Christian Exorcistic Tradition from the Outside
Interpreting the Two Exorcism Spells of the Paris Magical Codex (PGM IV/GEMF 57)

David Frankfurter
Boston University, USA

Abstract   This paper places the two unique exorcism spells in PGM IV/GEMF 57 in the contexts of late antique demon-belief, Jewish and Christian exorcistic traditions, and the scribal milieux of late antique formularies. Particular attention is paid to the construction of the demonic, the use of Old Coptic Egyptian in the Excellent Rite, and the use of the name Jesus in both spells. The formulary presents a snapshot of the Jewish/ Christian exorcistic tradition as it evolved from the pre- to post-fourth century worlds and spawned these two anomalous additions to the Paris Magical Codex.

Keywords   Exorcism. Demon. Ritual expert. Jewish exorcistic tradition. Christian exorcistic tradition. Scribal traditions.

Summary   1 Introduction. – 2 The Background of the Exorcism Spells in GEMF 57/PGM IV. – 2.1 Apocalyptic Demonology and Its Associated Rituals in Early Judaism (and Its Christian Formations). – 2.2 … against the Background of Popular Demonology in Roman and Late Antique Cultures. – 2.3 Scribal Milieux for the Systematization of Demons in the Roman Period. – 2.4 The Exorcism Spells in the Paris Magical Codex in the Context of Ancient Demonology. – 3 The Two Exorcistic Spells of GEMF 57/PGM IV. – 3.1 Jewish Features of the Exorcistic Spells. – 3.2 Anomalous Features. – 4 Conclusions: The Two Exorcism Spells as Outsiders' Perspective on a New Ritual Practice.

1 Introduction

This paper addresses the two exorcism spells[1] in the third-/fourth-century Paris Magical Codex (PGM IV/GEMF 57), both of which employ Jewish incantations and both of which invoke Jesus as the principal authority for the expulsion of demons (a feature not commonly seen with exorcisms considered 'Jewish'). Although the procedures they describe for crafting and using material things (an olive-branch whip, an oil concoction, and a tin lamella inscribed with *voces magicae*) resemble ritual instructions throughout Greco-Egyptian formularies, these two spells are unique among the formularies both for their goals in expelling demons and for their use of the name Jesus as an invocation in pursuit of that goal. The first, "excellent procedure [*praxis*] for driving out demons" (ll. 1227-64) is also distinctive for writing (or preserving) its central incantation in Old Coptic. The second, much longer, with a protracted litany of Jewish *historiolae*,[2] is labelled the "tested charm of Pibechis for driving out demons" (ll. 3007-86). I will refer to them henceforth as the *Excellent Procedure* and the *Pibechis Charm*.

These two exorcistic spells have preoccupied scholars since the beginning of the twentieth century for the religious paradoxes they present as part of an extensive formulary manuscript that displays no other Jewish or Christian interests or allegiances. They raise a range of questions, both philological and religious. Is the inclusion of Jesus (or 'Jesus Christ' in the Excellent Rite)[3] in the opening invocations of each spell just an afterthought tacked on by ignorant wizards or heathens, or the move of 'real' Christians? And if you remove Jesus as 'the god of the Hebrews' in the Pibechis Charm, do you then have a genuinely Jewish spell? Why in the Excellent Procedure is the central exorcistic formula in Old Coptic, a language almost never used for Christian or Jewish texts? Finally, if the compilers of the overall Paris Codex were neither Christian nor Jewish themselves,

---

1 I will use this term to designate the complete 'recipe' or ritual program structurally or verbally set apart in a formulary: from title and function to materials, ritual instructions, and verbal incantations.

2 An historiola is a brief, orally composed/transmitted (or orally imitated) recitation of a mythic scenario that pertains to a (generally medical) crisis in this world. Where the crisis in the human world remains unresolved, the historiola presents a narrative of gods or heroes confronting and resolving an analogous crisis. Thus through recitation (or inscription) the mythic event is supposed to act on the unresolved human situation. See Frankfurter 2001; 2017.

3 The orthography is actually *pe-chrēstos* (lit.: 'the Excellent') rather than *christos* ('the Annointed'). While I am taking this as a common alternate spelling for the same heavenly figure, there has been some discussion about how seriously to take this replacement (which may not have sounded different in antiquity). See Love 2016, 195-6.

why would they include these two ostensibly Christian spells, and where did the spells come from?

It is these spells' uniqueness among Greco-Egyptian formularies of the third and fourth centuries that has motivated this reconsideration of their historical significance. As I noted, The Excellent Procedure and the Pibechis Charm are the only *exorcism* rites in the extensive Paris Magical Codex, although several other rites include instructions to use a protective phylactery to ward off malicious *daimones*.[4] That is, they are the only spells that not only use *daimōn* (rather than, say, 'unclean spirit') to refer to malicious demons, they 'operationalize' that polarized conception of demons by ritually expelling them.[5] Both, in different ways, combine Jewish mythical references and liturgical phrases with mention of Jesus as a feature of God (also unique in Greco-Egyptian formularies of the third/fourth centuries). And apparently the editors themselves regarded these two spells as anomalies, for they each appear in portions of the Paris Magical Codex noted for their particularly 'miscellaneous' contents. The Excellent Procedure stands at the end of the second block of spells, bearing no relation to surrounding materials and succeeded by an empty space; the Pibechis Charm likewise occurs among exceedingly diverse materials (LiDonnici 2022, 182-3, 190). The two spells thus seem to have come into the codex as independent additions, perhaps towards the end of the editorial process – perhaps even as 'filler' material.

In this paper I will argue that, whether or not the spells originated in Jewish or Christian scribal milieux, their final transmission and editing into the Paris Codex took place among Greco-Egyptian scribes who perceived in the spells' claims and verbal structures an unusual approach to spirits and *daimones* and a new sort of ritual to undergird this approach. In this way, the incorporation of the exorcism spells constitutes an outsider's (non- Jewish/Christian) perspective on the Jewish/Christian exorcistic tradition and on the growth of Christian ritual traditions in fourth-century Egypt.

To get to this final proposition, however, I will first offer some observations on the nature of exorcistic language of demons in contrast both to an everyday 'lived' experience of demons and to an exclusively scribal enterprise of 'demonology.' These observations will help to frame the Pibechis spell and the Excellent Procedure as,

---

4 Ll. 86-87; 2510-20 ("against every evil daimon, whether evil male or female"); ll. 2695-2707 ("guard me against every daimon of the air, of the earth, and under the earth [...]") – discussed below.

5 I will henceforth use *demon* to refer to malicious supernatural beings; *daimōn* to refer to the more ambiguous supernatural figures invoked in the Greco-Egyptian formularies; and *demonic being* to refer to the range of spirits, ghosts, and witches that were imagined to bring misfortune in ancient cultures. See Sfameni Gasparro 2001.

indeed, anomalous in the PGM/GEMF collections, yet rooted in Jewish and Christian traditions.

2 The Background of the Exorcism Spells in GEMF 57/PGM IV

Evidence from Jewish and Christian literature of the early Roman period points to the special interest that both religious traditions (or, more properly, Judaism and its early Christ-oriented formations) showed in exorcism as a 'signature ceremony'.[6] The early texts show that exorcism and exorcistic formulae were shared among specialists – Jewish and Christian – claiming special authority against demonic forces, which were conceptualized as an army under Satanic (or similar) control. In addition, they describe the exorcism of spirits as a process of *expulsion* rather than control or accommodation, or subjection (as is characteristic of spirit adjuration in the Greco-Egyptian formularies).[7]

2.1 Apocalyptic Demonology and Its Associated Rituals in Early Judaism (and Its Christian Formations)

Early Christian texts like the Gospel of Mark, the Gospel Sayings source, and Luke-Acts show that a specialization in exorcism probably distinguished the Christ-movement by the middle of the first century, when it was still very much part of Judaism.[8] Josephus's famous scene of an exorcism of emperor Vespasian by the ritual expert Eleazar, as well as Qumran fragments of exorcistic formulas used in this apocalyptic Jewish sect, both suggest that the notion of an order of specifically evil demons to be expelled had become a specialty of Jewish ritual experts during the Roman period.[9] So the proliferation

---

6 On the association of Christians with exorcistic performance in the third century, see Origen, *c. Cels.* 1.6; 6.39; 7.4.

7 As most clearly laid out in Lewis 2003, the resolution of spirit possession in many traditional societies involves not expulsion but pacification of the spirit and the training of the possessed person to accommodate the spirit. In the Jewish/Christian exorcistic traditions and rites examined in this paper, a polarization is assumed between subject and demon that can only be resolved through the expulsion of the demon. See Bazzana 2020, ch. 2. Late antique (IV-VI CE) amulets that invoke the tradition of Solomon's control of demons do so in order to *repel* demons: e.g., P. Col. 338, in Jordan, Kotansky 1997; ACM 20 = Vienna G337; ACM 21 = PGM P17; SEG 44.772, in Giannobile, Jordan 2006.

8 Q/Lk 11:24-26; Mk 3:22-27, 6:7-13; Acts 19:11-19.

9 Josephus., *Ant.* 8.45-49. Qumran: e.g., 11QApocryphal Psalms[a]; 11QPsalms[a] col. XXVII, in García Martínez 1994, 376-8, cf. 309. Bohak (2008, 88-114) offers a thorough overview of early Jewish exorcistic traditions.

of charismatic experts in exorcism within the early Christ-movement would have been one way in which these apocalyptic movements actually participated, in, rather than diverged from, a Jewish frame of reference. The peculiar interest in exorcism on the part of Christ-groups, and the recollections of their founders as exorcists, probably arose from their apocalyptic orientation: successful combat against demons as a ritual performance signifying the imminence of the eschaton (e.g. Mk 3:24-26; Lk 10:17-19).[10] That is, a typical exorcistic act against a local demon could be transformed both theatrically and in oral tradition into the vanquishing of eschatological forces.[11]

But this interest in the expulsion and vanquishing of the demonic among Jewish ritual specialists and Christ-*ekklēsiai* clearly involved a sharing of verbal techniques. Luke-Acts recalls that from an early point Jewish exorcists outside the Christ-movement were also invoking "Jesus" as a powerful *vox magica*.[12] Christian exorcists themselves, while promoting the name of Jesus as a singular invocation, were also invoking "the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob" – so we learn from Justin and Origen. In fact, Origen observes, this formula was often delivered in Hebrew to enhance its magical alterity.[13]

The notable feature in these early texts is that, by virtue of the early Christian interest in (a) the uniform danger of demons, (b) their apocalyptic and Satanic nature, and (c) their ritual expulsion as a signature apocalyptic performance, the name 'Jesus' came to serve as a potent *vox magica* in the ritual field of exorcism. But this apocalyptic, polarized image of demons promulgated in Jewish/Christian exorcistic traditions was *not* the common picture of demons or demonic beings in the ancient world.

---

10 Depictions of armies of demons: e.g., Mk 5:9; and armies of angels: 2 Macc 5:2-3; 10:29-30; Matt 26:53.

11 The primary articulation of this apocalyptic perspective seems to have been the II BCE Enochic *Book of the Watchers* 9-10, 15-16, which taught that the demons of this world are the remains of the impure giants killed at the time of the flood and will be destroyed at the eschatological judgment.

12 Acts 19:13ff; Mk 9:38-39; Irenaeus, *Adv.Haer.* 2.6.2. Still in the fifth or sixth century CE a Babylonian Jewish apotropaic bowl in Aramaic invokes Jesus, the Father, and the Holy Spirit to seal its spell: Bowl M163, § 10, in Levene 2012, 124, 127, 137.

13 Justin, *Dial.* 85.3; Origen, *c. Celsum* 3.33; 5.45; and the unprovenanced Greek foil amulet using lists of patriarchs presumably against evil forces, in Bohak and Faraone 2018. In general see Rist 1938, 298.

2.2 … against the Background of Popular Demonology in Roman and Late Antique Cultures

How, then, were demons conceived in the wider world of Roman and late antique cultures? If we can talk about a 'lived demon-experience' in the Roman empire and ancient Near East, it would involve the topography of liminal spaces in the local environment, traditions of theriomorphic spirits both capricious and hostile, the creeping night-witch figures who attack women and babies within the home, the ghosts of the untimely dead, and so on.[14] The data from antiquity gives us no reason to assume hard and fast divisions between ghosts, witches, particular beasts, and 'demons'.[15] For one Judah, living in a region of Sicily in the third or fourth century, it was the goddess Artemis and the evil she might bring that he sought to repel (GMA 33). The demonic could cover a very wide spectrum. Gaining a sense of control over these threats may involve avoidance and protective gestures, domestic *apotropaia* posted on the door-frame or worn on the body (Mitchell 2007; Wilburn 2019). It may also involve consultation with a ritual specialist who might use a spirit's theriomorphic features (wolf? snake? mouse?) as a way of identifying and thus controlling the demon by means of an amulet, or he might adjure a part of the body as itself agential or independently malicious.[16] Controlling ambiguous but potentially malicious forces could even extend to diverting them to one's enemies, as a second-century lamella asks: "Demon menacing *here*, menace on my behalf now, now, at the house of Julia Cyrilla" (GMA 23). A malicious demon can thus (hopefully) be deployed elsewhere by the power of the written word and its material vehicle.[17]

This fluidity of environmental dangers, of liminal zones and their supernatural denizens, has been usefully captured in a modern context by the anthropologist Charles Stewart in his 1991 study of the demonic on the island of Naxos, Greece. The demonic is articulated in folklore, sensed in the landscape, and experienced around social behavior and gender propriety.[18] And while Stewart convincingly

---

[14] See Brashear 1990; Frankfurter 2006, 13-15; 2012; 2025.

[15] See Kotansky 1995; Johnston 1999, 127-99; Patera 2014; Faraone 2018, 198-220.

[16] Kotansky 1995, 243-77; Frankfurter 2018; Faraone 2007. Also on the role of the ritual expert in negotiating an interpretation of demonic attack see Frankfurter 2002.

[17] The lamella is itself gold (and found in the remains of a workshop), yet the function of the adjuration leans toward a curse, which would ordinarily use cheaper materials like lead. Gold served more commonly for apotropaic amulets one wears, and it is unclear why one would wear this lamella. I would propose that the gold was chosen for its material efficacy: both to protect the wearer from the demon and to facilitate its diversion to Julia Cyrilla. Cf. Kotansky 1994, 100 ad l.4.

[18] Stewart 1991.

describes a cultural system that combines notions of demonic beings with social action and religious location, this is not a system that exists in textual or canonical form (Stewart 1991, 162-91). What is important to recognize in all these kinds of simple ad-hoc apotropaic and exorcistic rituals in folk demon experience is that they do not presume a *demonology* – a cosmic system or hierarchy. They (or their specialists) work ritually, with words and efficacious materials, with *particular situations* of supernatural attack. They might draw on larger myths of authority against demonic beings, like Solomon iconography or Christ-historiolae, but without specifying a class or nature of the demon.[19] Or they aim to list all conceivable dangers one might encounter in one's home and village, as two amulets compile: "sorcery and potions and curse-tablets and the untimely dead and the violently dead and from every evil act" (Heintz 1996, 297); or "evil acts and every (supernatural) visitation and [every apparition] of Hekate and every attack [of a ghost] and [from every] onslaught [of spirits appearing] in sleep [or] mute *daimones* and from […] epilepsy".[20] The ritual scribes' efforts here to list so many dangers aim at a kind of locally-bound comprehensiveness not based in an ideology of cosmic evil – a demonology.[21]

Amulets, intended for people to wear in everyday life, often show more popular or 'lived' traditions of malicious spirits, whereas formularies, apocryphal narratives, and speculative works often display scribal efforts to systematize demon traditions, to construct actual demonologies. When we are talking about popular demonology and the ritual experts who construct images of authority to repel those demons, we are looking at a flexible, ambiguous conception of demonic beings, based in local folklore and local interpretations of authoritative tradition.

The Paris Magical Codex itself includes two elaborate spells, a preliminary component of whose performance involves the preparation of just this sort of apotropaic *phylakterion* to wear during the rite. These are the texts of the amulets as instructed in two recipes of the Paris Magical Papyrus:

---

19 On the use of Solomon traditions in *apotropaia* see (Boustan, Beshay 2014; Frankfurter 2019a, 737-40; Franek 2025)

20 Daniel 1977, 145-9. Compare Mokhtarian 2025 on lists of all conceivable places and people of vulnerability in the household, and Frankfurter 2023 on lists of vulnerable access points for demonic beings.

21 On apotropaic listing see Gordon 1999; Frankfurter 2006, 15-19; Reed 2020, 46-54.

MOULATHI CHERNOUTH AMARŌ MOULIANDRON, guard me from every evil daimon, whether an evil male or female.[22]

EPOKŌPT KŌPTO BAI BAITOKARAKŌPTO KARAKŌPTO CHILOKŌPTO BAI Guard me from every daimon of the air, on the earth and under the earth, and from every angel and phantom and ghostly visitation and enchantment, me NN.[23]

These apotropaic formulae could be said to anticipate an interest in exorcism. Yet inscribed amulets were meant preemptively to *repel* various demonic spirits through identifying and listing their dangers, as in the (real) amulets above: male or female daimons, chthonic or aerial daimons, angels or "enchantment [*epipompē*]".[24]

This language of naming malevolent spirits is important, since different exorcistic traditions within and without Judaism and Christianity had different ways of constructing their opponents (see Bazzana 2020, 39-42). But it is always an approximation – a performative experiment in the wielding of words (with, ideally, the voluntary responsiveness of the demon-afflicted to vocalize a demon's name). And the ambiguous sense of the demonic typical of folk experience and evident in these last apotropaic amulets reveals an important difference between the two exorcism spells of the Paris Codex. The Pibechis Charm, reflecting this same kind of ambiguous demonology, initially adjures [*horkizo*] the *daimones* "to say whatever sort you are: [...] heavenly or aerial, terrestrial [...] or netherworldly [...]" (ll. 3037-45). Like the apotropaic amulets, it cannot identify the demonic dangers it will combat; they can only be prospectively listed. In contrast, the Excellent Procedure specifies "this unclean demon Satan" as the object of exorcism (ll. 1238-9) – language familiar from Gospel tradition (Sfameni Gasparro 2001, 163-4). It reflects an early Jewish (and Christian) exorcistic tradition that configured exorcism as an apocalyptic, dualistic battle against particular arch-demonic figures (Satan, Belial, Asmodeus et al.) – a very different sense of the demonic, preserved in scribal milieux, and by the fourth century, most likely Christian.

---

22 PGM IV.2510-20, tr. GMPT, 84. The plain apotropaic sense of this amulet text does not fit with preceding instructions in the same recipe (ll. 2505-20) that specify that the required *phylaktērion* would protect the ritualist from being thrown out of the sky by the goddess.

23 PGM IV.2695-2707, tr. GMPT, 88.

24 Cf. PGM IV.86-87, another *phylakterion* for *daimoniazomenois* – those 'possessed' by demons or somehow demonically afflicted in body – but without instructional context.

2.3   Scribal Milieux for the Systematization of Demons in the Roman Period

The systematization of this folk or 'lived experience' of demons takes place through the various efforts of institutional and (to a lesser degree) freelance scribes. Historically, temples and priesthoods would define various ranks or types of demons in order to juxtapose them to particular gods: "Demons X, Y, and Z are vanquished by the power of Re-Harakhty of Thebes".[25] In addition, literary works like the *Book of the Watchers* (1 En 1-36; III BCE), the *Book of Jubilees* (I BCE), Tobit (III BCE), *Testament of Abraham* (I-III CE), *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* (I-III CE), *Apocalypse of Peter* (II CE), and the *Testament of Solomon* (IV CE), display various kinds of systematization of demon traditions, from depicting their individual natures (and capacities to be adjured) to narrating their cosmogonic origins and eschatological fate.[26] While modern writers on demonology tend to rely on such works for their reconstructions, these books are better imagined as scribal appropriations of popular demon traditions for theological or speculative purposes. It is also important to remember that neither temple traditions nor fictional narratives supplanted the more fluid folk traditions of the demonic in local cultures of the ancient world, although they might reintroduce authoritative names or traditions into local cultures. This process seems to have occurred, for example, by the medium of amulets, whose scribes would address everyday crises and fears with a range of scriptural, liturgical, and even iconographic elements, communicating authority from religious tradition.[27]

Whereas above (section 2.2) I used apotropaic amulets as evidence for folk demon-belief, here I look at them as the written products of scribes, both freelance and associated with religious institutions, and therefore as carrying a certain normative power to introduce into folk culture traditions about demons and their expulsion. Amulet scribes responded to the exigencies and fears of folk life but then translated those situations into textual and iconographic forms that might draw on scripture, apocryphal folklore, and what Theodore de Bruyn has called the "customary practices" of amulet production in the ancient world, like vowel sounds and *voces magicae*.[28] Indeed, we might imagine amulet-making as a craft tradition in its own right. And in that context we can also see incipient tendencies to systematize

---

25   E.g., Edwards 1960 and more generally, Frankfurter 2006, 15-26.

26   See esp. Reed 2020. On the complex dating of *Testament of Solomon*, see now Franek 2025, 51-5.

27   In general see De Bruyn 2017; Frankfurter 2019a.

28   De Bruyn 2017, 19, 56-64; Frankfurter 2019b; Kotansky 1995, 266-75; 2019.

demonic beings: e.g., the third-/fourth-century papyrus fragment that lists twenty-four (?) causes of misfortune ("death, darkness, [...] evil, evil eye, debauchery, slavery, [...]") in two columns surrounded by an Ouroboros: afflictions plucked from the world, systematically inscribed, and symbolically arrested in the space of the amulet.[29]

As products of scribal milieux akin to those who crafted amulets, formularies also show some tendencies to systematize demonic beings, whether through listing or editors' need for demonological consistency.[30] In the Paris Magical Codex, a *daimōn* is an ambiguous figure, associated closely with the untimely dead but functioning both as agent of a god and servant to the ritualist's commands.[31] But the world of the formularies and their collectors also lay at a cultural and religious distance from the popular demonology sketched above. The Greco-Egyptian formularies in general collect few apotropaic and healing spells,[32] while the supernatural dangers that threaten the ritual expert (who is often presumed to be seeking an oracle or vision of a god) tend to have their own esoteric backgrounds, like an oracular goddess who might, if enraged, throw the ritualist out of the sky.[33]

The historian of religions Jonathan Z. Smith once asked, "Why is it that the demonic, associated with the marginal, the liminal, the chaotic, the protean, the unstructured appears cross-culturally as so rigidly organized a realm?" (Smith 1978, 437). But in fact this was not the case, in antiquity or at other times. I have argued here that popular experience of demons in ancient cultures involved a fluidity, ambiguity, and local definition of demonic beings, but that local, inchoate picture could undergo systematization in a number of scribal worlds: temples, literary works, amulet-crafting, and formulary-collecting. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that any demonologies that resulted from such scribal efforts did not thereby reflect popular, 'lived' notions of demonic beings (even though some influence on popular folklore doubtless took place). Demonology

---

29 PGM CXXI = P. Med. Inv. 71.58, ed. Geraci 1979. See also GMPT, 317. It is, of course, possible that this fragment comes from a formulary's depiction of an apotropaic amulet.

30 On the relationship between formulary and amulet composition (as well as performance), see De Bruyn 2017, 75-88; Faraone 2022.

31 As spirits of untimely dead: ll. 340-9, 462, 447, 1968; as chthonic: l. 2088; as associated with night: l. 1228; as agents of particular gods: ll. 964, 2987; as subject to the ritualist's commands: ll. 1968, 2088; as having a material image for domestic veneration: l. 1858; as characteristically terrified at the sound of divine names: ll. 358, 2541; as associated with particular herbs: l. 2974. See also Sfameni Gasparro 2001.

32 The Coptic magical codex Michigan 136, also dated to the fourth century, offers an important contrast to the Greek formularies, since it contains predominantly healing spells. See ACM 43 and now Zellmann-Rohrer, Love 2022.

33 GEMF 57/PGM IV.2501-14.

was a phenomenon of the literate elite, sometimes priestly, sometimes of esoteric groups, who might through lists and calculations control imaginatively the world of chaotic forces: *daimones*, planets, fallen angels and their offspring, and so on.[34]

2.4 The Exorcism Spells in the Paris Magical Codex in the Context of Ancient Demonology

We thus have several contexts in which demons – ambiguous or malevolent supernatural beings, night-witches and *biaiothanatoi*, denizens of liminal places or alien temples – arose as (a) threats to negotiate ritually and (b) topics of discussion and speculation. These contexts include: popular demon experience; Jewish and Christian exorcistic traditions; and the literate scribal subcultures of amulet crafters, formulary compilers and authors of apocryphal works. To which context would we attribute the two exorcism spells of the Paris Magical Codex?

It seems clear that they both reflect the Christian exorcistic tradition as it developed within Judaism but apart from either the popular domain of multiple ambiguous demonic beings or a more systematized image of *daimones* such as formulary scribes were developing. The Pibechis Spell and the Excellent Rite both assume a world in which demons are polarized rather than negotiable or ambiguous. They aim for the *expulsion* of spirits, which was a Jewish ritual innovation adopted in the early Christ movement as a signature performance. In these two spells there is no purpose imagined for *daimones* apart from their removal from bodies – *ekbalein*, used three times in the Excellent Procedure.[35] "*Every daimōn* is frightful [*phrikton*],"[36] instructs the Pibechis Charm (ll. 3017-18), which is itself designated to heal *daimoniazomenous*" (l. 3007). Given the anomaly of this exorcistic conception of demons, it is all the more interesting that the editor(s) of the Paris Papyrus included the two exorcistic spells in the formulary at all. Did they incorporate them out of general interest in new *daimōn*-related recipes or simply because they were at hand, evidence of a new type of Christian ritual libretto circulating in fourth-century Egypt?

---

34 See esp. Frankfurter 2006, ch. 2; Marx-Wolf 2016; Reed 2020, 46-54, 228-46.

35 Compare l. 1245: *exelthe daimon*. In the Pibechis Charm's final note on its efficacy on the possessed body the editor says that the demon will be *eiskrithēsetai*, "expelled" (ll. 3083-4).

36 Cf. P. Oslo I.1.261. The meaning is 'frightful' rather than 'frightened'.

3 The Two Exorcistic Spells of GEMF 57/PGM IV

3.1 Jewish Features of the Exorcistic Spells

The exorcistic tradition that polarizes demons as evil derives from apocalyptic Judaism and Christian groups as part of Judaism. But in so identifying this perspective on demons with Jewish tradition it is important to note that 'Jewish' should not be taken to imply that 'actual' Jews were the transmitters or immediate composers of the spells. Rather, this exorcistic tradition originated in Jewish religious groups, especially those (like Christians) with an apocalyptic orientation, and it would have been associated with Jewish authority: particular names, myths, and verbal formulae.

Both exorcistic spells are assemblages of Jewish verbal techniques to expel demons.[37] Unlike later Christian amulets from Egypt that drew explicitly on the Gospel tradition in formulating their authority, these exorcistic spells use Jewish liturgical and poetic passages.[38] The Excellent Procedure invokes (notably in Old Coptic, to be discussed below) the "God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob," a common Jewish magical formula in antiquity, expropriated from liturgical contexts (Rist 1938). The Pibechis Charm invokes stories associated with the Exodus, with Solomon, with the division of the Jordan river, with the destruction of the primordial Giants, with the Temple in Jerusalem, and so on. Its God appears in fire and lives in his own holy paradise. Indeed, one of the adjurations calls for God's "inexorable angel [to] come down and [...] expel the lingering demon [*eiskrinetō ton periptamenon daimona*] from this image [*plasmatos*]" (ll. 3024-6).[39] This adjuration draws on Jewish traditions of the human body as the 'image' of God as well as on liturgical traditions of angels as envoys sent down from the heavenly throne.[40] The author of the Pibechis Charm is clearly acquainted with Jewish liturgical tradition and folklore as a repository of efficacious speech.

The Pibechis Charm concludes by adjuring the reader or patient to avoid pork; yet this detail does not secure a Jewish *Sitz-im-Leben*. In fact, the instruction is worded in such a way that Jewish meal purity becomes an exotic mode of ritual preparation, of self-purification, rather than the habitus of an insider (Bohak 2008, 207).

---

37 Eitrem 1966, 15–30; van der Horst 2006.

38 Compare ACM 17, 21, which both use gospel references to protect from demons.

39 Tr. GEMF (emended).

40 See, e.g., Tobit 3:16-17. *Plasma* implies a figurine or model produced according to a preexisting form; cf. Col 1:15, which uses *eikon* to express Christ's unique nature as image of God, a different idea.

These are, in many ways, quite different exorcistic spells, but they both view Jewish liturgical speech – both what one might hear in a synagogue and what a skilled liturgical poet might improvise from biblical tradition – as singularly efficacious against demons. Considering the added use of the name 'Jesus', to be discussed in the next section, the power imputed to Jewish liturgical speech suggests that, for those who initially compiled these exorcisms, Jewish ritual speech in particular offered a unique resource for anti-demon incantation.

3.2 Anomalous Features

3.2.1 The Name Jesus

It is significant that the only two exorcistic spells in the Paris Magical Papyrus are also the only spells invoking Jesus. As I have argued above, use of the name Jesus in the context of an adjuration does not in itself imply a 'Christian' origin. Christian literature itself recalls others using Jesus's name for ritual. But there is reason to infer a connection between the use of this name and the function of the spells: that is, in the world of the editors and their sources, the practice of specifically expelling demons was associated with the authority of this particular name. Here the two spells diverge, however. In the Pibechis Charm the name is tacked on as the name of the "god of the Hebrews: IĒSOU IABA IAĒ ABRAŌTH [...]" (ll. 3019-20): that is, as the first of a string of 'Jewish-sounding' *voces magicae*.[41] In the Excellent Procedure, however, the name is presented as part of a liturgical formula, written in Old Coptic Egyptian (i.e., Egyptian grammar and presumably pronunciation, but, in this case, mostly Greek letters):[42]

> Hail, God of Abraham! Hail, God of Isaac! Hail, God of Jacob!
> Jesus, the Christ, the one holy of spirit, the Son of the Father, who is in the upper part of the Seven and who is in the inner part of the Seven.

---

[41] Here I credit the editors of GEMF II for not isolating Jesus's name (as in GMPT) but placing it in small capitals to indicate its inclusion among a set of *voces magicae* (GEMF II, fc). Cf. Betz 1986, 96.

[42] On the nature of Old Coptic Egyptian in this passage see esp. Love 2016, 64-5, 220-1.

> Bring Iao Sabaoth. May your [Iao's] power be channelled through[43] NN, until you expel this unclean demon, Satan, who is in him! (ll. 1231-8)[44]

The first element (A) is clearly Jewish in origin (and probably in continuing association, too) – a potent magical formula derived from Jewish liturgy. The second part (B), which seems to conflate Jesus with the Holy Spirit, may draw on an esoteric Christological tradition.[45] The third part (C) returns to an exorcistic invocation by the authority of the Jewish god, expelling a demonic being (Satan) familiar in biblical (and early Christian) folklore (but not, notably, in the traditions of the extant Greco-Egyptian formularies like the Paris Codex). From these details – and even more from its solitary preservation in Old Coptic Egyptian – scholars conclude that this entire passage must have had an independent existence subsequent to its appearance in the Excellent Procedure, although clearly it originated as an exorcistic formula.

3.2.2   The Use of Old Coptic Egyptian for a Liturgical Formula

Why, then, was the incantation preserved in Old Coptic and retained thus in the editing of the Paris Magical Papyrus? Its preservation here occurs too early in time to reflect the promulgation of Coptic in Egyptian Christian institutions (and Old Coptic was not a Christian language in any event). It is likewise doubtful that such a formula would have been put in Egyptian for purely practical reasons (e.g., inclusivity of non-Greek participants) when most liturgical formulae in the fourth century were promulgated in Greek.[46] The Egyptian philologist Edward Love is then surely correct that the use of Old Coptic Egyptian instead of Greek here constituted a "proliferation of efficacy" – a way of amplifying the power of the formula through the exotic sounds of Egyptian.[47]

Yet the proliferation of efficacy based on the alterity of tongues had already surrounded the Jewish liturgical formula (A) for some time,

---

43   Lit., 'come out from'.

44   Tr. GEMF II, emended to reflect liturgical mode.

45   See in general Love 2016, 58-60; Dosoo 2026, 173-4. In general on the use of liturgical (incl. credal) formulas in exorcistic spells see De Bruyn 2017, 207–8.

46   On the continuing importance of Greek in Egyptian Christian liturgies through the fifth century: Mihálykó 2019, 254-7. Korshi Dosoo has speculated that the formula was originally in Greek and translated into Egyptian for Egyptian Christians: Dosoo 2026, 171-2, 176.

47   Love 2016, 214, 220-1.

as Origen explains. Writing shortly before the probable compilation of the Paris Codex, he asserts that the power of Hebrew is lost in Greek translation:

> If anyone who utters an invocation or oath names "The God of Abraham and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," he would effect something, either because of the nature of these names, or even because of their power; for daimons are overcome and made subject to him who says these things [...]. If we were to translate the name Israel into Greek or another language, we would effect nothing. But if we keep it as it is [i.e., in Hebrew], [...] then something would happen in accordance with the power which such invocations are said to possess when a formula of this kind is pronounced. We would say the same also of the word Sabaoth, which is frequently used in spells, [...] if we keep it with its own sounds, we will cause something to happen.[48]

Of course, Old Coptic Egyptian is not Hebrew (nor in any way like Hebrew!). But in a world that idealized 'linguistic alterity' – the mysteriously potent sounds of foreign tongues – it is quite likely that the scribes involved in the editing of this exorcistic passage (and its embedding in a more comprehensible Greek spell) regarded Old Coptic Egyptian as possessing the same efficacious Otherness that Origen imputed to Hebrew.[49]

An illuminating *comparandum* comes from the *Corpus Hermeticum*, which is roughly contemporaneous with Origen and the Paris Magical Codex. A famous passage asserts that any translation from Egyptian into Greek "will greatly distort the sense of the writings, and cause much obscurity. Expressed in our native [Egyptian] language, the teaching conveys its meaning clearly, for the very quality of the sounds <...>; and when the Egyptian words are spoken, the force of the things signified works in them".[50] The claims here, like the Hermetic composition itself, are thoroughly Greek; yet the attribution of special powers to foreign tongues – and specifically to the Egyptian tongue – is both characteristic of the early Roman period and relevant to the Old Coptic passage. Both Hebrew (for Origen) and Egyptian (for the Hermetic author) were imagined to convey powers in their native sounds, powers that would be obliterated in Greek

---

translation.[51] Could Old Coptic Egyptian have been imagined as interchangeable with (or at least replaceable for) Hebrew by virtue of their similar alterity and antiquity? I would propose that the compiler of the Excellent Procedure had no Hebrew text or form to render the liturgical passage above in mysterious and potent sounds, so Egyptian (rather than *voces magicae*) offered the best substitution.[52]

4 Conclusions: The Two Exorcism Spells as Outsiders' Perspective on a New Ritual Practice

In many ways these two exorcism spells are constructed within the ritual world and discourse typical of the Greco-Egyptian formularies: the incantations alternate with material ingredients and gestures; they use *voces magicae* common to many spells. Indeed, "Jesus" in the Pibechis Charm belongs to a string of *voces magicae* intended to conjure the esoteric name of the Jewish god, while the use of Old Coptic Egyptian in the Excellent Procedure suggests the crafting (at some stage) of linguistic alterity for aural potency (Egyptian in lieu of Hebrew). And yet their overall function to expel spirits, which are depicted as frightful demons, sets both spells apart from the rest of the Paris Magical Papyrus, where *daimones* tend to be ambivalent spirits (often *aoroi*) that can be invoked and subjugated to the ritualist's will. Coupled with the equally unusual invocation of "Jesus the Christ" (Excellent Procedure) and "God of the Hebrews IĒSOU IABA IAĒ ABRAŌTH" (Pibechis Charm), the two spells point to the same ritual link between the name Jesus and the expulsion of malign spirits that Luke-Acts and Origen described. But are these exorcisms, then, evidence of novel ritual practices from within a Christian milieu or from the perspective of others?

It is difficult to determine the religious allegiances of the initial composers of these spells, and it may be presumptuous, even anachronistic, to expect 'religious allegiances' at all in the crafting of apotropaic amulets and spells. The editors of the Paris Magical Papyrus themselves were most likely not Jewish or Christian, in the sense that these religions might determine ritual creativity. At least

---

51 We are most familiar with Greek depictions of translating from the Hebrew (2 Macc; Ep. Aristeas), but *voces magicae* themselves make clear that Hebrew names and language were also regarded as carrying an archaic potency On the exoticization of Hebrew language, see, e.g.: PGM XIII.80-81; P. Mich. Inv. 599, referring to the power intrinsic to "all the special names that are written in Hebrew" (ACM 133, p. 304).

52 One might also propose, on historical grounds, that in the mid-third century CE, Jews had still not recovered their cultural presence after the massacres that followed the 116-17 Jewish revolt, so that a Greco-Egyptian scribe would have had no recourse to Jewish ritual experts to acquire the necessary words. See Kerkeslager 2006.

in its Old Coptic Egyptian section, the Excellent Procedure may have originated in a Christian milieu; and, by the evidence of its series of *historiolae* from Jewish lore, the Pibechis Charm could have originated in a Jewish milieu (without the superfluous admonition to avoid pork). But these features could as easily have been imitated and cobbled together.[53] What is important to recognize is the way Jewish and Christian details of verbal authority, like liturgical phrases and key divine names, naturally coalesce in the composition of an exorcism spell, for this genre of ritual speech (and therapeutic intervention) seems to have been a common development in both traditions. Moreover, these two spells suggest that exorcism was regarded by outsiders as a common power of Jewish and Christian ritual speech. That is, scribes knew that the efficacy of an exorcistic incantation must derive from Jewish authority – biblical lore, the invocation of the God of the Patriarchs – as well as the name Jesus.

These connections, apparently deemed essential by the scribes, are precisely the historical feature this paper seeks to highlight. In the world of Greco-Egyptian formularies and their scribal milieux, exorcism was itself an anomalous approach to *daimones*; and yet it had an important history as a ritual practice and a scribal (or liturgical) composition distinctive of Jews and Christians. So how, to such a scribe, would such a practice proceed— by what verbal formulae and names? This was the purpose of including these spells, to include and to imagine a ritual form that would have been in ascendance in the fourth century.

Yet there is no evidence that either of these spells had a performative 'life' apart from the libretto itself. They each came into being, like most formulary spells, as ideal depictions of rites, not as records of gestural practice. The Excellent Procedure and Pibechis Charm, both edited in their extant versions by scribes outside Jewish or Christian milieux, show that exorcism here was imagined to work by invoking Jewish lore and formulae and the name Jesus. (For others, it was imagined to work simply by invoking the powers of Solomon.)[54] This evidence does not point to the scribes' acquaintance with Juda*ism* or Christian*ity* (as we might imagine these exceedingly diverse religions in the third or fourth centuries), but simply with an emergent ritual form in the general world of the formulary scribes, one that they treated as a curious and complementary addition to the codex. But

---

53 On imitations of Jewish magical phrasing see Bohak 2008, 196-209; see also Love 2016, 216-19, on the floating authority of the name Jesus.

54 Note that the Pibechis Charm also invokes the exorcistic authority of Solomon: ll. 3039-42. On the widespread Solomonic exorcistic tradition see Torijano 2002, 41-88; Frankfurter 2019a, 737-40; Franek 2025. See also Boustan, Beshay 2014 on the appropriation of Solomon exorcistic traditions for late antique Christian institutional interests.

that emergent ritual form, exorcism, was an indication of the spread of Christianity in its distinctive demonological interests.

Abbreviations

ACM = Meyer, M.; Smith, R. (eds) (1994). *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*. San Francisco: HarperCollins.

GEMF = Faraone, C.A.; Torallas Tovar, S. (eds) (2022-). *Greek and Egyptian Magical Formularies, 1-*. Berkeley: California Classical Studies.

GMA = Kotansky, R.D. (ed.) (1994). *Greek Magical Amulets*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

GMPT = Betz, H.D. (ed.) (1986). *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

PGM = Preisendanz, K. (ed.) (1973). *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri, 1-2*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Teubner.

RGRW = *Religions of the Graeco-Roman World*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Bibliography

Bazzana, G.B. (2020). *Having the Spirit of Christ: Spirit Possession and Exorcism in the Early Christ Groups*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press.

Betz, H.D. (ed.) (1986). *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Including the Demotic Spells*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bohak, G. (2008). *Ancient Jewish Magic: A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bohak, G.; Faraone, C.A. (2018). "'Pay Heed, O Heaven, and I Will Speak' (Deut. 32:1): A Greek Amulet with Biblical and Angelic Names". *MHNH*, 18, 5-14.

Boustan, R.; Beshay, M. (2014). "Sealing the Demons, Once and for All: The Ring of Solomon, the Cross of Christ, and the Power of Biblical Kingship". *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*, 16, 99-129.

Brashear, W. (1990). "Zauberformular: Exkurs". *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, 36, 61-73.

Chadwick, H. (1965). *Origen: Contra Celsum*. Corrected. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Daniel, R.W. (1977). "Some Phylaktêria". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 25, 151.

De Bruyn, T. (2017). *Making Amulets Christian: Artefacts, Scribes, and Contexts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dosoo, K. (2026). "Egyptian Linguistic Influence in GEMF 57/PGM IV, Part 2: The Old Coptic Texts". Faraone, C.A.; Torallas Tovar, S. (eds), *New Approaches to the Great Paris Magical Codex (PGM IV/GEMF 57)*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 129-80.

Edwards, I.E.S. (1960). *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum: Fourth Series, Oracular Amuletic Decrees of the Late New Kingdom*. London: Trustees of the British Museum.

Eitrem, S. (1966). *Some Notes on the Demonology in the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. Symbolae Osloenses 20.

Faraone, C.A. (2007). "The Rise of the Demon Womb in Greco-Roman Antiquity". Parca, M.; Tzanetou, A. (eds), *Finding Persephone: Women's Rituals in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Bloomington; Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 154-64.

Faraone, C.A. (2018). *The Transformation of Greek Amulets in Roman Imperial Times*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Faraone, C.A. (2022). "The Traffic in Magical Recipes: Single-Sheet Formularies as Prompts for Oral Performance". Faraone, C.A.; Torallas Tovar, S. (eds), *The Greco-Egyptian Magical Formularies: Libraries, Books, and Individual Recipes*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 420-53.

Franek, J. (2025). *Solomonica Magica: Solomon, Sisinnius, and the Holy Rider on Greek-Inscribed Amulets from Late Antiquity and Early Byzantium*. Leiden; Boston: E.J. Brill. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 201.

Frankfurter, D. (2001). "Narrating Power: The Theory and Practice of the Magical Historiola in Ritual Spells". Meyer, M.W.; Mirecki, P.A. (eds), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 457-76.

Frankfurter, D. (2002). "Dynamics of Ritual Expertise in Antiquity and Beyond: Towards a New Taxonomy of 'Magicians'". Mirecki, P.; Meyer, M.W. (eds), *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 159-78. RGRW 141.

Frankfurter, D. (2006). *Evil Incarnate: Rumors of Demonic Conspiracy and Ritual Abuse in History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Frankfurter, D. (2012). "Introduction". *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*, 14, 1-8.

Frankfurter, D. (2017). "Narratives That Do Things". Johnston, S.I. (ed.), *Religion: Narrating Religion*. Farmington Hills (MI): Cengage; Macmillan Reference USA, 95-106. Macmillan Interdisciplinary Handbooks: Religion.

Frankfurter, D. (2018). "The Threat of Headless Beings: Constructing the Demonic in Christian Egypt". Ostling, M. (ed.), *Fairies, Demons, and Nature Spirits: 'Small Gods' at the Margins of Christendom*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 57-78. Palgrave Historical Studies in Witchcraft and Magic.

Frankfurter, D. (2019a). "Magic as the Local Application of Authoritative Tradition". Frankfurter, D. (ed.), *Guide to the Study of Ancient Magic*. Leiden; Boston: E.J. Brill, 720-45. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 189.

Frankfurter, D. (2019b). "The Magic of Writing in Mediterranean Antiquity". Frankfurter, D. (ed.), *Guide to the Study of Ancient Magic*. Leiden; Boston: E.J. Brill, 626-58. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 189.

Frankfurter, D. (2023). "The Supernatural Vulnerabilities of Domestic Space in Late Antique Egypt: Perspectives from the 'Magical' Corpus". Barrett, C.E. (ed.), *Households in Context: Dwelling in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 255-70.

Frankfurter, D. (2025). "On the Gender of Demons". Muehlberger, E.; Storin, B.K. (eds), *Discipline, Authority, and Text in Late Ancient Religion: Essays in Honour of David Brakke*. Turnhout: Brepols, 153-73.

García Martínez, F. (1994). *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. Transl. by W.G.E. Watson. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Geraci, G. (1979). "Un'actio magica contro afflizioni fisiche e morali". *Aegyptus*, 59, 63-72.

Giannobile, S.; Jordan, D.R. (2006). "A Lead Phylactery from Colle San Basilio (Sicily)". *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, 46, 73-86.

Gordon, R.L. (1999). "'What's in a List?' Listing in Greek and Graeco-Roman Malign Magical Texts". Jordan, D.R.; Montgomery, H.; Thomassen, E. (eds), *The World of Ancient Magic*. Bergen: Norwegian Institute at Athens, 239-77. Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 4.

Heintz, F. (1996). "A Greek Silver Phylactery in the MacDaniel Collection". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 112, 295-300.

Horst, P.W. van der (2006). "The Great Magical Papyrus of Paris (PGM IV) and the Bible". *Jews and Christians in Their Graeco-Roman Context: Selected Essays on Early Judaism, Samaritanism, Hellenism, and Christianity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 269-79.

Johnston, S.I. (1999). *Restless Dead: Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jordan, D.; Kotansky, R.D. (1997). "A Solomonic Exorcism". *Kölner Papyri 8*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 53-69. Papyrologica Coloniensia 7.8.

Kerkeslager, A. (2006). "The Jews in Egypt and Cyrenaica, 66 – ca. 235 C.E.". Katz, S.T. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 53-68.

Kotansky, R.D. (1994). *Greek Magical Amulets: The Inscribed Gold, Silver, Copper, and Bronze Lamellae — I: Published Texts of Known Provenance*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag. Papyrologica Coloniensia 22.1.

Kotansky, R.D. (1995). "Greek Exorcistic Amulets". Meyer, M.W.; Mirecki, P. (eds), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 243-77. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 129.

Kotansky, R.D. (2019). "Textual Amulets and Writing Traditions in the Ancient World". Frankfurter, D. (ed.), *Guide to the Study of Ancient Magic*. Leiden; Boston: E.J. Brill, 507-54. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 189.

Levene, D. (2012). *A Corpus of Magic Bowls: Incantation Texts in Jewish Aramaic from Late Antiquity*. 2nd ed. Southampton: Dan Levene.

LiDonnici, L.R. (2022). "Compositional Patterns in the Paris Magical Codex (GEMF 57 = PGM IV)". Faraone, C.A.; Torallas Tovar, S. (eds), *The Greco-Egyptian Magical Formularies*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 169-92.

Love, E.O.D. (2016). *Code-Switching with the Gods: The Bilingual (Old Coptic-Greek) Spells of PGM IV and Their Linguistic, Religious, and Socio-Cultural Context in Late Roman Egypt*. Berlin: De Gruyter. Zeitschrift Für Ägyptische Sprache Und Altertumskunde, Beihefte 4.

Marx-Wolf, H. (2016). *Spiritual Taxonomies and Ritual Authority: Platonists, Priests, and Gnostics in the Third Century C.E.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Mihálykó, Á. (2019). *The Christian Liturgical Papyri: An Introduction*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. Studies and Texts in Antiquity and Christianity 114.

Miller, P.C. (1986). "In Praise of Nonsense". Armstrong, A.H. (ed.), *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality: Egyptian, Greek, Roman*. New York: Crossroad, 481-505. World Spirituality 15.

Mitchell, J. (2007). "Keeping the Demons Out of the House: The Archaeology of Apotropaic Strategy and Practice in Late Antique Butrint and Antigoneia". Lavan, L.; Swift, E.; Putzeys, T. (eds), *Objects in Context, Objects in Use: Material Spatiality in Late Antiquity*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 273-310.

Mokhtarian, J.S. (2025). "Families, Lineage, and Lists of Protections in the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic Incantation Bowls". Marcus, A.W.; Mokhtarian, J.S. (eds), *Aramaic Incantation Bowls in Their Late Antique Jewish Contexts*. Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 187-220.

Patera, M. (2014). *Figures grecques de l'épouvante de l'antiquité au présent: Peurs enfantines et adultes*. Leiden: E.J. Brill. Mnemosyne Supplements 376.

Reed, A.Y. (2020). *Demons, Angels, and Writing in Ancient Judaism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rist, M. (1938). "The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: A Liturgical and Magical Formula". *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 57(3), 289-303.

Scott, W. (1924). *Hermetica*, vol. 4. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sfameni Gasparro, G. (2001). "Magie et démonologie dans les Papyrus Graecae Magicae". Gyselen, R. (ed.), *Démons et merveilles d'orient*. Bures-sur-Yvette: Groupe pour l'étude de la civilisation du Moyen-Orient, 157-74. Res Orientales 13.

Smith, J.Z. (1978). "Towards Interpreting Demonic Powers in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity". *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 2.16.1, 425-39.

Stewart, C. (1991). *Demons and the Devil: Moral Imagination in Modern Greek Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tardieu, M. (2013). "'Ceux qui font la voix des oiseaux': Les dénominations de langues". Tardieu, M.; Van den Kerchove, A.; Zago, M. (eds), *Noms barbares I: Formes et contextes d'une pratique magique*. Turnhout: Brepols, 143-53. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences religieuses 162.

Torijano, P.A. (2002). *Solomon the Esoteric King: From King to Magus, Development of a Tradition*. Leiden: E.J. Brill. Supplements to JSJ 73.

Wilburn, A.T. (2019). "Building Ritual Agency: Foundations, Floors, Doors, and Walls". Frankfurter, D. (ed.), *Guide to the Study of Ancient Magic*. Leiden; Boston: E.J. Brill, 555-602. RGRW 189.

Zellmann-Rohrer, M.; Love, E.O.D. (2022). *Traditions in Transmission: The Medical and Magical Texts of a Fourth-Century Greek and Coptic Codex (Michigan Ms. 136) in Context*. Berlin: De Gruyter. Archiv für Papyrusforschung Beihefte 47.