The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Notes, Critical and Explanatory, on the Magical Papyri

Ernst Riess

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 09 / December 1896, pp 409 - 413

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00204988, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00204988

How to cite this article:

Ernst Riess (1896). Notes, Critical and Explanatory, on the Magical Papyri. The Classical Review, 10, pp 409-413 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00204988

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Classical Review

DECEMBER 1896.

NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY, ON THE MAGICAL PAPYRI.

Now, when, as it seems, the remnants of ancient superstition are, at last, about to be critically edited, I think it the right moment to contribute to their study a number of notes, which,—now for a considerable time,—have accumulated among my papers. The texts which I use are: (1) Parthey, *Zwei griech. Zauberpapyri*, Berl. Akad. Abh. 1865 (B. 1, B. 2); (2) Dieterich, *Jahrb. f. Philol. Suppl.* xvi. (V); Abraxas, Leipzig 1891 (W); (3) Wessely, *Griech. Zauberpapyrus*, Wien. Denkschr. xxxvi.: *Neue griech. Zauberpapyrus*, *ibid.* xlii. (We. i. We. ii.).

V, i. 33. A certain number of birds shall be strangled *μέχρις οὗ ἕκαστον τῶν ζώων ἀποπνύγη* <καὶ τὸ ἀ<ι>μα αὐτῶν εἰς α<υ>τὸν ἔλθῃ; thus Leemans and Dieterich, whose reference to We. i. Par 40 is useless, as there the cock is to be butchered. We must read: <καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα. For the sacrifice is offered to a wax doll representing Eros. To this the breath of the victims shall give life and breath. We must picture to ourselves the animals as strangled right before the face of the image (cp. 32, 33: ἀναπνίξεις ἅμα προσφέρων τῷ Ἐρωτι), so that their breath reaches it. Thus the last breath of a dying man was taken up by his next of kin with their mouths in order to continue the existence of his spirit; Tyler, *Primitive Culture*, i. 433; E. Rohde, *Psyche* 22, 1.

V, iii. 27 ff. might well be added to Mr. H. C. Trumbull's long list of threshold-sacrifices in his new book (*The Threshold-*

Covenant). But what is *ὄν ὄρνιθος ἀρσενικοῦ*? Certainly, no monstrous curiosity, but simply an egg which would hatch a male chicken (*ὄρνις* here used for fowl, as so often). It was a current belief among the ancients that long, pointed eggs contained male birds (Columella, viii. 5, 11; cp. Aristotle, π. ζω. γεν. iii. 27).

V, 4, 3. *ὄνειρον π...αι* Pap. *πέμψαι* Leemans, *πέμπε* Dieterich. But *πέμψαι* is sufficient; for the meaning of the passage is: write on a tablet the following charm and the dream which you want to send and put this into the mouth of a cat.

V, v. 1 read *καὶ τὰ κρέα σου* instead of *κράτέα*: he will give thy flesh to the dogs.

V, 5, 11, 12. *χρημάτισον, εἰ περὶ τοῦδε, περὶ πάντων (?) πυνθάνω*. Knoll (*Philol.* liv. 560), wants to read *εἰ<π>ε* *περὶ τοῦδε* a.s.f. But it is better to add another *εἰ* before *περὶ πάντων*.

V, 8, 6 f. *πρὸς ἀρμονίαν τῶν ἑπτὰ φθόγων ἔχόντων φωνὰς πρὸς τὰ κῆ φῶτα τῆς σελήνης*, and identically recurring W. xvii. 30 (Abraxas 196, 2). Dieterich apparently has no explanation to offer. Yet, as far as I know, these two quotations give the earliest, if not the only mention in a Greek author of the 'stations of the moon' the *nakshatras*, which play so prominent a part in Indian astrology.

V, 9, 4. Before *θεὲ μέγιστε* a lacuna must be assumed to exist, as otherwise the charmsong would begin too abruptly. The words *θεὲ μέγιστε* ὅς *ὑπερβάλλεις τὴν πᾶσαν δύναμιν* have been used to fill this blank.

But they more properly belong to a lost part of the *ἐπικλήσις*. Cp. 21 *ἐπεκαλεσάμην σε, θεὲ μέγιστε, καὶ διὰ σοῦ τὰ πάντα*. Here before καὶ the words *ὅς—δύναμιν* would be well in place.

V, 12, 13. λαβὼν *ρίζαν πασιθέαν ἢ ἀρτεμισίαν*. This mystical name of the *ἀρτεμισία*, occurs, I think, only once in ancient literature: in a gloss, C. G. L. iii. 571, B, 67: *paspispha* (r. *πασιθέα*) *artemisia*.

W. i. 19 ff. (Abr. 171, 5 ff.). *ὁ δὲ Μωσῆς λέγει ἐν τῇ Κλειδί· 'σκευάσεις ἐπὶ παντὸς ὄροβον ἡλιακόν', κύαμον Αἰγύπτιον τοῦτοῖς λέγει*. Thus Dieterich. The manuscript has: *οδελεγει ἐν τῇ κλειδί μουσῆς σκευασεῖς ἐπὶ παντος οροβου ηλιακον κυαμω αιγυπτιω τουτοις λεγει*. This order is much better than the 'restored' one. Apparently we must read *ὁ δὲ λέγει ἐν τῇ Κλειδί Μωσῆς 'σκευάσεις ἐπὶ παντὸς ὄροβον ἡλιακόν' κυάμω Αἰγυπτίῳ τοῦτοῖς λέγει*. 'What Moses says in his Key you must prepare for it all..., with that he means' and so on. On account of *κυάμω* we perhaps must even read *ὀρόβω ἡλιακῶς* as dative of means, and attribute the confusion of cases to the writer.

W. x. 15 (Abr. 176, 10). The papyrus uses the abbreviation *ὁϑ* for *ὁ θεός*. The sign usually means *ὄνομα*. Is it too bold to see here the influence of the Hebrew *יהוה* the reverential substitute for the Lord's name? Certainly the book itself claims to be the key of Moses and shows unmistakeable traces of Hebrew influence. Compare also p. 176, 33 *ἀδωναίε βασυμμ* (read *βασημμ* = *בשם* as p. 182, 12) *Ἰαώ*.

W. xiv. 43 (Abr. 178, 16). *ἐφελκυσάμενος πνεῦμα πάσαις ταῖς αἰθήσεσι* (thus D. *αἰσθήσεσι* Leemans *αἰθήσεσι* P) *φράσον τὸ ὄνομα τὸ πρῶτον ἐνὶ (ἐνὶ is only a misprint) πνεύματι*. Dieterich's *αἰθήσεσι* I confess I do not understand. As *αἰσθήσις* can mean 'the organ of perception,' Leemans's conjecture, I think, is very acceptable: draw thy breath with all thy organs and pronounce the first name in one breath. Compare the similar command, Paris, 658 ff (We. i. 61) *ἄλον ἀποδιδοὺς τὸ πνεῦμα βασανίζων τὴν λαγόνα μυκῶ*.

W. iii. 35, xv. 32 (Abr. 180, 12). *κύριε, τῇ πόστῃ καλῶ τὸν θεόν* etc. But the sense demands *κύριε τῇ ποστῇ· καλῶ κ.τ.λ.* For the sorcerer was commanded (8 ff) for seven days to salute the sun, naming every day, first, the θεοὶ ὠρογενεῖς, *εἶτα τοὺς ἐφεβδοματικούς τεταγμένους· μαθὼν δέ, the text proceeds, τὸν κύριον τῆς ἡμέρας, ἐκείνων ἐνόχλει*. That is to say, he had to salute the ruler of the day by his name and the words *κύριε τῇ ποστῇ* stand like our NN. as a blank to be

filled every day with the ruling name by the conjurer himself.

W. vii. 17 (Abr. 190, 8). Leemans has brilliantly corrected the corrupt letters into *περιπατεῖτω*. Dieterich returns to *πυρὶ πατεῖτω* of the MS. But even Homer sometimes nods. For what is more important in an *ἐγερσις σώματος νεκροῦ* than to make the corpse walk about? And the manuscript itself goes on with these words *ἐπὶ τόνδε τὸν τόπον!*

Par(isinus) 32 (We. i. 15) read: *ποίησον ἐπὶ δύο πλίνθων ἐπὶ κροτάφων <ἀνεστη> κυῶν ἐκ ξύλων ἐλαίνων τοῦτ' ἐστιν κλήμ<ατος W> <π>υράν: make a pyre upon two bricks standing on their narrow sides from olive wood, viz. twigs (perhaps *κληματῖδων*).*

Par. 45 (ibidem) *ἀνιπιθι*: read *ἀνάπιθι*.

Par. 59 (We. i. 46). *της*. The scribe did not want to correct a wrong letter, but to insert *ἦ* before *της*: to the eastern parts of the city or of the village or of the house.

Par. 213-14 (We. i. 51). *ἀμφιέσθητι λευκοῖς ἱμᾶσιν*: thus Wessely's index under *ἱμ*. But as nobody can dress in straps, we must read *εἷμασιν*. Still *ἱμᾶσιν* might be explained as meaning the narrow linen-strips, in which mummies were wrapped.

Par. 215 (We. i. 50): *ἐπὶ θυελίβανον σταγοναῖον*. This was the only incense permitted for sacrifices, as we learn from Pliny *N.H.* xii. 61, where we are also informed that this kind was considered 'masculus.' Thus we read Par. 907 (We. 67): *λίβανον ἀρσενικόν*.

Par. 236 (ibid.). *δεῦρο ὁ τις θεός*. What this means is made clear by 252-53 *ἐπιτάσσει σοι ὁ μέγας θεός τις (λέγε τὸ ὄνομα)*. The magician, while reciting the charm, had to substitute the name of the god he wanted to conjure in the 'blank' indicated by *τις*, which is simply equivalent to *ὁ δεῖνα*. This sure example, thus, guards the *εἰς τὴν τινα χρεῖαν* (*τινακρεῖαν* Pap.) 289 (We. 51) against the attempted 'emendation' *δεῖνα*.

Par. 271 ff (We. i. 51). Among the numerous fragments of hexameters in the neighbourhood of this line (e.g. *τὸν πρῶτα θεῶν ὀργίλον διέποντα* 261-2; *ἐπουρανίων σκηπτρον βασιλείων ἔχοντα* 262-3) one verse at least has been preserved entire: *κληῖζω, παντοκράτωρ, ἵνα μοι πράξης ἄσ' ἐρωτῶ*. In the papyrus the prosaic *ποιήσης* crowded out the original. This hexametric *ἐπικλήσις*, apparently, was closed by a single line in the remarkable metre which also occurs 2543 ff. *Τυφὼν μέγιστ' ἀκουσόν μου τοῦ δεινὸς καὶ ποιήσον | τὸ πρᾶγμα* 277.

Par. 286 ff. (We. 51). This incantation, which would have deserved a place in Heim's *Incantamenta magica*, seems to have been metrical. Thus we read 287 the rest of a senarius: *χειρὶ πενταδακτύλῳ* and a complete verse, slightly corrupted still exists 290: *οὐκέτι βρεχθήσεται ποτ' ἐν βίῳ πάλιν* (πωποτε Pap.).

Par. 296 ff. (We. i. 52). It is interesting to notice that a similar group to the one described here was used by the Egyptians as a seal to brand sacrificial animals; see Plut. *Is. et. Osir.* 31.

Par. 475 ff. (We. i. 56) read: Ἰλαθί μοι Πρόνοια καὶ Τύχη τάδε γράφοντι (γραφεντι Pap.) τὰ πατροπαράδοτα (πρατὰ παράδοτα We.) μυστήρια.

Par. 484 (We. i. 57). Μίθρας ἐκέλευσέν μοι μεταδοθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλου αὐτοῦ, ὅπως ἐγὼ μόνος ΑΙΗΤΗΣ οὐρανὸν βαίνω. In these letters either *μύστης* or *μυητής* is hidden. *Μύστης*, at the first glance, would seem more probable, on account of the *μόνος*. But 477 *μόνῳ* δὲ τέκνῳ ἀξίῳ μνείσθαι (Dieterich Abr. 163, 4) and 732-3 *ἐὰν δὲ θέλῃς καὶ σὺν μύστη χρησασθαι* make *μνητής* preferable. I do not think it necessary to insert *εἰς* before *οὐρανόν*.

Par. 530 (We. i. 58) read: ἔστιν μοι θνητὸν γεγῶτα συνα<ν>εἶναι ταῖς χρυσοειδέσιν μαρμαρυγαῖς. For the magician himself becomes a star 574: *εἰμὶ σύμπλανος ὑμῖν ἀστήρ*.

Par. 633 ff. (We. i. 60) read *στραφήσονται ἐπὶ σε αἱ ἀκτῖνες· ἔσιδε <δὲ> (εσειδε Pap.) αὐτὸν μέσον· ὅταν οὖν τοῦτο ποιήσῃς, ὅψει θεός*.

The verses 662 to 705 have been well explained by Dieterich (Abr. 105) as referring to the god Mithras. But I must object to his referring the *μόσχου ὄμῳ χρύσειον*, ὅς ἐστιν ἄρκτος ἢ κινούσα οὐρανὸν 699 ff. to the same group of ideas. For the hindleg of the ox is from remotest antiquity the Egyptian constellation of what we call the Wain: cp. Lepsius' *Chronologie der alten Aegypter*.

Par. 745 (We. i. 63): for *αὐτονῶ φθόγγῳ* read *ἀτόνῳ* 'in a low voice.'

The verses 835 ff. (We. i. 65) give an astrological piece, which here is entirely out of place. It is, however, very important, as it proves that these magical papyri are only somebody's inconsiderate attempt to gather a number of stray charms into a larger collection (cp. Dieterich, *Jahrb. Suppl.* xvi. 758). In this way our little fragment, apparently once a part of an elaborate horoscope, came to be embodied in the Parisian papyrus, albeit it possesses

no magical meaning whatever. But Wessely was utterly wrong in affixing to it the title 'Stufenjahre' or climacteric years. A comparison with Vettius Valens, an astrologer of the second century A.D., soon to be edited, shows the real meaning of the fragment. The sixth chapter in the sixth book of his *ἀνθολογία* treats *περὶ τῆς εἰς δέκα ἔτη μῆνας ἑννέα διαιρέσεως ἐμπράκτων τε καὶ ἀπράκτων χρόνων*. That is, a distribution of the life among the planets according to a fixed interval of ten years and nine months, during which period the ruling planet was the *ἀφίτης* or principal factor in determining its events. About this Saumaise wrote at some length in his 'anni climacterici.' Wessely's misnomer is due to a superficial perusal of this book.

Par. 1065 ff. (We. i. 71): *τῆς αὐγῆς ἀπόλυσις· χωχω Ω χωχωχ* (it is an anagram) *ιερά αὐγὴ ἵνα καὶ ἡ αὐγὴ ἀπέλθῃ. χώρει ἱερά αὐγὴ, χώρει καλὸν καὶ ἱερὸν φῶς τοῦ ὑψίστου θεοῦ*. The proper order of these words was: *τῆς αὐγῆς ἀπόλυσις, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ἱερά αὐγὴ ἀπέλθῃ* (καὶ because the *ἀπόλυσις* of the god himself had been given 1035 ff.) *χ-χ. χώρει* and so forth. The words *ιερά αὐγὴ* after the Ephesium gramma must be struck out, as wrongly repeated.

Par. 1079 (*ibid*) we have in *ἀνειδωλόπληκτον* an interesting proof of the tenacity with which superstitious beliefs again and again creep forth. For hitting 'πλήγειν' is the most dreaded action of sprites: cp. Aristoph. *Birds* 1492. From this very inclination the *ἥρωες* = souls had, at a later time, even been named *πλήκται*: Rohde, *Psyche* 225, 4. Cp. also Brit. Mus. 120, 240 (We. ii. 27).

In the hymn to the Moon (2242 ff.), which has been partly restored by Wessely (We. i. 31) one complete senarius can be added after his verse 25: *ὀλκίτι, λοφαίη, φασγάνων θυμάντρια* (2267). Among the *disiecta membra* from here to 2285, where Wessely's restoration again begins, a number of Greek words can be found by slight emendations. 2270 for *σκοπεη* read *σκοταίη* or *σκοτεΐη*; 2271 for *νομεή* read *νομαίη*; 2273 *ινδαλίμη* is adjective formed from *ινδάλλομαι*; *ibid.* *διχθιρα* apparently is *δέχθειρα* = *δέκτειρα* cp. *δέκτρια* from *δεκτήρ*: Archilochos 19 Bgk.⁴; 2275 *μιτρη* is *μητρεΐη*. 2276 *ειδεα* is *Ἰδαία*; *ibid.* *λυκο σπηλητι* probably *Λυκοπολῖτι*. Another complete senarius occurs 2279: *ἀκτίνας* (belonging to <κε> *καλλισμένην*!) ἡ *σώτειρα* *Παγγαίη* (?) *Κυνώ*. The following line, also, may perhaps be restored thus: *Κλωθαίη, πανδώτειρα* (Hymn. Orph. 10, 16; 26, 2 Abel), *δολιχῇ, κύδιμε*.

Par. 2604 (We. i. 109) *συριστὶ ἡταρον*

κονβυθου πνουσαν. These Ephesia grammata are good Greek: *δγκον βυθοῦ πνέουσα* (ν) and together with *τύχη θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων* (2602) they form one complete verse of the *διαβολή*, which has only been obscured by the inserted abracadabra.

One verse and part of another can be added to the Hecate hymn 2714 ff. (We. i. 114). 2775 we have to read *Ἰὼ πασικράτεια καὶ Ἰὼ πᾶσι μεδέουσα, Ἰὼ παντροφέουσα*. For *Ἰὼ* as a name of Hecate or rather Selene cp. Malalas in Lobeck's *Aglaophamus* 401/2 note†: οἱ Ἀργεῖοι μυστικῶς τὸ ὄνομα τῆς σελήνης τὸ ἀποκρυφόν *Ἰὼ λέγουσιν ἕως ἄρτι*; and to *παντροφέουσα* see the numerous beliefs about growth and decrescence of all things in sympathy with the waning or filling moon: Roscher, *Selene*, 64 ff. 184 ff.; Pauly-Wissowa i. 39.

Par. 3096 (We. i. 122). Among the ingredients of a sacrifice occurs *σιλούρου καρδία*. Wessely as well as Dieterich (Abraxas 79) change this into *αἰλούρου*. However, a sacred fish *σιλουρος* was found in the Nile (Wiedemann, notes on Herodotus ii. p. 176). It was believed to be connected with the dog-star and with thunder storms; cp. Pliny *H.N.* 9, 58: *fluviatili silurus caniculae exortu sideratur et alias semper fulgure sopitur*.

Par. 3119 ff. (We. i. 123). It is well known that great power was attributed to a certain order of words and letters. In this connection it is interesting to notice that the *ἀπόλυσις* contained in these verses is formed by exactly the same letters, but in inverted order, by means of which 3103 ff. the god had been conjured.

Par. 3173 (We. i. 124). Certain reeds must be cut *πρὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῆς, μετὰ δυσμᾶς* . . of the Sun himself? We must add *σελήνης*; this word was all the more likely to drop out after a C as it almost always in these papyri is only indicated by the sign (C).

Brit. Mus. 46 (We. i. 132 ff.). This papyrus throws an interesting light on the tradition of the sorcerers' handbooks. With verse 176 a 'rhyme' begins abruptly, in which Hermes is implored to reveal a thief. After this, in 185, there comes another spell, to be said over bread and cheese; these, as we hear in 300, are to be kneaded together, and to be given to the people suspected of the theft. But the confusion is not yet at an end. In 200 the *ποιήσις*, i.e. the preparations accompanying the magical action, begins, only to be interrupted, however, in 206 after the words *ἐπίθετες <ἐς> βωμόν γήινον*, in the very middle of the sentence. Here, in 206, begins the

preparation of a *Ἑρμοῦ δακτύλιος*, in no way connected with the previous charm. This is brought to an end in 296, and now our manuscript goes on, as if absolutely nothing had intervened, with . . *νον* (i.e. *γήινον ἐπίθετε ζμύραν κ.τ.λ.*). That is to say: the verses 297 and following are the direct continuation of the charm 176-205. This strange confusion is difficult to explain, unless we assume that the compiler of our manuscript left out three columns of his archetype, consisting of thirty lines each, but found out his mistake after he had copied another three columns, and then simply copied the forgotten part, without giving the slightest warning of his mistake to the reader. How very improbable such an explanation is, is apparent. To me it seems that the confusion is older by at least one generation, if not by more. The confused order within the charm itself points to a more rational solution, viz., that the original was compiled from loose scraps, without much regard to their connection, and that the *Ἑρμοῦ δακτύλιος* found its way into the very centre of the 'theft-charm' simply because in this, too, Hermes was invoked.

B. M. 46, 469/70 (We. i. 138). The demon *Ἰδαῖος δάκτυλος*, whom Wessely has thought to find here, must give way to the less interesting, but more intelligible words *ἰδιον δάκτυλον*. The passage will thus read: *εἶρας αὐτὸν* (the previously described jasper ring) *εἰς τὸν ἴδιον τῆς ἀριστερᾶς σου χειρὸς δάκτυλον ἕσω βλέποντα* (that is, facing the palm). The ring-finger is the *ἴδιος δάκτυλος* for wearing a ring. A number of reasons for this relation, from the 'Aegyptiorum sapientia' are given by Macrobius vi. 13, 8 ff.

Pap. Mimant 2391 (We. i. 147), vs. 258 read: *δεῦρό μοι, κύριε, ὁ <τὸ φ> ὡς ἀνάγων* (*ω <πρ>ωσανα <γ>ων* We.).

B. M. 121, 309^a ff. (We. ii. 39) read: *ἐξαίρων τὸν κύκλον τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ τὴν σελήνην ἐμπεριλαμβάνων* (*ἐμπερεια . . νων* We.); cp. 375 *τὴν σελήνην ἐμπεριλαμβάνων*.

Ibid. 332 (We. ii. 31) *τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδρυμένον*; read *γῆς*.

Ibid. 388 (We. ii. 33), in a charm, destined to work insomnia *<κε . . > νείτω*, read *<ἀγρυν > νείτω*.

The Ephesia grammata 393 ff. contain a number of good Greek epithets of Aphrodite, who is here invoked (396 *ἐξορκίζω ὑμᾶς, ἅγια ὀνόματα τῆς Κυπρίδος*). 393 *καμωπι*: in this probably *Κανωπι <τι>* is hidden. We might think of *Καμήφι*, Stob. *Floril.* i. 41, s. 44, p. 288 Mein. But he was a male being. About Kanopus and its orgies see Wiede-

mann on Herod. ii. p. 90 f. 394 *ραδοχ*: probably *ροδόχειρ*; ibidem *ἐρατεινή*. 395 *εισω* probably *Ἰσίη* cp. 500, then *Βουβάστι, ποθῶπι*, and in the same line *φαφίετι* perhaps *Παφίη τε*.

B. M. 121, 679 (We. ii. 43) *ἐὰν μὲν ὁ πρῶτος λύχνος τεταρῇ γνῶσι εἰλημπαί*. Read *πτάρη*. Compare on this omen Anthol. Pal. vi. 333: *ἦδη, φίλε λύχνε, τρίς ἔπαρες*; Ovid, *Heroid.* 19, 251: *sternuit et lumen*.

Plenty of good Greek words again are hidden in the Ephesia grammata B. M. 121, 948 ff. (We. ii. 51), a love charm, by the help of Aphrodite-Selene. 950 *ειλαρωτι* read *ἰλαρῶπι*. *ἡροδία*: ἡ *Ῥοδία*? 954: *βαυβωφοβειος*: *Βαυβὼ φόβειος* (or *φοβερός*?).

B. M. 121, 986 (We. ii. 52). *ὑπόκειται τὸ ζῳδιον* 987 *ν* (stands probably for *ν=ιον*, the well-known later form of *-ιον* terminations. Repetitions of the last part of words at the beginning of the next line are frequent in the papyri) *θανμαστὸν τοῦ ξξ* ὃ *ἔχει ἐν τοῖς πεδίλοις*. The sign no doubt is meant as *Ἑρμοῦ* and is the oldest example known to me of the modern and mediaeval symbol of the planet, the herald staff.

B. M. 122, 56, 57 (We. ii. 56): *ἐπύγραφε τὸν τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ*. *τόν* no doubt is a mistake for *τὸ δν<ομα>*.

B. M. 122, 48, 49 (We. ii. 56): *τὸ δὲ δεύτερο<ν> ὄνομα ἔχον ἀριθμὸν εἰς (εἰς MS.) τῶν κυριευόντων τοῦ κόσμου τῇ<ν> ψῆφον ἔχοντα* *τξε* *πρὸς τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ*. *εἰ* seems to be certain; the lords of the world are the five planets. On the other hand, it seems not improbable that after *τοῦ κόσμου* a line is missing, although this assumption is by no means necessary. The fifteen letters answering to the *τε* *ἡμέραι τῆς ἀνατολῆς τῆς σελήνης* seem to me to refer to the number of days during which the moon is waxing, roughly speaking fifteen. But the expression *ἀνατολή* for this period certainly is very singular. A similar use of *ἀνατολή*, however, occurs in B 1, 235-6: *πῖε αὐτὸ ἐπὶ ἡμέρα ζ' νήστης, ἐξ ἀνατολῆς οὔσης τῆς σελήνης*, and B 2, 80: *χρῶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνατολικοῖς*.

Pap. R(ainer) 1, 34 ff. (We. ii. 66, 67). *ὀρκίζω ὅσα ἔστιν πνεύματα ἢ κλαίοντα ἢ γελῶντα φοβερά ἢ ποιοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον δυσόνειρον ἢ ἔκθαμβον ἢ ἀμανρίαν ποιοῦντα ἢ ἀλλοιωσύνην φρενῶν ἢ ὑποκλοπὴν καὶ ἐν ὕπνῳ καὶ δίχα ὕπνου*. As a whole, Wessely's emendations of these lines are correct. It is only in the *γελωνία*, where misapplied

knowledge has led him astray. He proposes to read *Γελώνια* and thinks these sprites are beings after the fashion of Gello, Empusa, and Mormo. Of course, everybody sees that the contrast *κλαίοντα πνεύματα* imperiously demands *γελῶντα*. But I want to call the attention of the reader to the fact, that these lines give us a remarkable insight into the tenacity and vividness of popular belief. For every one of the features here ascribed to the *πνεύματα* exists in modern folklore as well. The whole circle of ideas, in which we find ourselves, has, for the field of Teutonic folk-lore, been treated by Laistner in his admirable *Rätsel der Sphinx*, while on the basis of a 'Hellenistic' relief O. Crusius (the Philologus L 102 ff.) has traced part of these ideas through Greek religion. The *πνεύματα κλαίοντα* remind one of the numerous German legends about souls which cry and whimper for salvation (e.g. Grimm, *Sagen* no. 224); the *πνεύματα γελῶντα φοβερά*—this word I take to be adverbial accusative—of the 'höhnisches Lachen' of the 'Kobold' (Grimm, *ibid.* no. 46, 72, 74, 76, 122), and probably also of the strange sounds which caused 'Panic terror.' They make man *δυσόνειρον*, i.e. *δνειρώπτοντα*: see Crusius cited above; or *ἐκθαμβον*, *attonitum*; this needs no examples. Or they cause blindness; thus Epizelos was blinded in the battle of Marathon, because he had seen a spectre, Herod. vi. 117; (E. Rohde, *Psyche* 171, 1). They cause furthermore mania; this, too, is too well-known to need any illustrations, except a reference to the booklet *περὶ ἱερῆς νούσου*. But what is meant by (*ποιοῦντα*) *ὑποκλοπὴν καὶ ἐν ὕπνῳ καὶ δίχα ὕπνου*? The word *ὑποκλοπή* is not found in Stephanus, but surely means 'stealthy theft.' Of what? One might think of the 'succubus et incubus' tales. This, however, would have been expressed, if I am right, by *δυσόνειρος*. May we not think of the theft of babies and the substitution of 'change-lings.' The belief exists in modern Greek superstition, where these unhappy beings are called 'children of the Neraids' (Schmidt, *Volksleben* 118). That the fairies like to surprise recently confined women during their sleep is general belief. But they appear, also, under many disguises at other times. For this subtle and unexpected change the expression *ὑποκλοπή* seems to be very happily coined.

ERNST RIESS.

Norwalk, Conn.