifact prefer a date of the fourth or fifth centuries CE (cf. G. Vitelli, *Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto: Papiri greci e latini*, vol. 6 [Florenz: Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana, 1920] 151-2; M. Naldini, *Documenti dell’antichità cristiana: Papiri e pergamene greco-egizie della Raccolta Fiorentina* [Firenze: Le Monnier, 1965], 32; PGM 2: 207; Wessely, “Monuments,” 413), Rosario Pintaudi draws attention to the remains of a Byzantine protocol on the other side of the amulet (PSI I 65), which makes a sixth-century CE date more probable (“Per la datazione di PSI VI 719,” *AnPap* 2 [1990]: 27-28). In their brief descriptions of this artifact, La’da and Papatthomas prefer this later date (“A Greek Papyrus Amulet,” 109, 112). Mirecki goes with the earlier dating, but does not provide his reason for doing so (“Evangelion-Incipits,” 148).

<sup>52</sup> For the identification of this passage, see n. 53 below.

PGM 2: 207-208, no. 19; Ralhfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 117, no. 2075; TM 61617; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 155, no. 423; Wessely, “Monuments,” 413, no. L.

- i. *Incipits* of the Gospels: **(Jn)** ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος **(Mt)** βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ **Δαυετ** υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ **(Jn 1:23 or Mk 1:2?)**<sup>53</sup> καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης **(Mk)** [ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ<sup>54</sup> **(Lk)** Ἐπε[ιδ]ήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπιχειρήσαν ἀν[ατάξα]σθαι δ[ι]ήγ[η]σιν περὶ τῶν ἐπιπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν π[ι]ραγμάτων.<sup>55</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Though John 1:23 is referenced along with the Gospel *incipits* by many editors and commentators of PSI VI 719, a sufficient reason for the odd placement of this scriptural text has yet to be provided. Indeed, the occurrence of John 1:23 in the midst of the Gospel *incipits* is perhaps the most puzzling aspect of this apotropaic artifact. While it is possible that its “prophetic” character precipitated its usage, situating Christ within the *Heilsgeschichte* of Israel as a means of praise, another explanation is perhaps preferable: the reference is to what would later be known as Mk. 1:2, not to Jn. 1:23. Although the wording of PSI VI 719 matches that of Jn. 1:23 (καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης), Mk. 1:2 provides a close parallel (καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ) and could easily be confused. This seems to be the case with the ritual specialist behind BCI 426 (no. 3). In BCI 426, the words after the Matthean *incipit* and before the Lukan *incipit* read, “The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, just as Isaiah the prophet spoke” (τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης). Strongly suggesting that the seventh-century author did not make a detour at Jn 1:23 before continuing on to Lk 1:1 is the fact that immediately following the opening words of the four Gospels in BCI 426 is the phrase: “The four beginnings of the Gospel which is Holy: the Gospel according to Matthew, the Gospel according to Mark, the Gospel according to Luke, the Gospel according to John” (τῶν ἀρχῶν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἁγίου κατὰ ματθαῖον, κατὰ μαρκόν, κατὰ λουκᾶν, κατὰ ἰωάννην). A further indication that the beginning of Mark’s Gospel was not clear to the ritual specialist behind PSI VI 719 is his or her addition of the Matthean phrase “υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ” (probably borrowed from Mt 1:1) at the end of the Markan *incipit*, an anomalous reading among ancient manuscripts (cf. Biondi, “Le citazioni bibliche,” 123). This confusion over the proper wording of the Gospel of Mark should not be surprising in light of its relative unpopularity in late antiquity. Martin Hengel (*Die Evangelienüberschriften*, 13) observes that of the twenty extant pre-Constantinian Gospel papyri from Egypt, only one includes the Gospel of Mark (The Chester Beatty Codex). This de-emphasis on Mark’s Gospel in the apotropaic record is also indicated by P Cairo CG 10696 (no. 16), which includes the opening words of all of the Gospels except Mark. Finally, and perhaps most obviously, it should be emphasized that the proximity of the problematic fragment to the Markan *incipit* speaks loudly in favor of Mk 1:2 as the intended scriptural unit. Thus, in my view, the author intended to list the *incipit* of Mark’s Gospel in conjunction with the other three Gospels, but switched the order of the initial words and used the language from the more-familiar Johannine parallel. It should be emphasized that as awkward as the phrase “...just as Isaiah the prophet spoke, the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ” is as a discrete unit in PSI VI 719, it is functionally equivalent to the “Markan” *incipit* (in the “original” order) in BCI 426. A similar explanation may be implicit in Kurt Aland’s list of scriptural passages for PSI VI 719, as he excludes Jn 1:23, but includes Mk 1:1 with a parenthetical question mark (*Repertorium* 1: 355, var. 31).

<sup>54</sup> For the phrase υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ, see Mt 1:1.

<sup>55</sup> Δαυετ (read Δαυιδ); ἐπιχειρήσαν (read ἐπεχείρησαν) ἐπιπληροφορημένων (read ἐπιπληροφορημένων).

## 11. Pushkin Museum Coptic Amulet (=P. Moscow Copt. 36)

- a. Date: unknown.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: parchment.
- d. Language: Coptic.
- e. Physical Description: 6.5 x 30 cm; writing on one side (flesh side?).
- f. Contents: nine crosses; Mt 1:1; Mk 1:1; Lk 1:1; Jn 1:1; Mt 8:14-15; Mt 8: 16a, 16c-17; two “private prayers”,<sup>56</sup> three crosses.
- g. *Editio princeps*: B. A. Turaev, “Coptic Vellum Amulet [in Russian],” *Christian East* 1 (1912): 203-206.
- h. Bibliography: S. Gaselee, “Bibliography of 1912-13: Christian Egypt,” *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 1 (1914): 47-69, at 54; Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipients,” 149-50, no. 11; P. V. Jernstedt, *Coptic Texts of the State Museum of Fine Arts named after A. S. Pushkin* [in Russian] (Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences, 1959), 84-85, no. 36.
- i. *Incipients* of the Gospels: (**Mt**) ΠΧΩΦΜΕ ΜΠΕΧΠΟ Ν̄Π̄(ΗCOY)C̄ ΠΕΧ̄(ΡΙCΤΟ)C̄ ΠΩΗΡΕ  
N̄ΔΔΥΕΙΔ (**Mk**) ΤΔΡΧΗ ΜΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ Π̄Π̄(ΗCOY)C̄ ΠΕΧ̄(ΡΙCΤΟ)C̄ ΠΩΗΡΕ  
ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ (**Lk**) ΕΠ<Ε>ΙΔΗΠΕΡ ΔΔΔΔ ΔΙΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΕCΔΔΙ ΝΝΩΔΧΕ ΕΤΒΕ ΝΕΔΒΗΥΕ  
N̄ΤΔΠΕΥΔΗΤ ΤΩΤ<sup>57</sup> ΔΡΔΙ<sup>58</sup> ΝΔΗΤΟΥ<sup>59</sup> (**Jn**) ΔΝ ΤΕΔΟΥΕΙΤΕ ΝΕΦΩΟ[ΟΠ ΝCΙ] ΠΩΔΧΕ ΔΥΦ ΠΩΔ[ΧΕ ΝΕΦ]ΩΟΟΠ <N>NΔΔΡΜ ΠΝΟ[ΥΤΕ] ΔΥΦ ΝΕΥΝΟΥΤΕ Π[Ε ΠΩΔΧΕ].

<sup>56</sup> Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipients, 150.

<sup>57</sup> *Sahidica* and Horner read ΕΝΤΔΥΤΩΤ.

<sup>58</sup> The Pushkin Museum Coptic Amulet agrees with Horner here. *Sahidica* reads ΔΡΔΕΙ.

<sup>59</sup> The Pushkin Museum Coptic Amulet has an anomalous reading here, utilizing the third-person plural pronominal suffix (N̄ΔΗΤΟΥ) instead of the first person plural pronominal suffix (N̄ΔΗΤN̄), as in Horner and *Sahidica*.

## 12. P. Vindob. inv. G 348

- a. Date: VI-VII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 7.5 x 12 cm (originally c. 8.5-9 x 12 cm); (recto) blank; (verso) writing perpendicular to the fibers.
- f. Contents: Mt 1:1; Mk 1:1; Lk 1:1; Jn 1:1; LXX Ps 90:1-16 (except 7c, 8).<sup>60</sup>
- g. *Editio princeps*: Daniel, “A Christian Amulet on Papyrus,” 400-404.
- h. Bibliography: Chapa, “Su demoni e angeli,” at 84, no. 9; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 169; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 194, no. 84; LDAB 3482; Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipits,” 148, no. 8; Ralhfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 392, no. 2179; TM 62319.
- i. *Incipits* of the Gospels: (**Mt**) [βίβλος] γενέσεως Ἰη(σο)ῦ Χρ(ιστο)ῦ (**Mk**) ἀρχὴ τοῦ ευαγγ[ελίου] (**Lk**) ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν [ἀνατά]ξασθαι διήγησιν (**Jn**) ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ [ὁ λόγος] ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.<sup>61</sup>

## 13. Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet

- a. Date: V-X CE.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Cf. P. Oxy. 1928 (no. 8), which utilizes the titles of the Gospels in conjunction with LXX Ps 90:1-16.

<sup>61</sup> ευαγγ[ελίου] (read εὐαγγελίου).

<sup>62</sup> Concerning the date of this amulet, J. Drescher oscillates between early and late periods: “...if the name Philoxine is correctly read, this corrupt form might suggest a later rather than an earlier date. So might the fact that a Philoxenus, son of Euphemia, uses Coptic rather than Greek. Then there is the reference to the camel... If we owe this to the Arab Invasion, it could hardly have become familiar to the Copts before the 8<sup>th</sup> century. On the other hand, the grammar and spelling here are better than one often finds in Coptic amulets of a later period” (“A Coptic Amulet,” in *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum*, ed. Thomas Whittemore [Boston: The Byzantine Institute, Inc., 1950], 265-70, at 266)

- b. Provenance: Egypt (Oxyrhynchus?).<sup>63</sup>
- c. Material: parchment.
- d. Language: Coptic.
- e. Physical Description: 11 x 19.5 cm; folded twelve times in length and three or four times in breadth; writing on one side (flesh side?).
- f. Contents: LXX Ps 90:1-2 (**no. 34**); Mt 1:1; Jn 1:1; Lk 1:1; Mk 1:1; a series of adjurations of (1) entities, who represent personifications of features of God (e.g., Orphamiel [“the great finger of the Father”], Orpha [“the whole body of God”]), (2) inanimate objects (e.g., “the throne of the Father,” “the seven curtains that are drawn over the face of God”), and (3) other entities (e.g., “the seven Cherubim”); an adjuration based on the words of Jesus on the cross in Aramaic (ΕΛΩΙ ΕΛΩΙ ΕΛΕΜΔ ΣΔΒΔΚΘΔΝΙ) with translation.<sup>64</sup>
- g. *Editio princeps*: J. Drescher, “A Coptic Amulet,” 265-70 (and plate III).
- h. Bibliography: *ACM*, 115-16, no. 62 (English translation); Mirecki, “Evangelion- Incipits,” 149, no. 10; TM 98054.
- i. *Incipits* of the Gospels: (**Mt**) ΠΧΩΩΜ[Ε ΜΠΕΧΠΟ ΜΤ(ΗΣΟΥ)C ΠΕΧ(ΡΙCΤΟ)C Π]ΩΗΡΕ **ΝΔΔΥΕΙΤ** ΠΩΗΡΕ ΝΔΒΡΔΔΔΜ (**Jn**) ΔΝ ΤΕΔΟΥΕΙΤΕ ΝΕΦΩΟΟΠ ΝCΙ ΠΩΔΧΕ ΔΥΩ ΠΩΔΧΕ ΝΝΕΦΩΟΟΠ ΝΝΔΔΡΜ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ (**Lk**) ΕΠ <Ε>ΙΔΗΠΕ[Ρ ΔΔ]ΔΔ ΔΙΤΟΟΤΟΥ (**Mk**) ΤΔΡΧΗ ΜΠΕΥΔΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΝΤ(ΗCΟΥ)C ΠΕΧ(ΡΙCΤΟ)C.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>63</sup> Concerning the provenance of the Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet, Drescher writes, “...the name Philoxenus was almost unknown at Thebes but popular at Oxyrhynchus. ...So, if the name is rightly read in the [a]mulet, it might suggest the neighborhood of Oxyrhynchus” (“A Coptic Amulet,” 265).

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Brit. Lib. Or. 6796(4) and P. Heid. 1359 (=PGM 2: 202-203, no. 14).

<sup>65</sup> ΝΔΔΥΕΙΤ (read ΝΔΔΥΕΙΔ).

## 14. Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls

- a. Date: VIII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Antinoopolis).<sup>66</sup>
- c. Material: adobe.
- d. Language: Coptic and Greek.
- e. Physical Description: the original shape of the grotto formed a trapezoid: 7 m (north) x 4.15 m (east) x 7 m (south) x 3.20 m (west); heavily damaged (especially the eastern wall).
- f. Contents: (starting north and moving clockwise) Lk 1:1-3; LXX Ps 118:1-3 (**no. 53**); LXX Ps 127:1[-2] (**no. 53**); sacred names;<sup>67</sup> Jn 1:[1-4a]4b-5;<sup>68</sup> LXX Ps 31:1-2 (**no. 53**); Mt 1:1-3; LXX Ps 40:1-2 (**no. 53**); sacred names; Mk 1:1-2; LXX Ps 111:1-2 (**no. 53**); sacred names.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Gustav Lefebvre, “Egypte chrétienne III,” *ASAE* 10 (1909): 260-71.
- h. Bibliography: S. Kent Brown, “Coptic and Greek Inscriptions from Christian Egypt: A Brief Review,” in *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, ed. Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 26-41, at 33;<sup>69</sup> H. Leclercq, “Egypte,” in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, vol. 4.2 (Paris: Le R<sup>me</sup> dom Fernand Cabrol, 1920), cols. 2430-471, at

---

<sup>66</sup> For more information on this site, see W. B. Donne, “Antinoopolis, Antinoe,” *DGRG* 1 (1873), 141.

<sup>67</sup> It is likely that images accompanied many of the names of prophets and other famous figures on the original four walls of the Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls (cf. Lefebvre, “Egypte chrétienne III,” 269-71).

<sup>68</sup> Jn 1:1-3 (and the first part of v. 4), which would have been part of the now damaged eastern wall, is no longer extant. The remainder of this “incipit” (through v. 5) is found on the southern wall.

<sup>69</sup> Brown noticed affinities of the biblical texts cited on the chapel walls at Antinoopolis with the same biblical texts in Codex Alexandrinus. Thus, he concludes, “...even though the chapel itself was likely built in the eighth century C.E., it is clear that the scribe who copied the text had access to a very early manuscript that bore links to Codex Alexandrinus.”

2503f.; Mirecki, “A Coptic Limestone,” 50 n. 14 and 68 n. 47; Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipits,” 153, no. 17.

- i. *Incipits* of the Gospels: **(Lk)** ἔπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπ[ε]χείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ τῶν **πεπληρωφορημενων** ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, καθὼς **παρεδωσαν** ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λογοῦ ἔδοξε κ[ἀ]μοὶ παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκρ{ε}ιβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι, κράτιστε Θεόφι[λε **(Jn)** [ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν, ἐν αὐτῷ] ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ ο[ὐ] κατέλαβεν. **(Mt)** βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰ(ησοῦ) Χ(ριστοῦ) υἱοῦ Δα(υὶ)δ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ. Ἀβραάμ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰσαάκ, Ἰσαάκ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰακώβ, Ἰακώβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰούδαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ, Ἰούδας δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Φάρες καὶ τὸν Ζάρα ἐκ τῆς Θαμάρ] **(Mk)** [ἀρχὴ τοῦ] εὐαγγ[ε]λίου [Ἰ(ησοῦ) Χ(ριστοῦ) υ(ι)οῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, καθὼς γέ]γράφται ἐν [τῷ Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ· ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ<sup>70</sup> ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώ]πο[υ σου, ὅς] κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>70</sup> If this reconstruction by Lefebvre is correct, it would place the Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls text of Mark in accordance with various textual witnesses, including the following: **Ⲭ**, **A**, **L**, **W**, *f*<sup>1.13</sup>, *vg*<sup>cl</sup>, *sy*<sup>h</sup>, *sa*<sup>ms</sup>, *bo*<sup>ms</sup>.

<sup>71</sup> πεπληρωφορημενων (read πεπληροφορημένων); παρεδωσαν (read παρέδοσαν).

## I. 2. Ritual Artifacts with Two or Three Gospel *Incipits*

### 15. BGU III 954 (=P. Berlin/Berol. 954; PGM 2: 97, no. 9)<sup>72</sup>

- a. Date: VI CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Heracleopolis Magna).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: papyrus dimensions unknown; folded dimensions (1 x 2 cm);<sup>73</sup> writing on one side (recto?); folds.
- f. Contents: invocation of the divine and St. Serenus; prayer of Silvanus, son of Searapion, for protection (from “the demon of the evil eye, the (demon) of unpleasantness, and the demon of the evil deed”);<sup>74</sup> Mt 9:6-13; Jn 1:1 (?); Mt 1:1 (?); divine titles (based on “Nicene Creed”);<sup>75</sup> prayer for light to the divine; prayer for health to St. Serenus.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Wilcken, “Heidnisches und Christliches,” 431-36.
- h. Bibliography: *ACM*, 42, no. 18; Aland, *Repertorium* 1: 352, var. 28; Biondi, “Le citazioni bibliche,” 113; E. Boswinkel et al., ed., *Berichtigungsliste der griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten*, vol. 5 (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 14; J. O’Callaghan, *El Cristianismo Popular en el Antiguo Egipto*. (Madrid: Cristiandad, 1975), 119; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 166; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 188, no. 26; Φ. Κουκολέ, “Εκ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν παπύρων,” *Βυζαντίς*

---

<sup>72</sup> Unfortunately, the text was destroyed in a fire at the port of Hamburg (upon arrival) and there are no extant photographs of the artifact.

<sup>73</sup> Wessely, “Monuments,” 420.

<sup>74</sup> In contrast to the impression left by Marvin Meyer’s translation of this text, I have argued that this text is not properly classified as an “exorcistic” text; rather than seeking to remove an unwanted entity, the client Silvanus sought to prevent various demonic entities from harming him (“Canonical Power,” 34f.).

<sup>75</sup> George Milligan, ed., *Selections from the Greek Papyri* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), 132; *ACM*, 42.

2 (1912): 475-503, at 503; Kraus, “Manuscripts with the Lord’s Prayer,” 246-47; La’da and Paphthomas, “A Greek Papyrus Amulet,” 112; LDAB 6231; Leclercq, “Papyrus,” cols. 1387-88; Milligan, *Selections from the Greek Papyri*, 132; Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipits,” 146, no. 6; PGM 2: 197, no. 9; Sanzo, “Canonical Power,” 28-45; T. Schermann, *Ägyptische Abendmahlsliturgien des ersten Jahrtausends* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1912), 206; TM 64990; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 263, no. 720; Wessely, “Monuments,” 420-22; Ulrich Wilcken, ed., *Ägyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin: Griechische Urkunden*, vol. 3.3 (Berlin 1903), 278-79, no. 954; idem and L. Mitteis, eds., *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*, vol. 1.2 (Leipzig: B. Teubner, 1912), 159, no. 133.

- i. *Incipits* of the Gospels:<sup>76</sup> (Jn) ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ [λόγος] (Mt) βίβλος γε[νέσεως] Ἰ(ησοῦ) Χ(ριστοῦ), υἱ]ο[ῦ] Δαυίδ, υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ].

**16. P. Cairo CG 10696 (=PGM 2: 193-94, no. 5c)**

- a. Date: V-VI CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 26.4 x 6.4 cm; (recto) writing perpendicular to the fibers; (verso) blank.

---

<sup>76</sup> Wessely was the first to reconstruct the Johannine and Matthean *incipits* (“Monuments,” 421). Wessely was followed in the editions of Preisendanz, Leclercq, and Sanzo as well as in the translations of Meyer and Sanzo. Thus, the *incipits* are not found in the editions of Wilcken and in the translation of Milligan (*Selections*, 134). It should be stressed that since BGU III 954 was destroyed before the edition of Wessely (and no photographs exist), all reconstructions are based on Wilcken’s editions.

- f. Contents: LXX Ps 21:20-23; naming of four martyrs (Sabbatios, Probatios, Stephanos, Kyriakos); a request for protection from physical harm for a female in the “name of the Lord”; Lk 1:1; Mt 1:1; Jn 1:1; an invocation of saints Phokas and Merkourios for protection.
- g. *Editio princeps*: B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, eds., *Catalogue general des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire*, vol. 10 (Cairo: Imprimerie de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale, 1903), 85, no. 10696.
- h. Bibliography: Aland, *Repertorium* 1: 350, var. 26; Biondi, “Le citazioni bibliche,” 111; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 185; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 186, no. 22; LDAB 6096; Leclercq, “Papyrus,” 1389-90; Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipients,” 148, no. 7; PGM 2: 193-94, no. 5c; A. Pietersma, *Two Manuscripts of the Greek Psalter in the Chester Beatty Library Dublin* (Rome: Typis Pontificiae Universitatis Gregoriana, 1978), 13-14; Ralhs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 163; TM 64858; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 294-95, no. 897.
- i. *Incipients of the Gospels: (Lk)* [ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐ[πε]χείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι > διήγησιν περὶ τ(ῶν) πεπληροφο<ρημένων> ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμ<ά>τ<ων>. **(Mt)** βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰ(ησοῦ) Χ(ριστοῦ). **(Jn)** ἐν ἀρχῇ [ἦν ὁ] λόγος κ[αὶ] ὁ λό[γ]ο[ς] ἦν πρὸς τὸν] θεόν καὶ θεὸς [ἦν] ὁ λόγος.

### I. 3. Ritual Artifacts with One Gospel *Incipit*

#### 17. P. Heid. L 5 (= *Suppl. Mag.* 1: 104-12, no. 36)<sup>77</sup>

- a. Date: V-VI CE.

<sup>77</sup> P. Heid. L 5 disappeared in 1945. Thus, all that remains is a typewritten transcription of Karl Preisendanz, based on the previous transcriptional work of O. Guéraud.

- b. Provenance: Egypt (Babylon).<sup>78</sup>
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Latin.
- e. Physical Description: 19.1 x 10.2 cm; writing on one side (recto?).
- f. Contents: cross; Trinitarian invocation; Jn 1:1 (?); request for healing to God through Jesus Christ; LXX Ps 20, 4-6a, 7b; LXX Ps 15:11b-c; LXX Ps 20:4a, 3b; conjuration of God through angels (Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, Azazel, Uriel, Jeremiel, Photuel) and by the twenty-four elders; Trishagion.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Daniel and Maltomini, "From the African Psalter," 253-65 (and table XII).
- h. Bibliography: J. Bidez, "Bulletin critique et chronique bibliographique," *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 15 (1940): 213-14; R. Cavenaile, *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum*, vol. 4 (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1958), 409, no. 316; de Bruyn, "Papyri," 167; idem and Dijkstra, "Greek Amulets," 194, no. 77; LDAB 4221; E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, vol. 8 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1959), 55, no. 1222; Johannes Kramer, "A Linguistic Commentary on Heidelberg's Latin Papyrus Amulet," *ZPE* 74 (1988): 267-72; Karl Preisendanz, "Mitteilungen," *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 61 (1940): 739-40; idem, "Wichtige Überlieferungsquellen der antiken Magie," *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 16 (1940): 408-409, at 409; idem, "Review of *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum*," *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 80 (1959): 311; idem, "Zur Überlieferung der griechischen Zauberpapyri," in *Miscellanea Critica: Festschrift zum 150-*

---

<sup>78</sup> P. Heid. L 5 was discovered by C. Schmidt in Fustat during the summer of 1937 along with P. Heid. 1101 (= *Suppl. Mag.* 1: 90-96, no. 32).

*jährigen Bestehen des Verlages B. G. Teubner*, vol. 1, ed. Johannes Irmscher (Leipzig: Verlag B. G. Teubner, 1964), 203-17, at 213, no. XCIV; *Suppl. Mag.* I, 104-12, no. 36; TM 63029; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 367, no. 1213.

- i. *Incipit* of the Gospel: in principio erat deus et deus erat [lumen?].<sup>79</sup>

**18. P. Iand. I 6 (=P. Iand. 14; P. Giss. Lit. 5.4; PGM 2: 206-207, no. 17)**

- a. Date: V-VI CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Hermopolis?).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 30 x 15.3 cm; (recto) writing parallel to the fibers; (verso) blank; several folds.
- f. Contents: Matthean title; Mt 8:1; Mt 6:9-10a; Mt 6:13b and doxological ending to the Lord's Prayer (ὅτι [ι σου] ἔστι ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶ[ν] αἰώνων); unidentified text (ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ κόσμου... ὁ ἀρχὴ τοῦ κόσμου... [ἀ]νεκαστός ἐστιν καὶ [12 spaces] πομαί γα[.] ναντην... τα διοικούντα τὴν [κτίσιν, 6 spaces] ἡ τοῦ. ὑμᾶς τὸν β[ρ]α[χ]ίονα τοῦ ἀθανάτου θεοῦ καὶ τὴν τῆς δεξιᾶς αὐτοῦ χίρα); Lk 11:1-1b?;<sup>80</sup> Mt 6:10a-c; the "Exorcism of Solomon" (with reminiscences of LXX Ps

---

<sup>79</sup> In light of the obvious differences between P. Heid. L 5 and the text of John 1:1 in the Vulgate, Daniel and Maltomini write, "[Here is] a misquotation or summary of the beginning of John" ("From the African Psalter," 262).

<sup>80</sup> The identification of Lk 11:1-2 has been noted by several commentators/editors of P. Iand. I 6 (e.g., Wessely, "Monuments," 417; PGM 2: 206). Lk 11:1-2 is the preface to the Lukan version of the Lord's Prayer. Since the Matthean fragment that occurs immediately after this text in the amulet is the Matthean version of the Lord's Prayer, I think there is good reason to believe that the author, despite the passage's Lukan tendencies, *intended* to provide the Matthean preface in conjunction with the Matthean version of the Lord's Prayer. In fact, the fragment's designation as "Lukan" is a bit misleading, as there are several non-orthographical deviations from that preface in P. Iand. I 6, which correspond to no known manuscript tradition: the use of διδάσκαλε instead of κύριε; the "disciples" come to Jesus and inquire about prayer (Lk 11:1 has "a certain disciple" [τις τῶν μαθητῶν]); the equivalent of Lk 11:2 is remarkably different in P. Iand. I. 6: καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἐὰν προσεύχησθε, οὕτως λέγετε (Lk 11:2: εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ὅταν προσεύχησθε λέγετε). Thus, the text as it stands deviates from both versions of the preface and suggests that the author was unclear as to the words that immediately preceded the Lord's Prayer. Whether this version of the preface originated with P. Iand. I 6 or its *Vorlage*, it seems likely that the Matthean

90:6-7); Lk 11:1b-c; Mt 6:11-12a; LXX Ps 90:13; request for protection? (ἡ  
νυκτερινῆς ἢ ὅσα τυφλὰ δαιμόνια ἢ κω[φὰ ἢ ἄλ]αλα ἢ νωδὰ ακα ἢ οἰτο  
νόσημα κ<α>ὶ πονηρὸν συνάντημα ἀπὸ τοῦ φοροῦντος, ἀμήν); Lk 11:1c-2a;  
Mt 6:12-13b.

- g. *Editio princeps*: Ernest Schaefer, *Papyri Iandani*, vol. I, *Voluminum codicumque fragmenta graeca cum amuleto christiano* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1912), 18-32, no. 6.
- h. Bibliography: *ACM*, 45ff., no. 21; Aland, *Repertorium* 1: 354, var. 30; Biondi, “Le citazioni bibliche,” 111; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 167; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 188, no. 36; S. Gaselee, “Bibliography,” 54; Peter Kuhlmann, ed., *Die Giessener Literarischen Papyri und die Caracalla-Erlasse: Edition, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Gießen: Universitäts-Bibliothek, 1994), 170-83, no. 4; H. G. Gundel, *Katalog der literarischen Papyri in der Gießener Universitätsbibliothek. Kurzberichte aus den Giessener Papyrussammlungen*, vol. 39 (Gießen: Universitäts-Bibliothek, 1977), 31, no. 39; LDAB 6107; PGM 2: 206-207, no. 17; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 130-31; TM 64868; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 299, no. 917; Wessely, “Monuments,” 415-17, no. N.
- i. *Incipit* of the Gospel: Εὐαγγέλι[ι]ον κατὰ Μαθ<θ>αῖον.

**19. P. Köln VIII 340 (Cologne, Papyrussammlung P. 649 + Cologne, Papyrussammlung P. 689)**

- a. Date: V/VI CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: papyrus.

---

version was *intended* by the ritual expert behind P. Iand. I 6, despite the extant text’s affinities with the Lukan version.

- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: originally a single sheet, now in two fragments (3.5 x 15.8 cm; 3.4 x 5.1 cm); evidence of folding on both fragments; writing on both sides.
- f. Contents: (side A) seven crosses (staurograms), Jn 1:1-11, invocation to God the Father and Mary ([τὴν θεο]τόκον Μαρίαν), praises; *characteres*; (side B) two drawings; lacunose text with request for healing and protection.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Maltomini, “340. Amuleto con NT Ev. Jo. 1, 1-11,” 82-95 (and table VII a, b).
- h. Bibliography: de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 167; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 190, no. 45; LDAB 2813; TM 61663.
- i. *Incipit* of the Gospel: ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦ[ν ὁ] λόγος καὶ ὁ [λόγος ἦν] πρὸς τὸν θεὸν [καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ [λόγος.] οὗτος ἦν [ἐν] ἀρχῇ πρὸς τ[ὸν] θεὸν. πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο (καὶ) χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲν<sup>81</sup> ὃ γέ[γ]ο[ν]εν. ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν [καὶ] ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀ<ν>θρώπων· καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ <φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν. ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος> ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ {παρὰ θεοῦ}, [ὁ]ν[ο]μα αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης· [οὗτος] ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτυρή[σῃ] περὶ τοῦ φωτός, ἵνα πάντες πιστευσουσιν δι’ αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἦν >ικεῖνος τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ’ ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός. ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον, [ε]ρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον. ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, καὶ [ὁ κόσμος]

<sup>81</sup> P. Köln VIII 340 agrees here with several mss. (e.g., P<sup>66</sup>, κ\*, D, f<sup>1</sup>) against NA<sup>27</sup> (οὐδὲ ἐν).

δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένε[το], καὶ ὁ κόσμος {κόσμος} αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω. εἰς τὰ ἴδια  
ἐλθεν, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτῶν οὐ παρέλαβον.<sup>82</sup>

**20. P. Oxy. VIII 1077 (=PGM 2: 191, no. 4)**

- a. Date: VI CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Oxyrhynchus).
- c. Material: parchment.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 11.1 x 6 cm; text is written on one side (flesh side?) in a series cross-shaped patterns; manuscript was folded and then cut into 15 octagonal units (one cross-shaped section of text [with the exception of the picture in the middle] for each octagonal unit).
- f. Contents: (modified) Matthean title; Mt 4:23-24; picture (of client?).<sup>83</sup>
- g. *Editio princeps*: Arthur S. Hunt, “Amulet: St. Matthew’s Gospel iv,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 8, ed. Arthur S. Hunt (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1911), 10-11, no. 1077 (and plate I).
- h. Bibliography: *ACM*, 33, no. 7; Biondi, “Le citazioni bibliche,” 112; Kenneth Willis Clark, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937), 139; de Bruyn, “Appeals to Jesus,” 66; idem, “Papyri,” 168; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 186, no. 19; Ulrike Horak, *Illuminierte Papyri, Pergamente und Papiere*, vol. 1 (Wien: Holzhausen, 1992), 247, no. 206; TM 61805; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 127, no. 341; PGM 2: 191, no. 4; Wessely, “Monuments,” 413-15, no. M.

---

<sup>82</sup> πιστευσουσην (read πιστεύσωσιν); κεινος (read ἐκεῖνος); [ε]ρχωμενον (read ἐρχόμενον); ελθεν (read ἦλθεν); αὐτῶν (read αὐτόν).

<sup>83</sup> De Bruyn, “Appeals to Jesus,” 66.

- i. *Incipit* of the Gospel: Ἰαματικὸν εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαίον.<sup>84</sup>

**21. P. Oxy. VIII 1151 (=PGM 2: 192-93, no. 5b)**

- a. Date: V CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Oxyrhynchus).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 4.4 x 23.4 cm; (recto) writing parallel with the fibers; (verso) blank; found tightly folded and tied with a string.
- f. Contents: cross; command for the “hated spirit” (πνεῦμα μεμισημένον) to flee; request to ὁ θεὸς τῆς προβατικῆς κολυμβήθρας (cf. Jn 5:2) to remove any evil from “Johannia, whom Anastasia, that is Euphambia, bore”; cross; Jn 1:1, 3;<sup>85</sup> cross; request for Christ to heal “every sickness and every malady” (Mt 4:23/9:35); request to heal and to protect from various demons “Johannia, whom Anastasia, that is Euphambia, bore”; request for intercessory prayers from “the bearer of God” (θεοτόκος), the archangels, and “the holy and glorious apostle and evangelist and theologian, John” (τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐνδόξου ἀποστόλου καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ καὶ θεολόγου Ἰωάννου), Saint Serenus, Saint Philoxenus, Saint Victor, Saint Justin, and “all of the saints” (καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων) grounded in the powerful nature of the Lord God; cross.

---

<sup>84</sup> Ματθαίον (read Μαθθαῖον).

<sup>85</sup> Many editors and commentators have incorrectly labeled the Johannine reference as John 1:1-3 (e.g., Aland, *Repertorium* 1: 356; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 168; Biondi, “Le citazioni bibliche,” 109; Pickering, “Non-continuous,” 134; Preisendanz, PGM 2: 192; Wessely, “Monuments,” 419; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 308; von Dobshütz, “Zur Liste,” 188), instead of John 1:1, 3 (i.e., this manuscript is missing John 1:2: “οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν”).

- g. *Editio princeps*: Arthur S. Hunt, “1151. Christian Amulet,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 8, ed. Arthur S. Hunt (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1911), 251-53, no. 1151.
- h. Bibliography: *ACM*, 40-41, no. 16; Aland, *Repertorium* 1: 356, var. 32; Elmar Bartsch, *Die Sachbeschwörungen der Römischer Liturgie* (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlag, 1967), 231; Biondi, “Le citazioni bibliche,” 109; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 168; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 186, no. 21; LDAB 2802; Leclercq, “Papyrus,” col. 1384-85; George Milligan, *Here and There among the Papyri* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923), 151; Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipients,” 146, no. 3; O’Callaghan, *El Cristianismo Popular*, 121; PGM 2: 192-93, no. 5b; TM 61652; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 308, no. 959; E. von Dobshütz, “Zur Liste der neutestamentlichen Handschriften IV,” *ZNW* 32 (1933): 185-206, at 188; Wessely, “Monuments,” 417-20, no. O.
- i. *Incipit* of the Gospel: ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν.<sup>86</sup>

## 22. P. Rylands 101

- a. Date: unknown.<sup>87</sup>
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: papyrus.

<sup>86</sup> P. Oxy. VIII 1151 deserves a place in the text-critical discussion concerning the phrase, “ὃ γέγονεν” in the Johannine prologue. In contrast with the majority of ante-Nicene writers (cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 167-68), the ritual specialist behind P. Oxy. VIII 1151 placed “ὃ γέγονεν” with what proceeds (John 1:3), not with what follows (John 1:4). This puts P. Oxy. VIII 1151 in agreement with NA<sup>27</sup> and UBS<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>87</sup> The only venues to comment on the dating of this artifact are the *Leuven Database of Ancient Books* (108452) and *Trismegistos* (108452), both of which provide a broad temporal range for P. Rylands 101 (400 – 899 CE).

- d. Language: Coptic.
- e. Physical Description: 8.5 x 6 cm; writing on both sides.
- f. Contents: (recto) Mk 1:2; (verso) dividing line of dots; partial list of 40 Martyrs of Sebaste.
- g. *Editio princeps*: W. Crum, *John Rylands*, 52, no. 101.
- h. Bibliography: LDAB 108452; Mirecki, “Evangelion-Incipients,” 150-51, no. 13; TM 108452.
- i. *Incipit* of the Gospel: ΚΑΤΑ ΘΕ<sup>88</sup> ΕΥΧΗ<sup>89</sup> ΖΗΤΗΣ[ΔΙΔΑΧΕ]ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ ΧΕ ΕΙΣ ΖΗ[ΗΤΕ Τ]ΗΝΑΧΟΥ<sup>90</sup> ΠΑΔΓΓΕΛΟΣ [ΖΑΤΕ]ΚΖΗ<sup>91</sup> ΝΗСВТΕ<sup>92</sup> ΝΤΕΚ<ΖΙΗ>.<sup>93</sup>

## II. Other Possible *Incipits* of Multiunit Corpora

I have included the two passages (on the same artifact) in the category treated in this chapter because I believe they have a multiunit corpus in view. The first (P. Amh. I 3 [b]) utilizes the first words of Hebrews, a multiunit text. In the second case (P. Amh. I 3 [c]), the author (probably different from the writer of P. Amh. I 3 [b]) included the initial verses of Genesis 1 (according to two versions). If this passage was intended as an *incipit*, it could have had as its target corpus material from the entire Bible or simply material from Genesis. In either case, we are dealing with a multiunit item.

### 23. P. Amh. I 3 (b)

- a. Date: (beginning of) IV CE.

<sup>88</sup> The inclusions of ΘΕ corresponds to Horner’s edition (cf. P. Anastasy 9). *Sahidica* omits ΘΕ.

<sup>89</sup> P. Rylands agrees with Horner here. *Sahidica* reads ΠΕΤΧΗ.

<sup>90</sup> *Sahidica* and Horner read ΤΗΝΑΧΟΥ.

<sup>91</sup> P. Rylands agrees with Horner here. *Sahidica* reads ΖΙΖΗ ΜΜΟΚ.

<sup>92</sup> P. Rylands agrees with Horner here. *Sahidica* reads ΝΗСВТΕ.

<sup>93</sup> *Sahidica* reads ΤΕΚΖΙΗ.

- b. Provenance: Egypt (Fayum).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description (including P. Amh. I 3 [a] and [b]): 20.9 x 23.5 cm; (recto) writing in three columns (=P. Amh. I 3 [a]) with another text written above the second column (=P. Amh. I 3 [b]); (verso) writing in a single column of sixteen lines (P. Amh. I 3 [c]).
- f. Contents (including P. Amh. I 3 [a] and [b]): (P. Amh. I 3 [a]) an early correspondence with a bishop,<sup>94</sup> (P. Amh. I 3 [b]) Heb 1:1; (P. Amh. I 3 [c]) Gen 1:1-5 according to Septuagint and Gen 1:1-2a, 3-4, 5b according to Aquila's translation (**no. 24**).<sup>95</sup>
- g. *Editio princeps*: Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, ed., *The Amherst Papyri Being an Account of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of the Right Hon. Lord Amherst of Hackney, F.S.A. at Didlington Hall, Norfolk*, pt. 1, *The Ascension of Isaiah, and other Theological Fragments with Nine Plates* (London: Oxford University Press, 1900), 30-31 (and plate 1).
- h. Bibliography: Aland, *Repertorium* 1: 360, var. 35; Alan England Brooke and Norman McLean, ed., *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Uncial Mss., with a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the*

---

<sup>94</sup> According to David G. Martinez, P. Amh. I 3 (a) “provides our earliest attestation of Christian clergy in a dated Christian text” (“The Papyri and Early Christianity,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, ed. Roger Bagnall [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009], 590-622, at 603).

<sup>95</sup> Concerning the odd placement of the scriptural units on this text, Herbert Musurillo writes, “[t]he actual physical appearance of the papyrus suggests that it was deliberately cut in order that the verses from Genesis might be written in the centre portion of the verso with the verse from Hebrews inscribed on an outside fold” (“Early Christian Economy: A Reconsideration of P. Amherst 3 [a] [=Wilcken, Chrest. 126],” *Chronique d’Égypte* 61 [1956]: 124-34, at 124).

*Septuagint*, vol. 1, *The Octateuch*, pt. 1, *Genesis* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1906), 1 (in apparatus as “U<sub>2</sub>”); Clark, *A Descriptive Catalogue*, 170-71; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 176; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 208, no. 155; Adolf Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten: Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923), 172-79, no. 21; LDAB 3475; Martinez, “The Papyri and Early Christianity,” 590-622, at 603-604 (and figs. 25.3a-b); Musurillo, “Early Christian Economy,” 124-34; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 260-61, no. 912; C. H. Roberts, “Early Christianity in Egypt: Three Notes,” *JEA* 40 (1954): 92-96, at 95-96; idem, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (London: Oxford University Press, 1979), 9 and 75 n. 2; TM 62312; Ludwig Traube, *Nomina sacra: Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung* (München, C. H. Beck, 1907), 60f., 88, 95; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 28, no. 3; C. Wessely, “Les plus anciens monuments du Christianisme écrits sur papyrus: Texts grecs édités[,] traduits[,] et annotés,” in *Patrologia Orientalis*, vol. 4.2 (Paris: Firmin-Didot et C<sup>ie</sup>, Imprimeurs-Éditeurs, 1946), 99-200, at 138-39.

- i. *Incipit* of Hebrews:<sup>96</sup> πολυμερῶς κ(αὶ) πολυ[τρό]πως **παλε** ὁ θε(ε)ὸς  
λαλήσ[α]ς το[ῖ]ς πατρά[σιν] ἡμ[ῶ]ν ἐν τοῖς προ[φ]ητά[ις].<sup>97</sup>

#### 24. P. Amh. I 3 (c)

- a. For basic description, see **no. 23**.
- b. *Incipit* of Genesis (LXX and Aquila translation<sup>98</sup>): **(LXX)** ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ  
θε(ε)ὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν. ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος κ(αὶ)

<sup>96</sup> The *editio princeps* of P. Amh. I 3 (b-c) did not include any accents. For the reader’s convenience, I have supplied them in both of the texts.

<sup>97</sup> παλε (read πάλα).

ἀκατασκεύαστος, κ(αὶ) σκό[τ]ος ἐπάνω τῆς ἀβύσσου, καὶ πν(εῦμ)α θε(ο)ῦ  
ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω του ὕδατος. κ(αὶ) εἶπεν ὁ θε(ός)ς γε[νη]θήτω φῶς. κ(αὶ)  
ἐγένετο φῶ[ς]. καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θε(ός)ς τὸ φ[ῶ]ς ὅτ{ε}ι καλόν. καὶ δι[ε]χώρισε(ν)  
ὁ θε(ός)ς ἀνὰ μέσ[ο]ν τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ ἀνὰ μέ[σον] τοῦ σκοτούς. καὶ ἐγένετο  
ἑσπέρα καὶ ἐ[γεν]ετο πρωί, ἡμέρα μ{ε}ια. **(Aquila)** ἐν κεφαλεω ἔκτισεν  
θε(ός)ς σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τ[ῆ]ν γῆν. ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν κένωμα καὶ [ο]ὔθεν καὶ  
[εἶ]πεν θε(ός)ς [γ]ε[ν]ηθήτω φῶ[ς] καὶ ἐγέν[ετ]ο φῶς [κ(αὶ) εἶδε]ν θε(ός)ς τὸ  
φῶ[ς] ὅτι ἀγαθόν..διεχ[ώρισεν] θε(ός)ς μετοξὺ φω[τὸς] κς μετοξὺ τοῦ  
[σκότο]υς καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσ[π]έρα καὶ [...π]ρωί, ἡ[μ]έρα πρωτή.<sup>99</sup>

### III. Patterns and Trends

The potential instances of *incipits* of multiunit corpora reflect diverse scribal practices. No clear pattern emerges concerning number, order, or length of the *incipit*. As I intend to show, even if we set aside orthographical issues, the diversity in this extant material is clear.

With respect to the initial words and/or titles of the Gospels, in particular, the ritual specialists could either make use of four,<sup>100</sup> three,<sup>101</sup> two,<sup>102</sup> or one<sup>103</sup> of the Gospel *incipits*. Moreover, of the ritual artifacts that make use of multiple Gospel *incipits*, the order of these

<sup>98</sup> The Aquilian version of Deut 32:1-3 was used for apotropaic purposes on a copper lamella from Sicily (Roy Kotansky, *Greek Magical Amulets: The Inscribed Gold, Silver, Copper, and Bronze Lamellae*, pt. 1, *Published Texts of Known Provenance* [Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1994], 126-54, no. 32).

<sup>99</sup> κεφαλεω (read κεφαλαίω); κς (read καὶ).

<sup>100</sup> **Nos. 1-14.** It should be highlighted that P. Berol. 22 2235 (**no. 6**), which follows the canonical order, repeats the Gospel of Matthew after the Gospel of John.

<sup>101</sup> P. Cairo inv. 10696 (**no. 16**).

<sup>102</sup> BGU III 954 (**no. 15**).

<sup>103</sup> **Nos. 17-22.**

*incipits* does not follow a consistent pattern: nine follow the “canonical order”;<sup>104</sup> three have John first followed by Matthew;<sup>105</sup> one has John first followed by Luke;<sup>106</sup> one has Matthew first followed by John;<sup>107</sup> one has Matthew first followed by Luke;<sup>108</sup> one begins with Luke.<sup>109</sup>

Finally, there does not seem to be unanimity as to what constitutes the boundaries of the opening words from a Gospel: the opening words of Matthew occur both with<sup>110</sup> and without<sup>111</sup> the references to Jesus’ familial relationship to David and Abraham; the Markan *incipit* can end with “Gospel,”<sup>112</sup> “Jesus Christ,”<sup>113</sup> the extended phrase “Son of God,”<sup>114</sup> with a reference to “Isaiah the prophet,”<sup>115</sup> or even material from the “Isaiah” quote;<sup>116</sup> the Lucan *incipit* can extend through the end of what we call Lk1:1<sup>117</sup> or beyond,<sup>118</sup> or simply relate that “many have undertaken<sup>119</sup> to set in order a narration (of someone/something)”;<sup>120</sup> the Johannine *incipit* can

<sup>104</sup> Anchorite’s Grotto in Nubia (no. 1), BCI 426 (no. 3), P. Anastasy 9 (no. 5), P. Berol. 22 235 (with a repetition of Matthew’s *incipit*) (no. 6), P. Mich. 1559 (no. 7), P. Rylands 104 (no. 9), Pushkin Museum Coptic Amulet (no. 11), P. Vindob. inv. G. 348 (no. 12), Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls (no. 14).

<sup>105</sup> BKT VI 7.1 (no. 2), PSI VI 719 (no. 10), BGU III 954 (John and Matthew *incipits* only) (no. 15).

<sup>106</sup> P. Oxy. 1928 (no. 8).

<sup>107</sup> Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet (no. 13).

<sup>108</sup> Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (no. 4).

<sup>109</sup> P. Cairo inv. 10696 (no. 16).

<sup>110</sup> BKT VI 7.1 (no. 2), BCI 426 (no. 3), P. Anastasy 9 (no. 5), P. Mich. 1559 (no. 7), PSI VI 719 (no. 10), Pushkin Museum Coptic Amulet (no. 11), Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet (no. 13), Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls (no. 14), BGU III 954 (no. 15).

<sup>111</sup> Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (no. 4), P. Vindob. G. 348 (no. 12), P. Cairo inv. 10696 (no. 16).

<sup>112</sup> P. Vindob. G. 348 (no. 12).

<sup>113</sup> Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (no. 4), P. Mich. 1559 (no. 7), Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet (no. 13).

<sup>114</sup> BKT VI 7.1 (no. 2), PSI VI 719 (with the additional phrase, “ϣιοϣ ’Αβραάμ”) (no. 10), Pushkin Museum Coptic Amulet (no. 11).

<sup>115</sup> BCI 426 (no. 3), P. Anastasy 9 (no. 5).

<sup>116</sup> P. Rylands 101 (no. 22). The inscription on the Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls (no. 14) extends the quotation through the entirety of Mark 1:2. As I argue above, PSI VI 719 (no. 10) includes the “Isaiah” quote before what we call Mark 1:1. The scare quotes around “Isaiah” is occasioned by the fact that Mark 1:2, though attributed to Isaiah in the text, is a composite quote of Mal. 3:1 (cf. Ex. 23:20) and Is. 40:3.

<sup>117</sup> BCI 426 (no. 3), P. Anastasy 9 (no. 5), PSI VI 719 (no. 10), Pushkin Museum Coptic Amulet (no. 11), P. Cairo inv. 10696 (no. 16).

<sup>118</sup> Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls (no. 14). Lefebvre observes that the Lukan *incipit* probably extended through Luke 1:4 (“Egypte chrétienne,” 266 n.1).

<sup>119</sup> Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (no. 4), Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet (no. 13).

<sup>120</sup> P. Mich. 1559 (no. 7), P. Vindob. G. 348 (no. 12).

end after the first “Logos,”<sup>121</sup> after the first reference to “God,”<sup>122</sup> through the end of what we call “verse one,”<sup>123</sup> or even include subsequent material from the first chapter of John.<sup>124</sup>

To qualify this diversity, it is helpful to make a distinction between the Coptic and Greek manuscripts. It is a curious fact that, with the sole exception of P. Rylands 101 (**no. 22**), every Coptic artifact makes use of at least the four Gospel *incipits*.<sup>125</sup> Also, there is a surprising amount of agreement among the Coptic amulets with respect to order of the *incipits*: with the exception of the Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet (Matthew, John, Luke, Mark) and Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (Matthew, Luke, John, Mark), all of these Coptic artifacts follow the “canonical order” in their presentation of the Gospel *incipits*. It is possible that this agreement is reflective of the codification of the order of the Gospels over time. Unfortunately, the dating of many of these manuscripts is based on tenuous grounds (esp. paleography).<sup>126</sup> Thus, an explanation for this tendency based on temporal grounds is premature at this time. It should be noted, however, that agreement among the Coptic artifacts with respect to number and order should not be taken as tantamount to uniformity; the particular wording of the *incipits* among these artifacts is still quite diverse.

In contrast to the Coptic ritual artifacts, only half of the extant Greek apotropaic devices make use of all four Gospel *incipits*: BKT VI 7.1 (**no. 2**); P. Oxy. XVI 1928 (**no. 8**); PSI VI 719 (**no. 10**); P. Vindob. G. 348 (**no. 12**); Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls (**no. 14**). Stated in reverse,

---

<sup>121</sup> Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (**no. 4**) (ends with πωλλε), BGU III 954 (**no. 15**).

<sup>122</sup> P. Mich. 1559 (**no. 7**), Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet (**no. 13**).

<sup>123</sup> BCI 426 (**no. 3**), P. Anastasy 9 (**no. 5**), PSI VI 719 (**no. 10**), Pushkin Museum Coptic Amulet (**no. 11**), P. Vindob. G. 348 (**no. 12**), P. Cairo inv. 10696 (**no. 16**).

<sup>124</sup> BKT VI 7.1 (**no. 2**), Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls (**no. 14**), P. Köln VIII 340 (**no. 19**), P. Oxy. VIII 1151 (**no. 21**).

<sup>125</sup> P. Berol. 22 235 (**no. 6**) repeats the *incipit* of the Gospel of Matthew after the four Gospel *incipits*.

<sup>126</sup> For problems with dating ancient manuscripts more generally, see Peter Parsons, “A People of the Book?” in *I papiri letterari cristiani: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi in memoria di Mario Naldini, Firenze, 10-11 Giugno 2010*, ed. Guido Bastianini and Angelo Casanova (Firenze: Istituto Papirologico “G. Vitelli,” 2011), 47-57, at 55-57.

half of the extant Greek manuscripts that seek out the ritual power of the Gospel *incipits* utilize three or fewer of them. Among the Greek texts that make use of all four Gospel *incipits*, there is also less agreement than the Coptic artifacts with respect to order: P. Oxy. XVI 1928 (Jn, Lk, Mk, Mt); PSI VI 719 (Jn, Mt, Mk, Lk); P. Vindob. G. 348 (Mt, Mk, Lk, Jn); BKT VI 7.1 (Jn, Mt, Mk, Lk); Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls (the order depends upon one's directional orientation). Of these five texts, only BKT VI 7.1 and PSI VI 719 agree in order.

#### **IV. Conclusions**

In this chapter, I surveyed the opening lines/titles of multiunit corpora that may have been used as *incipits*. I have also drawn attention to the great diversity of potential *incipits* with respect to number, order, and length. In the following chapter, I will turn my attention to the *incipits* of single-unit corpora, providing a preliminary survey. As was the case with the *incipits* in this chapter, the potential *incipits* of single-unit corpora (some of which occur on manuscripts with the opening lines of multiunit corpora) defy a consistent pattern.

## Chapter Four

In this chapter, I survey the potential *incipits* of single-unit texts, which were primarily intended for apotropaic purposes. It should come as little surprise that an even larger and more diverse collection of texts is represented in this category than among the potential *incipits* of multiunit corpora.

I have divided this survey into three sections (with sub-sections). In the first section, I examine the potential *incipits* of the biblical psalms. I begin by isolating the most common example of the potential psalmic *incipits*, that of LXX Ps 90.<sup>1</sup> I then survey the remaining candidates for psalmic *incipits*. The second section consists of potential *incipits* of sacred material from non-psalmic texts, all of which are single-unit items. In the third section, I consider two *incipits* that may have invoked either a single-unit text or a multiunit corpus. I then synthesize the results of my study, highlighting the diversity of potential *incipits* of single-unit texts.

As this survey is the first of its kind, I was required to utilize a wide range of collections and articles in order to compile this list. For the Greek materials, I was heavily dependent upon Theodore de Bruyn's survey of the use of scripture on amulets more generally.<sup>2</sup> I have included all of the potential apotropaic *incipits* of single-unit corpora in de Bruyn's first three categories, which range from manuscripts that were "certainly amulets" to manuscripts that were "likely amulets" to manuscripts that were "possibly amulets."<sup>3</sup> The works of Thomas Kraus,<sup>4</sup> Jean

---

<sup>1</sup> On account of its ubiquity, I deemed it appropriate to isolate the usage of the *incipit* of LXX Ps 90.

<sup>2</sup> De Bruyn, "Papyri."

<sup>3</sup> My reasoning for including artifacts from de Bruyn's category "possibly amulets" is that I believe that the operating presupposition, governing the distinction between "amulets" and other manuscript classifications (e.g., school exercise, a miniature codex, an *aide-mémoire*, a private prayer) is predicated on the assumed utility of "magic" as a discrete category and hence, distinct from other realms of human experience (e.g., "religion," "education" [cf. "science"]). Though this subject transcends the concerns of my project, it should be noted that the

Maspero,<sup>5</sup> and Georges Nachtergaele<sup>6</sup> were also indispensable for compiling the Greek materials, especially in identifying the armbands and the so-called “Bous-amulets” containing LXX Ps 90:1. I have also consulted numerous other works, which I have listed in the bibliographies of individual artifacts. For the Coptic materials, I consulted various collections of “magical” media, most importantly those of Marvin Meyer and Richard Smith,<sup>7</sup> Angelicus Kropp,<sup>8</sup> Viktor Stegemann,<sup>9</sup> and Sergio Pernigotti.<sup>10</sup> It should be highlighted that the following survey of artifacts is preliminary and is primarily intended to give the reader a sense of the diversity among the potential *incipits* of single-unit texts. An exhaustive list of potential *incipits* in this category—especially in Coptic—remains a desideratum.

The artifact numbers for this chapter begin where the numbers for the multiunit corpora left off. I follow the protocol established in Chapter Three, not repeating the description of an artifact that has already been discussed—whether in this chapter or in Chapter Three. In such cases, I supply the initial artifact number in this volume, where descriptive information can be found.

## I. Psalmic *Incipits*

As we have already seen, the psalms played an integral part in the “religious” world of late antique Egypt, including apotropaic contexts. In this section, I will survey the ritual artifacts

---

assumption that ancients (or moderns, for that matter) approached scriptures from purely “educational” or “religions/devotional” vantage points has yet to be shown. I would argue that an apotropaic function of scripture should be the default category and hence assumed even when another function is also likely.

<sup>4</sup> Kraus, “Fragmente eines Amulett-armbands”; idem, “Septuaginta-Psalms 90 in apotropäischer Verwendung”; idem, “Psalm 90 der Septuaginta in apotropäischer Funktion”; idem, “Septuagint Psalm 90 and the Iconographic Program.”

<sup>5</sup> Maspero, “Bracelets-amulettes.”

<sup>6</sup> “Une amulette chrétienne du Musée des Beaux-Arts de Dijon,” *Ricerche di egittologia e di antichità copte* 4 (2002): 93-101.

<sup>7</sup> *ACM*.

<sup>8</sup> *Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte*.

<sup>9</sup> *Die koptischen Zaubertexte*.

<sup>10</sup> *Testi*; idem, “La magia copta.”

that may have utilized *incipits* of the biblical psalms. I begin with a list of artifacts with the potential *incipit* of LXX Ps 90, the most frequently used biblical psalm in the extant record. I then survey ritual artifacts that (may) utilize the *incipits* of other biblical psalms.

### I. 1. *Incipits* of LXX Ps 90

LXX Ps 90 has been a staple in the ritual lives of individuals across various eras and regions. One can find LXX Ps 90 in instances of demonic struggle in as diverse media and contexts as the Qumran documents,<sup>11</sup> the New Testament,<sup>12</sup> a “magical” bowl discovered near Kadhimain,<sup>13</sup> and the Cairo Geniza materials.<sup>14</sup> It should come as no surprise that the rabbis isolated this psalm as particularly efficacious against demons, using such labels as “song for the stricken,”<sup>15</sup> “song referring to evil spirits,”<sup>16</sup> and “song for demons.”<sup>17</sup>

Whether referencing the entire text or selecting appropriate aspects from this psalm, Egyptians were not excluded from this broader trend in global ritual practice.<sup>18</sup> Indeed, as we have already seen, there are several aspects of this psalm—both with respect to content and form—that would make it an appropriate text against demonic attack.

---

<sup>11</sup> 11Q11. For commentary on this artifact, see especially Émile Puech, “11QPsAp<sup>a</sup>: Un rituel d’exorcismes. Essai de reconstruction,” *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1990): 377-408; idem, “Les deux derniers Psaumes Davidiques du rituel d’exorcisme, 11QPsAp<sup>a</sup> IV 4-V14,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 64-89; idem, “Les Psaumes Davidiques du rituel d’exorcisme (11Q11),” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998*, ed. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino Garcia Martinez and Eileen M. Schuller (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 160-81.

<sup>12</sup> Mt 4:6.

<sup>13</sup> Joseph Naveh and Shaul Shaked, eds., *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 184-87, no. B11.

<sup>14</sup> T-S K 1.127.

<sup>15</sup> שיר פגועין (y. Shabbat 6 [8b]). Translation taken from Dennis C. Duling, “Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David,” *HTR* 68 (1975): 235-52, at 239.

<sup>16</sup> שיר של פגועים (b. Shavuot 15b). Translation taken from Duling, “Solomon,” 239.

<sup>17</sup> שיר של הפגועים (y. ‘Eruvin 10 [26c]). Translation taken from Duling, “Solomon,” 239.

<sup>18</sup> On the relative popularity of this psalm in the Greek apotropaic record of late antique Egypt, see Chapa, “Su demoni e angeli,” esp. 68-69.

In the following survey, I provide basic information for seventeen ritual artifacts that utilize the opening words of this particular psalm. The artifacts represented in this list represent a wide variety of media, including manuscripts, ostraca, chapel walls, wooden boards, and bracelets.

**25. BKT VI 7.1 (=P. Berol. 6069)**

- a. For basic information, see **no. 2**.
- b. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90: ὁ κατοικον ἐν βοηθείᾳ τοῦ ὑψίστου ἐν σκέπη τοῦ κ(υρίου) τοῦ οὐρανοῦ αὐλησθαι.<sup>19</sup>

**26. BKT VIII 12 (=P. Berol. 3601)**

- a. Date: VII-VIII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: parchment.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: single fragmentary text, 13.2 x 5 cm (originally 33 x 20 cm);<sup>20</sup> writing on one side (flesh side?).
- f. Contents: LXX Ps 90:1-6.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Otto Stegmüller, ed., *Berliner Septuagintafragmente*, Berliner Klassikertexte aus den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, vol. VIII (Berlin: Weidmann, 1939), 33-34, no. 12.
- h. Bibliography: de Bruyn, "Papyri," 170; idem and Dijkstra, "Greek Amulets," 196, no. 93; La'da and Papatthomas, "A Greek Papyrus Amulet," 109, no. 24; LDAB

---

<sup>19</sup> κατοικον (read κατοικῶν); αὐλησθαι (read ἀυλισθήσεται).

<sup>20</sup> Stegmüller, *Berliner Septuagintafragmente*, 33; de Bruyn, "Papyri," 170; idem and Dijkstra, "Greek Amulets," 196, no. 93. Perhaps based on his own estimation, van Haelst claims that the original measured 30 x 20 cm (*Catalogue*, 84).

3417; Ralhs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 17-18; TM 62257; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 83-84, no. 197; J. W. Wevers, “Septuaginta-Forschungen,” *ThR* 22 (1954): 85-190, at 132.

- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90: [ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν βοηθείᾳ τοῦ ὑψίστου] ἐν σκέπη τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ (οὐρα)νοῦ ἀλίσθησθήσεται ἐρεῖ τῷ κυρίῳ Ἐπιλήμπτω μου εἰ καὶ καταφυγὴ μου, ὁ θεὸς μου, ἐλπὶς ἐπ’ αὐτὸν, ὅτι αὐτὸς ῥύσεται με ἐκ [παγίδος θηρευτῶν καὶ ἀπὸ λόγου ταραχώδους. ἐν τοῖς μεταφρένοις αὐτοῦ ἐπισκιάσει σοὶ καὶ ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας αὐτοῦ ἐλπιδίαι ὅπλα κυκλώσει σε ἢ ἀλήθεια αὐτοῦ οὐ φοβηθήσῃ ἀπὸ φόβου νυκτερινοῦ ἀπὸ βέλους πετομένου ἡμέρας ἀπὸ πράγματος δι[απορευομένου].

**27. BKT IX 206 (=P. Berol. 21911; *Suppl.Mag.* 1: 72-73, no. 26)**

- a. Date: V CE.
- b. Origin: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 5.2 x 4.2 cm; (“verso) writing perpendicular to the fibers; (“recto”) blank;<sup>21</sup> two vertical folds.
- f. Contents: prayer to Mary to stop the “discharge (ῥέυμα), pains of the eyes (τοὺς πόνους τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν) of Poibammon, the son of Athanasios”; LXX Ps 90:1.
- g. *Editio princeps*: William Brashear, “Vier Berliner Zaubertexte,” *ZPE* 17 (1975): 25-33, at 30-31, no. 3 (and plate IIc).

---

<sup>21</sup> This way of construing the “recto” and “verso” is inherited from Brashear, who writes, “Quer zu der Fasern läuft die stark nach rechts geneigte und feine Schrift, die wohl ins 5. Jhdt. n. Chr. gehört. Rekto unbeschrieben.” Daniel and Maltomini use more generic language: “The writing runs against the fibers, and the back is blank” (*Suppl.Mag.* 1: 72).



**29. P. Laur. IV 141 (=PL inv. III/501)**

- a. Date: V CE.<sup>24</sup>
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 26.7 x 14.3cm; writing on both sides; (recto) writing both parallel with and perpendicular to the fibers; (verso) writing parallel with the fibers.
- f. Contents: (recto, perpendicular to the fibers) cross (staurogram); LXX Ps 90:1-6 with concluding remarks: [γρά]μματα τῆς σῆς<sup>25</sup> ἀδελφικῆς δια[θέσεως]; (recto, parallel with the fibers) cross (staurogram); an epistolary greeting with concluding remarks: Αὐρήλιος Ἰωάννης υἱὸς Π... μητρὸς Σερήνας ὀρμώμενος ἐκ ταύτης τῆς [πό]λεως Αὐρηλίῳ Θιλοξένῳ υἱῶ Δ[ο]ρωθέου μητρὸς Ε...νας [ὀρ]μώμενος [ἀπ]ὸ τῆς α[ὐ]τῆς χαίρ[ειν.] ὁμολ[ογῶ] ἐκουσία γνώμη...[γρά]μματα τῆς ἡμῶν μ[...]; (verso) endorsement (?): μετὰ τὴν ὑπα[τεῖαν Φλ]αυίου Θεοδορίχου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου).
- g. *Editio princeps*: Pintaudi, *Dai papyri*, 33-35 (and figure CII); idem, “PL III/501” 50-54 (and figure IV).
- h. Bibliography: Cavallo and Maehler, *Greek Bookhands*, 46, no. 19b (with image), 130 (transcription); de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 178; de Bruyn and Dijkstra, “Greek

---

<sup>24</sup> On the basis of the reference to Φλαυίου Θεοδορίχου (see “Contents” below), Guglielmo Cavallo and Herwig Maehler provide a more precise date, suggesting that the texts on this artifact “were written [by the same hand] around A.D. 485 or 486, as the post-consulate of Flavius Theodorichus is still found in date formulae as late as September 486” (*Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period A. D. 300-800* [London: University of London, 1987], 46).

<sup>25</sup> Σῆς is omitted in Ralhfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 115.

Amulets,” 210, no. 169; LDAB 3235; Ralhs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 114-15; TM 62075.

- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90: ὁ κατοικ[ῶ]ν ἐν [β]ση[θεία το]ῦ ὑψίστου ἐν σκέ[π]η τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀλίσθησ[ετ]αι ἐρ[εῖ] τῷ κ(υρί)ῳ μου **αντι[λη]μφορ** μ[ο]υ εἶ καὶ καταφυγή μου [ὁ] θεός μου βοηθός μου καὶ ἐλπῶ ἐπ’ αὐτόν ὅτι αὐτὸς **ρ]ησεται μοι** ἐκ **παγιδας** [θη]ρευτῶν καὶ ἀπὸ λόγου τ[α]ρα[χ]ῶδους ἐν τοῖς μεταφρένοις αὐτοῦ **υποσκιασ[ει] σ]αι** καὶ ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας αὐτοῦ ἐλπ<ε>ῖς ὄπλω **κυκλωση** σε ἢ ἀλήθ<ε>ια αὐτοῦ οὐ φοβη[θή]ση καὶ ἀπὸ φό[β]ου **νυκτηρινου** ἀπὸ βέλου(ς) πετομένου ἡ[μ]έρ[α]ς ἀ[πὸ] πράγματος ἐν **σκοτια** [= σκότει] διαπορευομ[έν]ου.<sup>26</sup>

**30. P. Princ. II 107 (=Suppl.Mag. 1: 78-79, no. 29)**

- a. Date: V-VI CE.<sup>27</sup>
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 13 x 15.5cm; (recto) perpendicular to the fibers; (verso) blank; folded six times from right to left; folded once from top to bottom.
- f. Contents: lacunose section, which references the ailment (fever with shivering [ρύγοπύρετον]); adjuration of Michael, the archangel; command to stay away from the wearer of the amulet; adjuration and request of deliverance for the client, “Taiolles, daughter of Isidoros”; LXX Ps 90:1-2; a jumbled version of the

<sup>26</sup> αντι[λη]μφορ (read ἀντιλήμπτωρ); ρ]ησεται (read ρύσεται); μοι (read με); παγιδας (read παγίδος); υποσκιασ[ει] (read ἐπισκιάσει); σ]αι (read σοι); κυκλωση (read κυκλώσει); νυκτηρινου (read νυκτερινού); σκοτια (read σκότει).

<sup>27</sup> Kase dated this manuscript to the IV-V CE (*Papyri*, 102).

beginning of the Lord's Prayer (Mt 6:9, 11 [no. 55]),<sup>28</sup> the Trishagion in accordance with the *Liturgy of St. Mark*,<sup>29</sup> list of sacred names.

- g. *Editio princeps*: Kase, *Papyri*, 102-103, no. 107.
- h. Bibliography: APIS princeton.apis.p5; de Bruyn, "Papyri," 168; idem, "The Use of the Sanctus," 17-18; idem and Dijkstra, "Greek Amulets," 194, no. 70; Roy Kotansky in *GMPT*, "PGM LXXXIII. 1-20" (English translation); Kraus, "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer*," 255-66; LDAB 5835; Preisendanz, "Zur Überlieferung," 214; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 334; Alan E. Samuel, "How Many Gnostics?" *BASP* 22 (1985): 297-322, at 317; *Suppl.Mag.* 1: 78-82, no. 29 (reedited);<sup>30</sup> TM 64605; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 310, no. 967.
- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90: ὁ κατικὸν ἐν βοήθια τοῦ ὑψίστου ἔνσκεπι τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ αὐλιστησετε. ἐρ<ε>ῖ τοῦ θεοῦ<sup>31</sup> <ἀντιλήμπτωρ μου εἶ> καὶ καταφυγή μου καὶ βοηθὼς μου,<sup>32</sup> ἐλπιδῶ εφ' αὐτῶν.<sup>33</sup>

### 31. PSI VI 719 (=PGM 2: 207-208, no. 19)

- a. For basic information, see no. 10.
- b. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90: ὁ κατοικῶν [ἐν βοηθεί]α τοῦ ὑψίστου καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.

<sup>28</sup> The verse numbers have been incorrectly labeled as Matthew 6:9-11 by Kase (*Papyri*, 103), LDAB (5835), Kotansky (*GMPT*, 300), de Bruyn and Dijkstra ("Greek Amulets," 194).

<sup>29</sup> For the Trishagion in the *Liturgy of St. Mark*, see Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, 132; Cuming, *Liturgy of St Mark*, 37-39. For a general discussion of the use of Sanctus in apotropaic rituals, see de Bruyn, "The Use of the Sanctus."

<sup>30</sup> Though Daniel and Maltomini note the missing phrases from the Lord's Prayer, they still reference the passage as Mt 6:9-11 (idem, 79).

<sup>31</sup> The edition of Rahlfs reads τῷ κυρίῳ here (*Septuaginta*, 100).

<sup>32</sup> The phrase, "καὶ βοηθὼς μου" is missing from the edition of Rahlfs (*Septuaginta*, 100).

<sup>33</sup> κατικὸν (read κατοικῶν); βοήθια (read βοηθεία); σκεπι (read σκέπη); αὐλιστησετε (read ἀλισηθήσεται); ἐλπιδῶ (read ἐλπῶ); εφ' (read ἐπ'); αὐτῶν (read αὐτόν).

### 32. PSI VII 759

- a. Date: V; VI CE.<sup>34</sup>
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 28 x 20.5 cm; writing runs perpendicular to the fibers; writing on both sides.<sup>35</sup>
- f. Contents: (verso) 2 unidentified lines in Coptic; citation of LXX Ps 90:1-4;<sup>36</sup> (recto) 18 lines of a homily (including citations of Ps 7:15b and Mt 19:29).
- g. *Editio princeps* (of verso): Kilpatrick, “Ps 90: 1-4 (LXX),” 224.
- h. Bibliography: H. I. Bell, A. D. Nock, and H. J. M. Milne, “Bibliography: Graeco–Roman Egypt A. Papyri (1924-1926),” *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 13 (1927): 84-121, at 92; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 179; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 212, no. 177; Degni, “PSI VII 759,” 159 (and plate LXVIII); La’da and A. Papatomas, “A Greek Papyrus Amulet,” 108; LDAB 3232; Naldini, *Documenti*, 29-30, no. 35 (with image); idem, “Ascesi biblica in un frammento adespoto (PSI 759),” in *Forma futuri: Studi in onore del Cardinale Michele*

---

<sup>34</sup> Though G. Vitelli, the original editor of the recto of PSI VII 759, assigned a fifth-century CE date to the artifact (*Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto: Papiri greci e latini*, vol. 7 [Firenze: Stabilimento Tipografico E. Ariani, 1925], 43-45), Paola Degni preferred a sixth-century CE date (“PSI VII 759,” in *Scrivere libri e documenti nel mondo antico: Mostra di papiri della Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Firenze, 25 Agosto-25 Settembre 1998*, ed. Guglielmo Cavallo, Edoardo Crisci, Gabriella Messeri, Rosario Pintaudi [Firenze: Edizioni Gonnelli, 1998], 159).

<sup>35</sup> It should be noted that the writing on the verso does not match that of the recto (Rahlf and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 117).

<sup>36</sup> The identification of LXX Ps 90:1-4 was by no means immediate. G. Vitelli provided a basic reconstruction of the text, but evidently did not recognize it as the opening lines of LXX Ps 90 (*Papiri greci e latini*, 45). The text on the verso was identified incorrectly (typographical error?) as “Ps. xl” by Bell, Nock, and Milne (“Bibliography,” 92). It was eventually identified correctly as the opening lines of LXX Ps 90 by Silvio Giuseppe Mercati, who also provided a basic reconstruction (“Ps. 90, 1-2 riconosciuto nel papiro PSI 739 [sic],” *Biblica* 8 [1927]: 96). Since G. D. Kilpatrick provided the first accurate edition of the verso (with proper identification), I have assigned the label *editio princeps* below to his edition (“Ps 90: 1-4 [LXX],” 224).

*Pellegrino* (Torino: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1975), 70-78; Mercati, "Ps. 90, 1-2," 96; Pintaudi, "PL III/501," 54; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 117-18; TM 64718; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 83, no. 196, and 355, no. 1176; J. W. Wevers, "Septuaginta-Forschungen seit 1954," *ThR* 33 (1968): 18-76, at 57.

- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90:<sup>37</sup> ὁ κατο]ικῶν ἐν βοηθ<ε>ία τοῦ ὑψιστοῦ ἐν σκεπεί τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ [αὐλισ]θή[σεται ἐρε]ι τοῦ κ(υρίο)υ ἀντιλύμπτωρ μου οἱ καὶ καταφυγή<sup>38</sup> [μου ὁ θεός μου, βοηθ]ός μου, ελπισω ἐπ' αὐτω ὅτι<sup>39</sup> αὐτως [ρύσεταιί με ἐκ παγί]δ[ος] θηρευτῶν καὶ ἀπ[ὸ] λόγ[ο]υ [ταραχῶδους ἐν τοῖς με]ταφρένοι[ς].<sup>40</sup>

**33. P. Vindob. G 2312, formerly P. Vindob. G 8032 (=Stud.Pal. XX 294; Rainer 528)**

- a. Date: VI-VII CE.<sup>41</sup>
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Fayum).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 14.9 x 6 cm;<sup>42</sup> writing on one side (recto?) perpendicular to the fibers; folded lengthwise into 5 parts and widthwise into 7 parts.

<sup>37</sup> This reproduction is based primarily on the edition of Kilpatrick ("Ps 90: 1-4 [LXX]," 224); however, I have modified a few elements in conjunction with the improvements of Pintaudi ("PL III/501," 54).

<sup>38</sup> Kilpatrick's edition reads, "καταφυγή" ("Ps 90: 1-4 [LXX]," 224).

<sup>39</sup> Kilpatrick's edition reads, "ἐπ' αὐτῶ ὅτι" ("Ps 90: 1-4 [LXX]," 224).

<sup>40</sup> σκεπεί (read σκέπη); οἱ (read εἶ); ελπισω (read ἐλπιδῶ?); αὐτω (read αὐτόν).

<sup>41</sup> C. F. G. Heinrici dated this papyrus from the fourth century CE (*Die Leipziger Papyrusfragmente der Psalmen* [Leipzig: Verlag der Durrischen Buchhandlung, 1903], 30). Most scholars have preferred the later date, however. This later date was first suggested by Wessely ("Monuments," 411).

<sup>42</sup> There is surprising disagreement about the physical dimensions of this artifact. Wessely ("Monuments," 411) provides the measurement 60 x 159 mm (=6 x 15.9 cm), van Haelst (*Catalogue*, 83) and Rahlfs/Frankel (*Verzeichnis*, 393) give the dimensions 6 x 14.7 cm, and Jutta Henner, Hans Förster, and Ulrike Horak (*Christliches mit Feder und Faden: Christlichen in Texten, Textilien und Alltagsgegenständen aus Ägypten; Katalog zur Sonderausstellung im Papyrusmuseum der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek aus Anlaß des 14. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie* [Wien: Österreichische Verlagsgesellschaft C. & E. Dworak, 1999], 48) and de Bruyn ("Papyri," 169; idem and Dijkstra, "Greek Amulets," 193) provide the dimensions 6 x 14.9 cm (though

- f. Contents: 7 star-shaped signs (above the text); citation of LXX Ps 90:1-2; citation of Rom 12:1-2a; citation of Jn 2:1-2a (**no. 59**); list of sacred names and characters.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Henrici, *Die Leipziger Papyrusfragmente*, 30-32.
- h. Bibliography: Aland, *Repertorium* 1: 337, var. 13; E. Bormann, “Amulet mit Stellen der heiligen Schrift,” in *Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer: Führer durch die Ausstellung*, ed. J. Karabacek et al. (Vienna: Hölder, 1894), 124-25, no. 528; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 169; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 192, no. 59; Henner, Förster, and Horak, *Christliches mit Feder und Faden*, 48, no. 38 (with photograph); Horak, *Illuminierte Papyri*, 248, no. 219; La’da and A. Papatomas, “A Greek Papyrus Amulet,” 109, no. 23; LDAB 3488; Leclercq, “Papyrus,” col. 1387-88; A. Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931), 15 (under P. Vindob. G 8032); Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 393; TM 62325; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 83, no. 195; C. Wessely, ed., *Catalogus papyrorum Raineri, Series Graeca*, pt. 1, *Textus graeci papyrorum, qui in libro “Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer-Führer durch die Ausstellung Wien 1894” descripti sunt*, rev. ed. (Amsterdam: Verlag Adolf M. Hakkert, 1969), 141, no. 294 (handwritten edition); idem, “Monuments,” 411, no. J.
- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90: ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν βοηθ<ε>ία τοῦ ὑψ[ί]σ<τ>ου ἐν σκέπη το[ῦ] θ(εο)ῦ τοῦ οὐ(ρα)νοῦ ἀλίσθεται ἐρ<ε>ῖ τῶ [κ](υρί)ω<sup>43</sup> ἀντιλήμπτωρ μου εἶ καὶ καταφυγή μου ὁ θ(εὸ)ς β[οη]θός<sup>44</sup> μου καὶ ἐλπιδὴ ἐπ’ αὐ[τ(όν)].

---

arrange according to w x h [=14.9 x 6 cm]). As I have not been able to measure P. Vindob. G 2312 myself, I have gone with most recent measurement of de Bruyn, who performed a manuscript autopsy on May 11, 2009.

<sup>43</sup> There is a lacuna in the text here, which is a point of controversy. The *editio princeps* (reflected above) reconstructs the first letter of the *nomina sacra* as “κ,” reflecting the vocabulary of Rahlfs’ edition of the LXX

### 34. Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet

- a. For basic information, see **no. 13**.
- b. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90: [ΠΕΣΜΟΥ ΝΤΩΔΗ] ΝΔΔΥΕΙ Τ ΠΕΤΟΥ[Η2 2Δ ΤΒΟΗΘΙ Δ ΜΠΕΤΧΟCΕ 4ΝΔ]ΩΩΠΕ 2Δ [ΘΔΙΒΕC ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΤΠ]Ε Ε4ΝΔΧΟΟC ΜΠΧΟΕΙC [ΧΕ ΝΤΚ ΠΑΡΕ4ΩΟΠΤ ΕΡΟΚ ΔΥΩ] ΠΔΜΔΜΠΩΤ ΠΔ[ΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΙΝΔΝΔ2ΤΕ Ε]ΡΟΚ.

### 35. SB I 970 (=PGM 2: 212, no. T2b; Cairo Museum, inv. 25864)

- a. Date: II-VII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: wood.
- d. Language: Greek (with a Coptic letter?).
- e. Physical Description: 3 x 3.8 cm; rectangular board with perforated handle; small indentations along the bottom; straight lines occur above and below the writing; writing on both sides.
- f. Contents: (face A) declination of βου̅ς,<sup>45</sup> LXX Ps 90:1; (face B) continuation of LXX Ps 90:1, ἀλλ[.].
- g. *Editio princeps*: J. G. Milne, ed., *Catalogue general des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, N<sup>os</sup> 9201-9400, 26001-26123, 33001-33037: Greek Inscriptions* (Oxford: University Press, 1905), 133, no. 33019 (drawing and basic description).

---

(*Septuaginta*, 100). Wessely, however, has reconstructed the *nomina sacra* as θ(ε)ω in both of his editions of the text. After examining the photograph in *Christliches mit Feder und Faden*, I concluded on the side of the *editio princeps*, as there are traces of the four points of the kappa. The German translation of P. Vindob. G 2312 in *Christliches mit Feder und Faden* also reflects the text of the *editio princeps*: “Er wird zum Herrn sagen...” (idem, 48).

<sup>44</sup> βοηθός is missing from the edition of Rahlfs (*Septuaginta*, 100). For a similar reading, see **nos. 28, 32** (cf. **no. 30**).

<sup>45</sup> On the word βου̅ς and its cognates, see e.g., W. Brashear, “Lesefrüchte,” *ZPE* 50 (1983): 97-107, at 102; Kraus, “βους, βαιυχωωχ und Septuaginta-Psalms 90?”; Giovanna Menci, “Un amuleto ‘Bous’ da Antinoe,” *ZPE* 159 (2007): 249-52; Nachtergaele, “Une amulette chrétienne”; P. J. Sijpesteijn, “Objects with Script in the Collection Moen,” *ZPE* 42 (1981): 111-12, at 112.

- h. Bibliography: Brashear, “Lese Früchte,” 101, no. 4a; Patrice Cauderlier, “Tablettes grecques d’Égypte: Inventaire,” in *Les tablettes à écrire de l’Antiquité à l’Époque Moderne*, ed. Élisabeth Lalou, *Bibliologia* 12 (Turnhout, Brepols, 1992), 63-94, at 89, no. 256, and 93, no. 305; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 169; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 190, 43; LDAB 3463; Nachtergaele, “Une amulette chrétienne,” 96, no. 8; PGM 2: 212, no. T2b; Friedrich Preisigke, ed., *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, vol. 1 (Strassburg: K. J. Trübner, 1915), 80, no. 970; TM 62302; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 82-3, no. 194.
- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90: ω κα†κον<sup>46</sup> χιψιστ[ου].<sup>47</sup>

**36. SB I 1572 (=University of Missouri-Columbia, no. 77.246)**

- a. Date: VI-VII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (near Saqqara).
- c. Material: silver.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: c. 25.5 x 2.5 cm; armband/bracelet consisting of eight medallions (diameter range: 7.7-7.9 cm) with LXX Ps 90:1 written between each medallion.
- f. Contents: band inscription: LXX Ps 90:1; scenes on eight medallions: Annunciation; Nativity; Trinity (?) with Chnoubis, ring signs, and pentalpha with

<sup>46</sup> This reconstruction is based on the work of W. Brashear (“Lese Früchte,” 101), who correctly interpreted what was previously thought to be a cross (e.g., PGM 2: 212, T2b) as the Coptic † (carrying the phonetic value of “ti”). Nachtergaele agrees with this interpretation (“Une amulette chrétienne,” 96).

<sup>47</sup> ω (read ó); κα†κον (read κατοικῶν); χιψιστ[ου] (read ὑψίστου). It should be highlighted that the reconstruction of χιψίστου is based on the work of Nachtergaele (“Une amulette chrétienne,” 96). Others have preferred the reconstruction κονχίψιστ[ου] (e.g., Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden* 1: 80, no. 970; PGM 2: 212, no. T2b). W. Brashear separates χι from ψίστου (“Lese Früchte,” 101).

“(ε)ῖς θεὸς<sup>48</sup> ὁ νικων (read νικῶν)”,<sup>49</sup> Baptism; Adoration of the Cross; Women at the Tomb; Holy Rider with pentalpha; Ascension.

- g. *Editio princeps*: Maspero, “Bracelets-amulettes,” 274-75, no. I.
- h. Bibliography: Leclercq, “Amulettes,” col. 1822; Kraus, “Fragmente eines-Amulett-Armbands,” 122-23, no. 14; Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden* 1: 136, no. 1572; TM 93798 (with SB I 1573); van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 81, no. 184; Gary Vikan, “Art, Medicine, and Magic in Early Byzantium,” *DOP* 38 (1984): 65-86, at 74-76 (and figure 8, drawing); idem, “Two Byzantine Amuletic Armbands and the Group to Which They Belong,” *The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 49/50 (1991/1992): 33-51, at 40 n. 11, no. 11 (and figure 10[a-i], photograph).
- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90: ὁ κατοικον ἐν βοιθια τοῦ <ὕ>ψίστου ἐν σκεπι τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐ[ρα]ν(οῦ).<sup>50</sup>

### 37. SB I 1574a

- a. Date: VI-VII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (near Saqqara).
- c. Material: silver.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: the dimensions of this artifact remain unpublished,<sup>51</sup> armband/bracelet consisting of eight medallions with LXX Ps 90:1 written between each medallion.

<sup>48</sup> θεός is incorrectly accented as θεὸς in Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden* 1: 136, no. 1573.

<sup>49</sup> This *Heis Theos* was separated from the rest of SB I 1572 and given a separate catalogue number by Preisigke (*Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden* 1: 136, no. 1573).

<sup>50</sup> κατοικον (read κατοικῶν); βοιθια (read βοηθεία); σκεπι (read σκέπη).

- f. Contents: band inscription: LXX Ps 90:1; scenes on eight medallions: Annunciation; Nativity; Trinity (?) and unclear signs; Baptism; Chnoubis (?) and unclear signs; Crucifixion; Women at the Tomb; Holy Rider.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Maspero, “Bracelets-amulettes,” 250-51, no. II.
- h. Bibliography: Kraus, “Fragmente eines-Amulett-Armbands,” 123, no. 15; Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden* 1: 136, no. 1574; TM 93799; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 81, no. 185; Vikan, “Art, Medicine, and Magic,” 74-75 n. 53 (and figure 9); idem, “Two Byzantine Amuletic Armbands,” 40 n. 11, no. 8 (and figure 9).
- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90: ὁ κατοικον ἐν βοηθείᾳ τοῦ ὑψίστου ἐν σ<κέπη>.<sup>52</sup>

**38. SB I 1575 (=SB I 1574b; Musée des Antiquités, Kairo, no. 40637)<sup>53</sup>**

- a. Date: VI-VII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (near Saqqara).
- c. Material: silver.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: the dimensions of this artifact remain unpublished; armband/bracelet consisting of eight medallions with LXX Ps 90:1 written between each medallion.

<sup>51</sup> Complete editions (with physical descriptions) of both SB I 1574a and SB I 1574b are desiderata.

<sup>52</sup> κατοικον (read κατοικῶν).

<sup>53</sup> The relationship between SB I 1574(a) and SB I 1575 is unclear. According to Maspero, these are two separate artifacts, the latter corresponding to Museum of Antiquities, Cairo, no. 40637 (“Bracelets-amulettes,” 251). Preisigke, however, lists SB I 1575 as one of the medallions on SB I 1574(a): “[a]uf einem Medaillon des vorgenannten Armbandes [=SB I 1574]” (*Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden* 1: 136). To confuse matters further, van Haelst conflates the testimonies of Maspero and Preisigke and provides three different catalogue numbers (*Catalogue*, 81, nos. 185-7): Maspero, “Bracelets-amulettes,” 250, no. II; idem, no. III; idem, 251 (=SB I 1575; Musée des Antiquités, Kairo, no. 40637). Trismegistos (no. 93800) and La’da and Papatomas follow suit (“A Greek Papyrus Amulet,” 109). As a result of this confusion, Thomas Kraus has labeled these artifacts as SB I 1574a and SB I 1574b respectively, concluding that 1574b is the same artifact as 1575, but that it is distinct from 1574a (“Fragmente eines-Amulett-Armbands,” 123).

- f. Contents: band inscription: LXX Ps 90:1; scenes on eight medallions: Annunciation; Nativity; Trinity (?) and unclear signs; Baptism; Chnoubis (?) and unclear signs; Crucifixion; Women at the Tomb; Holy Rider.<sup>54</sup>
- g. *Editio princeps*: Maspero, “Bracelets-amulettes,” 250-51, no. III (8).
- h. Bibliography: Kraus, “Fragmente eines-Amulett-Armbands,” 123, no. 16; La’da and Papathomas, “A Greek Papyrus Amulet,” 109, no. 20 [=SB I 1574b]; idem, no. 21 [=SB I 1575]; Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden* 1: 136, no. 1575; TM 93800 (=SB I 1574b); idem, 93801 (=SB I 1575); van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 81, no. 186 (=SB I 1574b); idem, 81, no. 187 (=SB I 1575); Vikan, “Two Byzantine Amuletic Armbands,” 40 n. 11, no. 7.
- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90: ὁ κατ[οι]κῶν ἐν βοηθῶν τοῦ ὑψίστου.<sup>55</sup>

**39. SB I 1576 (Musée des Antiquités égyptiennes, Kairo, no. 7025)**

- a. Date: VI-VII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (near Saqqara).
- c. Material: iron.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 7.1 cm; armband/bracelet with four orb-shaped medallions (2 cm) with LXX Ps 90:1 written between each orb-medallion.
- f. Contents: band inscription: LXX Ps 90:1; scenes on four orb-shaped medallions: Women at the Tomb (?); image destroyed; Resurrection of Lazarus (?); Holy Rider.

<sup>54</sup> The identical descriptions given for SB I 1574 and SB I 1575 reflects an inference from the edition of Maspero, who described both artifacts simultaneously, noting that the difference between the two was minimal (“Bracelets-amulettes,” 250). Maspero also contends that these two artifacts were written by the same individual (idem).

<sup>55</sup> βοηθῶν (read βοηθεία).

- g. *Editio princeps*: Josef Strzygowski, ed., *Catalogue general des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, nos. 7001-7394 et 8742-9200: Koptische Kunst* (Vienne: Imprimerie Adolf Hozhausen, 1904), 331-32, no. 7025 (and figure 403).
- h. Bibliography: Kraus, “Fragmente eines-Amulett-Armbands,” 123, no. 17; La’da and Papathomas, “A Greek Papyrus Amulet,” 109, no. 22; Maspero, “Bracelets-amulettes,” 252, no IV; TM 93802; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 81, no. 188;<sup>56</sup> Vikan, “Two Byzantine Amuletic Armbands,” 40 n. 11, no. 10.
- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90: ὁ **κατυκον** ἐν βοι<η>θ<εῖα>.<sup>57</sup>

**40. SB I 2021 (=PGM 2: 212, no. T2a)**

- a. Date: unknown.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: wood.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 3.5 x 5.5 cm;<sup>58</sup> writing on both sides; board with perforated handle.
- f. Contents: (face A) declination of βουῆς; (face B) LXX Ps 90:1, αμιταφου.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Giacomo Lumbroso, *Documenti greci del Regio Museo Egizio di Torino* (Torino: Stamperia Reale, 1869), 23-24, no. IV.10 (=idem, “Documenti greci del Regio Museo Egizio di Torino,” *AAT* 4 [1868-1869], 683-721, at 701-702, no. IV.10).
- h. Bibliography: Brashear, “Lesefrüchte,” 101, 4b; Cauderlier, “Tablettes grecques,” 89, no. 255 and 93, no. 304; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 169; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek

<sup>56</sup> Here van Haelst incorrectly labels SB I 1576 as “M. Strzygowski, *Koptische Kunst*, n° 7022, p. 331.”

<sup>57</sup> κατυκον (read κατοικῶν).

<sup>58</sup> Kraus, “βους, βαινχωωχ und Septuaginta-Psalm 90?” 483.

Amulets,” 190, no. 42; LDAB 3449; Edmond Le Blant, “Tablai égyptiennes a inscriptions grecques,” *Rev. Arc.* (2<sup>nd</sup> ser.) 29 (1875): 231-42, 304-12, at 241-42, no. 80;<sup>59</sup> Leclercq, “Amulettes,” cols. 1821-22; Giacomo Lumbroso, *Del papiro greco LXIII del Louvre sulla seminataura delle terre regie in Egitto e di alcune iscrizioni inedite del Museo Egiziano di Firenze* (Turin: Stamperia Reale, 1879), 26; Nachtergaele, “Une amulette chrétienne,” 95, no. 6; PGM 2: 212, T2a; Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden* 1: 169, no. 2021; TM 62288; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 82, no. 193.

- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90: ου κατηκων ἐν βοηθεια δ’ εψίστου.<sup>60</sup>

**41. SB I 3573 (=T. Berol. inv. 2148)**

- a. Date: VII-IX CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: wood.
- d. Language: Greek (with a Coptic letter?).
- e. Physical Description: 2.3 x 4.1cm (depth, 0.4 cm); writing on both sides; rectangular board with perforated handle.
- f. Contents: (face A) declination of βοῦς; (face B) βοῦς, LXX Ps 90:1 (?); αλαιλε.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Le Blant, “Tablai égyptiennes,” 306, no. 86.
- h. Bibliography: Königliche Museen zu Berlin, *Ausführliches Verzeichnis der ägyptischen Altertümer und Gipsabgüsse*, 2 Aufl. (Berlin: W. Spemann, 1899), 394, no. 2148; F. Bilabel, ed., *Veröffentlichungen aus den badischen Papyrus-*

<sup>59</sup> This bibliographical reference is incorrectly associated with SB I 970 (see **no. 35**) in LDAB and TM.

<sup>60</sup> ου (read ó); κατηκων (read κατοικῶν); βοηθία (read βοηθεία); εψίστου (read ὑψίστου). The reconstruction δ’ ἐψίστου [=ὑψίστου] is based on the work of W. Brashear (“Lese Früchte,” 101; see also Nachtergaele, “Une amulette chrétienne,” 95). Earlier commentators connected these two lexemes to form δεψίστου (e.g., Lumbroso, *Documenti greci*, 24; PGM 2: 212, no. T2a; Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden* 1: 169).

*Sammlungen*, vol. 4, *Griechische Papyri* (Heidelberg: Verlag der Universitätsbibliothek, 1924), 47-48; Brashear, “Lesefrüchte,” 102, no. 4c; Cauderlier, “Tablettes grecques,” 88, no. 254, and 93 no. 303; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 169; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 190, no. 52; Kraus, “Βουσ, Βαιυχωωχ und Septuaginta-Psalm 90?” 483, no. 10; Leclercq, “Amulettes,” col. 1822 (figure 488); LDAB 3443; Nachtergaele, “Une amulette chrétienne,” 96, no. 7; Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden* 1: 243, no. 3573; TM 62282; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 82, no. 192.

- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 90 (?): **δ/χιψιστου**.<sup>61</sup>

## I. 2. Other Psalmic *Incipits*

### 42. The London Hay Cookbook (=London, Private Collection Hay 10391)

- a. Date: VI/VII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Thebes?).<sup>62</sup>
- c. Material: leather.
- d. Language: Coptic.
- e. Physical Description: 19 x 64.5 cm; a recipe book (or “cookbook”), containing numerous spells written on both the “recto” and the “verso”; several cracks with larger gaps on the edges and in the middle.
- f. Contents: invocation of the guardians; instructions for performance (including proper ingredients, actions, timing, invocations, and adjurations); ritual

<sup>61</sup> δ/χιψιστου (read ὕψιστου). As Le Blant noted, the initial letter of this word closely resembles the Coptic χ (“Tablai égyptiennes,” 306). This Coptic reconstruction was preferred by Brashear (Brashear, “Lesefrüchte,” 102).

<sup>62</sup> Walter E. Crum writes, “In the case of Hay’s MSS., the presumption is that they were procured at Thebes, but as to this no certain evidence is now to be at hand” (“Forward” to Kropp, *Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte* 1: xii).

instructions for particular occasions (e.g., “a brain that hurts” [ΟΥΔΝΚΕΦΔΛΛΟC  
ΕΦΤΤΚΔC],<sup>63</sup> discharge [ΟΥΖΡΕΥΜΔ]<sup>64</sup>); LXX Ps 69:1; invocations; further  
occasions; sacred names; doxology; sacred names.

- g. *Editio princeps*: Kropp, *Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte* 1: 55-62, no. M;  
idem, II, 40-53, no. 14.
- h. Bibliography: Crum, “Forward” to Kropp, *Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte* 1:  
xii; David Frankfurter and Marvin Meyer in *ACM*, 263-69, no. 127 (description  
and English translation); LDAB 100015; TM 100015.<sup>65</sup>
- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 69:<sup>66</sup> ΠΝΟΥΤΕ †ΖΤΗΚ ΕΤΔΒΟΙΘΙΑ.<sup>67</sup>

**43. O. Medinet Habu 1175 + Medinet Habu 935 + London, University College, Petrie  
Museum UC 62851 (formerly London, University College, Petrie Museum 13)**

- a. Date: VII/VIII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Medinet Habu).
- c. Material: ostracon of smooth red ware.
- d. Language: Greek and Coptic.
- e. Physical Description: (overall measurement) 20 x 23.5 cm; originally a single  
sherd (now extant in three fragments); writing on one side.

---

<sup>63</sup> Translation Frankfurter and Meyer, *ACM*, 267.

<sup>64</sup> In order to cure this ailment (which is aligned with a blood flow [Ο(Υ)ΚΩ ΠCΟΦ]), the ritual specialist proscribes a *historiola* (specifically a *similia similibus* formula), which draws a ritual comparison between Elijah stopping the Jordan River with his staff and crossing it like dry land (cf. 2 Kings 2:8) and the cessation of the discharge. For a similar *historiola* against discharge, see P. Heid. inv. G. 1101.

<sup>65</sup> Images of the “recto” and “verso” (and a brief description) of the “London Hay Cookbook” are available on the British Museum’s website:  
[http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search\\_the\\_collection\\_database/search\\_object\\_details.aspx?objectid=110128&partid=1&output=Places%2F!!%2FOR%2F!!%2F35545%2F!!%2F35545-3-2%2F!!%2FFound%2FAcquired+Thebes%2F!!%2F!!%2F!!%2F&orig=%2Fresearch%2Fsearch\\_the\\_collection\\_database%2Fadvanced\\_search.aspx&currentPage=6&numpages=10](http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/search_object_details.aspx?objectid=110128&partid=1&output=Places%2F!!%2FOR%2F!!%2F35545%2F!!%2F35545-3-2%2F!!%2FFound%2FAcquired+Thebes%2F!!%2F!!%2F!!%2F&orig=%2Fresearch%2Fsearch_the_collection_database%2Fadvanced_search.aspx&currentPage=6&numpages=10)

<sup>66</sup> LXX Ps 69:1 is prefaced in this artifact by the phrase, “ΖΝ ΠΕΨΔΛΜΟ.”

<sup>67</sup> ΕΤΔΒΟΙΘΙΑ (read ΕΤΔΒΟΗΘΙΑ).

- f. Contents: cross; LXX Ps 30:2-8 (Greek); cross; LXX Ps 30:2a, 3-7a (Coptic); cross; LXX Ps 30:7b-8a; cross.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Cornelia Eva Römer and Monika Hasitzka, “Psalm 30, 2-8 in Greek and Coptic: Joined Ostraca in London and Chicago,” *APF* 53 (2007): 201-203 (and plate 7).<sup>68</sup>
- h. Bibliography: Crum, *Varia coptica*, 7, no. 1 (only London, University College, Petrie Museum UC 62851); de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 175; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 204, no. 137; LDAB 3367; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 56 (only O. Medinet Habu 1175); TM 62207; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 67, no. 132 (only O. Medinet Habu 1175); Wikgren, “Two Ostraca Fragments,” 181-84 (and plate Vb).<sup>69</sup>
- i. *Incipits* of LXX Ps 30: (**Greek**) ἐπὶ σοί, κύριε, ἤλπισα, μὴ καταισχυθείην] εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· ἐν τῇ] δικαιοσύνη σου] ρηση με κ(αὶ) ἐξελοῦμαι. κλινον [πρὸς με] τὸ οὖς σου, τάχυνον τ(οῦ) ἐξελέσθαι [με·] γενοῦ με εἰς θ(εὸν) ὑπερασπιστὴν κ(αὶ) εἰς οἶκον καταφυγῆς τοῦ σώσαί με. ὡτι κραταιωσις κ(αὶ) καταφυγή μου εἶ σὺ κ(αὶ) ἕνεκεν τ(οῦ) ὀνόματός σου ὀδηγήσ<ε>ις με κ(αὶ) διαθρέψεις μοι· ἐξάξ<ε>ις με ἐκ παγίδος ταύτης, ἧς ἔκρυψάν μοι, ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὑπερασπιστής μου), κύριε. εἰς χεῖρας σου παραθήσομαι τὸ πν(εῦμ)ά μου· ἐλυτρώσω με, κύριε ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας. ἐμ{ε}ίσησας τοὺς διαφυλά<σ>σοντας ματαιότητος δι[ὰ] κενῆς· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ κ(υρί)ῳ

<sup>68</sup> Though London, University College, Petrie Museum UC 62851 and O. Medinet Habu 1175 had been published by Walter Crum (*Varia coptica: Texts, Translations, Indexes* [Aberdeen: The University Press, 1939], 7, no. 1) and Allen Wikgren (“Two Ostraca Fragments of the Septuagint Psalter,” *JNES* 5 [1946]: 181-84) respectively, Römer and Hasitzka were the first to recognize that these two ostraca (along with O. Medinet Habu 935) originally formed a single artifact. What is more, Römer and Hasitzka were the first to edit O. Medinet Habu 935. I have, therefore, reserved the designation *editio princeps* for the complete edition of Römer and Hasitzka.

<sup>69</sup> Wikgren only provides an edition of O. Medinet Habu 1175.

ἤλπισα· ἀγαλλιάσομαι κ(αὶ) εὐφρανθήσομαι ἐπὶ τῷ ἐλέει σου. (Coptic)<sup>70</sup>  
 ΕΙΚΔ ΖΤΗ Ε'ΡΟΚ' ΠΧΟΕΙC ΜΠΡΤΡΑΧΕΙ ΨΙΠΕ ΨΔ ΕΝΕΖ ΝΔΖΜΕΤ ΝΓΤΟΥ'ΧΟΪ'  
 ΖΝ ΤΕΚΔΙΚΔΙΟCΥΝΗ ΡΙΚΕ ΜΠΕΚΜΔΔΧΕ ΕΡΟΪ ΝΓΒΕΠΗ ΕΤΟΥΧΟΙ ΧΕ ΝΤΟΚ ΠΕ  
 ΠΑΤΔΧΡΟ ΔΥΩ ΠΔΜΔ ΜΠΩΤ ΕΤΒΕ ΠΕΚΡΔΝ ΚΝΔΧΙ ΜΟΕΪΤ ΖΗΤ ΔΥΩ ΝΓCΔΝΟΥΩΤ  
 ΚΝΔΝΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝ ΤΕΙΒΟΡΒC ΝΤΔΥΖΟΠC ΕΡΟΪ ΧΕ ΝΤΟΚ ΠΕ ΤΔΝΔΨΤΕ ΠΧΟΕΙC  
 †ΝΔΒΟΙΛΕ ΜΠΔΠΝ(ΕΥΜ)Δ ΕΝΕΚCΙΧ ΠΧΟΕΙC ΔΚCΨΤΕ ΜΜΟΙ ΠΧΟΕΙC ΠΝΟΥΤ(Ε)  
 ΝΤΜΕ ΔΚΜΕCΤΕ ΝΕΤΖΔΡΕΖ ΕΜΠΕΤΨΟΥΕΙΤ <ΕΠΧΙΝΧΗ> [Δ]ΝΟΚ ΔΕ ΔΙΚΔ ΖΤΗ  
 ΕΠΧ(ΟΕΙ)C †ΝΔΤΕΛΗΛ ΤΔΕΥΦΡΔΝΕ ΕΧΜ ΠΕΚΝΔ.<sup>71</sup>

#### 44. O. Medinet Habu 1269 (= *JNES* 5 [1946] 181-2)

- a. Date: VI/VII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Medinet Habu).
- c. Material: ostracon of red-orange medium-fired clay.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 9.7 x 5.7 cm; writing on one side.
- f. Contents: LXX Ps 20:2a-5.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Wikgren, "Two Ostraca Fragments," 181-82 (and plate Va).
- h. Bibliography: de Bruyn, "Papyri," 175; idem and Dijkstra, "Greek Amulets," 206, no. 145; LDAB 3132; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 56-57; TM 61973; Kurt Treu, "Christliche Papyri (1940-1967)," *APF* 19 (1969): 169-206, at 176; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 64, no. 122; Wevers, "Septuaginta-Forschungen," 135f.

<sup>70</sup> The Coptic is missing LXX Ps 30:2b and ends at 30:8a. The Cross at the end likely indicates that no further text was intended.

<sup>71</sup> ρηση (read ῥῆσάι); μοι (read με); με (read μοι); ωτι (read ὅτι) κραταιωσις (read κραταίωμά); ΕΙΚΔ (read ΔΙΚΔ).

- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 20: [κ(ύρι)ε, ἐν τῇ δυ]ν[άμει σου εὐφρανθήσεται ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ οἰπη τῶ [σωτηρίῳ σου ἀγαλλιάσεται]ι σφρόδρα. τὴν [ἐπιθυ]μίαν [τῆς ψυχῆς] αὐτοῦ ἔδωκας αὐτῶ καὶ τ(ῆ)ν [δέησιν τῶ]ν χ<ε>ιλεων αὐτοῦ οὐχ ῥύστη[σας αὐτό]ν, οἰδι προέφθασας αὐτὸν [ἐν εὐλογ]ιης χρηστότητός σου. [Διάψαλμα.] ηθηκας ηπη δην κηφ[αλην αὐτο]ῦ στέφανος ηκ ληθο[υ τιμίου.] Ζωὴν ιτησσαδω σε, κ[αὶ ἔδωκας] αὐτου μακρότητα [ἡμερῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶ]να καὶ εἰς [τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος. ἀμήν].<sup>72</sup>

#### 45. P. Heid. inv. G 1367 + 2259

- a. Date: V/VI CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 10.7 x 2.4 cm; (recto) writing perpendicular to the fibers; (verso) blank; *transversa charta*.
- f. Contents: LXX Ps 80:1-4.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Georg Schmelz, “Septuaginta-Fragmente aus der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung,” *ZPE* 116 (1997): 61-65, at 61-62 (and plate I 1).
- h. Bibliography: de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 177; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 214, no. 185; LDAB 3274; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 145; Cornelia Römer, “Christliche Texte II (1996-1997),” *APF* 44 (1998): 127-39, at 130 (=AT 4; 117a); TM 62114.

<sup>72</sup> οἰπη (read ἐπί); οἰδι (read ὄτι); εὐλογ]ιης (read εὐλογίας); ηθηκας (read ἔθηκας); ηπη (read ἐπί) δην (read τῆν) κηφ[αλην] (read κεφαλῆν); ηκ (read ἐκ); ληθο[υ] (read λίθου); ιτησσαδω (read ἡτήσατό); αὐτου (read αὐτῶ).

- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 80: [εἰς τὸ τέλος, ὑπὲρ τῶν ληνῶν· τῷ Ἄσαφ ψα(λμός)·  
[ἀγαλλιᾶσθε τῷ θε(ε)ῷ τῷ βοηθῷ ἡμ]ῶν ἀλαλάξατε του θε(ε)ου Ἰακώβ·  
[λάβετε ψαλμὸν καὶ δότε τύμπανον ψαλτήριον τερπνὸν μετὰ κιθάρας·  
σ]αλ[πι]ζατε ἐν νεομενιαν σάλ[πι]γγι ἐν εὐσήμεν ἡμέρα ἑορτῆς ἡμῶν].<sup>73</sup>

**46. P. Rain. ex. no. 188, box 201**

- a. Date: VI/VII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Fayum).
- c. Material: parchment.
- d. Language: Coptic.
- e. Physical Description: 11 x 2 cm; writing on both sides.
- f. Contents: (flesh side) cross; first portion of LXX Ps 109:1;<sup>74</sup> (hair side) second portion of LXX Ps 109:1; ritual signs.
- g. *Editio princeps*: J. Krall, “Aus einer koptischen Klosterbibliothek,” *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer* 1 (1897): 62-72, at 68.
- h. Bibliography: Richter, “Verwendung von Psalmen,” 288; Stegemann, *Die koptischen Zaubertexte*, 25-26 (description), and 62-63 (edition), no. XLII [105] (and plate III.1); Arthur Adolphe Vaschalde, “Ce qui a été publié des versions Coptes de la Bible: Troisième Groupe; Textes en Moyen Égyptien,” *Le Muséon* 46 (1933): 299-306, at 301.

<sup>73</sup> του θε(ε)ου (read τῷ θε(ε)ῷ); σ]αλ[πι]ζατε (read σαλπίσατε); νεομενιαν (read νεομηνία). The dative τῷ θε(ε)ῷ is not only reflective of Rahlfs version of LXX Ps 80:2 (*Septuaginta*, 88), but it also reflects the preferred case of the verb ἀλαλάζω (cf. Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, et al., *Greek-English Lexicon with a Revised Supplement* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996], 60).

<sup>74</sup> On the basis of the passage cited, Stegemann argued that this “Schutzamulett” was likely used by a soldier (*Die koptischen Zaubertexte*, 62). Siegfried G. Richter, however, correctly notes that this passage does not necessarily suggest a military context, as it would be appropriate for a variety of situations (“Verwendung von Psalmen,” 288). For the amuletic usage of portions of LXX Ps 109, see e.g., P. Vindob. 27290 A (no. 50).

- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 109: ΠΕΧΕ ΠΘ̄C̄ ΜΠΑΘ̄C̄<sup>75</sup> ΧΕ 2ΜΔΔC ΝCΔ<sup>76</sup> ΟΥΙΝΕΜ ΜΜΔĪ  
 ΨΔΝ†ΚΩ ΝΝΕΚΧΕΧΕ ΤΗΛΟΥ<sup>77</sup> ΝCΔΠΕCΗΤ ΝΝΕΚCΔΛΛΥΧ.<sup>78</sup>

**47. P. Ross.-Georg. 1.1 (Kekelidze Manuscript Institute inv. no. 220)**

- a. Date: VI CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 13 x 8.5 cm; (recto) writing perpendicular to the fibers; (verso) blank; traces of folding.
- f. Contents: LXX Ps 49:1b-7c.
- g. *Editio Princeps*: G. Zereteli and O. Krueger, eds., *Papyri russischer und georgischer Sammlungen (P. Ross.-Georg.)*, vol. 1, *Literarische Texte* (Tiflis: Georgisches Museum, 1925), 1-2, no. 1.
- h. Bibliography: Aland, *Repertorium* 1: 334, var. 10; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 172;<sup>79</sup> idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 200, no. 112;<sup>80</sup> LDAB 3343; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 369; TM 62183; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 73, no. 152.

<sup>75</sup> The Greek version of this psalm has κύριος instead of θεός (cf. MT Ps 110:1: נאם יהוה לאדני; Vul. 109:1: Dixit Dominus Domino meo). According to the edition of the Coptic Psalter by E. A. Wallis Budge, the Coptic text of LXX Ps 109:1 should correspond to the Septuagint here (*The Earliest Known Coptic Psalter: The Text, in the Dialect of Upper Egypt, Edited from the Unique Papyrus Codex Oriental 5000 in the British Museum* [London: Kegan Paul, Trench, and Trübner & Co., 1898], 121). Thus P. Rain. ex. no. 188, box 201 provides a rather interesting variant of LXX Ps 109:1. If the ritual specialist was not relying on a manuscript which had ΠΘ̄C̄, the replacement of “God” for “Lord” may have been intentionally chosen to highlight the divinity of Christ, whom the specialist thought was intended by ΠΧΘΕΙC̄ (or ὁ κύριος) in his/her *Volage*.

<sup>76</sup> British Museum Or. 5000 has 21 instead of ΝCΔ (Budge, *Coptic Psalter*, 121).

<sup>77</sup> The emphasis on the victory over “all” (ΤΗΛΟΥ [= Sah. ΤΗΡΟΥ]) one’s enemies is extant neither in the Greek Ps 109:1 nor in the Coptic text of British Museum Or. 5000 (cf. Budge, *Coptic Psalter*, 121).

<sup>78</sup> ΟΥΙΝΕΜ (read ΟΥΝΔΜ). It should also be noted that ἸΝΝΕΚΟΥΕΡΗΤΕ (instead of ΝΝΕΚCΔΛΛΥΧ) is used for τῶν ποδῶν σου in Budge’s edition of LXX Ps 109:1 (*Coptic Psalter*, 121).

<sup>79</sup> De Bruyn incorrectly identifies P.Ross.-Georg. 1 as “PGM P16.”

<sup>80</sup> De Bruyn and Dijkstra incorrectly identify P.Ross.-Georg. 1.1 as “PGM P16.”

- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 49: [θεὸς θεῶν κύριος ἐλάλ]ησεν καὶ **εκαλησεν** τὴν γῆν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν [ἡλίου καὶ μέχρι δυσμῶν. ἐκ Σιων ἢ εὐπρέπεια τῆς ὠραιότητος αὐ]τοῦ ὁ θεὸς ἐμφανῶς ἤ[ξ]ει ὁ θεὸς [ἡμῶν καὶ οὐ παρασιωπήσεται· πῦρ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ καυθήσ]ετ[αι] καὶ κύκλω αὐτοῦ καταιγὶς σφόδρα [προσκαλέσεται τὸν οὐρανὸν ἄνω καὶ τὴν γῆν διακρίναι τὸν λ]αὸν αὐτοῦ **συναγαγεται αυτου** του<ς> ὁσίους αὐ[τοῦ] τοὺς διατιθεμένους τὴν διαθήκην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ θυσίαις. καὶ ἀν]αγγελοῦσιν [ο]ἱ οὐρανοὶ τ[ῆ]ν διαθήκην<sup>81</sup> αὐτοῦ [ὅτι <ὁ> θεὸς κριτῆς ἐστίν. ἄκουσον λαός μου καὶ λαλήσω σοι Ἰσραηλ καὶ διαμ]αρτυρωμαι σοι ὁ θ(εὸ)ς ὁ θ(εό)ς σου ε<ί>μι ἐγώ.<sup>82</sup>

**48. P. Vindob. 3089 (= MPER N.S. XVII 1)**

- a. Date: VI/VII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: parchment.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 7.3 x 5 cm (sheet); a single sheet folded to make two leaves; writing on all sides; Ps 1:3-4 on leaf one (recto and verso); Ps 4:2 on leaf two (recto and verso [plus three unidentified letters]).
- f. Contents: (leaf one, both sides) Ps 1:3-4; (leaf two, both sides) cross; Ps 4:2; unidentified letters.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Kurt Treu and Johannes Diethart, eds., *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (Papyrus Erzherzog*

<sup>81</sup> Rahlfs edition reads δικαιοσύνην (*Septuaginta*, 51).

<sup>82</sup> εκαλησεν (read ἐκάλεσεν); συναγαγεται (read συναγάγετε); αυτου (read αὐτῶ).

*Rainer*): *Griechische Literarische Papyri Christlichen Inhaltes* 2.1, *Textband* and 2.2, *Tafelband* (Wien: Verlag Brüder Hollinek, 1993), 15, no. 1 (and plate I).

- h. Bibliography: de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 180; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 206, no. 149; LDAB 3388; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 395; TM 62228.
- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 4: ἐν τῷ επικαλησθε με οισουκουσε μου ὁ θε(εὸς) τῆς δικαιοσυνης μο[υ]· ἐν θλίψει ἐπλάτηνάς μο[ι]· (οι)κτιρισω(ν) με καὶ οισακουσον τῆς προσευχῆς μου.<sup>83</sup>

**49. P. Vindob. G 26166 (MPER N.S. IV 11)**

- a. Date: V/VI CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Fayum).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 9 x 8 cm; writing on both sides; (recto) writing perpendicular to the fibers; (verso) writing perpendicular to the fibers; folded several times; there is a hole in the middle of the papyrus, through which a cord may have been threaded.
- f. Contents: (recto) χμγ; cross; LXX Ps 62:2-3; (verso) cross; Ps 3:5-6; ritual sign.
- g. *Editio princeps*: Peter Sanz, ed., *Griechische literarische Papyri: Christlichen Inhaltes*, vol 1, *Biblical, Väterchriften und Verwandtes*, MPER N.S. IV (Baden bei Wien: Rudolf M. Rohrer Verlag, 1946), 26-27, no. 11.

---

<sup>83</sup> επικαλησθε (read ἐπικαλεῖσθαί); οισουκουσε (read εἰσήκουσέν); δικαιοσυνης (read δικαιοσύνης); (οι)κτιρισω(ν) (read οἰκτίρησόν); οισακουσον (read εἰσάκουσαν).

- h. Bibliography: Aland, *Repertorium*, 1: 335, var. 11; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 173; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 198, no. 96; LDAB 3291; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 409-10; TM 62131; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 74-75, no. 160.
- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 62: ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεός μου πρὸς σ]ε̅ ὀρθρισὸ ετηψ[η]σεν σε ἢ ψηχη μου. ποσα[π]λος {σ}ε<sup>84</sup> ἢ σάρξ ἰμου εγ γῆ ἐρήμ[ω] (καὶ) απατω (καὶ) ἀνηδρο ουτος ἐν τῷ ἀγίῳ ὦ{π}φθην ση τοῦ εἰτιν τὴν δύναμίν σου (καὶ) τὴν δόξαν [σου].<sup>85</sup>

**50. P. Vindob. 27290A (MPER N.S. IV 23)**

- a. Date: VI CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Hermopolis Magna).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 4.5 x 9.5 cm; writing on both sides; (recto) writing perpendicular to the fibers; (verso) writing parallel with the fibers; the papyrus was folded twice.
- f. Contents: (recto) cross (staurogram); Ps 2:7; LXX Ps 109:3; LXX Ps 86:2, 5;<sup>86</sup> LXX Ps 64:2; a “non-biblical” doxology: σαλπυξετε αὐτὸ<ν> (καὶ)

<sup>84</sup> The *editio princeps* reads πασαπλοσε. The omission of the second sigma may signal an instance of parablepsy. That πασαπλος σε was originally intended is strengthened by the frequency with which the ritual specialist has the second-person accusative σε instead of the dative σοι. This tendency corresponds to the preference for the accusative above all other cases in Byzantine Greek (Sanz, *Griechische literarische Papyri*, 27).

<sup>85</sup> ὀρθρισὸ (read ὀρθρίζω); ετηψ[η]σεν (read ἐδίψησέν); σε (read σοι); ψηχη (read ψυχῆ); ποσα[π]λος (read πασαπλῶς); ἰμου (read μου); εγ (read ἐν); απατω (read ἀβάτω); ἀνηδρο (read ἀνύδρω); ουτος (read οὕτως); ση (read σοι); εἰτιν (read ἰδεῖν).

<sup>86</sup> I have not considered LXX Ps 86:2 in P. Vindob. 27290A an *incipit* because both the title (Τοῖς υἱοῖς Κορε ψαλμὸς ᾠδῆς) and opening line (οἱ θεμέλιοι αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις) are missing.

ευφρανθητο (καὶ) δουλεύσατε [(καὶ)] ὑμνήσατε εἰς παντ[α]ς αἰῶνας;<sup>87</sup>

(verso) another phrase: σὲ ἀκαπα κίριος;<sup>88</sup> ritual symbols.

- g. *Editio princeps*: Sanz, *Griechische literarische Papyri: Christlichen Inhaltes*, 40-42, no. 23.
- h. Bibliography: Aland, *Repertorium* 1: 329, var. 5; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 173; de Bruyn and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 198, no. 98; LDAB 3350; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 412-13; TM 62190; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 56, no. 93.<sup>89</sup>
- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 64: σου πρέπ(ε)ι ὕμνος (ἐν Σιῶν).<sup>90</sup>

### 51. P. Vindob. G 29 435

- a. Date: V/VI CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Heracleopolis?).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 13.3 x 19.2 cm; (recto) writing parallel with the fibers; (verso) is blank.
- f. Contents: unidentified text (εἰλεξ...); LXX Ps 24:15; LXX Ps 49:1-2 (with ἐντεσεω...).
- g. *Editio princeps*: Rosario Pintaudi, “LXX Ps 24, 15; 49, 1-2 in un papiro di Vienna (P.Vindob. G. 29435),” *Sacris Erudiri* 31 (1989-1990): 357-58.

---

<sup>87</sup> σαλπυξετε (read σαλπίζετε); ευφρανθητο (read εὐφράνθητε).

<sup>88</sup> ἀκαπα (read ἀγαπα); κίριος (read κύριος).

<sup>89</sup> Van Haelst unhelpfully lists LXX Pss 31:11 and 96:12—presumably corresponding to the two “non-biblical” elements in P. Vindob. 27290A—among (LXX) Pss 2:7, 109:3, 86:2, 5, and 64:2. Though there may be allusions to these two psalms in the two phrases, the connection is tenuous at best. For a similar approach to finding “biblical” parallels, see Biondi, “Le citazioni bibliche.”

<sup>90</sup> σου (read σοί).

- h. Bibliography: de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 180; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 214, no. 181; LDAB 3294; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 414-15; TM 62134.
- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 49: ὁ θε(εὸ)ς θε(εῶ)ν κ(ύρι)ος ἐλάλησεν καὶ ελαλησεν τη γη<sup>91</sup> [ἐ]κ Σιων ἢ εὐπρέπια τῆς ὠρεώτητος α[ὐτοῦ ὁ] θε(εὸ)[ς] ἤξει ἐμφανῶς ἐντεσεω[...].<sup>92</sup>

## 52. P. Vindob. G 39205 (= P. Bingen 16)

- a. Date: V/VI CE.<sup>93</sup>
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: parchment.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 11.3 x 7.2 cm (originally 14 x 13 cm); writing on both sides; the artifact was folded seven times.<sup>94</sup>
- f. Contents: (flesh side) LXX Ps 43:21-24; (hair side) LXX Ps 43:27-44:2.

<sup>91</sup> The Septuagint text according to the edition of Rahlfs includes the following phrase after τὴν γῆν and before ἐκ: ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου καὶ μέχρι δυσμῶν (*Septuaginta*, 51).

<sup>92</sup> ελαλησεν (read ἐκάλεσεν?); τη γη (read τὴν γῆν). Concerning ἐντεσεω[, Pintaudi speculates as follows: “Ad ἐμφανῶς, dopo uno spazio, segue nel papiro ἐντεσεω[: si potrebbe intendere ἐν τες εω[ = e.g. ἐν ταῖς ἐο[ρταῖς Ez. 36, 38; 46,11, espressione che però non ricorre nei Salmi; ma anche ἐν ταῖς ἐω[θιναῖς ὥραις...” (Pintaudi, “LXX Ps 24, 15; 49, 1-2,” 358).

<sup>93</sup> There is no agreement on the date of P. Vindob. G 39205 among the editors/commentators: the *editio princeps* places it within the second half of the fourth century (Peter Arzt-Grabner and Michael Ernst, “Ps., 43, 21-24.27 und Ps., 44, 1-2 LXX,” in *Papyri in honorem Johannis Bingen octogenarii (P. Bingen)*, ed. Henri Melaerts, Rudolf de Smet, and Cecilia Saerens [Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2000], 79-84, at 80); de Bruyn lists a fourth-century CE date (“Papyri,” 177); Fraenkel places P. Vindob. G 39205 in the fourth or fifth centuries CE (*Verzeichnis*, 421); LDAB (7997) and Pasquale Orsini (*Manoscritti in maiuscola biblica: Materiali per un aggiornamento* [Cassino: Edizioni dell’Università degli studi di Cassino, 2005], 58-59) put the date of composition in the fifth century CE. Subsequent to the original publication of this artifact, Peter Arzt-Grabner argued that P. Vindob. G 39205 should be dated to “the second half of V or beginning of VI C.E.” (“Psalms as Magic? P. Vindob. 39205 Revisited,” in *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa*, ed. Johann Cook [Leiden: Brill, 2009], 37-43, at 41). I follow the dating in Arzt-Grabner’s second analysis on account of the parallels he draws between P. Vindob. G 39205 and other manuscripts (e.g., Codex Guelferbytanus Weissemburgensis 64, P. Vindob. G 26093), which date within those temporal parameters (“Psalms as Magic?” 43-44).

<sup>94</sup> It is likely that the folds were made at a later date. Thus, P. Bingen 16 may be an example of the so-called “Schmuckcodex” (de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 158).

- g. *Editio princeps*: Arzt-Grabner and Ernst, “Ps., 43, 21-24.27 und Ps., 44, 1-2 LXX,” 79-84 (and plate 9).
- h. Bibliography: Peter Arzt-Grabner, “Psalms as Magic?” 37-43 (and photos, 39, 40); de Bruyn, “Papryi,” 177; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 208, no. 160; LDAB 7997; Frederico Morelli, “La raccolta dei P. Bingen,” *Chronique d’Égypte* 77 (2002): 312-21, at 314; Orsini, *Manoscritti in maiuscola biblica*, 58-59; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 421-22; TM 66747.
- i. *Incipit* of LXX Ps 44: εἰς τὸ τ[έ]λος ὑπὲρ τῶ[ν] ἀλλοιω[θη]σομένων [τοῖς] ὑἱοῖς Κο[ρε εἰς σ]ύνεσι[ν ὠδῆ] ὑπὲρ τ[οῦ ἀ]γαπητοῦ Ἐξηρ[εύξατ]ο ἡ καρδ[ία μου] λόγον [ἀγ]αθόν λέγω ἐγὼ τὰ ἔργα μ[ου τῶ] βασιλεῖ ἡ {δέ}<sup>95</sup> γλῶ[σσά μου κάλαμος].

### 53. Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls

- a. For basic information, see **no. 14**.
- b. *Incipits* of LXX Pss 118,<sup>96</sup> 127, 31, 40, 111 (beginning north and moving clockwise): (**LXX Ps 118:1-3**) μακάριοι [οἱ] ἄμωμοι ἐν ὁδῶ, οἱ πορευόμενοι ἐν νόμῳ κ(ύριου). μακάριοι οἱ ἐξερευνῶντες τὰ μαρτύρια αὐτοῦ ἐν ὅλη καρδίᾳ ἐκζητήσουσιν αὐτόν. οὐδὲ<sup>97</sup> γὰρ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀν[ομί]αν ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ ἐπορεύθησαν; (**LXX Ps 127: 1[-2]**)<sup>98</sup> μακάριοι πάντες οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν κ(ύριον), οἱ πορευόμενοι ἐν ταῖς ὁδο[ις αὐτοῦ]; (**LXX Ps**

<sup>95</sup> As Arzt-Grabner and Ernst have observed, P. Vindob. G 39205 is unique among mss. of LXX Ps 44 in its inclusion of the particle δέ (“Ps., 43, 21-24.27,” 83).

<sup>96</sup> On account of its length and thematic complexity, it is possible that LXX Ps 118 should be considered a multiunit text. For instance, P. Vindob. 26786, a fifth- or sixth-century CE amulet from Hermopolis Magna, only cites LXX Ps 118:155-60 (along with Ps 3:2-4). On the other hand, Athanasius seems to treat this psalm as an entire thematic unit in *Ep. Marc.* 15.

<sup>97</sup> According to the edition of Rahlfs, the Greek text of Psalm 118 has οὐ instead of οὐδέ (*Septuaginta*, 131).

<sup>98</sup> According to Lefebvre, the original inscription certainly included LXX Ps 127:2 as well (“Égypte chrétienne III,” 267 n. 2).

**31:1-2** [μακάριοι ὦ]ν ἀφέθη[σαν αἰ] ἀνομίαι, καὶ ὦν [ἐ]πεκα[λύφθη]σαν αἰ ἄμαρ[τί]αι. μακάριοι ἀνὴρ **ω** οὐ μὴ **λογεῖσθαι** κ(ύριο)ς ἁμαρτίαν, οὐδὲ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ δόλος; (**LXX Ps 40:1-2**) μακάριος [ὁ σ]υν[ί]ων ἐπὶ πτωχὸν καὶ πένητα, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πονηρᾶ ρύσεται αὐτὸν [ὁ κ(ύριο)ς]. κ(ύριο)ς διαφυλάξει αὐτὸν καὶ ζήσῃ αὐτὸν καὶ μακαρίσαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ γῆ, καὶ μὴ παραδώ<η> αὐτὸν εἰς χεῖ {ε}ρας ἐχθρῶν<sup>99</sup> αὐτοῦ; (**LXX Ps 111:1-2**) μα[κάριος ἀνὴρ ὁ φοβούμενος τὸν κ(ύριο)ν, ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς αὐτοῦ θελήσει σφόδρα. δ]υνα[τὸν ἐ]ν τῇ γῆ ἔ[στ]αι τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ.<sup>100</sup>

## II. *Incipits* of Other Single-Unit Texts

### II. 1. *Incipits* of the Lord's Prayer

#### 54. Louvre MND 552 B

- a. Date: VII (?) CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (Antinoopolis).
- c. Material: wood.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 15.5 x 1.8 cm; wooden tablet; written on both sides; three holes.
- f. Contents: (side A) Mt 6:9; (side B) unidentified text (ελχα..τωκη βοηθ.).
- g. *Editio princeps*: Anna Passoni dell'Acqua, "Frammenti inediti del Vangel secondo Matteo," *Aegyptus* 60 (1980): 96-119, at 107-109 [plates 4-5].

<sup>99</sup> Rahlfs' edition has the singular ἐχθροῦ (*Septuaginta*, 42).

<sup>100</sup> ω (read οῦ); λογεῖσθαι (read λογίσηται).

- h. Bibliography: Cauderlier, “Tablettes grecques,” 86, no. 218; Raffaella Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco–Roman Egypt* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 252-53, no. 322; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 181; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 204, no. 134; Kraus, “Manuscripts with the *Lord’s Prayer*,” 248 (and figure 6); LDAB 6594; TM 65348; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 129-30, no. 349.
- i. *Incipit* of Lord’s Prayer (Matthean version): **Πατηρ ἡμῶν ου ἐν τοῖς σ.υρανι.**<sup>101</sup>

**55. P. Princ. II 107 (=Suppl.Mag. 1: 78-79, no. 29)**

- a. For basic description, see **no. 30**.
- b. *Incipit* of the Lord’s Prayer (according to the *Suppl.Mag.* I 29): πατήρ ὑμῶν<sup>102</sup> <ὁ> ἐν τῆς οὐρανῆς, ἀγιασθήτω **τω** θέλημά σου, **των** ἄρτων ὑμῶν τῶν ἐπιούσιων.<sup>103</sup>

**56. PSI VI 719 (=PGM 2: 207-8, no. 19)**

- a. For basic information, see **no. 10** (cf. **no. 31**).
- b. *Incipit* of Lord’s Prayer (Matthean version): **Πατηρ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐ[ραν]οῖς, ἀγιασθητο** τὸ ὄνομά σου κ[αὶ τὰ ἐξῆς].<sup>104</sup>

<sup>101</sup> Πατηρ (read Πάτερ); ου (read ὁ); σ.υρανι (read οὐρανῶις). Concerning the sigma in σ.υρανι, Passoni della’Acqua suggests that it probably derived from a (mistaken) repetition of the last letter of the dative plural definite article immediately preceding it (“Frammenti inediti,” 109).

<sup>102</sup> Or ἡμῶν. Although Daniel and Maltomini reconstruct the Greek text as πατήρ ὑμῶν, they translate this phrase as “our father” (*Suppl.Mag.* 1: 80).

<sup>103</sup> τω (read τό); των (read τόν).

<sup>104</sup> Πατηρ (read Πάτερ); ἀγιασθητο (read ἀγιασθήτω).

## II. 2. Other *Incipits*

### 57. Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (=P. Lond. Copt. 317)

- a. For basic description, see **no. 4**.
- b. *Incipit* of the Letter of Christ to Abgar: ΠΑΝΤΙΓΡΑΦΟΝ ΝΤΕ[ΠΙCΤΟ]ΛΗΝ[ΤC  
ΠΕ]ΧC ΠΩ[ΗΡΕ] ΜΠΝΟΥ[ΤΕ] ΕΤΟΝZ.

### 58. P. Berol. 16158

- a. Date: VI/VII CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 13.3 x 9 cm; writing on both sides (though from different hands);<sup>105</sup> traces of folding.
- f. Contents: (recto) *Ode of Moses* 1:1-2 (= Ex 15:1-2); (verso) lacunose text which was probably either a list or invoice.<sup>106</sup>
- g. *Editio princeps*: Treu, “Neue Berliner Septuagintafragmente,” 50.
- h. Bibliography: Aland, *Repertorium* 1: 325, var. 1; LDAB 3358; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 170; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 206, no. 154; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 33; TM 62198; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 96, no. 242; F. Vattioni, “Il cantico di Mosè (Es. 15,1-19) nei papyri e nella Vetus Latina,” *Studia Papyrologica* XVII (1978): 35-47.

---

<sup>105</sup> Kurt Treu, “Neue Berliner Septuagintafragmente,” *APF* 20 (1970): 43-65, at 50. Treu notes that the list or invoice on the verso probably dates from the sixth century CE, while the citation from the first ode dates from the sixth or seventh century CE (idem).

<sup>106</sup> Ibid.

- i. *Incipit of First Ode of Moses* (= Ex 15:1-2): ἀ<ι>σωμεν τῷ κ(ύρι)ῶ, ἐνδόξως γὰρ δεδοξαστε· ἵππον κ(αι) ἀναβάτην ἐριψεν εἰς θάλασσα(ν) βοηθὸς κε σκεπαστῆς ἐκενετο με εἰς σωτηρίαν· ουδος θεου μου<sup>107</sup> κε δοξάσω αὐτόν. θ(εὸ)ς τ[ο]ῦ πατρός μου, κ(αι) ὑψώσω ἀ[ὐ]τόν.<sup>108</sup>

**59. P. Vindob. G 2312, formerly P. Vindob. G 8032 (=Stud.Pal. XX 294; Rainer 528)**

- a. For basic description, see **no. 33**.
- b. *Incipit of “Wedding at Cana”* (cf. John 2:1-2a): καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ γάμος ἐγένετο ἐγ Κανα τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐκλήθη δὲ ὁ Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ μετ’ αὐ[τ(όν)].<sup>109</sup>

**III. Single-Unit or Multiunit *Incipits*?**

In the following two cases, the ritual specialists cite the initial words of Ps 1. If indeed the ritual specialists intended these words to function as *incipits*—and hence, metonymically—these citations raise questions concerning conceptual referentiality. Simply put, did the ritual specialist envision Ps 1 or (aspects of) the Psalter, more generally?

**60. PSI V 533**

- a. Date: V-VI CE.
- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.

<sup>107</sup> According to Rahlfs’s edition, Ode 1 reads: μου θεός (*Septuaginta*, 164).

<sup>108</sup> δεδοξαστε (read δεδόξασται); ἐριψεν (read ἔρριψεν); κε (read καί); ἐκενετο (read ἐγένετό); με (read μοι); ουδος (read οὐτός); θεου (read θεός); κε (read καί).

<sup>109</sup> ἐγ (read ἐν).

- e. Physical Description: 15 x 14 cm; writing on both sides; (recto) writing parallel with the fibers; (verso) five lines of text (cursive script); evidence of folding.
- f. Contents: (recto) unidentified text in cursive script (words deciphered: l. 4, κακόν; l. 6, τού]τω τῶ ψαλμῶ); Ps 1:1-2 (in uncial script);<sup>110</sup> (verso) unidentified text in cursive script (words deciphered: ll. 4-5, δύο συμ[άρχους] καὶ δύο παιδός, ἐπειδὴ θέλω σωφρονίσαι).<sup>111</sup>
- g. *Editio princeps*: Bartolletti, “Papiri inediti della raccolta Fiorentina,” 176-78 (and table I).
- h. Bibliography: Aland, *Repertorium* 1: 328, var. 4; LDAB 3269; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 155 and 173; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 196, no. 91; Naldini, *Documenti*, 33, no. 41 (and table XXV); Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 126; TM 62109; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 54, no. 85.
- i. *Incipit* of Ps 1: οὐκ ἔσται καὶ μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς οὐκ ἐπορεύθη ἐν βουλήν ἄσεβῶν καὶ ἐν ὁδῶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐπὶ καθ(έ)δρα λοιμον οὐκ ἐκαθεισεν ἀλλ’ ἡ{ν} ἐν νομῶ κυριῶ τὸ θέλη[μα αὐτοῦ].<sup>112</sup>

### 61. P. Taur. inv. 27 (=T[emporaneo] Gr[eco] 1)

- a. Date: IV-V CE.<sup>113</sup>

<sup>110</sup> Ps 1:1-2 is written in two columns in the extant artifact. Since the second column breaks off in the middle of a word, however, it is likely that originally there was a third column, which continued the text of Ps 1:2 (Vittorio Bartolletti, “Papiri inediti della raccolta Fiorentina, I—amuleto cristiano [con Psalm. I, 1 sg.],” *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*. Ser. 2 26 [1957]: 176-89, at 177).

<sup>111</sup> Vittorio Bartolletti tentatively suggests that all of the texts could be the work of a single author, as they were written in the same red ink (“Papiri inediti della raccolta Fiorentina,” 176). It is likely, however, given the two different scripts that, even if they were written by the same scribe, they were written on at least two different occasions. I will, therefore, make a distinction in my discussion of PSI V 533 (no. 60) between the original author and the later redactor with the proviso that a single author may have been responsible for both stages of composition.

<sup>112</sup> λοιμον (read λοιμῶν); ἐκαθεισεν (read ἐκάθισεν); κυριῶ (read κυρίου).

<sup>113</sup> Augusto Traversa hesitantly dated P. Taur. inv. 27 to the second century CE (“Notizie di papiri greci inediti del Museo Egiziano di Torino,” in *Memoriam Achillis Beltrami: Miscellanea philologica* [Genua: Istituto di filologia classica, 1954], 227-37, at 236). This is doubtful, however, since the Cross on the artifact probably reflects a post-

- b. Provenance: Egypt (unknown).
- c. Material: papyrus.
- d. Language: Greek.
- e. Physical Description: 10.5 x 11.3 cm; (recto) writing parallel with the fibers in red ink; (verso) blank.
- f. Contents: cross (staurogram); Ps 1:1.<sup>114</sup>
- g. *Editio princeps*: Traversa, “Notizie di papyri greci inediti,” esp. 236-37 (with photo).
- h. Bibliography: Aland, *Repertorium* 1: 327, var. 3; Bartolleti, “Papiri inediti,” 177 n. 4; Cecchetti, “Un interessante documento,” 557-78 (with photo); LDAB 3212; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 179; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 206, no. 144; Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 371; TM 62053; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 53-54, no. 84.
- i. *Incipit* of Ps 1 (according to the *editio princeps*): μακάριος ἀνὴρ, ὃς οὐκ ἐπορεύθη ἐν βουλή<i>[α]</i>σεβῶν, καὶ ἐν ὁδῶ<i>[α]</i> ἀμαρτωλῶν οὐκ ἔστη, καὶ ἐπὶ καθέδρα<i>[α]</i> ἐνλοιμῶν οὐκ ἐκάθισεν.

---

Constantinian phenomenon (C. R. Morey, *Early Christian Art: An Outline of the Evolution of Style and Iconography in Sculpture and Painting from Antiquity to the Eighth Century* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953], 128; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 54). The dating in this case is not without significance. Iginio Cecchetti, who takes the second-century CE date for granted, not only points to P. Taur. inv. 27 as an early witness to the Greek text of Ps 1:1, but also interprets the use of the psalmic fragment within the context of early “Christian” persecution (“Un interessante documento,” 567-68). It should be noted that in a postscript, Cecchetti states his awareness of (then) newly published material that sheds light on the dating of P. Taur. inv. 27 (idem, 577).

<sup>114</sup> There is no indication that the ritual specialist had plans to continue the text of Ps 1 (Traversa, “Notizie di papyri greci inediti,” 236). In fact, the specialist indicates that he/she has completed the writing by including two marks, which together resemble a colon, after the final word, ἐκάθισεν (cf. Cecchetti, “Un interessante documento,” 558). Thus, Cecchetti appropriately states, “[v]a poi rilevato che il nostro Papiro...non è un frammento, bensì un documento integro” (idem, 566).

#### IV. Patterns and Trends

The potential *incipits* of single-unit texts—like their multiunit counterparts—defy any consistent pattern. The extant record attests to “*incipits*” that range in length from a single word to a long passage. For instance, ritual specialists cited the beginning of LXX Ps 90, the most common in the extant apotropaic record, at various lengths. They could cite a single word,<sup>115</sup> a phrase,<sup>116</sup> a sentence,<sup>117</sup> or an extended passage.<sup>118</sup>

Likewise, potential *incipits* of other single-unit texts that have multiple witnesses were cited diversely. Within ancient ritual practice, what might be classified as the “initial words” of the Lord’s Prayer could extend to the word “heaven,”<sup>119</sup> or to “your name,”<sup>120</sup> or even beyond.<sup>121</sup> The beginning of LXX Ps 49, which is attested at length in two artifacts, could be cited for ritual power through what we would deem the second verse<sup>122</sup> or as far as the seventh verse.<sup>123</sup>

#### V. Conclusions

In this chapter, I surveyed the opening lines of single-unit texts that may have been used as *incipits*. This survey demonstrated that *incipits* of single-unit texts, like *incipits* of multiunit corpora, could be utilized in diverse ways. In the following chapter, I will offer an initial attempt at distinguishing the opening lines that functioned as *incipits* from those that functioned as independent thematic units.

---

<sup>115</sup> SB I 3573 (no. 41). In Chapter Five, I question whether this is indeed a citation of LXX Ps 90:1.

<sup>116</sup> PSI VI 719 (no. 31 [see nos. 10 and 56]); SB I 970 (no. 35); SB I 1572 (extends through τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐ[ρᾶ]ν(οῦ)) (no. 36); SB I 1574a (no. 37); SB I 1575 (no. 38); SB I 1576 (no. 39); SB I 2021 (no. 40).

<sup>117</sup> BKT VI 7.1 (no. 25 [see no. 2]); BKT IX 206 (no. 27).

<sup>118</sup> BKT VIII 12 (extends through LXX Ps 90:6a) (no. 26); P. Anastasy 9 (no. 28 [see no. 5]); P. Laur. IV 141 (no. 29); P. Princ. II 107 (no. 30 [see no. 55]); PSI VII 759 (no. 32); P. Vindob. G 2312 (no. 33); Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet (no. 34 [see no. 13]).

<sup>119</sup> Louvre MND 552 B (no. 54).

<sup>120</sup> PSI VI 719 (no. 56 [see nos. 10 and 31]).

<sup>121</sup> P. Princ. II 107 (no. 55 [see no. 30]).

<sup>122</sup> P. Vindob. G 29 435 (no. 51).

<sup>123</sup> P. Ross.-Georg. 1.1 (no. 47).

## Chapter Five

In the introduction to this study, I drew a distinction between the citation of an opening line as an opening line (i.e., an *incipit*), on the one hand, and the citation of an opening line as an independent textual unit, on the other hand. This distinction has not been proposed and certainly not systematically applied in previous scholarship on ancient “magic.” It is likely, however, that both functions were at play in late antique ritual practice.

In the following discussion, I identify, with varying levels of certainty, which opening lines were used as independent units and which were used as *incipits*. I will then examine the implications of this analysis for two aspects of late antique ritual culture: the commonality of psalmic *incipits* and the relationship between rigid faithfulness to inherited traditions and ritual efficacy.

### I. *Incipits* in the Extant Apotropaic Record

Some of the opening lines in the apotropaic record were certainly used as *incipits*. In fact, the ritual specialist behind PSI VI 719 explicitly indicates that LXX Ps 90:1 (**no. 31**) and the opening phrase of the Lord’s Prayer (Mt 6:9 [**no. 56**])—assuming the likely reconstruction of a lacuna in the text—were intended to function as *incipits* in his or her ritual. In ll. 4-5 of PSI VI 719, we read: “The one who dwells [in (the) protectio]n of the most high **and so forth**. Our Father who is in h[eav]en [,] let your name be holy **a[nd so forth]** ( Ὁ κατοικῶν [ἐν βοηθεί]α τοῦ ὑψίστου καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. Πάτηρ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐ[ραν]οῖς, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου

κ[αὶ τὰ ἐξῆς]).” Of particular significance for the current discussion is the one and, most likely, two occurrences of the phrase “and so forth” (καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς).<sup>1</sup>

The phrase καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς is an explicit indicator that LXX Ps 90 and (probably) Mt 6:9 were used as *incipits* on PSI VI 719.<sup>2</sup> Although καὶ τὰ λοιπά (κτλ) was a more common way to express *et cetera* in antiquity, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς was a known substitute.<sup>3</sup> For instance, in his refutation of the “Marcionites,” Epiphanius of Salamis wrote:

At the very beginning he [Marcion] excised all of Luke’s original discussion—his ‘inasmuch as many have taken in hand,’ and so forth (καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς), and the material about Elizabeth and the angel’s annunciation to the Virgin Mary; John and Zacharias and the birth at Bethlehem; the genealogy and the subject of the baptism. All this he took out and turned his back on, and made this the beginning of the Gospel, ‘In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar,’ and so forth (καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς).<sup>4</sup>

In his discussion, Epiphanius clearly used καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς twice as a shorthand for cited material that is to follow. In the first instance, he employed the phrase in association with the traditional Lukan *incipit*. In the second case, he used it after a citation from Lk 3:1, which, according to Epiphanius, constituted the beginning of Marcion’s version of the Gospel of Luke. This passage from the *Panarion* confirms that LXX Ps 90:1 and, most likely, Mt 6:9 on PSI VI 719 were intended as *incipits*. We thus have explicit evidence that *incipits* were used in ritual contexts.

In addition to this explicit evidence, the presence of multiple opening phrases on a given artifact, especially in sequence, provides a strong indication that each opening line was intended

---

<sup>1</sup> Kraus fails to mention that the second potential instance of καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς is part of a lacuna in the text (“Manuscripts,” 246).

<sup>2</sup> Judge, “Magical Use of Scripture,” 341.

<sup>3</sup> For καὶ τὰ λοιπά, see Liddell, Scott, et al., *Greek-English Lexicon*, 1060. For καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, see idem, 594.

<sup>4</sup> πάντα τὰ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς τῷ Λουκᾷ πεπραγματευμένα τουτέστιν ὡς λέγει, ἐπειδὴ περ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, πάντα τὰ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς τῷ Λουκᾷ πεπραγματευμένα τουτέστιν ὡς λέγει, ἐπειδὴ περ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, καὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου εὐαγγελιζομένου Μαρίαν τὴν παρθένον, Ἰωάννου τε καὶ Ζαχαρίου καὶ τῆς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ γεννήσεως, γενεαλογίας καὶ τῆς τοῦ βαπτίσματος ὑποθέσεως—ταῦτα πάντα περικόψας ἀπεπήδησεν καὶ ἀρχὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔταξε ταύτην, ἐν τῷ πεντεκαίδεκάτῳ ἔτει Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς (*Panarion* III.42.11.4). Translation taken from *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Book 1 (Sects 1-46)*, trans. Frank Williams (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 280.

to function as the beginning of a scriptural unit. In other words, the more opening lines on a given artifact, the more likely that each was meant to function as an *incipit*.<sup>5</sup> The clearest examples of this principle are the artifacts that list multiple opening lines from the “canonical” Gospels. These exemplars not only include artifacts that utilize the opening lines of at least the four “canonical” Gospel *incipits* (**nos. 1-7, 10-14**), but also those that list either three (**no. 16**) or two (**no. 15**).<sup>6</sup> In several of these cases, the metonymic function is reinforced by the use of abbreviated citations. For instance, the Markan *incipit* on P. Vindob. G 348 (**no. 12**), which is accompanied by the other three Gospel *incipits*, simply reads, “[ ’A]ρχὴ τοῦ εὐα[γγελίου],” without a reference to Jesus Christ (or his title as the “Son of God”). Emblematic of this tendency toward abbreviation are the Lukan *incipits*, where several artifacts cite only the phrase, “Inasmuch as many have undertaken” (Brit. Lib. Or 4919[2] [**no. 4**], P. Berol. 22 235 [**no. 6**], Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet [**no. 13**]). What is the apotropaic value of such fragmentary phrases—especially in the citations from the Gospel of Luke—if they are not referencing something else? To be sure, it is sometimes difficult to determine the kinds of associations that ritual specialists make in their uses of the scriptures. In conjunction with the occurrence of multiple opening lines, however, these abbreviated references imply that the ritual specialists pointed beyond the words on the page to “target” material.

The use of multiple (*seriatim*) opening lines in the extant apotropaic record is not limited to the Gospel *incipits*. For instance, the opening lines of Genesis and Hebrews are juxtaposed with one another in the final redaction of P. Amh. I (b-c) (**nos. 23-24**), mutually reinforcing the function of each opening line as an *incipit*. In addition, the opening lines of single-unit texts are

---

<sup>5</sup> I will discuss the reason for this referential quality below.

<sup>6</sup> It must be emphasized, however, that Mt 1:1 and Jn 1:1 occur in lacunose section of BGU III 954 (**no. 15**) and were reconstructed on the basis of the *editio princeps* by Wessely without reference to the manuscript (“Monuments,” 421).

occasionally listed with the initial words of multiunit corpora or those of other single-unit texts. In some cases, the opening line of a single-unit text is juxtaposed with the opening lines of the Gospels: BKT VI 7.1 (**no. 25**); P. Anastasy 9 (**no. 28**); PSI VI 719 (**nos. 31 and 56**); Robert Nahman Coptic Amulet (**no. 34**); Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls (**no. 53**); Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (**no. 57**). In other cases, opening lines of single-unit items are juxtaposed with one another: P. Princ. II 107 (**nos. 30 and 55**); P. Vindob. G 2312 (**nos. 33 and 59**). In either case, the citation of initial words from multiple texts and/or corpora provides a strong indication that the author was citing each text as an *incipit*.

Titles of scriptural units also clearly indicate a metonymic function. In two instances, the ritual specialist used the titles of the four Gospels in lieu of the opening words: P. Oxy. XVI 1928 (**no. 8**) and P. Rylands 104 (**no. 9**). In two additional cases, the Matthean title alone was used: P. Iand. I 6 (**no. 18**) and P. Oxy. VIII 1077 (**no. 20**). In the latter artifacts, the referential quality of the Matthean title is reinforced by the use of other material from the Gospel of Matthew. Moreover, gospel titles were occasionally used in conjunction with opening lines from the Gospels: BCI 426 (**no. 3**); P. Anastasy 9 (**no. 5**); P. Mich. 1559 (**no. 7**). This pairing of opening line and authorial title clearly indicates that the ritual specialist intended a metonymic function and, therefore, clearly signals the use of *incipits*.

Along these lines, two artifacts explicitly use the opening lines as titles. The London Hay Cookbook (**no. 42**) introduces LXX Ps 69:1 with the phrase, “in the psalm (2N ΠΕΨΔΛΜΟ).” The use of this phrase suggests that the ritual specialist used the initial words as the title of the psalm. Likewise, [τού]τῶ τῶ ψαλμῶ is extant in a cursive hand in the upper part of the recto on PSI V 533 (**no. 60**), a ritual artifact that organizes Ps 1:1-2 in two columns in uncial script.<sup>7</sup> While it is uncertain whether the initial author intended Ps 1:1-2 as an *incipit*, the addition of the phrase

<sup>7</sup> Bartolletti, “Papiri inediti della raccolta Fiorentina,” 176.

[τού]τω τῷ ψαλμῷ demonstrates that the later editor used Ps 1:1-2 as a title. In each of these cases, the deliberate reference to the opening line as title for the psalm points to subsequent material from that psalm and thus signals its use as an *incipit*.

Two additional artifacts possess other features that suggest the ritual specialists deployed the opening lines as *incipits*, albeit with less certainty than the examples already discussed. On P. Oxy. VIII 1151 (**no. 21**), Jn 1:1, 3 was likely used as an *incipit*. For instance, the ritual specialist highlights the importance of material from the Gospel of John by alluding to Jn 5:2 and by invoking “the holy and glorious apostle and evangelist and theologian, John (τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐνδόξου ἀποστόλου καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ καὶ θεολόγου Ἰωάννου).” Moreover, the use of language derived from or corresponding to Mt 4:23/9:35 (“Lord, Christ, Son and Word of the living God, the one who healed every sickness and every malady [κύριε, Χριστέ, υἱὲ καὶ λόγε τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, ὁ ἰασάμενος πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν]”) indicates the interest of the ritual specialist in healing narratives from the life of Jesus more generally.<sup>8</sup>

Attention to the format of P. Oxy. VIII 1151 also suggests that Jn 1:1, 3 was used as an *incipit*. Despite the availability of space on the preceding line, Jn 1:1, 3 is given a new line on the strip of papyrus and bracketed by crosses. This dislocated feature is reinforced in the text of the ritual, as Jn 1:1, 3 is sandwiched between elements that are seemingly unrelated (occurring after the name of the client, Johanna [l. 10], and before the direct invocation of Christ [beginning at l. 23]).<sup>9</sup> In other words, the ritual specialist has provided visual and textual cues that this scriptural citation is set apart from the remainder of the ritual. This level of dislocation would be surprising if the ritual specialist had intended to cite Jn 1:1, 3 purely as an independent scriptural unit

---

<sup>8</sup> De Bruyn appropriately classifies Mt 4:23/9:35 as a “clausal *historiola*” (i.e., a ritual narrative that is subordinated to a directive utterance) (*Appeals to Jesus*, 67). On “clausal *historiolae*,” see Frankfurter, “Narrating Power,” 469.

<sup>9</sup> P. Cairo 10696 (**no. 16**) is perhaps the closest analogue to P. Oxy. VIII 1151 in this regard, situating three Gospel *incipits* (Lk 1:1; Mt 1:1; Jn 1:1) in between a lacunose phrase (“the salvation...of the living God”) and a plea to saints Phocas and Macarios for protection. Cf. also P. Rylands 104 (**no. 9**) and BGU III 954 (**no. 15**).

without reference to a target text. Instead, this dislocation is more characteristic of the ritual use of *incipits* (especially of multiunit corpora) because they reference items that often transcend the “words on the page.” In light of this evidence, I contend that P. Oxy. VIII 1151 cited Jn 1:1, 3 as an *incipit* and, hence, as a means of tapping into the precedent associated with Jesus material from the Gospel of John, at the very least.

There is reason to think that Jn 1:1-11 on P. Köln VIII 340 (**no. 19**) was also used as an *incipit*. While the length of the citation would make it the longest *incipit* in the extant apotropaic record, the extended Johannine *incipit* (Jn 1:[1-4a]4b-5) on Thebaid Chapel Grotto Walls (**no. 14**) cautions us against using length as a primary criterion for determining whether a textual unit is an *incipit*. In fact, I would argue that in light of other features of this artifact, the length of the citation from the beginning of John in this particular case makes it more likely that it was used as an *incipit* than as an independent textual unit.

The disjointed relationship between Jn 1:1-11 and the remainder of the ritual’s text may be of use in determining the function of the opening words from John’s Gospel on P. Köln VIII 340. Healing and protection are twin themes in the seventy-four lines of text on P. Köln VIII 340. The healing motif begins immediately following Jn 1:1-11 on side A of the amulet (ll. 2-33a). In the second half of line 33, the ritual specialist begins an invocation to God, Mary Theotokos, and Jesus that requests healing by alluding to Mt 4:23/9:35: ἀπωδιώξῃς ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ (i.e., the one making this invocation) πᾶσαν νό[σον κ]αὶ πᾶ[σαν] μαλα[κίαν] (ll. 43-46).<sup>10</sup> This invocation is followed, in turn, by another lacunose section on side A—now a separate

---

<sup>10</sup> For the contention that πᾶσαν νό[σον κ]αὶ πᾶ[σαν] μαλα[κίαν] on P. Köln VIII 340 is indeed an allusion to Mt 4:23/9:35, see Maltomini, “340. Amuleto con NT,” 91; de Bruyn, “Appeals to Jesus,” 69.

fragment—that seems to call for the healing and protection of the client.<sup>11</sup> Finally, the theme of healing is highlighted on side B of P. Köln VIII 340, where a now lacunose text is written above, to the right of, and below the first of two drawings of human figures praying in the *orantes* position. Among the few readable words in this lacunose text, are *θερασπεύεις* (read *θεραπεύεις*, “you are healing” [ll. 8-9]) and *βοήθεια* (“shelter, protection” [l. 13]).<sup>12</sup>

The emphases on healing and protection in P. Köln VIII 340 makes the extended citation from Jn 1:1-11 unexpected as an independent textual unit; despite taking up a great deal of space on the artifact (31 lines out of 76 lines), there is nothing explicit about either healing or protection in this citation. In fact, although the citation from Jn 1:1-11 is the longest section in the ritual, it is the only section that uses neither healing nor protection as themes. To be sure, the beginning of the Gospel of John has many features that would make it attractive to a ritual specialist (e.g., glorification of the Word, the emphasis on creation).<sup>13</sup> But the prominence of healing and protection in P. Köln VIII 340, in general, and the allusion to Jesus’ healing ministry (cf. the reference to Mt 4:23/9:35 in ll. 44-46), in particular, make it more likely that Jn 1:1-11 functioned as an *incipit* rather than as an independent unit. In other words, like P. Oxy VIII 1151 (no. 21), P. Köln VIII 340 probably used the Johannine *incipit* to tap into the precedent established by the healing and exorcistic narratives from the life of Jesus, including, but probably not limited to the Gospel of John.

Unfortunately, several artifacts do not provide sufficient evidence for determining the ritual function of the opening line of a scriptural unit. Some of these devices deploy the opening

<sup>11</sup> The extant thirteen lines of fragment read, “... πᾶ[ν] πνεῦμα ἰλγνγ . τὰ ὀφθαλμὸν πονηρὸν ἢ ἐπιβουλῆ(ν) ἀνθρώπου ο .. ζου. εἰς τὸν ἔνδοξον κ(υρίο)υ ὄ(νομα) .. ιαγα † εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνας {τῶν αἰῶν[ων]}, ἀμήν, ἀμήν, ἀμήν. (ritual signs, letters, and characters).”

<sup>12</sup> Cf. LXX Ps 90:1.

<sup>13</sup> For an analysis of independent ritual power of the first chapter of the Gospel of John, see Edmond Le Blant, “Le premier Chapitre de Saint Jean,” *Rev. Arch.* (3<sup>rd</sup> ser.) 25 (1894): 8-14; Skemer, *Binding Words*, 87-89. For the use of the opening line from the Gospel of John (in Greek) in Arabic exorcistic amulets, see Clifford Edmund Bosworth, *The Mediaeval Islamic Underworld: The Banu Sasan in Arabic Society and Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 128.

line as the only textual element on the artifact (BKT VIII 12 [no. 26], O. Medinet Habu 1269 [no. 44], P. Heid. inv. G 1367 + 2259 [no. 45], P. Ross.-Georg. 1.1 [no. 47]). Others juxtapose the opening line with ritual symbols, words, or other scriptural texts that do not offer sufficient information for determining whether or not the line functioned as an *incipit* (P. Rylands 101 [no. 22],<sup>14</sup> BKT IX 206 [no. 27], P. Laur. IV 141 [no. 29], SB I 970 [no. 35], SB I 2021 [no. 40], O. Medinet Habu 1175 + Medinet Habu 935 + London, University College, Petrie Museum UC 62851 [no. 43], P. Rain. ex. no. 188, box 201 [no. 46], P. Vindob. 3089 [no. 48], LXX Ps 62:2-3 [no. 49], P. Vindob. 27290A [no. 50], P. Vindob. G 29435 [no. 51], P. Vindob. G 39205 [no. 52], Louvre MND 552 B [no. 54], P. Berol. 16158 [no. 58], the original author of PSI V 533 (no. 60),<sup>15</sup> P. Taur. inv. 27 [no. 61]). Along these lines, I am hesitant to identify the use of LXX Ps 90:1 on the apotropaic armbands as *incipits* (nos. 36-39). Despite the use of multiple biblical and non-biblical traditions on these ritual devices (i.e., the images from the life of Jesus), I find no evidence that the remainder of LXX Ps 90 or portions thereof is being invoked. To the contrary, several motifs that are common in the apotropaic record are present in LXX Ps 90:1 (e.g., protection, an exalted title for God).

Finally, there are at least two cases in which it is difficult to determine whether the text on the device is even a citation of an opening line. In these cases, a metonymic function is a further extrapolation and, therefore, very difficult to establish. For instance, despite the common

---

<sup>14</sup> Crum bases his classification of P. Rylands 101 as an “amulet” in part on the assumption that Mk 1:2 was an *incipit*, arguing that the use of *incipits* in conjunction with the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste has precedent in the apotropaic record (*John Rylands*, 52). He cites P. Anastasy 9 (no. 5) as evidence—to which one could add Anchorite’s Grotto in Nubia (no. 1). I am not as inclined as Crum, however, to label Mk 1:2 an *incipit*. To be sure, the use of Mk 1:2, instead of Mk 1:1, does not preclude it from being an *incipit*, as this usage could have been the result of a general unfamiliarity with the beginning of the Gospel of Mark on the part of the ritual specialist (see n. 53 in Chapter Three). Yet it does not necessarily mean that Mk 1:2 was an *incipit*. Despite precedent in the apotropaic record, I remain unconvinced that this combination of texts alone is a sufficient basis for identifying Mk 1:2 as an *incipit*, let alone as a basis for the classification of P. Rylands 101 as an amulet.

<sup>15</sup> As I have noted above, the use of the phrase [τού]τω τῷ ψαλμῷ (in a different script) by the later redactor suggests that he or she intended the citation of Ps 1:1-2 as an *incipit*.

assumption in scholarship, I am not entirely convinced that  $\delta/\chi\iota\psi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  on SB I 3573 (**no. 41**) is a citation of LXX Ps 90:1.<sup>16</sup> The extant text shares only a single “word” ( $\delta/\chi\iota\psi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ) with LXX Ps 90:1, which deviates orthographically from the opening line ( $\acute{\omicron}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\hat{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \beta\omicron\eta\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\omicron}\ \underline{\upsilon}\psi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ). Its identification with LXX Ps 90:1 is, therefore, contingent upon the combination of  $\delta/\chi\iota\psi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  with  $\beta\omicron\hat{\omicron}\varsigma$ . To be sure, this combination could suggest a citation of LXX Ps 90:1 (e.g., SB I 970 [**no. 35**]; SB I 2012 [**no. 40**]). But this combination is not necessarily indicative of a citation of LXX Ps 90:1, as  $\beta\omicron\hat{\omicron}\varsigma$  was often used ritually without LXX Ps 90:1.<sup>17</sup>

More to the point, even assuming that  $\delta/\chi\iota\psi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  was meant as a citation of LXX Ps 90:1, I find no evidence that it would have been used as an *incipit*. It is more likely that it was deployed as an independent scriptural citation that promises protection for the client. In short, although it is certainly possible—but by no means proven—that  $\delta/\chi\iota\psi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  is a citation from LXX Ps 90:1, I find no evidence to suggest that it was an *incipit* meant to invoke (portions of) LXX Ps 90 metonymically.

The alleged *incipit* on P. Heid. L 5 (**no. 17**) presents us with a similar challenge. Daniel and Maltomini contend that the phrase, “in principio erat deus et deus  $\epsilon\grave{\rho}\alpha\tau$  [lumen?],” was a misquotation or summary of Jn 1:1.<sup>18</sup> The text of John 1:1 in the Vulgate reads: “In principio erat Verbum et Verbum erat apud Deum et Deus erat Verbum.” The differences between these two “versions” are striking. In fact, the similarities between the possible Johannine *incipit* on P. Heid. L 5 and Jn 1:1 (Vulgate) extend only to the phrase, “In principio erat.” If Daniel and Maltomini have reconstructed the lacunose section of the text correctly, the alleged Johannine *incipit* alludes as much to the beginning of Genesis (cf. the phrase “in principio”; “Deus” as the subject; the

---

<sup>16</sup> For the identification of this “word” as coming from LXX Ps 90:1, see e.g., Brashear, “Lesefrüchte,” 102; de Bruyn, “Papyri,” 169; idem and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets,” 190.

<sup>17</sup> Nachtergaele, “Une amulette chrétienne,” 93-95, nos. 1-5

<sup>18</sup> “From the African Psalter,” 262.

reference to “light”) as it does to the Johannine *incipit*. Before any discussion of a metonymic function can go forward on solid ground, a more substantial argument for the phrase’s derivation from Jn 1:1 (or Gen 1:1) is needed. For the meantime, the phrase in question is better explained as a formula designed by the ritual specialist to reinforce the amulet’s general emphasis on the glory and power of God.

I, therefore, maintain that, for cases in which the supporting data for a metonymic function is limited or inconclusive, we should assume that the opening lines were deployed as independent units. In other words, the burden of proof falls on the identification of an opening line as an *incipit*. Of course, it might be argued that the lack of a clear indication of a metonymic function does not necessarily preclude the possibility that an opening line was intended as an *incipit*. For this reason, further criteria for identifying whether or not these opening lines were deployed as *incipits* must be developed.

## **II. Implications**

In this chapter, I have suggested a distinction between opening lines deployed as independent scriptural units and opening lines used as *incipits*. I then discussed the artifacts that I surveyed in Chapters Three and Four, organizing them according to the probability of their opening lines functioning as *incipits*.

The results of this analysis carry implications about ancient ritual practice. In the discussion to follow, I will focus my attention on what I view as the two most important implications. First, I contend that the opening lines, which were either certainly or probably used as *incipits* (see Table 2 below), are limited to only a few biblical passages. Since the certain or probable *incipits* from the psalms are almost exclusively limited to LXX Ps 90, the general

suggestion that *incipits* of psalms were common should be qualified. Second, I examine implications of the formal diversity of certain or probable *incipits* for the relationship between faithfulness to established patterns and ritual efficacy more generally. I maintain that the extant scriptural *incipits* challenge the notion that rigid faithfulness to inherited patterns was necessary for ritual efficacy.

## II. 1. The Limited Selection of *Incipits* in the Extant Record

Among the opening lines that were either certainly *incipits* or probably *incipits*, almost all of them are from the Gospels, LXX Ps 90, or the Matthean Lord's Prayer (Mt 6:9). The exceptions to this pattern are as follows:

1. P. Amh. I (a-b) (**nos. 23-24**): *incipits* of Genesis and Hebrews.
2. The London Hay Cookbook (**no. 42**): *incipit* of LXX Ps 69.
3. Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls (**no. 53** [cf. **no. 14**]): *incipits* of LXX Pss 118, 127, 31, 40, 111.
4. Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (**no. 57** [cf. **no. 4**]): *incipit* of Jesus' letter to Abgar.
5. P. Vindob. G 2312 (**no. 59** [cf. **no. 33**]): *incipit* of Jn 2 (the Wedding at Cana).
6. PSI V 533 (**no. 60**): *incipit* of Ps 1.

Although it is likely that further discoveries and the development of additional criteria for identifying *incipits* will expand the number of representative artifacts, it is striking at present that ritual specialists deployed *incipits* of such a small range of texts and corpora.

These data are significant for reconstructing the use of psalmic *incipits* other than the *incipit* of LXX Ps 90. To be sure, seven psalmic *incipits* other than LXX Ps 90:1 are part of the extant record; however, five of these were found in one context, Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls

(no. 53). In fact, there are only three ritual artifacts in the extant record that likely utilized the *incipits* of psalms other than LXX Ps 90. This dearth of representatives should perhaps qualify the assumption that the *incipits* of psalms (as a general reference) were frequently deployed in ritual practice.<sup>19</sup> It would be more accurate to state that the *incipit* of LXX Ps 90 was frequently deployed, and that in only a few other instances were the *incipits* of psalms other than LXX Ps 90 used. It should also be highlighted that, insofar as there is no overlap among these other psalmic *incipits*, we cannot even speak of a second most common psalmic *incipit* in the ritual world of late antique Egypt.

## II. 2. *Incipits*, Faithfulness to Protocols, and Ritual Efficacy

The apotropaic use of scriptural *incipits* reflects the active engagement on the part of ritual specialists with an authoritative tradition. As we have seen, the *incipits* clustered around a select number of passages, for which there are numerous examples. They thus provide important insight into how ritual specialists engaged with authoritative traditions for ritual power. In particular, they offer a unique portrait of the relationship between faithfulness to established protocols and ritual efficacy. Taking the certain and probable *incipits* of both multiunit corpora and single unit texts/corpora together, we have a substantial corpus of artifacts from late antique Egypt that challenges the importance of standardization in achieving ritual efficacy.<sup>20</sup>

Among the likely *incipits*, the extent of the text cited ranges from a few words to lengthy passages. Moreover, when seriatim *incipits* were used (e.g., the Gospel *incipits*), the number of *incipits* cited varied and they could be arranged in almost any order. This absence of

---

<sup>19</sup> Pace de Bruyn, "Papyri," 149; de Bruyn and Dijkstra, "Greek Amulets," 172.

<sup>20</sup> This also has implications for our understanding of textual classification in antiquity more generally. I will return to this subject in the Conclusions.

standardization carries important implications for our understanding of the *modus operandi* of ritual specialists.

What is significant about the sheer diversity of apotropaic *incipits* is that they provide strong evidence for what ritual specialists *did not do*. Contrary to conventional wisdom, the *incipits* illustrate the flexibility enjoyed by ancient ritual specialists when utilizing scriptural power. In other words, the evidence paints the portrait of specialists creatively selecting and forging sacred traditions according to their particular interests (or the interests of their clients) and/or in conjunction with the physical limitations of the media at their disposal.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, we find among the scriptural *incipits* precisely the opposite of what Bronislaw Malinowski asserted about the necessity of faithfulness to established patterns for ritual efficacy:

Mythology and tradition are everywhere embedded, especially in the performance of the magical spell, *which must be repeated with absolute faithfulness to the traditional original* and during which mythological events are recounted in which the power of the prototype is invoked.<sup>22</sup>

The *incipits*, therefore, offer a unique challenge to the assumed relationship between ritual power and strict adherence to established ritual patterns.

---

<sup>21</sup> The apotropaic artifacts, therefore, seem to reflect the instability of textual transmission, which represents the ancient world more generally (Parsons, “A People of the Book?” 53-55). For a discussion that highlights both the diversity of early “Christian” literature in this regard, though qualifies that diversity by paying close attention to (theological) motivations for modifications, see Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of the Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 105ff. S. R. Pickering concludes concerning the use of three scriptural fragments (Ps 90:1-2, Rom 12:1-2, Jn 2:1-2) on P. Vindob. G 2312, “We can conclude that the scribe (or the scribe’s text) moves in and out of exact correspondence to a standard form of the New Testament passages, shifting in a flexible way between word-for-word transmission and free forms of transmission” (“Non-continuous,” 129). For an analysis of ancient authors’ reactions (e.g., curses) to this flexible scribal culture in antiquity, see Marc Drogin, *Anathema! Medieval Scribes and the History of Book Curses* (Totowa: Allanheld, Osmun, 1983). This flexible posture among apotropaic authors corroborates the views of David Frankfurter (“Narrating Power”) and H. S. Versnel (“Poetics”), both of whom emphasize the creative enterprise of ancient ritual experts, including the experts’ interaction with existing sources and traditions.

<sup>22</sup> “The Role of Magic and Religion,” in *Reader in Comparative Religion: An Anthropological Approach*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., ed. William A. Lessa and Evon Z. Vogt (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), 102-12, at 107. See also Naomi Janowitz, *Icons of Power: Ritual Practices in Late Antiquity* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002), xix-xx.

### III. Conclusions

In this chapter, I distinguished between artifacts that were used as *incipits* and those applied as independent thematic units. I then discussed the two most important implications to be drawn from the likely scriptural *incipits* of late antique Egypt. First, I challenged the claims often made about the ubiquity of *psalmic incipits* in general, pointing instead to the limited range of veritable *incipits* actually found in the record. Second, by highlighting the formal diversity of the likely *incipits* of both multiunit corpora and single-unit texts, I challenged the notion that strict conformity to established formulae and formal patterns was necessary for ritual efficacy in late antique Egypt.

**Table 2: Chart of Potential *Incipits*<sup>23</sup>**

Number in this volume	Opening Line(s) Cited	Likelihood of Being an <i>Incipit</i>	Number in this volume	Opening Line(s) Cited	Likelihood of Being an <i>Incipit</i>
1	Mt 2:1; Mk 1:1-2; Lk 1:1; Jn 1:1	1	32	LXX Ps 90:1-4	4
2 (25)	Jn 1:1-2; Mt 1:1; Mk 1:1; Lk 1:1	1	33 (59)	LXX Ps 90:1-2	1
3	Mt 1:1; Mk 1:1-2; Lk 1:1; Jn 1:1 (and titles)	1	34 (13)	LXX Ps 90:1-2	1
4 (57)	Mt 1:1; Lk 1:1; Jn 1:1; Mk 1:1	1	35	LXX Ps 90:1	4
5 (28)	Matthean title; Mt 1:1; Markan title; Mk 1:1; Lukan title; Lk 1:1; Johannine title; Jn 1:1	1	36	LXX Ps 90:1	4
6	Mt 1:1; Mk 1:1; Lk 1:1; Jn 1:1	1	37	LXX Ps 90:1	4
7	Matthean title; Mt 1:1; Markan title; Mk 1:1; Lukan title; Lk 1:1; Johannine title; Jn 1:1	1	38	LXX Ps 90:1	4
8	Johannine title; Lukan title; Markan title; Matthean title	1	39	LXX Ps 90:1	4
9	Matthean title; Markan title; Lukan title; Johannine title	1	40	LXX Ps 90:1	4
10 (31) (56)	Jn 1:1; Mt 1:1; Jn 1:23 or Mk 1:2 (?); Mk 1:1; Lk 1:1	1	41	LXX Ps 90:1 (?)	3
11	Mt 1:1; Mk 1:1; Lk 1:1; Jn 1:1	1	42	LXX Ps 69:1	1
12	Mt 1:1; Mk 1:1; Lk 1:1; Jn 1:1	1	43	LXX Ps 30:2-8 (Greek); LXX Ps 30: 2a, 3-7a (Coptic)	4
13 (34)	Mt 1:1; Jn 1:1; Lk 1:1; Mk 1:1	1	44	LXX Ps 20:2a-5	4
14 (53)	Lk 1:1-3; Jn 1:[1-4a]4b-5; Mt 1:1-3; Mk 1:1-2	1	45	LXX Ps 80:1-4	4
15	Jn 1:1 (?); Mt 1:1 (?)	2	46	LXX Ps 109:1	4
16	Lk 1:1; Mt 1:1; Jn 1:1	1	47	LXX Ps 49:1b-7c	4
17	Jn 1:1 (?)	3	48	Ps 4:2	4
18	Matthean title	1	49	LXX Ps 62:2-3	4
19	Jn 1:1-11	2	50	LXX Ps 64:2	4
20	(modified) Matthean title	1	51	LXX Ps 49:1-2	4
21	Jn 1:1, 3	2	52	LXX Ps 44:1-2	4
22	Mk 1:2	4	53 (14)	LXX Pss 118:1-3; 127:1[-2]; 31:1-2; 40:1-2; 111:1-2	1
23 (24)	Heb 1:1	2	54	Mt 6:9	4
24 (23)	Gen 1:1-5 (LXX) Gen 1:1-2a, 3-4, 5b (Aquila)	2	55 (30)	Mt 6:9,11	1
25 (2)	LXX Ps 90:1	1	56 (10) (31)	Mt 6:9	1
26	LXX Ps 90:1-6	4	57 (4)	Letter of Jesus to Abgar 1	1
27	LXX Ps 90:1	4	58	<i>Ode of Moses</i> 1:1-2 (= Ex 15:1-2)	4
28 (5)	LXX Ps 90:1-2	1	59 (33)	Jn 2:1	1
29	LXX Ps 90:1-6	4	60	Ps 1:1-2	4 (author 1) 1 (author 2)
30 (55)	LXX Ps 90:1-2	1	61	Ps 1:1	4
31 (10) (56)	LXX Ps 90:1	1			

<sup>23</sup> In this chart, the numbers signify the following: (1) certainly an *incipit*; (2) probably an *incipit*; (3) unlikely an *incipit*; (4) insufficient evidence for identifying the opening line as an *incipit*.

**SECTION THREE:**  
**TOWARD A THEORY OF THE SCRIPTURAL *INCIPITS***  
**FROM LATE ANTIQUE EGYPT**

## Chapter Six

In Section One, I demonstrated that ritual specialists viewed the Bible as a collection of thematic units, only some of which were efficacious for an apotropaic context. This observation was the basis for my division of *incipits* into *incipits* of multiunit corpora and *incipits* of single-unit texts. In Section Two, I surveyed the potential *incipits* of multiunit corpora and single-unit texts, highlighting their diverse formal features. I also offered there a preliminary attempt at distinguishing *incipits* from cases in which opening lines were used as independent thematic units. The certain and probable *incipits* in the extant apotropaic record cluster around a narrow range of scriptural passages and, hence, qualify the assumed ubiquity of psalmic *incipits*, in particular. Moreover, the certain and probable *incipits* reflect a diversity that challenges the assumption of an intrinsic relationship between ritual efficacy and faithfulness to protocols.

In this chapter, I generate a tentative theory of the ritual use of *incipits*. In accordance with the typology developed in Section One, I distinguish the ritual semantics of *incipits* of multiunit corpora from those of single-unit texts. Taking the Gospel *incipits* as a representative example of *incipits* of multiunit corpora, I maintain that the Gospel *incipits* invoked the power associated with a collection of disparate Jesus traditions, some of which may have derived from “non-canonical” materials. By extension, if I am right to assume that the opening materials of Genesis and Hebrews (and possibly Ps 1) were *incipits*, these also focused on select items from their respective corpora. Thus, the metonymic relation *pars pro parte/partibus* better characterizes the ritual use of *incipits* of multiunit corpora. At the same time, *incipits* of single-unit texts were more likely than their multiunit counterparts to have invoked their targets *pars pro toto*. Yet, despite this general distinction, I show that single-unit texts could at times operate

according to the *pars pro parte/partibus* metonymic relation. Building upon these theoretical insights, I situate the ritual use of *incipits* within the broader context of the ritual uses of sacred traditions in late antique ritual practice.

## **I. Toward a Theory of the Gospel *Incipits*: A Representative Case of *Incipits* of Multiunit Corpora**

### **I. 1. The Scope of Material Invoked by the Gospel *Incipits***

Scholars have disagreed on the scope of material invoked ritually by the Gospels *incipits*. Alongside the claim that the Gospel *incipits* possessed independent ritual power, some scholars have understood them as invoking the power inherent in the scriptures as a whole or, alternatively, in the Gospels as a specific sub-unit of the scriptures. I have already shown that the use of scripture in the extant apotropaic record suggests that *incipits* of multiunit corpora, such as the Gospel *incipits*, would not have invoked their contiguous materials *in toto*. I will now attempt to comment more fully on the likely range of materials that were the metonymic target of the Gospel *incipits*. I argue that the Gospel *incipits* invoked the power associated with several discrete narratives and sayings of Jesus, some of which may have derived from “non-canonical” traditions.

In his widely influential essay, “The Magical Power of Words,” Stanley Tambiah utilized metonymic and metaphorical theory to help parse out the “inner frame” of Trobriand “magic.”<sup>1</sup>

Drawing a distinction between metaphor and metonymy along classic lines—i.e., metaphor

---

<sup>1</sup> “The Magical Power of Words,” 189-98. Through this essay and others (e.g., idem, “Form and Meaning of Magical Acts: A Point of View,” in *Modes of Thought*, ed. R. Horton and R. Finnegan [London: Faber, 1973], 199-229), Stanley Tambiah has had a sizeable impact on theoretical approaches to ancient “magic”: e.g., Frankfurter, “Narrating Power,” 466-67; Christopher A. Faraone, “The Agonistic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells,” in *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, ed. Christopher A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 3-32, esp. 8.

involving a verbal transfer on the basis of “similarity,” while metonymy involving a verbal transfer based on “contiguity” (=association)—Tambiah argued that both linguistic concepts were crucial for understanding the *tapwana* (i.e., the second, longest, and primary portion of Trobriand spells).<sup>2</sup> For the purposes of the present discussion, I will focus on his observations concerning the use of metonymy in Trobriand ritual.

As part of the *tapwana*, the Trobriands frequently make use of rather lengthy lists.<sup>3</sup> Within what Tambiah has deemed their “simpler” spells, such lists can consist solely of enumerations of components of canoes, yam houses, or the body parts of the performer.<sup>4</sup> In “more complex” rituals, like one the Trobriands use when striking the soil, each part in the list (e.g., “the insects,” “the beetle with the sharp tooth”) is linked with a corresponding verb (e.g., “I blow,” “I drive off”), which when taken together, represent a desired action. In both kinds of spells, argued Tambiah, the individual items in the list construct metonymically a whole in order to provide a “realistic colouring to the description.”<sup>5</sup> Yet this metonymic use of lists is not confined to Trobriand rituals.

In their article on the ritual use of metonymy in Navaho apotropaic rituals, Margaret Field and Taft Blackhorse Jr. show that the “poetic device” of metonymy not only contextualizes or objectivizes the ritual language of the Navahos, it creatively indexes particular elements of their ritual environment.<sup>6</sup> For instance, as part of an invocation for protection, specific body parts of the healing agent (in this case, the holy man) are catalogued: “...with your holy feet you will

---

<sup>2</sup> Tambiah is beholden to Roman Jakobson (“Two Aspects of Language,” 55-82) for his distinction between metaphor and metonymy. For a much more nuanced distinction between these terms within a cognitive linguistic setting, see Francisco J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, “High-Level Cognitive Models: In Search of a Unified Framework for Inferential and Grammatical Behavior,” in *Perspectives on Metonymy: Proceedings of the International Conference ‘Perspectives on Metonymy,’ held in Łódź, Poland, May 6-7, 2005*, ed. Krzysztof Kosecki (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2007), 11-30, esp. 13f. (and literature cited).

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of the use of lists in ancient ritual practice, see Richard Gordon, “‘What’s in a list?’” 239-77.

<sup>4</sup> Tambiah, “Magical Power of Words,” 191.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid, 193.

<sup>6</sup> “The Dual Role of Metonymy in Navajo Prayer,” *Anthropological Linguistics* 44 (2002): 217-30.

guard me, with your holy legs you will guard me, with your holy body you will guard me, with your holy mind you will guard me, with your holy voice you will guard me.”<sup>7</sup> The function of cataloguing these appendages metonymically, argued Field and Blackhorse, is to construct ritually the deity or assistant in the present context.<sup>8</sup>

Despite various formal differences between the Trobriand and Navaho uses of metonymy, on the one hand, and the metonymic use endemic to the Gospel *incipits*, on the other, the “constructive” feature of these lists seems to apply to the *incipits*. Two points follow from this comparison. First, the seriatim listing of the introductory phrases and titles from the Gospels suggests that ritual specialists placed a particular sacred boundary around the four Gospels as a unit of holy writ—not around the scriptures more generally. It is a curious fact that none of the artifacts with all four Gospel *incipits* give any indication of alluding to a larger biblical corpus than the Gospels themselves. Stated differently, we do not find on any artifact the seriatim listing of fragments from other biblical sub-corpora (e.g., the Psalter<sup>9</sup> or Pauline *incipits*) juxtaposed with the Gospel *incipits*. Second, since we have seen that ritual specialists preferred the power associated with particular precedents or paradigms over against the generic power of the scriptures, it is likely that, rather than invoking a particular Gospel or the Gospels as a corpus, the Gospel *incipits* invoked select narratives and sayings contained in the Gospels.

Yet this connection between the Gospel *incipits* and elements from the Gospels must be qualified. There is reason to think that the narrative and apophthegmatic materials invoked by the *incipits* might not have all derived from our “canonical” Gospels. For instance, “G. Vitelli” PSI

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, 220. The authors observe that these “constitutive units” are in ascending order (idem, 221).

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, 224.

<sup>9</sup> Though psalmic incipits (LXX Pss 31, 90, 111, 118, 127) occur on the Thebaid Grotto Chapel Walls (no. 14), there is no indication that the entire corpus of Psalms (much less the entire biblical corpus) was invoked.

inv. 365,<sup>10</sup> an amulet I have already discussed in my analysis of scriptural relevancy (Chapter Two), also testifies to the porous boundaries between healing narratives of Jesus within the “canonical” Gospels and those from “non-canonical” Jesus traditions. For the reader’s convenience, I will repeat lines 9-12 of this amulet: “ὁ ποιήσας καὶ πολλὰς καὶ ἀφάτους ἰάσεις, πρὸς ἅ[ς] λέγουσιν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὐ[α]γγελίοις” (“the one who did both the many and ineffable healings, beyond those that are discussed in the sacred Gospels”). As is clear from this text, the “canonical” status of a particular healing narrative was of little importance for its ritual efficacy; the ritual specialist wanted to draw from as broad a narrative corpus as possible. From the vantage point of the author of “G. Vitelli” PSI inv. 365, the defining criterion of an efficacious healing story was its association with Jesus, not its inclusion in the “canonical” Gospels.

We may be able to identify some of these “non-canonical” traditions with the help of the extant apotropaic record. One “non-canonical” tradition that was probably invoked in many instances of the Gospel *incipits* was the Abgar/Jesus legend.<sup>11</sup> In one version of this tradition, the Edessen king Abgar writes a letter to Jesus requesting healing. Jesus responds with his own letter, stating that while his ministry commitments prevent him from coming to Edessa, he will send one of his disciples to heal the ailing king. This promise is fulfilled when Thaddeus (Addai) heals Abgar in Jesus’ stead. In another version, present, most notably, in several Coptic manuscripts, it is the Edessan people that are plagued with ailments. Instead of an emissary, Jesus heals the people *in absentia*. Furthermore, in this latter tradition Jesus’ letter is believed

---

<sup>10</sup> Vitelli, “Noterelle papirologiche,” 300-301.

<sup>11</sup> See Eusebius, *H.E.* I.13; *Acta Thaddaei* (Richard Adelbert Lipsius and Max Bonnet, eds., *Acta apostolorum apocrypha* [Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959]); *The Doctrine of Addai* (G. Phillips, ed., *The Doctrine of Addai, The Apostle* [London: Trubner & Co, 1876]).

to possess a certain apotropaic power in and of itself. For Jesus promises that wherever the letter is affixed, there will be protection from demonic attack.

There is compelling evidence that the Abgar/Jesus tradition had an impact on the materials invoked by Gospel *incipits*. For instance, it is found in rituals in which all four Gospel *incipits* are present: Anchorite's Grotto in Nubia (**no. 1**); Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (**no. 4**); P. Anastasy 9 (**no. 5**).<sup>12</sup> Of particular significance is the way that the Abgar/Jesus tradition was invoked in Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (**no. 4**). In this sixth or seventh century CE Coptic amulet, the ritual specialist juxtaposed the *incipit* of Jesus' letter to Abgar with the "canonical" Gospels. In fact, this "non-canonical" *incipit* occurs *before* the "canonical" Gospel *incipits*, which are placed in the anomalous order: Mt, Lk, Jn, Mk.<sup>13</sup>

In addition, the Abgar/Jesus correspondence is the most frequently used "non-canonical" tradition in the extant apotropaic record.<sup>14</sup> This is not necessarily surprising in light of its popularity in late antique Egypt more generally.<sup>15</sup> Thus, it is likely that the Abgar/Jesus legend was called to mind and invoked for many ritual specialists when they included the Gospel *incipits* in their rituals.

Further complicating matters is the applicability of a phenomenon that Homeric scholar John Miles Foley deemed "traditional referentiality." This term represents the mechanism by

---

<sup>12</sup> P. Anastasy 9 also records an additional letter from Jesus to Abgar as part of its ritual arsenal.

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion of this artifact, see Sanzo, "Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2)," forthcoming.

<sup>14</sup> In addition to the manuscripts cited above, see e.g., P. Oxy. LXV 4469 (Franco Maltomini, "4469. Letter of Abgar to Jesus [Amulet]," in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 65, ed. M. W. Haslam, A. Jones, et. al [London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1998], 122-29, no. 4469), P. Mich. Inv. 6213 (Yassa 'Abd al-Masih, "An Unedited Bohairic Letter of Abgar," *BIFAO* 45 [1947]: 65-80; Kevin P. Sullivan and Terry G. Wilfong, "The Reply of Jesus to King Abgar: A Coptic New Testament Apocryphon Reconsidered" [P. Mich. inv. 6213]," *BASP* 42 [2005]: 107-123), P. Got. 21 (Hjalmar Frisk, *Papyrus grecs de la Bibliothèque Municipale de Gothenbourg* [Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerber, 1929], 42; Herbert C. Youtie, "Gothenburg Papyrus 21 and the Coptic Version of the Letter to Abgar," *HTR* 24 [1931]: 61-65). It is also possible that P. Heid. 1101 is referencing this tale as part of its ritual performance, as Gianfranco Fiaccadori has argued ("Cristo all' Eufrate [P. Heid. G. 1101, 8 ss.]," *La parola de passato* 41 [1986]: 59-63). On the importance of the Abgar tradition in the apotropaic world of late antiquity, see Claudia Rapp, "Holy Texts," 218-19; Don Skemer, *Binding Words*, 96-105.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Tito Orlandi, "Abgar," in *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. 1, ed. Aziz S. Atiya (London: MacMillan, 1991), 7b-8a; Drioton, "Un apocryphe anti-arien," 306-26.

which an entire socially contingent tradition is evoked and aggregated through the performance of (a portion of) a well-known text. In Foley’s words,

Traditional referentiality...entails the invoking of a context that is enormously larger and more echoic than the text or work itself, that brings the lifeblood of generations of poems and performances to the individual performance or text...Such a process of generating meaning I call *metonymy*, designating a mode of signification wherein the part stands for the whole.<sup>16</sup>

Henk Versnel has suggested that “traditional referentiality” can be useful for understanding the use of authoritative traditions in ritual contexts.<sup>17</sup> Although I take issue with the *pars pro toto* model that informs Foley’s analysis, I agree with Versnel that “traditional referentiality” can be a useful tool for the scholar of ancient rituals. In particular, I find it helpful to expand and complicate the nature of the invoked materials behind the *incipits*.

There are traces of “traditional referentiality” in the apotropaic record of late antique Egypt. This can be seen, for example, in the conflation of different Jesus traditions that were deployed ritually. Brit. Lib. Or. 6796(4), 6796, a collection of two fifth–or sixth–century CE Coptic manuscripts that form a spell for exorcising all demonic forces, demonstrates how this conflation of Jesus traditions in ritual contexts could both accommodate and transcend canonical divides.<sup>18</sup> The spell begins with a prayer of Jesus on the cross (ΤΕΠΡΟCΕΥΧΗ ΝΤΙC ΠΕΧ̄C  
ΝΤΔϨΤΔΟΥ[ΟC 2ΙΧ̄Ν] ΠΕCϸϸϸC[Ο]ϸ), which describes the crucifixion scene and the events surrounding it:

---

<sup>16</sup> *Immanent Art*, 7. Raymond W. Gibbs approach to the function of metonymy in memory echoes the implications that Foley draws from “traditional referentiality.” Gibbs writes, “People’s knowledge in long-term memory of coherent, mundane series of events can be metonymically referred to by the mere mention of one salient subpart of these events. We see that the mention of the subpart metonymically stands for the whole event” (*The Poetics of the Mind: Figurative Thought, Language and Understanding* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994], at 330-31).

<sup>17</sup> “Poetics,” 124.

<sup>18</sup> For *editio princeps*, see Kropp, *Koptische Zaubertexte* I, 47-50, no. J (with German translation and notes in idem, *Koptische Zaubertexte* II, 57-62, no. XV and image of the bottom of 6796 in idem, *Koptische Zaubertexte* III, 217 [Tab 1, Image 1]). Cf. *ACM* no. 132 (English translation of the entire composite text and photograph of the bottom of 6796); LDAB/TM 100020.

“Eloi Eloi Lama Sabaktani Marmarimari,” that is “God, my god, why have you abandoned me?” Some of them said, “Elias,” others, “Jeremias.” One of them took a sponge and dipped it in vinegar, and he (that is, Jesus) took a taste. He said, “My father, all things have been completed,” and at once he gave up the spirit. The heaven opened, the earth quaked, and the bones of those who had died arose. In their bodies they went to Jerusalem, and they went (back) into the tomb.<sup>19</sup>

In this crucifixion account, the ritual specialist has synthesized details that are unique to the different Gospels: the allusion to LXX Ps 21:1 (see Mt 27:46; Mk 15:34); the dipping of the sponge in vinegar (see Mt 27:48); the phrase “My father, all things have been completed” (see Jn 19:30); references to the heaving opening, the earth quaking, and the bones of the deceased arising (see Mt. 27:51-53).

But the crucifixion tradition, integrated into the ritual of Brit. Lib. Or. 6796(4), 6796, also includes information from beyond the boundaries of the “canonical” Gospels. For example, at the bottom of Brit. Lib. Or. 6796 (the second leaf) is a rather interesting drawing of the crucifixion scene. In this picture, Jesus is depicted on the cross with the two crucified criminals (Mt 27:38, Mk 15:27, Lk 23:32-43). To be sure, a pictorial representation of the crucifixion is not particularly surprising in light of the interest of this ritual specialist in the final minutes of Jesus’ life. What is unusual about this drawing, however, are the specific names written above the pictures of the two criminals: Gestas (left) and Demas (right). While the criminals remain nameless in the “canonical” crucifixion narratives, the passion narrative in the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (hereafter *GNic*) does name the criminals “Gestas” and “Dismas” (*GNic* 9:5).<sup>20</sup> These names closely resemble those given in the Brit. Lib. Or. 6796.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Translation by Richard Smith in *ACM*, 290.

<sup>20</sup> *GNic* is also known as the *Acts of Pilate*.

<sup>21</sup> That there are different spellings of Dismas/Demas in the Brit. Lib. Or. 6796(4), 6796 and *GNic* is not surprising since these names circulated in various forms in antiquity (H. C. Kim ed., *The Gospel of Nicodemus: Gesta Salvatoris* [Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1973], 4).

*GNic* was a popular account of the passion of Christ that enjoyed a wide geographical circulation beginning in the fourth century CE. It was also translated very early from the original Greek into various languages.<sup>22</sup> Of particular significance for my present concerns is the Coptic tradition of *GNic*, which may go back as early as the fifth century CE.<sup>23</sup> This early date may suggest that our fifth–or sixth–century ritual specialist could have had direct access to a textual version. This would explain the close resemblance of the names of the two criminals. If there was not direct textual dependence, we can reasonably assume that Brit. Lib. Or. 6796(4), 6796 and *GNic* share a common tradition—whether written or oral.<sup>24</sup> Thus, we are presented with a situation in which “canonical” and “non-canonical” traditions of the crucifixion have been juxtaposed and even integrated through “traditional referentiality.”<sup>25</sup> In other words, when the ritual specialist thought about the crucifixion of Jesus, multiple written (and perhaps oral) traditions came to mind, “canonical” and (at least one) “non-canonical.”

There is evidence that a wide range of Jesus traditions were invoked even in cases in which only one *incipit* was used. In two ritual artifacts, P. Oxy. VIII 1077 (**no. 20**) and P. Oxy. VIII 1151 (**no. 21**), the single *incipit* is accompanied by language either derived from or

---

<sup>22</sup> Zbigniew Izydorczyk, “Introduction,” in *The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus: Texts, Intertexts, and Contexts in Western Europe*, ed. Zbigniew Izydorczyk (Tempe: Arizona Board of Regents for Arizona State University, 1997), 1-19, at 3.

<sup>23</sup> M. Vandoni and T. Orlandi, *Vangelo di Nicodemo*, pt. 2, *Traduzione dal copto e commentario* (Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1966), 76-77. Zbigniew Izydorczyk and Jean-Daniel Dubois also entertain the possibility that the Coptic tradition can be dated to the fifth century (“Before and Beyond the Medieval West,” in *The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus: Texts, Intertexts, and Contexts in Western Europe*, ed. Zbigniew Izydorczyk [Tempe: Arizona Board of Regents for Arizona State University, 1997], 21-41). To the contrary, G. C. O’Caellaigh contended that the Coptic tradition is no earlier than the tenth century CE (“Dating the Commentaries of Nicodemus,” *HTR* 56 [1963]: 21-58, at 30).

<sup>24</sup> Indeed, scholars have identified a variety of “derivative compositions” from the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (collectively known as “the Cycle of Pilate”), some of which include the passion narrative (cf. Izydorczyk, “Introduction,” 6-9).

<sup>25</sup> For the conflation of “canonical” and “non-canonical” traditions in the *Acts of Peter*, see Simon Lee, “The Transfiguration Remembered, Reinterpreted, and Reinacted in *Acts of Peter 20-21*: An Exploration of the Dynamic Relationship between the Scriptures, Their Interpretative Traditions, and Their Interpreting Community,” in *Jewish and Christian Scriptures: The Function of ‘Canonical’ and ‘Non-Canonical’ Religious Texts*, ed. James H. Charlesworth and Lee Martin McDonald (New York: T & T Clark, 2010), 173-96.

corresponding to Mt 4:23[-24]/9:35, a summary reference to Jesus' healing and preaching ministry in Galilee. As a result of its summary nature, this passage implies countless healings, which go without explicit mention in Matthew's Gospel. This passage offered the ritual specialist a considerable amount of freedom to create and apply numerous healing stories. In other words, by citing Mt 4:23[-24]/9:35, the specialist was given a kind of ritual "blank check."

In conclusion, it seems that the materials invoked through the Gospel *incipits* included not only "non-canonical" traditions, but also intertextual syntheses of established traditions that crossed various boundaries, such as "canonical"/"non-canonical" and "written"/"oral."

Accordingly, we should assume that in some cases the Jesus materials that were invoked through the Gospel *incipits* would be unrecognizable to us. The *historiola* in P. Heid. 1101, a ritual narrative that has eluded a convincing source critical solution, provides an illustration of how diverse Jesus traditions could be conflated in unexpected and unidentifiable ways:

For our Lord was pursued by the Jews (Ἰουδαίων), and he came to the Euphrates River and stuck in his staff, and the water stood still. Also you, discharge (ῥεῦμα), stand still, in the name of our Lord, who was crucified, from head to toe-nails.<sup>26</sup>

## I. 2. Metonymy and *Incipits* of Multiunit Corpora: Not *pars pro toto*, but *pars pro partibus*

I have attempted to show that, while the Gospel *incipits* by definition functioned metonymically, the "Bible" and its sub-corpora were not treated as "wholes" within the

---

<sup>26</sup> Translation taken from *Suppl. Mag.* 1: 92. For the *editio princeps*, see Franco Maltomini, "Cristo all'Eufrate P. Heid.G.1101: Amuleto cristiano," *ZPE* 48 (1982): 149-70. On account of the peculiar nature of the *historiola* in P. Heid. 1101, the little scholarship that has been devoted to it has been almost exclusively confined to source-critical aims. Franco Maltomini found a source-critical solution to the *historiola* in P. Heid. 1101 in the ninth century CE *Jordansegen* tradition (Maltomini, "Cristo all'Eufrate," 152-56). All of the ritual artifacts in this tradition share a basic *similia similibus* formula, usually to stop a hemorrhage: as Jesus stopped the Jordan River, so may the hemorrhage cease. Maltomini conceded, however, that this solution has difficulty accounting for the reference to the Euphrates River and (more importantly) for the reference to the Jewish pursuit of Jesus. He further argued that the reference to the Jews did not serve an immediate "magical" function (idem, 156). Appropriately unsatisfied with Maltomini's source-critical solution, Gianfranco Fiaccadori looked to the Abgar/Jesus correspondence for the source of this *historiola* ("Cristo all'Eufrate," 59-63). Among other connections, Fiaccadori noted that the theme of conflict between Jesus and the Jews makes its way into several of the accounts of this tradition (idem, 61-62). Although I am not convinced by either solution, I find Fiaccadori's solution more persuasive.

apotropaic world of late antique Egypt. Thus, I have argued that the metonymic relationship between the Gospel *incipits* and their implied antecedent is one that is not best characterized by the Latin phrase *pars pro toto* (or equivalent), strictly speaking. I will now attempt to provide a more adequate way of describing this metonymic relationship.

Rather than a *pars pro toto* relationship with their “targets,” I maintain that the Gospel *incipits* reflect a different kind of metonymy that is best represented by the phrase “part for part(s)” (*pars pro parte/partibus*).<sup>27</sup> Within metonymic theory, precedent for this kind of metonymy is found in the English language: the lexeme, “four-letter word.”<sup>28</sup> While this expression derives its meaning in part via a transitory reference to a whole (i.e., swear words or profanity),<sup>29</sup> it ultimately refers to particular vulgar terms, the imagined selection of which depends upon context and the individual making the statement.<sup>30</sup>

If we apply this transfer to the Gospel *incipits*, the “whole” corpus of the Gospels might be thought to stand behind the series of four Gospel *incipits*. But the Gospel corpus only served an intermediary role, encompassing a cluster of conceptually related items, namely sayings of and stories about Jesus. In other words, the “Gospels” were seen as a kind of repository of

---

<sup>27</sup> To be sure, for some linguists the distinction between part-for-whole and part-for-part(s) metonymic transfers is blurred. For instance, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson write the following concerning metonymy: “When we say that we need some *good heads* on the project, we are using ‘good heads’ to refer to ‘intelligent people.’ The point is not just to use a part (head) to stand for a whole (person) but rather to pick out a particular characteristic of the person, namely, intelligence, which is associated with the head. The same is true of other kinds of metonymies” (*Metaphors We Live By*, 36). In light of the potential for confusion, I believe that the part-for-part(s) label is more helpful, though if nuanced to mean particular parts within a “whole” (see the aforementioned quotation of Lakoff and Johnson), a part-for-“whole” label appropriately describes the metonymic relationship between the Gospel *incipits* and their implied corpus.

<sup>28</sup> This example reflects a sub-category of part-for-part metonymies, which Radden and Kövecses call “WORDS FOR THE CONCEPTS THEY EXPRESS” (“Towards a Theory of Metonymy,” 42). One might also point to the metonymic transfer that takes place in the phrase, “the bottle has soured.” In this case, one part of the “whole” (a bottle of milk) is meant to invoke another part (i.e., the milk). This particular part-for-part metonymy is labeled by Radden and Kövecses as “CONTAINER FOR CONTENTS” (*idem*, 41).

<sup>29</sup> Concerning this kind of metonymic expression, Radden and Kövecses contend that “the whole ICM [i.e., “idealized cognitive model”] is still present in the background” (“Towards a Theory of Metonymy,” 30).

<sup>30</sup> For a discussion of such “double metonymic shifts,” see Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, “High-Level Cognitive Models,” 14-15.

individual narrative and apophthegmatic units.<sup>31</sup> Yet only certain passages from that corpus were believed to be appropriate for apotropaic situations. Thus, rather than invoking the Gospel corpus as an undifferentiated “whole” sub-unit of sacred literature or every individual saying and narrative contained within the “Gospels,” I would propose that the ritual experts were ultimately invoking only select units from the known traditions about the life and ministry of Jesus that they felt would be efficacious. The metonymic target, therefore, was something akin to the late antique miscellany or St. Nilus’ *θησαύρισμα* and, hence, the “content” was limited to materials taken from known Jesus traditions that were thought to be *relevant* or *appropriate*.<sup>32</sup> It should be highlighted that, in some cases, these Jesus traditions may not have derived from the “canonical” Gospels.<sup>33</sup>

I do *not* suggest, however, that we can somehow know which stories and/or sayings were invoked in a particular instance of the Gospel *incipits*, as these would have varied according to the context in which the ritual specialist was operating. What is more, the notion of “traditional referentiality” should remind us that the particular events from the life and ministry of Jesus that a ritual expert or his/her client may have had in mind need not correspond to any known text. These qualifications notwithstanding, we can reasonably assume that healing and exorcistic narratives from the Gospels and other known Jesus traditions as well as some popular sayings (e.g., the Matthean Lord’s Prayer) figured prominently in a wide range of settings.

---

<sup>31</sup> For the idea of scripture functioning as a repository of divine decrees in the Jewish, Christian, and Muslim traditions, see Graham, *Beyond the Written Word*, 51.

<sup>32</sup> Accordingly, *pars pro toto* would accurately describe the metonymic relationship between the Gospel *incipits* and this imagined corpus. Petrucci appropriately writes, “...late antique and early medieval readers... must inevitably have ended up considering the individual texts contained in the book that they had in their hands [i.e., the miscellany] as a single whole; they then used them and memorized them as a whole, that is, in their unitary sequence” (“From Unitary Book to Miscellany,” 18). This imagined apotropaic miscellany parallels the *Paritta* in the Buddhist tradition. William A. Graham notes that such collections “often become the functionally primary scriptures of entire communities, since these are the texts that are known best by heart and used in daily life and ritual practice” (*Beyond the Written Word*, 66).

<sup>33</sup> It should be noted that in common parlance, the phrase “four-letter word” can also refer to expletives that are more than four letters (Radden and Kövecses, “Towards a Theory of Metonymy,” 42). This provides a helpful analogue to the use of the Gospel *incipits* to invoke materials outside of the “canonical” Gospels.

Despite limited evidence, the opening lines of the two other multiunit corpora on P. Amh. I 3 (a-b) (**nos. 23-24**) may contain *incipits* that functioned similarly to the Gospel *incipits*. It may be recalled that this apotropaic artifact includes the opening words of Genesis—according to the Septuagint and Aquila’s translation—and the *incipit* of Hebrews. It should be stressed that, like the Gospels, both Genesis and Hebrews are multiunit corpora. Thus, assuming that these opening lines were used as *incipits*, it follows that they related to their metonymic targets *pars pro parte/partibus* rather than *pars pro toto*.

A qualification, however, is in order. It is likely that Heb 1:1 on P. Amh. I 3 (b) (**no. 23**), assuming it was an *incipit*, invoked materials deemed relevant from Hebrews. It is not at all clear, however, the extent of the invoked target of the two prospective *incipits* of Genesis (**no. 24**). Do they have in mind material from the book of Genesis, the Pentateuch, or the Bible more generally? Unfortunately, there is insufficient evidence on the artifact to determine the answer to this question.

Likewise, the target of the *incipit* of Ps 1 in the later redaction of PSI V 553 (**no. 60**) is unclear. Did the *incipit* invoke Ps 1 or material from the Psalter as a discrete corpus? In this case, the identification of the scriptural target is intimately related to the type of metonymic transfer intended. Once again, the text offers little information for making this identification. As a default, I would error on the side of Ps 1 as the intended reference with a caveat that the *incipit* may have been intended to invoke elements from the Psalter more generally.

### **I. 3. The Gospel *Incipits* and the Ritual Use of “Gospels” in the Literary Record**

It is appropriate at this point to discuss literary texts, occasionally cited in scholarship in association with the Gospel *incipits*, which seem to imply the widespread ritual use of entire

gospel codices.<sup>34</sup> First, I will focus my attention on statements made by John Chrysostom and Augustine of Hippo regarding the ritual use of “Gospels.” I argue that the term “Gospels” in their discussions do not refer to entire Gospel codices, but to selections from the Gospels. I then turn my attention to accounts that more likely refer to the apotropaic use of entire codices. Utilizing insights from my earlier discussions of *historiolae* and *incipits* of multiunit corpora, I suggest that these codices most likely transferred power to the apotropaic situation *totum pro partibus*.

As is clear from their writings, John Chrysostom and Augustine were well aware of the use of “Gospels” for protection. In *Concerning the Statues*, Chrysostom writes: “Do you not see how women and little children suspend Gospels from their necks as a powerful amulet, and carry them about in all places wherever they go?”<sup>35</sup> In a more condemning tone, the same author refers to the protective use of the Gospels on beds:

since not even the Gospel hanging by our bed is more important than that alms should be laid up for you; for if you hang up the Gospel and do nothing, it will do you no such great good. But if you have this little coffer, you have a defense against the devil, you give wings to your prayer, you make your house holy, having meat for the King there laid up in store.<sup>36</sup>

Here Chrysostom argues that the giving of alms is more ritually efficacious than a gospel hanging from a bed.

In yet another venue, Chrysostom draws a connection between the ritual use of “Gospels” and the use of “Jewish” *tefillin*. He writes:

And what are these phylacteries, and these borders? Since they (i.e., the Jews) were continually forgetting God’s benefits, He commanded His marvelous works to be inscribed on little tablets, and that these should be suspended from their hands (wherefore also He said, “They shall be immoveable in your eyes”) which

---

<sup>34</sup> E.g., Frankfurter, “Narrating Power,” 465 n. 25; Judge, “Magical Use of Scripture,” 348.

<sup>35</sup> 19.14. Translation taken from Kim Haines-Eitzen, “Textual Communities in Late Antique Christianity,” in *A Companion to Late Antiquity*, ed. Philip Rousseau (London: Basil Blackwell, 2009), 146-57, at 155.

<sup>36</sup> *Hom. First Corinth.* 16.9.7 (PG 61.373). Translation taken from Philip Schaff, ed., *Saint Chrysostom’s Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians: Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church Part 12* (repr. Kessinger Publishing, 2004), 262.

they called phylacteries; as many of our women now wear Gospels hung from their necks.<sup>37</sup>

In addition to dissuading his readers from using the Gospels prophylactically through an association with women, Chrysostom here also includes the Jews to accomplish this goal, pointing to what he thinks is a ritual analogue to the apotropaic use of the Gospels (i.e., the *tefillin*).

Taking a more supportive approach to this apotropaic use of the “Gospels,” Augustine writes in his *Tractate on the Gospel of John*:

When your head aches, we praise you if you place the gospel at your head, instead of having recourse to an amulet. For so far has human weakness proceeded, and so lamentable is the estate of those who have recourse to amulets, that we rejoice when we see a man who is upon his bed, and tossed about with fevers and pains, placing his hope on nothing else than that the gospel lies at his head; not because it is done for this purpose, but because the gospel is preferred to amulets.<sup>38</sup>

For Augustine, the placement of a gospel at one’s head for healing is an appropriate substitution for an amulet.

There are many points of interest in these passages. For my present concerns, however, I will focus on the nature of the gospel artifacts that Chrysostom and Augustine mention. I maintain that there are reasons to believe that Chrysostom and Augustine were not referencing the use of entire gospel codices, but artifacts with select passages from the Gospels.

It should be highlighted at the onset that the relevance of this patristic evidence is questionable for a discussion of the extant apotropaic artifacts from late antique Egypt since this evidence does not come from Egypt. It is by no means certain that ritual practices known to

---

<sup>37</sup> *In Matth. hom.* 72 (PG 58.669). Translation taken from Philip Schaff, ed., *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, vol. 10, *St. Chrysostom: Homilies on the Gospel of Saint Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1888), 418. Cf. Jerome, *Comm. in Mt.* 23.5.

<sup>38</sup> *Tract. Gosp. Jn* 7:12. Translation based on Philip Schaff, ed., *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, vol. 7, *St. Augustin: Lectures or Tractates on the Gospel According to Saint John Homilies on the First Epistle of John, Soliloquies*, trans. John Gibb and James Innes (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1888), 52.

Chrysostom and Augustine in Antioch or North Africa respectively would necessarily correspond to that of Egyptians in the *chora*.

A further caution in using these literary sources relates to the nature of their respective testimonies. The statements made about the ritual use of the “Gospels” were designed to be prescriptive, not descriptive. What we have are the testimonies of two *men*, who would like to eradicate or to domesticate a ritual practice in accordance with their social and theological programs. For instance, Chrysostom’s emphasis on the use of these ritual devices by women (and children) and comparing them to Jewish *tefillin* were more likely meant to discourage the use of such artifacts than reflect social reality.<sup>39</sup> Nevertheless, because this literature has been cited in conjunction with the Gospel *incipits*, a few words are in order.

First, in the case of Chrysostom, an entire gospel codex seems unlikely to be in mind in light of the connection he draws between the gospel artifacts and the *tefillin*, which only contained four passages of scripture (Ex 13:1-10; 13:11-16; Deut 6:4-9; 11:13-32).<sup>40</sup> Although I think that Chrysostom’s primary reason for drawing this comparison was to dissuade his readers from using ritual devices, his use of this comparison suggests that he did not have in mind gospel codices.

Along these lines, both Chrysostom and Augustine juxtapose the gospel devices with amulets. The inscribed amulets that have survived from the ancient world contain texts that, for

---

<sup>39</sup> Chrysostom’s view of amulets corresponds to a traditional trope that associates women and “magic” (e.g., Athanasius, *De Amuletis* [PG 26.1320]; Ephraim, *Mēm̄rē sur Nicomédie*, XL 351, 353, 385-93). For discussions of this motif, see e.g., Todd Breyfogle, “Magic, Women, and Heresy in the Late Empire: The Case of the Priscillianists,” in *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, ed. Marvin W. Meyer and Paul A. Mirecki (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 435-54 and Richard Gordon, “Imagining Greek and Roman Magic,” in *The Athlone History of Witchcraft and Magic in Europe*, ed. B. Ankarloo and S. Clark (London: The Athlone Press, 1999), 159-266. It should be noted that A. D. Vakaloudi, relying primarily on the testimony of Ephraim Syrus, has speculated that women were in particularly attracted to “apotropaic magical ceremonies” (“ΔΕΙΣΙΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΑ,” 189).

<sup>40</sup> For discussions of this connection, see the following: von Dobschütz, “Charms and Amulets (Christian),” 425; H. F. Stander, “Amulets and the Church Fathers,” *Ekklesiastikos pharos* 75 (1993): 55-66, at 56; R. S. Fagen, “Phylacteries,” in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 5, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 368-70. For *tefillin*, more generally, see especially Yehudah Cohn, *Tangled Up in Text: Tefillin in the Ancient World* (Providence: Brown Judaic Studies, 2008).

the most part, are considerably shorter than gospel codices.<sup>41</sup> Thus, the comparison drawn between the “Gospels” and amulets also suggests that Chrysostom and Augustine did not have entire gospel codices in mind.

Two practical implications of these testimonies also suggest that only collections of passages from the Gospels were intended. First, the emphasis on the use of these devices by children in the statements of Chrysostom suggests that, at least in his testimonies, entire gospel codices were probably not in view. Second, both authors seem to presuppose that the use of these gospel artifacts was a widespread phenomenon. The implied ubiquity of these artifacts suggests that Chrysostom and Augustine had in mind small collections of passages from the Gospels, analogous to the rather common apotropaic devices we have discussed in this study. Indeed, the cost of a codex of an entire Gospel would be prohibitive to most ancients.<sup>42</sup> It is, therefore, unlikely that the statements of Chrysostom and Augustine refer to entire gospel codices. Instead, it is more likely that they had in mind small artifacts that contained citations from the Gospels, analogous to those preserved in the apotropaic record of late antique Egypt.<sup>43</sup>

This not to say that there is no evidence for the use of codices in late antique ritual contexts. For instance, the hermit Amoun was said to have worn a biblical codex around his

---

<sup>41</sup> To be sure, P. Anastasy 9 (nos. 5 and 28), a sixth-century ritual codex, utilizes multiple lengthy texts. Yet this artifact is the exception in ritual practice, not the rule.

<sup>42</sup> On the expense of ancient books, see Roger Bagnall, *Early Christian Books in Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 50-69. Though Bagnall is willing to grant that individuals in pre-industrial societies may have spent a higher percentage on purchases like clothing or books (64), it remains unlikely that a sizable population would be able to afford an entire Gospel corpus, especially among the non-clergy (62). As Sigrid Mratschek notes, “The relationship between salaries and prices confirms the picture that books in the Byzantine period were an article beyond the financial means of a man with an average income” (“*Codices vestri nos sumus: Bücherkult und Bücherpreise in der christlichen Spätantike*,” in *Hortus litterarum antiquarum, Festschrift für Hans Armin Gärtner zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. A. Haltenhoff and F.-H. Mutschler [Heidelberg: C. Winter, 2000], 369-80, at 373, citation and translation from Bagnall, *Early Christian Books*, 63).

<sup>43</sup> In fact, already in 1906, E. Nestle questioned the practicality of such artifacts, suggesting that the word εὐαγγέλια probably does not refer to the entire Gospel corpus, but instead may have in mind the Gospel *incipits* or select pericopae (“Evangelien als Amulett am Halse und am Sofa,” *ZNTW* 7 [1906]: 96). Likewise, Claudia Rapp notes, “...references in our sources to the miraculous use of ‘the gospel[s]’ do not always refer to the entire combination of the four Gospels, but...to individual Gospels, or parts thereof” (“Holy Books,” 202). Cf. Stander, “Amulets and the Church Fathers,” 57; Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 238.

neck.<sup>44</sup> Likewise, a disciple of Martin of Tours named Maximus is said to have worn a Gospel codex, a paten, and chalice around his neck.<sup>45</sup> In these cases, gospel codices were probably in mind. Does the evidence for such codices present a challenge to my theory of *incipits* of multiunit corpora? In other words, do these artifacts suggest that multiunit items were invoked *in toto*?

With respect to this matter, it is helpful to bear in mind the centrality of analogy in the creation of ritual power. As we have seen from our analysis of ancient *historiolae*, generic and undifferentiated concepts (e.g., “Word of God”)—beyond possessing little heuristic utility—do not reflect the kind of power desired in ancient rituals. What was thought to be effective was the precedent or paradigm for healing or protection established by prior acts of the divine. Accordingly, it is unlikely that undifferentiated notions of “biblical power” were at play when ancients suspended codices around their necks. This analysis, of course, raises an important question: how do we explain the uses of codices for ritual power?

At the very least, we can probably assume that these codices contained and/or symbolized the presence of God. This (metaphorical) association was likely operative in the use of the Bible for the swearing of oaths and at ecumenical councils.<sup>46</sup> Still at an abstract level, we can also assume a relationship between the presence of God and the protection of God. Yet, I believe we can be even more specific than merely highlighting the notion of the protective presence of God when defining the nature of this transfer of power.

---

<sup>44</sup> Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 8.1-3.

<sup>45</sup> Gregory of Tours, *Glory of the Confessors* 22. The Freer Collection also preserves folia of twelve unbound Coptic and Greek fragments from Egypt (5.6 x 8.4 cm – 9.0x 10.0 cm). For discussions, see William H. Worrell, *The Coptic Manuscripts in the Freer Collection* (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1923), xii-xiii; Rapp, “Holy Books,” 204.

<sup>46</sup> Rapp, “Holy Books,” 196-200.

The evidence from the apotropaic record may provide us with a helpful model. In particular, we may look to the ritual semantics of *incipits* of multiunit corpora for an analogue. If this comparison is appropriate, the power of the codex would have been linked with the particular precedent or paradigm associated with textual passages contained (or thought to be contained) therein. To put this in metonymic terms, the use of codices in apotropaic settings worked on the basis of the metonymic transfer *totum pro partibus* (“whole for parts”). In certain cases, these “biblical” precedents may have worked in conjunction with the transmission history of the artifact itself (e.g., the holiness of its scribe or previous owner) to attain ritual power.<sup>47</sup> While this approach goes some way towards explaining the ritual semantics of codices, this subject certainly requires further research.

## II. Toward a Metonymic Theory of *Incipits* of Single-Unit Texts

I have argued that *incipits* of multiunit corpora, as represented by the Gospel *incipits*, likely invoked their respective scriptural targets according to the metonymic transfer *pars pro parte/partibus*. In addition to “canonical” sayings and narratives, it is also likely that “non-canonical” materials were invoked on occasion. In this section, I will discuss the possible associations of the more elusive *incipits* of single-unit texts. I maintain that the metonymic transfer operative in *incipits* of single-unit texts likely varied between *pars pro toto* and *pars pro parte/partibus*.

In Chapter One, I showed that single-unit texts were utilized in various ways in the apotropaic world of late antique Egypt. Taking LXX Ps 90 and the Matthean Lord’s Prayer (Mt

---

<sup>47</sup> That certain artifacts *themselves* were considered powerful at some level is evident in cases in which the presence of the physical artifact facilitated miraculous events (e.g., John Moschus, *Pratum spirituale* 8 and Gregory of Tours, *Life of the Fathers* 6.6). It should be stressed that in such cases, the power did not derive from the “Word of God” as an abstract concept, but was tied to material objects.

6:9-13) as emblematic, I argued that ritual citations of single-unit texts ranged from short references to the entirety of the unit; in certain cases the entire single-unit text was thought to be efficacious in a ritual context, while in other cases only portions of the single-unit item were thought to be appropriate or necessary. This diversity sheds light on the operation of *incipits* of single-unit items.

Perhaps at the most basic level, this diversity indicates that ritual specialists would have approached *incipits* of single-unit texts from different perspectives. Thus, in certain instances, it is likely that the entire single-unit was invoked, while in others only portions of the single-unit text were deployed. Unfortunately, most artifacts offer little evidence to draw upon to determine the extent of the invocation.

Nevertheless, certain artifacts offer clues to the extent of the *incipit's* invocation. For instance, the use(s) of καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς on PSI VI 719 (**nos. 31 and 56**) after the citation(s) of LXX Ps 90:1 and, most likely, Mt 6:9 offer reasonable grounds for assuming a *pars pro toto* transfer. On the basis of its usage to refer to continuous text in Epiphanius' *Panarion*, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς likely invoked at least the words immediately following the *incipit* on PSI VI 719. Furthermore, as I noted in Chapter One, the final petition of the Matthean version of the Lord's Prayer ("deliver us from evil") was often seen as particularly appropriate in apotropaic situations. This preference for the final petition in the apotropaic record suggests that it may have been included in the ritual of PSI VI 719 (**no. 56**), in which case the Lord's Prayer would have been invoked *in toto*. By extension, the proximity of the two instances of καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς makes it likely that LXX Ps 90:1 was also invoked *in toto*. It should be highlighted that this hypothesis, which is admittedly tentative, rests on the reconstruction of καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς after Mt 6:9, most of which is missing in the extant text of PSI VI 719. If my extrapolations reflect the intentions of the author of PSI VI 719,

the *pars pro toto* model would accurately describe the metonymic transfer implied by the *incipits*.

In other instances, however, it is more likely that the ritual specialist was interested in only a portion or portions of a given single-unit item. For instance, the use of Jn 2:1 on P. Vindob G 2312 (**no. 59** [cf. **no. 33**]) likely only references part of the Wedding of Cana pericope.<sup>48</sup> In other words, although the limited nature of the evidence precludes a definitive solution, there are reasons to think that this narrative was not invoked *pars pro toto*.

The identification of the metonymic transfer of Jn 2:1 on P. Vindob G 2312 is linked with the reconstruction of the amulet's occasion. On account of the *incipit* of the Wedding at Cana narrative, it has been suggested that the amulet was designed for newly-weds.<sup>49</sup> Despite the use of Jn 2:1, however, I remain unconvinced that P. Vindob G 2312 was an amulet for newly-weds. It is more likely that we are dealing with a healing or general protective amulet. The two other scriptural passages on the artifact (LXX Ps 90:1-2 [**no. 33**] and Rom 12:1-2a) suggest as much. As has been highlighted throughout this study, the *incipit* of LXX Ps 90 is common in both healing and protective rituals.

Furthermore, the ritual specialist appears to have modified Rom 12:1-2a for a healing or protective context. Instead of the Pauline request for believers to present their bodies as “a living sacrifice” (θυσίαν ζῶσαν), Rom 12:1 on P. Vindob G 2312 reads: “I urge you, brothers, by the mercies of God to p[r]esent your bodies a healed soul (παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς ἀδελφοὶ διὰ τῶν ἐκτηρμῶν (read οἰκιρμῶν) τοῦ θεοῦ π[α]ραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν ψυχὴν σώζαν [read

---

<sup>48</sup> To the contrary, Pickering suggests that the entire narrative was invoked (“Significance,” 132).

<sup>49</sup> LDAB 3488. Even if the ritual specialist used Jn 2:1 *pars pro toto*, a wedding context should not necessarily be inferred. P. Mich. Inv. 3718, a manuscript from seventh-century CE Oxyrhynchus, allegorizes each of the words of Jn 2:1 (cf. A. Henrichs and E. M. Husselman, “Christian Allegorizations [P. Mich. Inv. 3718],” *ZPE* 3 [1968]: 175-89). The breakdown of the allegory is as follows: day = Christ; third = faith; the wedding = the “calling of the Gentiles” (ἡ κλήσις [read κλήσις] τῶν ἔθνων); Cana = the church.

σωθεῖσσαν?).<sup>50</sup> The use of the anomalous σῶζαν instead of ζῶσαν is an interesting orthographical phenomenon; the ritual specialist has simply switched the ζ and the σ. In light of the additional substitution of ψυχὴν for θυσίαν, however, metathesis is unlikely. Instead, σῶζαν represents an intentional alteration of the text of Rom 12:1. It is, therefore, likely that the passive participle of σῶζω was intended (hence, my tentative reconstruction, σωθεῖσσαν), since there is no object of the phrase. Furthermore, a “soul that heals” makes little sense on an amulet. This substitution of “healed soul” for “living sacrifice” in Rom 12:1 in conjunction with LXX Ps 90:1-2 provides strong evidence that P. Vindob G 2312 was not intended for newly-weds, but was a general ritual for healing or protection from illness.

This identification of the general apotropaic occasion of P. Vindob G 2312 carries significance for the kind of metonymic transfer implied by Jn 2:1. Although one cannot speak definitively on the matter, I find it unlikely that the entirety of the Wedding at Cana pericope was invoked for a healing or protection ritual. Several of the details (e.g., the size of waterpots, the customs of Jewish purification) do not appear relevant for an apotropaic occasion.<sup>51</sup> It is more plausible that the ritual specialist was invoking the power associated with Jesus’ first miracle in John’s Gospel, the transubstantiation of water into wine (Jn 2:7-10). This miracle demonstrates Jesus’ power to transform a substance through his preternatural power. Thus, in my estimation, Jn 2:1 on P. Vindob. G 2312 operated on the basis of a *pars pro parte* metonymic transfer.

---

<sup>50</sup> The otherwise unknown form σωθεῖσσαν (aor. pass. part. fem. ac. sing. of σῶζω) is based on the known aorist passive of σῶζω, σωθείς (cf. N. Marinone, *All the Greek Verbs* [London: Duckworth, 1985], 311). Although orthographically more similar to σῶζαν in P. Vindob. 2312, σῶσαν (aor. active part. fem. ac. sing. of σῶζω) is less likely. It would suggest that ψυχή is the agent of saving/healing as opposed to the recipient of healing. For the use of σῶζω to indicate healing, see e.g., P. Ludg. Bat. XIX 20 (= *Suppl. Mag.* 1: 102-103, no. 35). See also P. Vindob. inv. G 42406 (= *Suppl. Mag.* 1: 74-75, no. 27).

<sup>51</sup> To be sure, as we have seen, details that seem *prime facie* inappropriate for an apotropaic ritual were often invoked in apotropaic rituals. Moreover, P. Mich. Inv. 3718 provides evidence for the allegorization of the Wedding at Cana narrative (see n. 49 in this chapter). Thus, it is certainly possible that the entire text was invoked *pars pro toto* with each detail given an allegorical meaning fitting for an apotropaic context. Nevertheless, I find the *pars pro parte* solution more convincing.

In conclusion, the metonymic target behind the *incipits* of single-unit texts likely varied as much as the use of their contiguous texts in apotropaic situations. Thus, we can assume that some of these *incipits* invoked their contiguous texts *pars pro toto*, while others invoked their targets *pars pro parte/partibus*. Accordingly, it must be conceded that the metonymic boundary between *incipits* of multiunit corpora and *incipits* of single-unit texts was occasionally blurred. Nevertheless, I think that this distinction is helpful. To show the utility of my typology for understanding the ritual semantics of scriptural *incipits*, I now turn my attention to a ritual artifact (PSI VI 719 [nos. 10, 31, and 56]) that draws formal distinctions between *incipits* of multiunit corpora and those of single-unit texts.

### **III. The Distinction between *Incipits* of Multiunit Corpora and *Incipits* of Single-Unit**

#### **Texts: The *Incipits* on PSI VI 719 as a Test Case**

In this study, I have maintained that *incipits* of multiunit corpora in many cases would have had a different kind of metonymic relation with their targets than *incipits* of single-unit texts. I have argued that *incipits* of multiunit corpora operated on the basis of a *pars pro parte/partibus* metonymic relation with their targets, while *incipits* of single-unit texts often—though not necessarily always—invoked their targets according to a *pars pro toto* metonymic transfer. Lest this thesis be seen as purely theoretical, I now examine the use of *incipits* on PSI VI 719 (nos. 10, 31, and 56). I demonstrate that the ritual specialist makes a formal distinction between *incipits* of single-unit texts and multiunit corpora. I further argue that the formal distinction drawn by the ritual specialist of PSI VI 719 supports my thesis on the respective metonymic transfers of *incipits* of multiunit corpora and *incipits* of single-unit texts.

We have seen that PSI VI 719 provides the clearest instance(s) of metonymy in the extant apotropaic record. For the reader’s convenience, I will provide my translation of the entirety of this amulet:

(symbols) **(Jn 1:1)** In the beginning was the word and the word was with god and the word was god. **(Mt 1:1)** The book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, | son of David, son of Abraham. **(Mk 1:2)** Just [as] Isaiah the prophet [sa]id.<sup>52</sup> **(Mk 1:1)** [The beginning of the Gos]pel of Jesus Christ | son of god, son of Abraham. **(Lk 1:1)** Sin[c]e many have made an attempt to set in order (a) na[r]rat[i]on concerning the | [t]hings which have been fulfilled among u[s]. **(LXX Ps 90:1)** The one who dwells [in (the) shelte]r of the most high, and so | forth (καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς). **(Mt 6:9)** Our Father who is in h[eav]en, let your name be holy a[nd so forth] (καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς) Glory to the father and to the son | and to the holy spirit no[w a]nd forevermore. | Amen. (symbols).<sup>53</sup>

As I highlighted above, the ritual specialist is explicit about his or her use of metonymy, utilizing the phrase “and so forth” (καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς) immediately after the opening line of LXX Ps 90 and, most likely, after the opening phrase of the Matthean Lord’s Prayer (Mt 6:9). What is of interest for the present discussion is that the ritual specialist does *not* use this phrase after the four Gospel *incipits*. Why does he or she place καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς after LXX Ps 90:1 and Mt 6:9, but not after the *incipits* of the four Gospels?

In order to account for this difference in PSI VI 719, we must return to Epiphanius’ *Panarion*. The reader may recall that Epiphanius used the phrase καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς twice in his refutation of the “Marcionites” (the first after the traditional Lukan *incipit* [Lk 1:1] and the second after Marcion’s Lukan *incipit* [Lk 3:1]). At first glance, the use of καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς on PSI VI 719 for LXX Ps 90:1 (and Mt 6:9) and Epiphanius’ use of καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς for a multiunit corpus

<sup>52</sup> See n. 53 in Chapter Three.

<sup>53</sup> (symbols) Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν. καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὲτ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ. Καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης. [Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ. Ἐπε[ιδ]ήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπιχειρησαν (read ἐπεχείρησαν) ἀνατάξ[ε]σθαι δι[τῆ] γ[η]σιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων (read πεπληροφορημένων) ἐν ἡμῖν π[ρα]γματῶν. Ὁ κατοικῶν [ἐν βοθη]α τοῦ ὑψίστου καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. Πατήρ (read Πάτερ) ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐ[ραν]οῖς, αγιασθητο (read ἀγιασθήτω) τὸ ὄνομά σου καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.] Δόξα πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ καὶ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν (symbols)

(the Gospel of Luke) seems to challenge my distinction between *incipits* of multiunit corpora and those of single-unit texts. Upon closer inspection, however, Epiphanius' use of καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς actually supports my distinction.

In his first use of καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, Epiphanius explicitly states that Marcion excised material from the beginning of Luke's Gospel (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τῷ Λουκᾷ). This almost certainly refers to material from the Lukan prologue (Lk 1:1-4), as he follows this detail with a list of several events from the initial chapters of Luke that have also been excised from Marcion's version: Elizabeth (Lk 1:5-25, 39-45); the angel Gabriel's annunciation to Mary (Lk 1:26-38); John and Zacharias (Lk 1:57-80); Jesus' birth at Bethlehem (Lk 2:1-20); Jesus' genealogy (Lk 3:23-38); Jesus' baptism (3:21-22). Why would Epiphanius reference these other excised units if the *incipit* plus καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς included the entirety of Luke's Gospel? Even more obvious, in what way could Marcion have had a version of the Gospel of Luke if he excised the entire thing? Thus, the phrase καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς accompanied by the Lukan *incipit* most likely references only a single independent thematic unit from Luke's Gospel, his prologue (Lk 1:1-4).

The intended reference in the second instance of καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς in Epiphanius' *Panarion* is more difficult to determine. The phrase occurs in conjunction with the first few words of Lk 3:1 ("In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar"), where Marcion evidently began his Gospel. Does Epiphanius refer to the remainder of the Gospel of Luke by the phrase καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς or only to the remainder of a particular narrative unit?

The surrounding context provides us with clues and supports the contention that καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς refers only to a particular narrative unit. First, the proximity of the previous use of καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς suggests that both instances of this phrase share a common meaning. Second, he treats the

citation from Lk 3:1 and καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς as a unit, and he brackets that unit with information that highlights its function as the beginning of the Gospel:

ἀρχὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔταξε ταύτην  
ἐν τῷ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ ἔτει Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς  
ἐντεῦθεν οὖν οὗτος ἄρχεται καὶ οὐ καθ' εἰρμὸν πάλιν ἐπιμένει

[Marcion] made this the beginning of the Gospel  
'In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar,' and so forth.  
This, then, was his beginning; and yet, again, he does not continue in order.<sup>54</sup>

I maintain that the demonstrative ταύτην in the clause preceding ἐν τῷ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ (Lk 3:1) and the adverbs ἐντεῦθεν and οὖν in the clause following καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς mark off Lk 3:1 (plus καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς) as an entire unit and qualify that unit as the “beginning” of Marcion’s version of Luke. In my reading, therefore, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς simply refers to material immediately following the cited passage, most likely the balance of information that Luke provides concerning the historical setting in which John the Baptizer and Jesus began their respective ministries (Lk 3:1-2).

The usage of καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς in Epiphanius’ *Panarion* helps clarify the reason for the formal distinction that the author of PSI VI 719 makes between the *incipits* of LXX Ps 90 and the Matthean Lord’s Prayer, on the one hand, and the Gospel *incipits*, on the other hand. The ritual specialist used the phrase καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς for LXX Ps 90:1 and (most likely) for Mt 6:9 because these *incipits* and the words immediately following them were part of the metonymic target. In other words, the phrases “the one who dwells in the shelter of the Most High” and “Our Father who is in heaven, let your name be holy” and the words immediately following these phrases were included in the materials that the ritual specialist invoked *pars pro toto*—although the extent of the material invoked, especially in the case of the *incipit* of LXX Ps 90, remains unknown to us. By contrast, the phrase καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς does not occur with the Gospel *incipits* in

---

<sup>54</sup> Translation taken from Williams, *The Panarion*, 280.

the ritual of PSI VI 719 because the texts immediately following the *incipits* of the multiunit Gospels were not considered relevant and, hence, were not invoked. Instead, the ritual specialist used the Gospel *incipits* to attain relevant material from the life and ministry of Jesus that was scattered throughout the Gospels (and possibly beyond). The author of PSI VI 719, therefore, presupposed different kinds of metonymic transfers between *incipits* of multiunit corpora (i.e., the Gospel *incipits*) and *incipits* of single-unit texts (i.e., LXX Ps 90:1 and Mt 6:9) along the lines that I have drawn.

I will now examine the implications of my thesis for an analysis of continuity and innovation in late antique ritual practice. I maintain that, while there is evidence for *incipits* of single-unit texts in other corpora from late antiquity, *incipits* of multiunit corpora were unique to late antique Egyptian ritual practice.

#### **IV. The *Incipits* and Continuity and Innovation in the Ancient Mediterranean**

Now that I have established a preliminary theory of the ritual use of scriptural *incipits* in late antique Egypt, it is imperative to situate the *incipits* within the broader context of ritual uses of sacred texts in the ancient Mediterranean world. Was the Bible used ritually in other parts of the Mediterranean? Were other sacred texts used in similar ways to the Bible in ritual contexts? Was the ritual use of *incipits* limited to biblical literature? Was this ritual practice unique to Egypt in late antiquity? In this brief analysis, I maintain that the ritual use of passages from the Bible was not limited to Egypt. Moreover, the ritual use of sacred texts with analogical content was not restricted to the Bible. Yet the extant apotropaic record suggests that the use of *incipits* was almost exclusively limited to biblical materials. In addition, the ritual use of *incipits* of

multiunit corpora in late antiquity appears to be unique to the Greek and Coptic communities of Egypt.

The ritual use of the “Bible” in late antiquity was certainly not confined to Egypt. Although the sands of Egypt have preserved a disproportionate number of ritual artifacts and, hence, have allowed for a fuller picture of Egyptian ritual practice, there is evidence that the scriptures were used ritually in other parts of the ancient Mediterranean. We have already noted that Chrysostom and Augustine attempted to eradicate or to domesticate the ritual use of the “Gospels.” As I noted above, it is more probable that these authors had in mind selections from the Bible than entire codices. Moreover, amulets, formularies, and “magical bowls” from the Levant, written in Jewish Aramaic, utilize the “Hebrew scriptures.”<sup>55</sup> As in the ritual artifacts from late antique Egypt, these artifacts cite short excerpts from the scriptures and apply them to their rituals.<sup>56</sup>

In addition to the use of the Bible throughout the Mediterranean, scholars have long highlighted similarities between the ritual use of biblical passages and the ritual use of other sacred texts (esp. Homeric poetry) in antiquity. For instance, in 1850, G. Roeper drew a connection between the ritual uses of Homeric verses and passages from the Bible, deducing that

---

<sup>55</sup> See esp. Naveh and Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls*; idem, *Magic spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1993); Dan Levene, *A Corpus of Magic Bowls: Incantation Texts in Jewish Aramaic from Late Antiquity* (London: Kegan Paul, 2003).

<sup>56</sup> The *tefillin* also provide evidence for the ritual use of the scriptures in the broader ancient Mediterranean world. Passages from the Pentateuch (Ex 13:1-10; 13:11-16; Deut 6:4-9; 11:13-21) were inscribed on one or four parchment strips, placed in small leather cases (the *tefillin*), and worn around one’s head and left arm for protective power (Cohen, *Tangled Up in Text*, 1). Despite the non-apotropaic meaning of the cited passages in their original narrative contexts, these passages from the Pentateuch eventually acquired apotropaic significance during the Second–Temple period (idem, 35-48). This apotropaic function continued throughout late antiquity and even into the modern era (Ibid, 55-144; cf. Simon Dein, *Religion and Healing among the Lubavitch Community in Stamford Hill, North London* [Lewiston: Edwin Mellon, 2004], 90-92). As was the case with the ritual artifacts from late antique Egypt and the ritual uses of the scriptures elsewhere, the *tefillin* utilize excerpts from the biblical record for protective power. It is no wonder, therefore, that Chrysostom drew a parallel between the *tefillin* and the ritual use of the “Gospels” (*In Matth. hom.* 72 [PG 58.669]).

Homeric texts functioned ritually as “die bibel (sic) der Hellenen.”<sup>57</sup> More recently, David Brakke has drawn a connection between the ritual uses of these respective corpora. He writes:

The surviving magical texts with Christian elements are diverse: *some use passages from Scripture just as others use lines from Homer*; others call upon Christian divinities, angels, or biblical figures in words composed by the author.<sup>58</sup>

Indeed, there are parallels between the ritual uses of the scriptures and of Homeric verses. Most importantly, extracts from both texts could be applied to the ritual context without concern for their original contexts. In other words, analogies were drawn between the sacred verses cited and other textual/performative items in the ritual context. We have seen this interpretive approach continually in the ritual uses of the scriptures, as passages that originally had nothing to do with apotropaic rituals acquired apotropaic significance in ritual contexts. Likewise, Derek Collins has demonstrated that, while earlier ritual uses of Homeric verses often invoked the original narrative context (e.g., Porphyry, *VP* 32-33), verses of Homeric poetry in late antique rituals formed analogies primarily with the ritual context (e.g., PGM IV, ll. 821-24 [cf. PGM IV, ll. 2146-50]; PGM XXIIa, ll. 2-7, 9-10), typically without concern for the original narrative contexts of the *Illiad* and the *Odyssey*.<sup>59</sup> Thus, there is common ground between the ritual uses of the Bible and of Homeric poetry in late antiquity.

In sum, portions of different sacred texts were used analogically in late antique ritual practice, often without concern for their original narrative contexts. This analogical and de-/re-contextual posture is not only common to the ritual uses of (partially) shared scriptural corpora

---

<sup>57</sup> “Homerische Talisman,” *Philologus* 5 (1850): 162-65, at 163.

<sup>58</sup> Brakke, *Demons*, 232 (emphasis mine). I must concede that I am unable to determine if by “others” Brakke means “Christian” ritual experts that cite Homeric passages or “non-Christian” artifacts. If the former, I am curious which ritual artifacts he has in mind. In either case, he draws a parallel between the ritual uses of Homer and the scriptures.

<sup>59</sup> Collins, *Ancient Greek Magic*, 108; Idem, “The Magic of Homeric Verses,” *CP* 103 (2008): 211-36, at 215. See also Pierre Boyancé, *Le culte des muses chez les philosophes Grecs: Études d’histoire et de psychologie religieuses* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1937), 126. Collins has been particularly critical of Versnel’s use of “traditional referentiality” as it relates to the “magical” use of Homeric traditions (idem, 108; cf. n. 17 in this chapter).

across divides of geography, language, and religious community, but also shared with the ritual uses of other sacred corpora.

Yet this portrait of continuity in the ritual deployment of sacred texts requires nuance. In particular, a word is in order concerning the relative uniqueness of the scriptural *incipits* within late antique Mediterranean ritual culture. I will approach this question of uniqueness and innovation in terms of sacred corpus, geography, and language. In short, the extant apotropaic record from late antiquity suggests that *incipits* of single-unit texts were primarily a biblical phenomenon, but were probably not unique to the Egyptian landscape and not restricted to Greek and Coptic speaking communities. The ritual use of *incipits* of multiunit corpora, however, was restricted to the Bible, limited geographically to Egypt, and unique to Greek and Coptic speaking communities during late antiquity.

According to the extant record, the ritual deployment of *incipits* is almost exclusively reserved for the opening lines of texts from the biblical canon. To the best of my knowledge, there is only one clear “non-canonical” example of a ritual *incipit*: the *incipit* of Jesus’ letter to Abgar on Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) (**no. 57**). In this parchment amulet, the ritual specialist has placed this non-canonical *incipit* before the *incipits* of the four Gospels (order: Mt, Lk, Jn, Mk). In light of the ubiquity of the Abgar correspondence and other non-canonical sources in the apotropaic record, the uniqueness of Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) is surprising. Is the exceptional status of this parchment amulet an archaeological accident? If so, is the non-canonical *incipit* on Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) evidence of a broader phenomenon in late antique ritual practice? Or, to the contrary, was there antipathy among ritual experts toward the use *incipits* of non-canonical texts? If so, was the author of Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) a textual maverick in Egyptian ritual culture? Although I am inclined toward the former option, it is striking that, despite the numerous extant

ritual artifacts with citations of sacred texts, the *incipit* of Jesus' letter to Abgar on Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2) is anomalous. Thus, by and large, the deployment of *incipits* of sacred texts was limited to the biblical canon.

The use of scriptural *incipits*, however, may not have been restricted to Egypt. There is evidence for this ritual phenomenon in Jewish Aramaic artifacts. For instance, an apotropaic bowl with text written in Jewish Aramaic, discovered near Kadhimain (6 km north of Badhdad), includes the opening line of MT Ps 91 (=LXX Ps 90:1) along with other scriptural texts.<sup>60</sup> The remainder of the ritual has a particularly strong emphasis on protection from demonic forces, including a request for protection from "all evil things" (l. 5) and a citation from Zech 3:2 ("And the Lord said unto Satan, the Lord rebuke thee, O Satan: even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?").<sup>61</sup> This emphasis on protection from evil forces could be an indication that the opening line from MT Ps 91:1 was intended to function as an *incipit*.<sup>62</sup> In addition to this bowl, there are several metal armbands with MT Ps 91:1 from Syria and elsewhere.<sup>63</sup> Like their Egyptian counterparts (**nos. 36-39**), however, they offer little evidence for determining the functions of their opening lines.

It should be highlighted that all of the (potential) exemplars of ritual *incipits* outside Egypt are *incipits* of single-unit texts. Thus, as far as I can tell, the deployment of *incipits* of multiunit corpora in late antique rituals was not only restricted to units of the biblical canon, but it was also limited geographically to Egypt and exclusive to Greek and Coptic speaking

---

<sup>60</sup> Naveh and Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls*, 184-87, no. B11.

<sup>61</sup> ll. 5-6. Translation taken from Naveh and Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls*, 185.

<sup>62</sup> The opening lines of other psalms can be found in other artifacts written in Jewish Aramaic (cf. Naveh and Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls*, 94-97, no. A12 [MT Ps 94:1]; idem, *Magic spells and Formulae*, 43-50, no. A16 [MT Ps 115:1]). Unfortunately, there is little evidence in these artifacts to determine the functions of the opening lines.

<sup>63</sup> See e.g., Kraus, "Fragmente eines Amulett-armbands," 120-27, nos. 3, 7, 8, 11, 13, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28.

communities.<sup>64</sup> It must be conceded that this portrait of the uniqueness of multiunit *incipits* may simply be an archaeological accident, the result of Egypt's favorable climate for preserving ancient manuscripts. Nevertheless, there are ritual artifacts extant from other regions of the late ancient Mediterranean and, to the best of my knowledge, none utilize *incipits* of multiunit corpora.<sup>65</sup>

Based on the evidence in the extant apotropaic record, therefore, the interaction of the scriptures with late antique ritual culture, in general, and late antique Egyptian ritual culture, in particular, did not simply result in a conversion of ritual idioms. Rather, the unique structural character of the "Old" and "New" Testaments and their uses in late antiquity more generally (e.g., the liturgy) merged to allow for the creation of new ritual tactics. The scriptural *incipits* epitomize this textual innovation in ritual culture. Not only were scriptural verses with (de-/re-contextualized) analogies to the concerns at hand cited and imbued with ritual power—a tactic analogous to the ritual uses of other sacred corpora (esp. Homer). But now a particular kind of citation (i.e., the opening line of a scriptural unit) could be used to point beyond the "words on the page" to invoke all or portions of a relatively extensive textual unit. In late antique Egypt, in particular, certain opening lines (i.e., *incipits* of multiunit corpora) could evoke and invoke the analogical power of select narratives and sayings from a lengthy textual composition via metonymic transfer. The apotropaic use of scriptural *incipits*, therefore, demonstrates rather acutely the various ways the Bible, as a unique collection of texts, expanded ritual language and practice in late antiquity.

---

<sup>64</sup> My assertion that the ritual use of *incipits* of multiunit corpora is restriction to Greek and Coptic speaking communities is predicated on my thesis that P. Heid. L 5 (no. 17) was not an *incipit*. It should also be noted that there is evidence for the ritual use of the *incipit* of John's Gospel in the Latin West at a later period (cf. Le Blant, "Le premier Chaptire de Saint Jean," 11-13). Further research will need to establish whether or not there is a direct relationship between these artifacts and late antique Egyptian ritual practice.

<sup>65</sup> For amulets on various materials (esp. gold, silver, and copper) from other regions of the ancient Mediterranean, see Kotansky, *Greek Magical Amulets*.

## V. Conclusions

In this chapter, I proposed a novel theory regarding the use of *incipits*. I argued that *incipits* of multiunit corpora, as exemplified by the Gospel *incipits*, invoked the narrative power of multiple Jesus traditions, some of which were likely derived from “non-canonical” materials. A *pars pro parte/partibus* metonymic transfer, therefore, better describes the ritual use of *incipits* of multiunit corpora than the *pars pro toto* relation. I then considered evidence for the ritual use of gospel codices in the testimonies of Chrysostom and Augustine. I argued that the “Gospels” they describe were probably not codices, but selections of passages from the Gospels. Furthermore, while there is evidence for the ritual use of codices, insights from ancient *historiolae* suggest that, even in these cases, select narratives and sayings would have been invoked *totum pro partibus*. I next considered *incipits* of single-unit texts. In contrast with *incipits* of multiunit corpora, the *incipits* of single-unit texts were probably less uniform, in some cases relating to their contiguous units *pars pro toto*, while in other instances invoking material *pars pro parte/partibus*. As a test case for my distinction between the ritual uses of *incipits* of multiunit corpora and *incipits* of single-unit texts, I examined the *incipits* on PSI VI 719 (nos. 10, 35, and 56). The use of καὶ τὰ ἕξῃς (“and so forth”) after the single-unit *incipits* (LXX Ps 90:1 and Mt 6:9), but not after the *incipits* of multiunit texts (the Gospel *incipits*), suggests that the ritual specialist understood the *incipits* to be of two different kinds. Finally, I considered how this differentiated view of *incipits* modifies our conception of continuity and innovation in the ritual use of sacred texts. With the help of my theory of *incipits*, I demonstrated that, while the ritual use of *incipits* crossed boundaries of language and geography, the ritual deployment of *incipits* of multiunit corpora appears to be distinctive to the Greek and Coptic communities of late antique Egypt.

## Conclusions

*In the Beginnings* is the first extensive and sustained treatment of the use of scriptural *incipits* in the ritual world of late antique Egypt. This study was motivated by three primary objectives: to develop a helpful typology of the scriptural *incipits*; to create an initial corpus of *incipits*; and to propose the first extensive and focused theory of the ritual use of scriptural *incipits*. These three objectives also formed the basis for the organization of the project.

My first objective was to develop a useful typology of scriptural *incipits*. Drawing on metonymic theory, I noted that the “Bible” and larger biblical sub-corpora (e.g., the Gospels) occur at a higher partonomic level than individual psalms or pericopae. In other words, psalms and pericopae are individual thematic units in and of themselves, while the “Bible” and the Gospels contain multiple thematic units. Second, I demonstrated that, in the extant apotropaic record, the scriptures were divided into individual units and cited accordingly. Thus, individual psalms and pericopae were often cited or alluded to *in toto*. But, in the case of larger corpora, only discrete units were considered appropriate for apotropaic use.

This unit-based approach to the scriptures corresponds to literary representations of scriptural usage in demonic conflicts in which a hierarchically ordered Bible was operative. The literary evidence suggests not only that certain passages of the scriptures were preferred over others in particular demonic conflicts, but also that individual biblical units could belong to the arsenal of heretics and even demons. A unit-based approach to the Bible in ritual settings is also supported by *historiolae*, which are empowered by particular precedent or paradigm.

Accordingly, I divided the scriptural *incipits* into two types based on the unit-value of their contiguous scriptural items: *incipits* of multiunit corpora and *incipits* of single-unit texts.

This two-fold distinction provided the organizing principle for the remaining two objectives of my study.

The second objective of *In the Beginnings* was to establish an initial corpus of scriptural *incipits* used in apotropaic settings. In accordance with my two-fold typology, I surveyed separately the potential *incipits* of multiunit corpora (Chapter Three) and those of single-unit texts (Chapter Four). The survey of potential *incipits* vividly illustrated the difficulty in distinguishing between the use of opening lines as *incipits* and as independent scriptural units. I, therefore, mapped the relative likelihood of an *incipit* function among the opening lines used in the ritual artifacts I surveyed. As part of this analysis, I identified various indicators, derived from the primary sources, that suggest an opening line was intended to function as an *incipit*: explicit reference to a metonymic usage; the presence of multiple opening lines on a single artifact; the use of titles; the explicit identification of an opening line as a title; other internal features. Unfortunately, there are several instances of opening lines for which an *incipit* function cannot be established with certainty. Thus, the development of additional criteria for identifying an opening line as an *incipit* is a desideratum.

The results of this survey carried implications for at least two domains of late antique ritual practice. First, the certain or probable *incipits* were representative of only a small number of texts. In particular, only three ritual artifacts made use of *incipits* of psalms other than LXX Ps 90. This limited use of psalmic *incipits* should, therefore, qualify claims or inferences that psalmic *incipits* (generally speaking) were a widespread ritual phenomenon. Second, the formal diversity of the scriptural *incipits* of both *incipits* of multiunit corpora and single-unit texts raised questions about the importance of faithfulness to established patterns in ritual practice. For instance, the extant record indicates that the Gospel *incipits* could be found in any number,

arranged in any order, and cited at various lengths. The scriptural *incipits* thus provide unique evidence that ritual specialists of late antique Egypt were free to interact with authoritative traditions in accordance with the limitations of the artifacts at their disposal and in light of their personal preferences.

My third and final objective was to propose the first focused theory of the ritual use of scriptural *incipits*. Once again, the two-fold typology developed in Section One provided the basis for my theoretical discussion. I argued that *incipits* of multiunit corpora operated on the basis of the metonymic transfer *pars pro partibus*, seeking to attain the paradigmatic power associated with select narratives and sayings of a specific corpus. In the case of the Gospel *incipits*, the primary representatives of multiunit *incipits*, late antique Egyptian ritual specialists wanted the paradigmatic power associated with known traditions of the life of Jesus. The evidence suggests that, in certain cases, the materials from the life of Jesus invoked could also include those derived from “non-canonical” sources. Although the evidence is limited for the assumed targets of other *incipits* of multiunit corpora, it is likely that they also would have operated on the basis of the metonymic relation *pars pro parte/partibus*.

The assumed metonymic target of *incipits* of single-unit texts is more difficult to gauge. This difficulty relates to the diverse ways that ancient ritual specialists used single-unit texts from the scriptures. The extant apotropaic record provides evidence for the use of single-unit texts (e.g., psalms) in their entirety; however, the extant evidence also demonstrates that, for some ritual specialists, only certain portions of a single-unit text were seen as relevant. Thus, we should assume that, in certain cases, *incipits* of single-unit texts were invoked *pars pro toto*, while in other cases they were invoked *pars pro parte/partibus* (like the *incipits* of multiunit corpora).

Drawing upon my theoretical work on the scriptural *incipits*, I then situated the *incipits* within the broader context of ritual uses of sacred literature in the ancient Mediterranean. I demonstrated that the ritual use of the Bible was not confined to Egypt. I also provided evidence for the ritual use of other sacred traditions in late antiquity, in particular Homeric poetry. The ritual use of sacred literature, therefore, was not unique to the Bible. I then examined the relative uniqueness of the scriptural *incipits*, arguing that, while the ritual use of *incipits* crossed boundaries of language and geography, it was almost entirely restricted to biblical literature in late antiquity. Furthermore, the ritual deployment of *incipits* of multiunit corpora appears to be limited to the Greek and Coptic communities of late antique Egypt. The scriptural *incipits*, therefore, offer unique evidence for how the infusion of the Bible into late antique Egyptian culture expanded its range of ritual tactics.

I will now highlight two additional areas of research, related to the ritual use of *incipits*, that require further investigation: the relationship between the ritual use of *incipits* and the use of *incipits* as classificatory rubrics in late antique book culture and the applicability of the ritual use of *incipits* for understanding the use of relics.

As I noted in the Introduction, David Frankfurter suggested that the ritual use of *incipits* derived from the use of *incipits* as classificatory devices in late antique book culture.<sup>1</sup> Frankfurter's hypothesis is certainly reasonable; however, at this point, a relationship between these respective uses of *incipits* is by no means certain. More work needs to be done to determine if there is in fact any link between the ritual use of *incipits* and *incipits* as classificatory devices. Late antique monasteries provide a fruitful institutional context for assessing this relationship. In

---

<sup>1</sup> *Elijah in Upper Egypt*, 40 n. 27.

addition to scribal activity in monastic libraries (composition and copying of manuscripts), monasteries were likely venues for the composition of ritual devices.<sup>2</sup>

If a relationship between these respective uses of *incipits* can be established, the diverse ways *incipits* were utilized in apotropaic contexts carries implications for our understanding of *incipits* as classificatory devices. We have seen that the boundaries of *incipits* varied greatly in the extant apotropaic record and defy standardization. This would also suggest a lack of standardization of *incipits* in late antique Egyptian book culture more generally.

A second area that requires further research is the relationship between the ritual use of *incipits* and relics in late antiquity. What are the implications of a theory of *incipits* for understanding the metonymic relationship between a relic and its contiguous saint? There is evidence—albeit from outside of Egypt—for the relationship between these respective ritual practices. Alcuin of York draws a connection between the use of relics and the ritual use of scriptural fragments:

They carry amulets, believing them to be something holy. But it is better to imitate the examples of the saints in one's heart than to carry their bones in little bags. And it is better to hold the written teachings of the Gospels in one's mind, than to carry them, written on strips of parchment, around one's neck.<sup>3</sup>

Although he does not explicitly discuss the *incipits*, Alcuin's words are important for this discussion. Alcuin suggests that the Bible and saints were meronymically similar. For Alcuin, the fragmentation of the scriptures was analogous to the fragmentation of a saint's body.<sup>4</sup>

Accordingly, Alcuin's words raise questions about the perceived power transfer of relics. How was/were the bone(s) of a saint believed to have transferred protective power to the possessor of the bag?

---

<sup>2</sup> See n. 5. in Chapter Two.

<sup>3</sup> *Ep.* 290 (cited in Rapp, "Holy Books," 201).

<sup>4</sup> For this connection, see also Rapp, "Holy Books," 201.

Alcuin offers us a clue to this question by drawing an additional parallel between the examples of the saints and the teachings of the scriptures. For Alcuin, the perceived power or holiness of the relic derives from particular qualities of the saint associated with particular events from his or her life. This approach to ritual power is consistent with ancient *historiolae*, which mediate ritual power based on the precedent or paradigm associated with particular acts of the divine. Thus, Alcuin assumes not only that there is a meronymic similarity between the division of the scriptures and the division of the bodies of the saints, but also that there is a meronymic parallel between larger scriptural corpora and saints' lives. In other words, as it relates to the use of relics, saints' lives were understood as multiunit corpora, consisting of numerous events and qualities. Accordingly, it would seem that relics did not invoke their contiguous saint *pars pro toto*, whether understood generically (i.e., the "power" of the saint) or as a totality (i.e., everything about the saint), but *pars pro partibus*.<sup>5</sup> For Alcuin, therefore, relics and *incipits* of multiunit corpora would have operated according to the same perceived metonymic transfer of protective power.

To be sure, this metonymic analysis of the power of relics is confined to the opinion of a single author—albeit in agreement with other apotropaic practices from the late antique Mediterranean. Thus, further research by specialists in late antique and medieval relics will need to assess whether or not Alcuin's opinion of relics was widely shared. Such research will establish more fully the extent of the relationship between relics and the ritual use of *incipits*.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> For a contrasting opinion, see e.g., Rapp, "Holy Books," 201.

<sup>6</sup> Of interest for this discussion are medieval testimonies on the dilemma of bodily fragmentation in light of the importance of completeness in the final resurrection (e.g., Guibert, *De Pignoribus*; Herrad of Hohenbourg, *Hortus deliciarum*). For discussion on the relationship between relics (and other occasions of bodily fragmentation) and resurrection, see Caroline Walker Bynum, "Introduction: In Praise of Fragments: History in the Comic Mode," in *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* by Caroline Walker Bynum (New York: Zone Books, 1991), 11-26, at 11-13; idem, "Bodily Miracles and the Resurrection of the Body in the High Middle Ages," in *Belief in History: Innovative Approaches to European and American Religion*, ed. Thomas Kselman (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991), 68-106.

In closing, many late antique Egyptians faced a bleak existence; they combated ailments linked with perceived demonic threats. But ritual specialists, as experts in demonic battle, offered comfort and hope for victory over these threats. Along with other ritual tactics, deployed by these specialists, the scriptural *incipits* played an important role in battles waged at the interstices of the visible and invisible worlds.

## Bibliography

### I. Primary Sources and Major Corpora of Ritual Artifacts

Anonymous. *Acta Thaddaei*. In *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, edited by Richard Adelbert Lipsius and Max Bonnet. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959.

———. *The Doctrine of Addai, The Apostle*, translated and edited by G. Phillips. London: Trubner & Co, 1876.

———. *The Gospel of Nicodemus: Gesta Salvatoris*, edited by H. C. Kim. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1973.

*Athanasius: The Life of Antony and The Letter to Marcellinus*, edited and translated by Robert C. Gregg Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1980.

Betz, Hans D., ed. *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Including the Demotic Spells*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Daniel, Robert W. and Franco Maltomini, eds. *Supplementum Magicum*. 2 vols. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1990-92.

Evagrius of Pontus. *Talking Back, Antirrhêtikos: A Monastic Handbook for Combating Demons*, edited and translated by David Brakke. CSS 229. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2009.

Epiphanius of Salamis. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Book I (Sects 1-46)*, edited and translated by Frank Williams. NHS 35. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

Horner, George William. *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect: Otherwise Called Sahidic and Thebaic; With Critical Apparatus, Literal English Translation, Register of Fragments and Estimate of the Version*. 7 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1911-24.

- The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Kotansky, Roy. *Greek Magical Amulets: The Inscribed Gold, Silver, Copper, and Bronze Lamellae*. Pt. 1, *Published Texts of Known Provenance*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1994.
- Kropp, Angelicus. *Ausgewählte koptische Zaubertexte*, 3 vols. Bruxelles: Édition de la Fondation Égyptologique, 1930-31.
- Levene, Dan. *A Corpus of Magic Bowls: Incantation Texts in Jewish Aramaic from Late Antiquity*. London: Kegan Paul, 2003.
- Meyer, Marvin W. and Richard Smith, eds. *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1994.
- Naveh, Joseph and Shaul Shaked, eds. *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- . *Magic spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1993.
- Pachomian Koinonia*. 3 vols., translated by Armand Veilleux. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1981-82.
- Pachomiana Latina: Règle et épîtres de St. Pachôme, épîtres de St. Théodore et "Liber" de St. Orsiesius; texte latin de St. Jérôme*, edited by A. Boon. Louvain: Bureaux de la Revue, 1932.
- Pernigotti, S, ed. *Testi della magia copta* (Imola: La Mandragora, 2000).
- Preisendanz, Karl, ed. *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechen Zauberpapyri*. 2 vols. Rev. ed. A.

- Henrichs. Stuttgart: K G Saur Verlag Gmbh & Co, 1973.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.
- Roberts, Alexander and James Donaldson, eds. *Ante-Nicene Christian Library: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*. Vol. 10, *The Writings of Origen*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1869.
- Schaff, Philip, ed. *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Vol. 7, *St. Augustin: Lectures or Tractates on the Gospel According to Saint John Homilies on the First Epistle of John, Soliloquies*, translated by John Gibb and James Innes. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1888.
- . *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Vol. 10, *St. Chrysostom: Homilies on the Gospel of Saint Matthew*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1888.
- . *Saint Chrysostom's Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians: Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church Part 12*. repr. Kessinger Publishing, 2004.
- Stegemann, Victor, ed., *Die koptischen Zaubertexte der Sammlung Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer in Wien*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1934.

## II. Secondary Literature

- ‘Abd al-Masīh, Yassa. “An Unedited Bohairic Letter of Abgar.” *BIFAO* 45 (1947): 65-80.
- Aland, Kurt. “Evangelien als Amulett am Halse und am Sofa.” *ZNTW* 7 (1906): 96.
- . “Das Problem des neutestamentlichen Kanons.” In *Studien zur Überlieferung*

- des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes*, edited by Kurt Aland. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967, 1-23.
- Aland, Kurt and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament*, translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Amundsen, Leiv. "Christian Papyri from the Oslo Collection." *Symbolae Osloenses* 24 (1945): 121-47.
- Andrieu, M. and P. Collomp. "Fragments sur papyrus de l'Anaphore de saint Marc." *Revue des sciences religieuses* 8 (1928): 489-515.
- Arzt-Grabner, Peter. "Psalms as Magic? P. Vindob. 39205 Revisited." In *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa*, edited by Johann Cook. Leiden: Brill, 2009, 37-43.
- Arzt-Grabner, Peter and Michael Ernst. "Ps., 43, 21-24.27 und Ps., 44, 1-2 LXX." In *Papyri in honorem Johannis Bingen octogenarii (P. Bingen)*, edited by Henri Melaerts, Rudolf de Smet, and Cecilia Saerens. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2000, 79-84.
- Audet, J.-P. *La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1958.
- Bagnall, Roger. *Early Christian Books in Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Barns, J. W. B., H. Zilliacus, and C. H. Roberts, eds. *The Antinoopolis Papyri*. Pt. 2. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1960.
- Bartoletti, Vittorio. "Papiri inediti della raccolta Fiorentina, I—amuleto cristiano (con Psalm. I,1 sg.)." *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*. Ser. 2 26 (1957): 176-89.
- Bartrum, Ian. "The Constitutional Canon as Argumentative Metonymy." *Faculty Scholarship Series*, Paper 21 (2009): 1-71.
- Bartsch, Elmar. *Die Sachbeschwörungen der Römischer Liturgie*. Münster: Aschendorffsche

- Verlag, 1967.
- Behlmer, Heike. "Do Not Believe Every Word like the Fool...!: Rhetorical Strategies in Shenoute, *Canon 6*." In *Christianity and Monasticism in Upper Egypt*, edited by Gawdat Gabra and Hany N. Takla. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 2008, 1-12.
- Bell, H. I., A. D. Nock, and H. J. M. Milne. "Bibliography: Graeco-Roman Egypt A. Papyri (1924-1926)." *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 13 (1927): 84-121.
- Bidez, J. "Bulletin critique et chronique bibliographique." *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 15 (1940): 213-14.
- Bilabel, F., ed. *Veröffentlichungen aus den badischen Papyrus-Sammlungen*. Vol. 4, *Griechische Papyri*. Heidelberg: Verlag der Universitätsbibliothek, 1924.
- Biondi, Alessandro. "Le citazioni bibliche nei papiri magici cristiani greci." *Stud.Pap.* 20 (1979): 93-127.
- Blass, F. and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and Revision of the Ninth–Tenth German Edition Incorporating Supplementary Notes of A. Debrunner*, edited and translated by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Bormann, Eugen. "Amulet mit Stellen der heiligen Schrift." In *Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer: Führer durch die Ausstellung*, edited by J. Karabacek et al. Vienna: Hölder, 1894, 124-25.
- Bornkamm, Günther. "Die Sturmstillung im Matthäusevangelium." *Wort und Dienst. Jahrbuch der Theologischen Schule Bethel* 1 (1948): 49-54.
- Boswinkel, E. et al., eds. *Berichtigungsliste der griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten*. Vol. 5. Leiden: Brill, 1969.

- Bosworth, Clifford Edmund. *The Mediaeval Islamic Underworld: The Banu Sasan in Arabic Society and Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Boyancé, Pierre. *Le culte des muses chez les philosophes Grecs: Études d'histoire et de psychologie religieuses*. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1937.
- Boyarin, Daniel and Virginia Burrus. "Hybridity as Subversion of Orthodoxy? Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity." *Social Compass* 52 (2005): 431-44.
- Brakke, David. "Canon Formation and Social Conflict in Fourth-Century Egypt: Athanasius of Alexandria's Thirty-Ninth *Festal Letter*." *HTR* 87 (1994): 395-419.
- . *Demons and the Making of the Monk*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- . *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Brashear, William. "The Greek Magical Papyri: An Introduction and Survey; Annotated Bibliography." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang im der römischen Welt*. Vol. 18.5. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995, 3380-684.
- . "Lesefrüchte." *ZPE* 50 (1983): 97-107.
- . "Vier Berliner Zaubertexte." *ZPE* 17 (1975): 25-33.
- Breyfogle, Todd. "Magic, Women, and Heresy in the Late Empire: The Case of the Priscillianists." In *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, edited by Marvin W. Meyer and Paul A. Mirecki. Leiden: Brill, 1995, 435-54.
- Brightman, F. E. *Liturgies Eastern and Western: The Texts Original or Translated of the Principal Liturgies of the Church*. Vol. 1, *Eastern Liturgies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1896.

- Brooke, Alan England and Norman McLean, eds. *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Uncial Mss., with a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint*. Vol. 1, *The Octateuch*. Pt. 1, *Genesis*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1906.
- Brown, S. Kent. "Coptic and Greek Inscriptions from Christian Egypt: A Brief Review." In *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, edited by Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986, 26-41.
- Browne, Gerald. *Michigan Coptic Texts*. Barcelona: Papyrologica Castroctaviana, 1979.
- Budge, E. A. W. *Amulets and Superstitions*. London: Oxford University Press, 1930.
- . *Amulets and Talismans*. New York: University Books, 1961.
- ., ed. *The Earliest Known Coptic Psalter: The Text, in the Dialect of Upper Egypt, Edited from the Unique Papyrus Codex Oriental 5000 in the British Museum*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, and Trübner & Co., 1898.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921.
- Burton-Christie, Douglas. *The Word in the Desert: Scripture and the Quest for Holiness in Early Christian Monasticism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Cauderlier, Patrice. "Tablettes grecques d'Égypte: Inventaire." In *Les tablettes à écrire de l'Antiquité à l'Époque Moderne*, edited by Élisabeth Lalou. *Bibliologia* 12. Turnhout, Brepols, 1992, 63-94.
- Cavallo, Guglielmo and Herwig Maehler. *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period A. D. 300-800*. London: University of London, 1987.

- Cavenaile, R. *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum*. Vol. 4. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1958.
- Cecchetti, Igino. "Un interessante documento dei primi tempi del cristianesimo in Egitto: I papiro 'T. Gr. 1' del Museo Egizio di Torino." In *Miscellanea Giulio Belvederi*. Rome: Città del Vaticano, 1954-5, 557-78.
- Chapa, Juan. "Su demoni e angeli: il Salmo 90 nel suo contesto." In *I papiri letterari cristiani: atti del convegno internazionale di studi in memoria di Mario Naldini, Firenze, 10-11 Giugno 2010*, edited by Guido Bastianini and Angelo Casanova. Firenze: Istituto Papirologico "G. Vitelli," 2011, 59-90.
- Chartier, Roger. "Texts, Forms, and Interpretations." In *On the Edge of the Cliff: History, Language, and Practices*, translated by Lydia G. Cochrane. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997, 81-89.
- Chartier, Roger and Guglielmo Cavallo. "Introduction." In *A History of Reading in the West*, edited by Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier, translated by Lydia G. Cochrane. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999, 1-36.
- Choat, Malcolm. "Citation and Echo of the New Testament in letters on Papyrus." In *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*, edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. Brill, Leiden, 2006, 267-92.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Clark, Kenneth Willis. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937.
- Cohn, Yehudah. *Tangled Up in Text: Tefillin in the Ancient World*. Providence: Brown Judaic Studies, 2008.

- Collart, Paul. "Un papyrus Reinach inédit: Psaume 140 sur une amulette." *Aegyptus* 13 (1933): 208-12.
- . "Psaumes et amulettes." *Aegyptus* 14 (1934): 463-67.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Collins, Derek. *Magic in the Ancient Greek World*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub, 2008.
- . "The Magic of Homeric Verses." *CP* 103 (2008): 211-36.
- Colwell, Ernest Cadman. "The Contents of the Gospel Lectionary." In *Studies in the Lectionary Text of the Greek New Testament*. Vol. 1, *Prolegomena to the Study of the Lectionary Text of the Gospels*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1933, 1-5.
- Conzelmann, Hans. "Zur Lukasanalyse." *ZTK* 49 (1952): 16-33.
- . *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1954.
- Cribiore, Raffaella. *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Crum, Walter E. *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the British Museum*. London: British Museum, 1905.
- . *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in Collection of the John Rylands Library Manchester*. Manchester: At the University Press, 1909.
- . "41.—Coptic Graffiti &c. (Plates XXV-XXXVII)." In *The Osireion at Abydos*, edited by M. A. Murray. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1904, 39-43.
- . "Coptic Studies." *EEFAR* (1897-98): 55-70.
- . "La magie copte: Nouveaux texts." In *Recueil d'études égyptologiques dédiées à la*

- mémoire de Jean-François Champollion*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne H & E. Champion, 1922, 537-44.
- . *Varia coptica: Texts, Translations, Indexes*. Aberdeen: The University Press, 1939.
- Cruse, D. A. *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- . “On the Transitivity of the Part-Whole Relation.” *Journal of Linguistics* 15 (1979): 29-38.
- Cuming, Geoffrey J. *The Liturgy of St Mark: Edited from the Manuscripts with a Commentary*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990.
- Daniel, Robert. “A Christian Amulet on Papyrus.” *VC* 37 (1983): 400-404.
- Daniel, Robert and Franco Maltomini. “From the African Psalter and Liturgy.” *ZPE* 74 (1988): 253-65.
- De Bruyn, Theodore. “Appeals to Jesus as the one ‘who Heals every Illness and every Infirmary’ (Matt 4:23, 9:35) in Amulets in Late Antiquity.” In *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Montréal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser, 11-13 October 2006*, edited by Lorenzo DiTommaso and Lucian Turcescu, Leiden: Brill, 2008, 65-81.
- . “Papyri, Parchment, Ostraca, Tablets Written with Biblical Texts in Greek and Used as Amulets: A Preliminary List.” In *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach*, edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. Leiden: Brill, 2011, 145-89.
- . “The Use of the Sanctus in Christian Greek Papyrus Amulets.” In *Papers Presented at the Fourteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 2003: Liturgia et Cultus, Theologica et Philosophica, Critica et Philologica, Nachleben, First*

- Two Centuries*, edited by Mark J. Edwards, Francis Margaret Young, and Paul M. Parvis. Leuven: Peeters, 2006, 15-20.
- De Bruyn, Theodore and Jitse H. F. Dijkstra. "Greek Amulets and Formularies from Egypt Containing Christian Elements: A Checklist of Papyri, Parchments, Ostraka, and Tablets." *BASP* 48 (2011): 163-216.
- Degni, Paola. "PSI VII 759." In *Scrivere libri e documenti nel mondo antico: Mostra di papiri della Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Firenze, 25 Agosto-25 Settembre 1998*, edited by Guglielmo Cavallo, Edoardo Crisci, Gabriella Messeri, Rosario Pintaudi. Firenze: Edizioni Gonnelli, 1998, 159.
- Dein, Simon. *Religion and Healing among the Lubavitch Community in Stamford Hill, North London*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellon, 2004.
- Deissmann, Adolf. *Licht vom Osten: Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923.
- Delatte, Armand. *Anecdota Atheniensiæ*. Vol. 1, *Texts grecs inédits relatifs à l'histoire des religions*. Liège: University of Liège, 1927.
- Delattre, Alain. "Un extrait du Psaume 90 en copte Édition de P.Duk. inv. 448." *BASP* 43 (2006): 59-61.
- Drescher, James. "A Coptic Amulet." In *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum*, edited by Thomas Whittemore. Boston: The Byzantine Institute, Inc., 1950, 265-70.
- Drioton, E. "Un apocryphe anti-arien: Le version copte de la correspondance d'Abgar, roi d'Edesse, avec Notre Seigneur." *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* 20 (1915-17): 306-26.
- Dibelius, Martin. *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1919.

- Donne, W. B. "Antinoopolis, Antinoe." *DGRG* 1 (1873): 141.
- Drogin, Marc. *Anathema! Medieval Scribes and the History of Book Curses*. Totowa: Allanheld, Osmun, 1983.
- Duling, Dennis C. "Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David." *HTR* 68 (1975): 235-52.
- Dunn, James. *The Parting of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. London: SCM, 1991.
- Dyer, Joseph. "The Desert, the City and Psalmody in the Late Fourth Century." In *Western Plainchant in the First Millennium: Studies in the Medieval Liturgy and Its Music*, edited by Sean Gallagher, James Haar, John Nádás, and Timothy Striplin. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2003, 11-43.
- Eitrem, S. *Die Versuchung Christi*. Kristiania: Grøndahl & Søn's Boktrykkeri, 1924.
- Fagen, R. S. "Phylacteries." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Vol. 5, edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992, 368-70.
- Faraone, Christopher A. "The Agonistic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells." In *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, edited by Christopher A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991, 3-32.
- Fiaccadori, Gianfranco. "Cristo all' Eufrate (P. Heid. G. 1101, 8 ss.)." *La parola de passato* 41 (1986): 59-63.
- Field, Margaret and Taft Blackhorse. "The Duel Role of Metonymy in Navajo Prayer." *Anthropological Linguistics* 44 (2002): 217-30.
- Foley, John Miles. *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- Frankfurter, David. "Dynamics of Ritual Expertise in Antiquity and Beyond: Towards a New

- Taxonomy of ‘Magicians.’” In *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, edited by Paul A. Mirecki and Marvin W. Meyer. Leiden: Brill, 2002, 159-78.
- . *Elijah in Upper Egypt: The Apocalypse of Elijah and Early Egyptian Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- . *Evil Incarnate: Rumors of Demonic Conspiracy and Satanic Abuse in History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- . “Narrating Power: The Theory and Practice of the Magical *Historiola* in Ritual Spells.” In *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, edited by Marvin W. Meyer and Paul A. Mirecki. Leiden: Brill, 1995, 457-76.
- . *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- . “Ritual Expertise in Roman Egypt and the Problem of the Category ‘Magician.’” In *Envisioning Magic: A Princeton Seminar and Symposium*, edited by Peter Schäfer and Hans G. Kippenberg. Leiden: Brill, 1997, 115-35.
- Fredriksen, Paula. “What Parting of the Ways? Jews and Gentiles in the Ancient Mediterranean City.” In *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, edited by Adam Becker and Annette Reed. Tübingen: Mohr, 2003, 35-63.
- Frisk, Hjalmar. *Papyrus grecs de la Bibliothèque Municipale de Gothenbourg*. Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerber, 1929.
- Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Gaselee, S. “Bibliography of 1912-13: Christian Egypt.” *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 1

- (1914): 47-69.
- Geerard, M. *Clavis Apocryphorum Novi Testamenti*. Brepols: Turnhout, 1992.
- Gibbs, Raymond W. *The Poetics of the Mind: Figurative Thought, Language and Understanding*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Giorda, Mariachiara. "Monastic Property in Late Antique Egypt." *Coptica* 8 (2009): 1-19.
- Gordon, Richard. "Imagining Greek and Roman Magic." In *The Athlone History of Witchcraft and Magic in Europe*, edited by B. Ankarloo and S. Clark. London: The Athlone Press, 1999, 159-266.
- . "'What's in a List?' Listing in Greek and Graeco-Roman Malign Magical Texts." In *The World of Ancient Magic: Papers from the First International Samson Eitrem Seminar at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 4-8 May 1997*, edited by David R. Jordan, Hugo Montgomery, and Einar Thomassen. Bergen: The Norwegian Institute at Athens, 1999, 239-77.
- Graham, William A. *Beyond the Written Word: Oral Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Grenfell Bernard P. and Arthur S. Hunt, eds. *The Amherst Papyri Being an Account of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of the Right Hon. Lord Amherst of Hackney, F.S.A. at Didlington Hall, Norfolk. Pt. 1, The Ascension of Isaiah, and other Theological Fragments with Nine Plates*. London: Oxford University Press, 1900.
- . *Catalogue general des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire*. Vol. 10. Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1903.
- Grenfell, Bernard P. Arthur S. Hunt, and Harold I. Bell. "1928. Amulet (Psalm XC): Protocol."

- In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 16, edited by Bernard P. Grenfell, Arthur S. Hunt, and Harold I. Bell. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1924, 208-11, no. 1928.
- Griffith, F. L. "Oxford Excavations in Nubia." *LAAA* 14 (1927): 57-116.
- Gronewald, Michael. "336. Vaterunser," in *Kölner Papyri (P. Köln)*. Band 8, edited by Michael Gronewald, Klaus Maresch, and Cornelia Römer. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1997, 48-49.
- Gundel, H. G. *Katalog der literarischen Papyri in der Gießener Universitätsbibliothek. Kurzberichte aus den Giessener Papyrussammlungen*. Vol. 39. Gießen: Universitäts-Bibliothek, 1977.
- Hagner, Donald. *Word Biblical Commentary 33a: Matthew 1-13*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000.
- Hahneman, Geoffrey Mark. "The Muratorian Fragment and the Origins of the New Testament Canon." In *The Canon Debate*, edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002, 405-415.
- Haines-Eitzen, Kim. *Guardians of the Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . "Textual Communities in Late Antique Christianity." In *A Companion to Late Antiquity*, edited by Philip Rousseau. London: Basil Blackwell, 2009, 146-57.
- Hammond, C. E. *Outlines of Textual Criticism Applied to the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1884.
- Harris, B. F. "Biblical Echoes and Reminiscences in Christian Papyri." In *Proceedings of the 14th International Congress of Papyrologists, Oxford, 1974*. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1975, 155-60.

- Heinrici, C. F. G. *Die Leipziger Papyrusfragmente der Psalmen*. Leipzig: Verlag der Durrischen Buchhandlung, 1903.
- Henrichs, A. and E. M. Husselman. "Christian Allegorizations (P. Mich. Inv. 3718)." *ZPE* 3 (1968): 175-89.
- Henein, Nessim Henry and Thierry Bianquis. *La magie par les psaumes: Édition et traduction d'un manuscrit arabe chrétien d'Égypte*. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale Du Caire, 1975.
- Hengel, Martin. *Die Evangelienüberschriften*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1984.
- Henner, Jutta, Hans Förster, and Ulrike Horak. *Christliches mit Feder und Faden: Christlichen in Texten, Textilien und Alltagsgegenständen aus Ägypten; Katalog zur Sonderausstellung im Papyrusmuseum der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek aus Anlaß des 14. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie*. Wien: Österreichische Verlagsgesellschaft C. & E. Dworak, 1999.
- Hoogendijk, F. A. J. and P. van Minnen, eds. *Papyri, Ostraca, Parchments and Waxed Tablets in the Leiden Papyrological Institute (P. L. Bat. 25)*. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- Horak, Ulrike. *Illuminierte Papyri, Pergamente und Papiere*. Vol. 1. Wien: Holzhausen, 1992.
- Horsley, G. H. R. "93. Credal Formula in a Christian Amulet against Fever." In *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. Vol. 3, *A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1978*, edited by G. H. R. Horsley. North Ryde: Macquarie University, 1983, 114-19.
- . "Reconstructing a Biblical Codex: The Prehistory of MPER *n.s.* XVII.10 (P.

- Vindob. G 29 831*)." In *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses Berlin, 13-19.8.1995*, edited by Bärbel Kramer, Herwig Maehler, et al. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner Stuttgart, 1997, 473-79.
- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar and Erich Zenger, eds. *Psalms 2: A Commentary on Psalms 51-100*, translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- Hunt, Arthur S. "1077. Amulet: St. Matthew's Gospel iv." In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 8, edited by Arthur S. Hunt. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1911, 10-11, no. 1077.
- . "1151. Christian Amulet." In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. 8, edited by Arthur S. Hunt. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1911, 251-53, no. 1151.
- . "2065. Psalm xc." In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 17, edited by Arthur S. Hunt. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1927, 1-2, no. 2065.
- Hurtado, Larry. "Gospels (Genre)." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, I. Howard Marshall. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992, 276-82.
- Ioannidou, Grace, ed. *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Literary Papyri in Berlin: P. Berol. inv. 21101-21299, 21911*. Mainz: P. von Zabern, 1996.
- Izydorczyk, Zbigniew. "Introduction." In *The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus: Texts, Intertexts, and Contexts in Western Europe*, edited by Zbigniew Izydorczyk. Tempe: Arizona Board of Regents for Arizona State University, 1997, 1-19.
- Izydorczyk, Zbigniew and Jean-Daniel Dubois. "Before and Beyond the Medieval West." In *The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus: Texts, Intertexts, and Contexts in Western Europe*, edited by Zbigniew Izydorczyk. Tempe: Arizona Board of Regents for Arizona State University, 1997, 21-41.

- Jakobielski, Stefan. "Das Kloster der Heiligen Dreifaltigkeit: Bauphasen des nordwestlichen Anbaus." In *Dongola-Studien: 35 Jahre polnischer Forschungen im Zentrum des makuritischen Reiches*, edited by Stefan Jakobielski and Piotr O. Scholz. Warsaw: ZAS-PAN, 2001, 141-68.
- Jakobson, Roman. "Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbance." In *Fundamentals of Language*, edited by Roman Jakobson and M. Halle. The Hague: Mouton, 67-96.
- Janowitz, Naomi. *Icons of Power: Ritual Practices in Late Antiquity*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.
- Jernstedt, P. V. *Coptic Texts of the State Museum of Fine Arts named after A. S. Pushkin* [in Russian]. Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences, 1959.
- Johnson, Maxwell E. *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis*. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1995.
- Jordan, David R. "Notes and Observations: Choliambic for Mary in a Papyrus Phylactery." *HTR* 84 (1991): 343-46.
- Judge, E. A. "The Magical Use of Scripture in the Papyri." In *Perspectives on Language and Text: Essays and Poems in Honor of Francis I. Andersen's Sixtieth Birthday July 28, 1985*, edited by Edgar W. Conrad and Edward G. Newing (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 339-49.
- Kartsonis, Anna. "Protection Against All Evil: Function, Use and Operation of Byzantine Historiated Phylacteries." In *Presence of Byzantium: Studies Presented to Milton V. Anastos in Honor of his Eighty-fifth Birthday*, edited by A. R. Dyck and S. A. Takacs. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1994, 73-102.

- Kase, Edmond H., ed. *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*. Vol. 2. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. "Ps 90: 1-4 (LXX)." *ZAW* 78 (1966): 224.
- King, Karen L. *What is Gnosticism?* Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Knopf, Rudolf. "Eine Thonscherbe mit dem Texte des Vaterunser." *MDAIA* 25 (1900): 313-24.
- Koester, Helmut. *From Jesus to the Gospels: Interpreting the New Testament in Its Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Kolbet, Paul. "Athanasius, the Psalms, and the Reformation of the Self." *HTR* 99 (2006): 85-101.
- Κουκολε, Φ. "Ἐκ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν παπύρων." *Βυζαντίς* 2 (1912): 475-503.
- Krall, J. "Aus einer koptischen Klosterbibliothek." *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer* 1 (1897): 62-72.
- Kramer, Johannes. "A Linguistic Commentary on Heidelberg's Latin Papyrus Amulet." *ZPE* 74 (1988): 267-72.
- Kraus, Thomas J. "Βουσ, Βαινχωωχ und Septuaginta-Psalm 90? Überlegungen zu den sogenannten 'Bous'-Amuletten und dem beliebtesten Bibeltext für apotropäische Zwecke." *ZAC* 11 (2007): 479-91.
- . "Fragmente eines Amulett-armbands im *British Museum* (London) mit Septuaginta-Psalm 90 und der Huldigung der Magier." *JAC* 48/49 (2005/2006): 114-27.
- . "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer*--They Are More Than Simply Witnesses to That Text Itself." In *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their Worlds*, edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. Leiden: Brill, 2006, 227-66.
- . "Psalm 90 der Septuaginta in apotropäischer Funktion." In *Proceedings of the 24<sup>th</sup>*

- International Congress of Papyrology, Helsinki, 1<sup>st</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> of August 2004*. Vol. 1, edited by J. Frösén, T. Purola, and E. Salmenkivi. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 2007, 497-514.
- . “Septuaginta-Psalm 90 in apotropäischer Verwendung: Vorüberlegungen für eine kritische Edition und (bisheriges) Datenmaterial.” *BN* 125 (2005): 39-73.
- . “Septuagint Psalm 90 and the Iconographic Program on Byzantine Armbands.” In *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon*, edited by Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias. New York: T&T Clark, 2009, 137-47.
- Krebs, Fritz. “Altchristliche Texte im Berliner Museum.” *NKGW* 4 (1892): 114-20.
- . “Griechische Steininschriften aus Ägypten.” *NKGW* 15 (1892): 533-38.
- Kuhlmann, Peter, ed. *Die Giessener Literarischen Papyri und die Caracalla-Erlasse: Edition, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Gießen: Universitäts-Bibliothek, 1994.
- Lackoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- La’da, C. A. and A. Papatomas. “A Greek Papyrus Amulet from the Duke Collection with Biblical Excerpts.” *BASP* 41 (2004): 93-113.
- Łajtar, Adam and Jacques van der Vliet. *Qasr Ibrim: The Greek and Coptic Inscriptions Published on Behalf of the Egypt Exploration Society*. Warsaw: Faculty of Law and Administration of the University of Warsaw et al., 2010.
- Larsen, T. and A. Bülow-Jacobsen, eds. *Papyri Graecae Haunienses*. Vol. 3, *Subliterary Texts and Byzantine Documents from Egypt*. Bonn: R. Habelt, 1985.
- Le Blant, Edmond “Le premier Chaptire de Saint Jean.” *Rev. Arch.* (3<sup>rd</sup> ser.) 25 (1894): 8-14.
- . “Tablai égyptiennes a inscriptions grecques.” *Rev. Arc.* (2<sup>nd</sup> ser.) 29 (1875): 231-42.

- Leclercq, H. "Amulettes." In *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*. Vol. 1.2. Paris: Le R<sup>me</sup> dom Fernand Cabrol, 1907, cols. 1784-1860.
- . "Egypte." In *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*. Vol. 4.2. Paris: Le R<sup>me</sup> dom Fernand Cabrol, 1920, cols. 2430-471.
- Lee, Simon. "The Transfiguration *Remembered, Reinterpreted, and Re-inacted* in Acts of Peter 20-21: An Exploration of the Dynamic Relationship between the Scriptures, Their Interpretative Traditions, and Their Interpreting Community." In *Jewish and Christian Scriptures: The Function of 'Canonical' and 'Non-Canonical' Religious Texts*, edited by James H. Charlesworth and Lee Martin McDonald. New York: T & T Clark, 2010, 173-96.
- Lefebvre, Gustav. "Egypte chrétienne III." *ASAE* 10 (1909): 260-71.
- Leonas, A. "The Septuagint and the Magical Papyri: Some Preliminary Notes." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 32 (1999): 51-64.
- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, et al., *Greek-English Lexicon with a Revised Supplement*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Lieu, Judith. *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996.
- Limongi, D. "La diffusione dei Vangeli in Egitto (secc. I-VIII): Osservazioni sul *Vangelo secondo Marco*." *AnPap* 7 (1995): 49-62.
- Llewelyn, S. R. "The Christian Symbol ΧΜΓ, an Acrostic or an Isosephism?" In *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. Vol. 8, *A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published 1984-85*, edited by S. R. Llewelyn. Grand Rapids: William E. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998, 156-68.

- Lowe, E. A. *Codices Latini Antiquiores*. Vol. 8. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1959.
- Lumbroso, Giacomo. *Del papiro greco LXIII del Louvre sulla seminatura delle terre regie in Egitto e di alcune iscrizioni inedite del Museo Egiziano di Firenze*. Turin: Stamperia Reale, 1879.
- . “Documenti greci del Regio Museo Egizio di Torino.” *AAT* 4 (1868-1869), 683-721.
- . *Documenti greci del Regio Museo Egizio di Torino*. Torino: Stamperia Reale, 1869.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, translated by James E. Crouch. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- MacCoull, Leslie S. B. “Coptic Documentary Papyri as a Historical Source for Egyptian Christianity.” In *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, edited by Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986, 42-50.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. “The Role of Magic and Religion.” In *Reader in Comparative Religion: An Anthropological Approach*, edited by William A. Lessa and Evon Z. Vogt, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1965, 102-12.
- Maltomini, Franco. “340. Amuleto con NT Ev. Jo. 1, 1-11.” In *Kölner Papyri (P. Köln)*. Band 8, edited by Michael Gronewald, Klaus Maresch and Cornelia Römer. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1997, 82-95.
- . “4469. Letter of Abgar to Jesus (Amulet).” In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 65, edited by M. W. Haslam, A. Jones, et. al. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1998, 122-29, no. 4469.
- . “Cristo all’Eufrate P. Heid.G.1101: Amuleto cristiano.” *ZPE* 48 (1982): 149-70.
- . “Osservazioni al testo di alcuni papyri magici greci, III.” *Studi Classici e Orientali* 32 (1982): 235-40.

- Marinone, N. *All the Greek Verbs*. London: Duckworth, 1985.
- Marquès-Rivière, Jean. *Amulettes, talismans et pentacles dans les traditions orientales et Occidentales*. Paris: Payor, 1972.
- Martin, Alain. "P. Vindob. L.91, un fragment du *Pater* Latin." *Latomus* 42 (1983): 412-18.
- Martinez, David G. "The Papyri and Early Christianity." In *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, edited by Roger Bagnall. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, 590-622.
- Marxsen, Willi. *Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.
- Maspero, Jean. "Bracelets-amulettes d'époque byzantine." *ASAE* 9 (1908): 246-58.
- McDonald, Lee Martin. *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007.
- McKenzie, D. R. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. The Panizzi Lectures 1985. London: The British Library, 1986.
- Menci, Giovanna. "Un amuleto 'Bous' da Antinoe." *ZPE* 159 (2007): 249-52.
- Mercati, Silvio Giuseppe. "Ps. 90, 1-2 riconosciuto nel papiro PSI 739 [sic]." *Biblica* 8 (1927): 96.
- Metzger, Bruce M. "Greek Lectionaries and a Critical Edition of the Greek New Testament." In *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*, edited by Kurt Aland. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972, 479-97.
- . *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1998.
- Milligan, George. *Here and There among the Papyri*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923.
- ., ed. *Selections from the Greek Papyri*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910.

- Milne, J. G., ed. *Catalogue general des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, N<sup>os</sup> 9201-9400, 26001-26123, 33001-33037: Greek Inscriptions*. Oxford: University Press, 1905.
- Mirecki, Paul A. "Evangelion-Incipients Amulets in Greek and Coptic: Toward a Typology." In *Proceedings of the Central States Regional Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and the American Schools of Oriental Research*. Vol. 4, edited by J. J. Johnson Leese. Kirkwood: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001, 143-53.
- . "Manichaean Allusions to Ritual Magic: Spells for Invisibility in the Coptic *Kephalaia*." In *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World*, edited by Paul A. Mirecki and Jason Beduhn. Leiden: Brill, 2001, 173-80.
- . "A Seventh-Century Coptic Limestone in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (Bodl. Copt. Inscr. 426)." In *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, edited by Paul A. Mirecki and Marvin W. Meyer. Leiden: Brill, 2002, 47-69.
- Morelli, Frederico. "La raccolta dei P. Bingen." *Chronique d'Égypte* 77 (2002): 312-21.
- Morey, C. R. *Early Christian Art: An Outline of the Evolution of Style and Iconography in Sculpture and Painting from Antiquity to the Eighth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.
- Mratschek, Sigrid. "*Codices vestri nos sumus: Bücherkult und Bücherpreise in der christlichen Spätantike*." In *Hortus litterarum antiquarum, Festschrift für Hans Armin Gärtner zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by A. Haltenhoff and F.-H. Mutschler. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 2000, 369-80.
- Musurillo, Herbert. "Early Christian Economy: A Reconsideration of P. Amherst 3 (a) (=Wilcken, Chrest. 126)." *Chronique d'Égypte* 61 (1956): 124-34.
- Nachtergaeel, Georges. "Une amulette chrétienne du Musée des Beaux-Arts de Dijon." *Recherche*

- di egittologia e di antichità copte* 4 (2002): 93-101.
- Naldini, M. "Ascesi biblica in un frammento adespoto (PSI 759)." In *Forma futuri: Studi in onore del Cardinale Michele Pellegrino*. Torino: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1975, 70-78.
- . "Due papyri cristiani della collezione Fiorentina." *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 33 (1961): 212-18.
- Ñaptaś, Magdalena. "Comments on wall paintings from 'House A' in Old Dongola." In *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit: Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses, Münster, 20.-26. Juli 1996*. Vol. 1, edited by S. Emmel et al. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 1999, 230-37.
- Nicole, Jules, ed. *Texte grecs inédits de la Collection papyrologique de Genève*. Genève, Georg & cie, 1909.
- Niederwimmer, Kurt. *The Didache: A Commentary*, translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.
- Nongbri, B. "The Lord's Prayer and XMG: Two Christian Papyrus Amulets in Yale's Beinecke Library." *HTR* 104 (2011): 59-68.
- O'Caellaigh, G. C. "Dating the Commentaries of Nicodemus." *HTR* 56 (1963): 21-58.
- Orsini, Pasquale. *Manoscritti in maiuscola biblica: Materiali per un aggiornamento*. Cassino: Edizioni dell'Università degli studi di Cassino, 2005.
- Orlandi, Tito. "Abgar." In *The Coptic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1, edited by Aziz S. Atiya. London: MacMillan, 1991, 7b-8a.
- Osburn, Carroll D. "The Greek Lectionaries of the New Testament." In *The Text of the New*

- Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995, 61-74.
- Parrott, Douglas M. "The Scribal Note: VI,7a: 65,8-14." In *Nag Hammadi Codices V,2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502,1 and 4*, edited by Douglas M. Parrot. Leiden: Brill, 1979, 389-93.
- Parsons, Peter. "A People of the Book?" In *I papiri letterari cristiani: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi in memoria di Mario Naldini, Firenze, 10-11 Giugno 2010*, edited by Guido Bastianini and Angelo Casanova. Firenze: Istituto Papirologico "G. Vitelli," 2011, 47-57.
- Passoni dell'Acqua, Anna. "Frammenti inediti del Vangel secondo Matteo." *Aegyptus* 60 (1980): 96-119.
- Pankhurst, Anne. "Recontextualization of Metonymy in Narrative and the Case of Morrison's *Song of Solomon*." In *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, edited by Klaus-Uwe Panther and Günter Radden. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999, 385-99.
- Peers, Glenn. "Magic, the Mandylion and the Letter of Abgar: A Fourteenth-Century Amulet Roll in Chicago and New York." In *Intorno al sacro volto: Genova, Bisanzio e il Mediterraneo (XI-XIV secolo)*, edited by C. Dufour Bozzo, A. R. Calderoni Masetti, and G. Wolf. Venezia: Marsilio, 2007, 163-75.
- Pernigotti, S. "La magia copta: I Testi." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. II. 18.5. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995, 3380-684.
- Pestman, P. W. *The New Papyrological Primer*. Leiden: Brill, 1990.
- Petrucci, Armando. "From the Unitary Book to the Miscellany." In *Writers and Readers in*

- Medieval Italy: Studies in the History of Written Culture* by Armando Petrucci, edited and translated by Charles M. Radding. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995, 1-18.
- Pickering, S. R. "The Significance of Non-Continuous New Testament Textual Materials in Papyri." In *Studies in the Early Texts of the Gospels and Acts: The Papers of the First Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, edited by David G. K. Taylor. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999, 121-41.
- Pietersma, A. *Two Manuscripts of the Greek Psalter in the Chester Beatty Library Dublin*. Rome: Typis Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae, 1978.
- Pietschmann, Richard. "Les inscriptions coptes de Faras." *Rec. de Trav.* 21 (1899): 133-36.
- Pintaudi, Rosario. *Dai papyri della Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana*. Firenze: Gonnelli, 1979.
- . "LXX Ps 24, 15; 49, 1-2 in un papiro di Vienna (P.Vindob. G. 29435)." *Sacris Erudiri* 31 (1989-1990): 357-58.
- . "PL III/501." *ZPE* 35 (1979): 50-54.
- . "Per la datazione di PSI VI 719." *AnPap* 2 (1990): 27-28.
- Pitarakis, Brigitte. "Objects of Devotion and Protection." In *A People's History of Christianity*. Vol. 3, *Byzantine Christianity*, edited by Derek Krueger. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006, 164-81.
- Pleyte, Willem and Pieter Adrian Art Boeser. *Manuscripts coptes du Musée d'antiquités des Pays-Bas à Leide*. Leiden: Brill, 1897.
- Plumley, J. M. "Nubian Christian Numerical Cryptograms: Some Elucidations." In *New Discoveries in Nubia*, edited by P. van Moorsel. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1982, 91-97.
- Porter, Stanley. "Textual Criticism in the Light of Diverse Textual Evidence for the Greek New

- Testament: An Expanded Proposal.” In *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*, ed. Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. Leiden: Brill, 2006, 305-37.
- Preisendanz, Karl. “Mitteilungen.” *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 61 (1940): 739-40.
- . “Review of *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum*.” *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 80 (1959): 311.
- . “Zur Überlieferung der griechischen Zauberpapyri.” In *Miscellanea Critica: Festschrift zum 150-jährigen Bestehen des Verlages B. G. Teubner*. Vol. 1, edited by Johannes Irmischer. Leipzig: Verlag B. G. Teubner, 1964, 203-17.
- . “Wichtige Überlieferungsquellen der antiken Magie.” *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 16 (1940): 408-409.
- Preisigke, Friedrich, ed. *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*. Vol. 1. Straßburg: Verlag Karl J. Trübner, 1915.
- Puech, Émile. “11QPsAp<sup>a</sup>: Un rituel d’exorcismes. Essai de reconstruction.” *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1990): 377-408.
- . “Les deux derniers Psaumes Davidiques du rituel d’exorcisme, 11QPsAp<sup>a</sup> IV 4-V14.” In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. Leiden: Brill, 1992, 64-89.
- . “Les Psaumes Davidiques du rituel d’exorcisme (11Q11).” In *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998*, edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino Garcia Martinez, and Eileen M. Schuller. Leiden: Brill, 2000, 160-81.
- Quack, Joachim Friedrich. “From Ritual to Magic: Ancient Egyptian Precursors of the

- Charitesion and Their Social Setting.” In *Continuity and Innovation in the Magical Tradition*, edited by Gideon Bohak, Yuval Harari, and Shaul Shaked. Leiden: Brill, 2011, 43-84.
- Quecke, Hans. “Ein fajumisches Fragment aus Ps 90 (91) (pHeid. Kopt. 184).” In *Festschrift Elmar Edel, 12. März 1979*, edited by Manfred Görg and Edgar Pusch. Bamberg: Manfred Görg, 1979, 332-37.
- . “Psalmverse als ‘Hymnen’ in der koptischen Liturgie?” In *Christianisme d’Égypte: Hommages à René-Georges Coquin*. Louvain: Éditions Peeters, 1995, 101-14.
- Radden, Günter and Zoltán Kövecses. “Towards a Theory of Metonymy.” In *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, edited by Klaus-Uwe Panther and Günter Radden. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999, 17-59.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. *Psalmi cum Odis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931.
- Rahlfs, Alfred and Detlef Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*. Vol. 1.1: *Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- Rapp, Claudia. “Holy Texts, Holy Men, and Holy Scribes: Aspects of Scriptural Holiness in Late Antiquity.” In *The Early Christian Book*, edited by W. E. Klingshirn and L. Safran. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007, 194-224.
- Rebiger, Bill. “Die magische Verwendung von Psalmen im Judentum.” In *Ritual und Poesie: Formen und Orte religiöser Dichtung im alten Orient, im Judentum und im Christentum*, edited by Erich Zenger. Freiburg: Herder, 2003, 265-81.
- Rice, Donald. “Catastrop(h)es: The Morphogenesis of Metaphor, Metonymy, Synecdoche and Irony.” *Sub-Stance* 26 (1980): 3-18.

- Richter, Siegfried G. "Verwendung von Psalmen im koptischen Christentum." In *Ritual und Poesie: Formen und Orte religiöser Dichtung im alten Orient, im Judentum und im Christentum*, edited by Erich Zenger. Freiburg: Herder, 2003, 283-92.
- Roberts, C. H. "Early Christianity in Egypt: Three Notes." *JEA* 40 (1954): 92-96.
- . *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*. London: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Robinson, G. "KMΓ and ΘMΓ for XMΓ." *Tyche* 1 (1986) 175-77.
- Robinson, J. A. T. *Redating the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.
- Robinson, James M. *The Gospel of Jesus: A Historical Search for the Original Good News*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 2005.
- Roeper, G. "Homerische Talisman." *Philologus* 5 (1850): 162-65.
- Römer, Cornelia. "171. Christliches Amulett." In *Kölner Papyri (P. Köln)*. Band 4, edited by Bärbel Kramer, Cornelia Römer, Dieter Hagedorn, et al. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1982, 31-34.
- . "Christliche Texte II (1996-1997)." *APF* 44 (1998): 127-39.
- . "Psalm XC 12-16 and Excerpts from Odes 7 and 8." In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 75, edited by H. Maehler, C. E. Römer, and R. Hatzilambrou. London: The Egypt Exploration Society, 2010, 2-5, no. 5021.
- Römer, Cornelia Eva and Monika Hasitzka. "Psalm 30, 2-8 in Greek and Coptic: Joined Ostraca in London and Chicago." *APF* 53 (2007): 201-203.
- Rondeau, Marie-Josèphe. "L'Épître à Marcellinus sur les psaumes." *VC* 22 (1968): 176-97.
- . *Les commentaires patristiques du psautier (III<sup>e</sup>-V<sup>e</sup> siècles)*. Vol. 1. Rome: Pontificum Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1982.

- Rordorf, W. and A. Tuilier, *La Doctrine des douze Apôtres (Didachè)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1998.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco J. “High-Level Cognitive Models: In Search of a Unified Framework for Inferential and Grammatical Behavior.” In *Perspectives on Metonymy: Proceedings of the International Conference ‘Perspectives on Metonymy,’ held in Łódź, Poland, May 6-7, 2005*, edited by Krzysztof Kosecki. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2007, 11-30.
- Rupprecht, Hans-Albert, ed. *Sammelbuch Griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*. Vol. 14, Nr. 11264-12219. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983.
- Salzer, Dorothea M. “Biblische Anspielungen als Konstitutionsmerkmal jüdischer magischer Texte aus der Kairoer Geniza.” In *Was ist ein Text? Alttestamentliche, ägyptologische und altorientalistische Perspektiven*, edited by Ludwig Morenz and Stefan Schorch. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007, 337-52.
- Samuel, Alan E. “How Many Gnostics?” *BASP* 22 (1985): 297-322.
- Sanz, Peter, ed. *Griechische literarische Papyri: Christlichen Inhaltes*. Vol 1, *Biblical, Vaterschriften und Verwandtes*. MPER N.S. 4. Baden bei Wien: Rudolf M. Rohrer Verlag, 1946.
- Sanzo, Joseph E. “Brit. Lib. Or. 4919(2): An Unpublished Coptic Amulet in the British Library.” *ZPE* (forthcoming).
- . “Canonical Power: A ‘Tactical’ Approach to the Use of the Christian Canon in P. Berlin 954.” *Saint Shenouda Coptic Quarterly* 4 (2008): 28-45.
- Sayce, A. H. “Gleanings from the Land of Egypt.” *Rev. de Trav.* 20 (1898): 169-76.
- Schaefer, Ernest. *Papyri Iandani*. Vol. 1. *Voluminum codicumque fragmenta graeca cum amuleto christiano*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912.

- Schermann, T. *Ägyptische Abendmahlsliturgien des ersten Jahrtausends*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1912.
- Schiavo, Luigi. "The Temptation of Jesus: The Eschatological Battle and the New Ethic of the First Followers of Jesus in Q." *JSNT* 25 (2002): 141-64.
- Schlumberger, G. "Quelques monuments byzantins inédits: Amulettes, méreaux, etc." *Mélanges d'Archéologie Byzantine* 1 (1895): 163-70.
- Schmelz, Georg. "Septuaginta-Fragmente aus der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung." *ZPE* 116 (1997): 61-65.
- Schmidt, Carl and Wilhelm Schubart, eds. *Altchristliche Texte*, BKT 6. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1910.
- Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung*. Berlin: Trowitzsch, 1919.
- Schneider, Thomas. "Die Waffe der Analogie: Altägyptische Magie als System." In *Analogiedenke: Vorstöße in ein neues Gebiet der Rationalitätsforschung*, edited by M. Bachmann and K. Gloy. Freiburg: Verlag K. Alber, 2000, 37-85.
- Schubert, Paul. "Editing a Papyrus." In *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, edited by Roger S. Bagnall. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, 197-215.
- Schüssler, Karlheinz, ed. *Das sahidische Alte und Neue Testament: Vollständiges Verzeichnis mit Standorten sa 621-672*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009.
- Shandruk, Walter M. "Christian Use of Magic in Late Antique Egypt." *J ECS* 20 (2012): 31-57.
- Seto, Ken-ichi. "Distinguishing Metonymy from Synecdoche." In *Metonymy in Language and*

- Thought*, edited by Klaus-Uwe Panther and Günter Radden. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999, 91-120.
- Sijpesteijn, P. J. "Objects with Script in the Collection Moen." *ZPE* 42 (1981): 111-12.
- Skemer, Don C. *Binding Words: Textual Amulets in the Middle Ages*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006.
- Sørensen, Jørgen Podemann. "The Argument in Ancient Egyptian Magical Formulae." *Acta Orientalia* 45 (1984): 5-19.
- Stander, H. F. "Amulets and the Church Fathers." *Ekklesiastikos pharos* 75 (1993): 55-66.
- Stegmüller, Otto, ed. *Berliner Septuagintafragmente*. BKT 8. Berlin: Weidmann, 1939.
- Strzygowski, Josef, ed. *Catalogue general des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, nos. 7001-7394 et 8742-9200: Koptische Kunst*. Vienne: Imprimerie Adolf Hozhausen, 1904.
- Sullivan, Kevin P. and Terry G. Wilfong. "The Reply of Jesus to King Abgar: A Coptic New Testament Apocryphon Reconsidered" (P. Mich. inv. 6213)." *BASP* 42 (2005): 107-123.
- Tambiah, Stanley. "Form and Meaning of Magical Acts: A Point of View." In *Modes of Thought*, edited by R. Horton and R. Finnegan. London: Faber, 1973, 199-229.
- . "The Magical Power of Words." *Man* 3 (1968): 175-208.
- Thorndike, Lynn. *A History of Magic and Experimental Science During the First Thirteen Centuries of Our Era*. Vol. 2. New York: Columbia University Press, 1923.
- Tjäder, Jan-Olof. "Christ, Our Lord, Born of the Virgin Mary (XMF and VDN)." *Eranos* 68 (1970): 148-90.
- Traversa, Augusto. "Notizie di papyri greci inediti del Museo Egiziano di Torino." In *Memoriam Achillis Beltrami: Miscellanea philologica*. Genua: Istituto di filologia classica, 1954, 227-37.

- Treu, Kurt. "4010. Pater with Introductory Prayer." In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 60, edited by R. A. Coles, M. W. Haslam, P. J. Parsons et al. London: The Egypt Exploration Society, 1994, 5-7, no. 4010.
- . "Christliche Papyri (1940-1967)." *APF* 19 (1969): 169-206.
- . "Neue Berliner Septuagintafragmente." *APF* 20 (1970): 43-65.
- Treu, Kurt and Johannes Diethart, eds. *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer): Griechische Literarische Papyri Christlichen Inhaltes*, Vol. 2.1, *Textband* and 2.2, *Tafelband*. Wien: Verlag Brüder Hollinek, 1993.
- Turaev, B. A. "Coptic Vellum Amulet [in Russian]" *Christian East* 1 (1912): 203-206.
- Vakaloudi, Anastasia D. "ΔΕΙΣΙΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΑ and the Role of the Apotropaic Magic Amulets in the Early Byzantine Empire." *Byzantion* 70 (2000): 182-210.
- Van de Sandt, Huub and David Flusser. *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.
- Vandoni, M. and T. Orlandi. *Vangelo di Nicodemo*. Pt. 2, *Traduzione dal copto e commentario*. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1966.
- Van Groningen, B. A. "Projet d'unification des systèmes de signes critiques." *Chronique d'Égypte* 7 (1932): 262-69.
- Van Haelst, J. "Une ancienne prière d'intercession de la liturgie de Saint Marc (O. Tait-Petrie 415)." *Ancient Society* 1 (1970): 95-114.
- . *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1976.
- Vaschalde, Arthur Adolphe. "Ce qui a été publié des versions Coptes de la Bible: Troisième

- Groupe; Textes en Moyen Égyptien.” *Le Muséon* 46 (1933): 299-306.
- Vassiliev, A., ed., *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*. Pt. 1. Mosquae: University of Caesarea, 1893.
- Vattioni, F. “Il cantico di Mosè (Es. 15,1-19) nei papyri e nella Vetus Latina.” *Studia Papyrologica* 17 (1978): 35-47.
- Veilleux, Armand. *La liturgie dans le cénobitisme pachômien au quatrième siècle*. Rome: Herder, 1968.
- Vielhauer, Ph. *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Väter*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975.
- Von Dobschütz, E. “Charms and Amulets (Christian).” In *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*. Vol. 3, edited by Shailer Mathews and Gerald Birney Smith. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1923, 413-30.
- . “Zur Liste der neutestamentlichen Handschriften IV.” *ZNW* 32 (1933): 185-206.
- Vikan, Gary. “Art, Medicine, and Magic in Byzantium.” *DOP* 38 (1984): 65-86.
- . “Two Byzantine Amuletic Armbands and the Group to which they Belong.” *The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 49/50 (1991/1992): 33-51.
- Vitelli, G. “Noterelle papirologiche.” *Bulletin de la Société Archéologique d’Alexandrie* 23 (1928): 287-302.
- . *Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto: Papiri greci e latini*. Vol. 6. Florenz: Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana, 1920.
- . *Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto: Papiri greci e latini*. Vol. 7. Firenze: Stabilimento Tipografico E. Ariani, 1925.
- Walker Bynum, Caroline. “Bodily Miracles and the Resurrection of the Body in the High

- Middle Ages.” In *Belief in History: Innovative Approaches to European and American Religion*, edited by Thomas Kselman. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991, 68-106.
- . “Introduction: In Praise of Fragments: History in the Comic Mode.” In *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* by Caroline Walker Bynum. New York: Zone Books, 1991, 11-26.
- Wasserman, Tommy “P<sup>76</sup> (P. Oxy. Xxxiv 2684): The Epistle of Jude on an Amulet?” In *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*, edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. Leiden: Brill, 2006, 137-60.
- Wessely, C., ed. *Catalogus papyrorum Raineri, Series Graeca. Pt. 1, Textus graeci papyrorum, qui in libro “Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer-Führer durch die Ausstellung Wien 1894” descripti sunt*. Rev. ed. Amsterdam: Verlag Adolf M. Hakkert, 1969.
- . “Les plus anciens monuments du Christianisme écrits sur papyrus: Texts grecs édités[,] traduits[,] et annotés.” In *Patrologia Orientalis*. Vol. 4.2. Paris: Firmin-Didot et C<sup>ie</sup>, Imprimeurs-Éditeurs, 1946, 99-200.
- . “Les plus anciens monuments du Christianisme écrits sur papyrus (II).” In *Patrologia Orientalis*. Vol. 18. Ed. R. Graffin and F. Nau. Paris: Firmin-Didot et C<sup>ie</sup>, Imprimeurs-Éditeurs, 1924, 399-512.
- Wevers, J. W. “Septuaginta-Forschungen.” *ThR* 22 (1954): 85-190.
- . “Septuaginta-Forschungen seit 1954.” *ThR* 33 (1968): 18-76.
- Wikgren, Allen. “Two Ostraca Fragments of the Septuagint Psalter.” *JNES* 5 (1946): 181-84
- Wilcken, Ulrich, ed. *Ägyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin: Griechische Urkunden*. Vol. 3.3. Berlin 1903.

- . “Heidnisches und Christliches aus Ägypten.” *APF* 1 (1901): 396-436.
- Wilcken, Ulrich and L. Mitteis, eds. *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*. Vol. 1.2. Leipzig: B. Teubner, 1912.
- Wilkinson, Sir John Gardner. *Topography of Thebes, and General View of Egypt: Being a Short Account of the Principal Objects Worthy of Notice in the Valley of the Nile to the Second Cataract and Wadee Samneh, with the Fyoom, Oases, and Eastern Desert, from Sooez to Berenice; with Remarks on the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians and the Productions of the Country, Etc.* London: John Murray, 1835.
- Williams, Michael A. *Rethinking “Gnosticism”: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Winston, Morton E., Roger Chaffin, and Douglas Herrmann. “A Taxonomy of Part-Whole Relations.” *Cognitive Science* 11 (1987): 417-44.
- Wordsworth, John. *Bishop Sarapion’s Prayer-Book: An Egyptian Sacramentary Dated Probably about A.D. 350-356*. Hamden: Archon Books, 1964.
- Worrell, William. *Coptic Texts in the University of Michigan Collection*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1942.
- Youtie, Herbert C. “Gothenburg Papyrus 21 and the Coptic Version of the Letter to Abgar.” *HTR* 24 (1931): 61-65.
- Zenger, Erich. “Psalm 91.” In *Psalmen 51-100*, edited by F.-L. Hossfeld and E. Zenger. Freiburg: Herder, 2000.
- Zereteli, G. and O. Krueger, eds. *Papyri russischer und georgischer Sammlungen (P. Ross.-Georg.)*. Vol. 1, *Literarische Texte*. Tiflis: Georgisches Museum, 1925.