2021

The god Amun. The Great Harris Papyrus, Dyn. XX, British Museum.

The Ascent to the Hidden One: The Reception of the Egyptian One God in Neoplatonism and the Greek Magical Papyri

Word Count: 39,935

Tiana Blazevic

The University of Adelaide

Department of Classics, Ancient History and Archaeology

Table of Contents

Declaration 3

Abstract 4

Acknowledgements 5

Abbreviations (used in the notes and appendices) 6

Introduction 7

The Research Aims 8

The Background: The Supreme Being, ritual acts, and power dynamics 10

The Sources 12

The Greek Magical Papyri: Background and problems of authorship 14

Methodology 16

Chapter Overview 19

Chapter 1 21

1.1 Introduction: Historical Context 21

1.2 Egyptian Mouthpieces: Plato and Egypt 24

1.3 A Greek Egypt: Plutarch's *On Isis and Osiris* 28

1.4 Orientalising discourse in Iamblichus and Porphyry 31

1.5 Thinking with the Egyptians: The Egyptian priests in the exchange between Porphyry and Iamblichus. 33

1.6 Conclusion 36

Chapter Two 38

2.1 Introduction 38

2.2 Amun in the Hymns & Egyptian Theology 39

2.3 The Evolution of the One God 43

2.4 Comparing Cosmogonies: Egyptians and Neoplatonist 45

2.5 Creation and Manifestation: New Sources Analysed 46

2.6 Creation and the One God 49

2.7 The One and All: New Evidence 53

2.8 Egyptian Theology in Neoplatonic Terms 55

2.9 Conclusion 61

Chapter Three 63

Introduction 63

3.1 Communing or Coercing? Ritual Mastery and Magic 63

3.2 Theurgy, Theosophy and Ritual Authority 67

3.3 Knowledge of the Gods: Porphyry the High Priest of Philosophy 70

3.4 Ritual Mastery and the Rare Soul: Theurgy and Iamblichus 72

3.5 The One God in the *sustasis* rituals of the *PGM* 76

3.6 The reception of the One God in selected papyri 80

3.6.1 *PGM* III.494-611: Rite to Establish a Relationship with Helios 80

3.6.2 *PGM* IV.475-829: The Mithras Liturgy 81

3.6.3 *PGM* IV.930-1114: God as Self-Engendered 83

3.6.4 *PGM* VII.505-28: Meeting your own daimon 84

3.6.5 *PGM* XIII.1-343: A Sacred Book called "Unique" or Eight Books of Moses 85
3.7 Conclusion 86
Epilogue 88
Appendix A: Selected Platonist Texts (600 BCE-500 CE) 90
[1] Pythagoras of Samos (c. 570-495 BCE) 90
[2] Plato of Athens (c. 428-348 BCE) 90
[3] Plutarch of Chaeronea, Boeotia (c.46 BCE-119CE) 90
[4] Apuleius of Madaurus, Numidia (c. 124-170 CE) 90
[5] Maximus of Tyre late (c.2nd CE) 91
[6] Alcinous (Second c. CE) 91
[7] Numenius of Apamea (late 2nd. CE) 91
[8] Plotinus of Lycopolis, Egypt (c.204/5-270CE) 92
[9] Porphyry of Tyre (c. 234- 305 CE) 93
[10] Iamblichus of Chalcis (c. 245-325 CE) 96
Appendix B: The Leiden hymns 98
[1] Leiden Hymn X 98
[2] Leiden Hymn XL 99
[3] Leiden Hymn LXXX 100
[4] Leiden Hymn XC 101
[5] Leiden Hymn C 103
[6] Leiden Hymn CC 104
[7] Leiden Hymn CCC 106
Appendix C: Selected Hibis hymns 107
[1] Hymn to the Ba's of Amun 107
[2] Great Amun Hymn 110
[3] The Creator Hymn 116
Appendix D: Selected Ramesside Texts 121
Appendix E: *PGM* tables and characteristics of One God 122
Table 1: The One God cited in rituals for other magical purposes: necromancy and a ring ritual. 122
Table 2: The One God in *Sustasis* rituals 123
Table 3: The One God in the Egyptian *pẖ- nṯr* rituals 124
Table 4: The One God cited in divination, prayer, dream requests and other rituals 124
Appendix F: *PGM sustasis* rituals metadata and translations 127
Works Cited Primary 131
Works Cited: Secondary 133

Declaration

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name, in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

I acknowledge the support I have received for my research through the provision of an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship.

__ Date: 29/01/2021

Abstract

In the hymns of New Kingdom Egypt, the philosophies of the Neoplatonists of Late Antiquity and in the Greek Magical Papyri of the same era we find descriptions of a certain deity. This divine Supreme Being emerged from the darkness by creating himself and then all creation came after him. But no ordinary person could unify with such a hidden, obscure and remote deity unless they had undergone rigorous training.

This thesis aims to answer the questions: Why is it that we have this same description of this particular divinity in all three groups that are separated by thousands of years of history? In addition, why is the process of unification with this god so important in Late Antiquity? This thesis argues that in both the New Kingdom of Egypt and Late Antiquity there is a rise in a textual discourse surrounding God in the singular. However, beginning with Plato and reaching its apex in Late Antiquity with Porphyry and Iamblichus we also see philosophers competing for, or even asserting, the superiority of Greek philosophical knowledge over Egyptian rituals and religion.

This study uses three different disciplinary perspectives: anthropology, philosophy of religion and postcolonialism. In concrete terms, this means it applies ideas originating in the theories of Ritual Mastery, Universalism and Orientalism, respectively. Firstly, through the framework of Orientalism, this thesis demonstrates how particular Platonists assert the superiority of Greece and use the figure of the Egyptian priests as a mouthpiece for Greek philosophical discussions. Secondly, this thesis examines how there are universalist notions of God between both the Egyptians and the Platonists. Lastly, by focusing on Porphyry's and Iamblichus' discussions of theurgy (a ritualistic method which aims at the return of the soul to god) this thesis examines the professionalisation of theology and the innovation of ritual to allow a unification with the One God through the lens of Ritual Mastery.

Acknowledgements

I would like to first acknowledge my supervisor Professor Han Baltussen for all of his hard work and dedication to this thesis and my other endeavours. I would like to thank him for his support and care. The year 2020 proved difficult as COVID-19 disrupted so many aspects of our lives. Yet, despite this, Prof. Baltussen still responded to every panicked late-night email, put up with my ranting in every zoom meeting and was ever so patient with me.

I would also like to say a special thank you to my Australasian Women in Ancient World Studies mentor Dr. Julia Hamilton. Even though you are on the other side of the world, your advice, compassion, and care meant so much to me in this hard year; thank you for going above and beyond for me in finding sources, reading chapters, and providing wonderful advice. I hope to one day meet you in person. I would also like to thank Professor Malcolm Choat and his support of my book chapter as well as hunting down sources for me that were no longer available due to the pandemic.

I would also like to thank the faculty members and postgraduates at the University of Adelaide, Department of Classics, Ancient History and Archaeology. Thank you for your support, kind words and many laughs at our research seminars. Thank you also to my fellow postgraduate Mary Harpas who helped me with the mammoth task of editing this thesis; thank you for your kindness and friendship.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge my husband, Ben and my mother Paola. To my husband, thank you for bringing me coffee and making me laugh when you could see that I was struggling through my thesis, teaching, and my publications; your support of my career is endless and your laughter contagious. To my mother, thank you for being the amazing woman you are and for instilling in me perseverance, resilience, and courage.

Abbreviations (used in the notes and appendices)

Author	Abbreviation	Text	Abbreviation
Apuleius	Apul.	*Apology (Apologia)*	*Apol.*
		On the God of Socrates (De deo Socratico)	*De deo Soc.*
		Florida	*Flor.*
		Metamorphoses	*Met.*
Alcinous	Alc.	*The Handbook of Platonism (De doctrina Platonis)*	*De doct Pl.*
Augustine	August.	*City of God (De Civitae Dei)*	*De Civ. D.*
Eusebius	Eusb.	*Preparation for the Gospel (Praeparation Evangelica)*	*Praep. Evang.*
Maximus	Max.	*Orations*	*Or.*
Numenius	Numen.		
Iamblichus	Iambl.	*On the Mysteries (De Mysteriis Aegyptiorum)*	*De Myst.*
		Life of Pythagoras (de vita Pythagoras)	*VP*
		On the Soul (de Anima)	*De An.*
Plato	Pl.	*Crito*	*Cri.*
		Epinomis	*Epin.*
		Euthydem	*Euthyd.*
		Leges (Laws)	*Lg.*
		Menexenus	*Menex.*
		Phaedo	*Phd.*
		Phaedurs	*Phdr.*
		Politicus (Statesman)	*Plt.*
		Philebus	*Phlb.*
		Protagoras	*Prt.*
		Republic	*Rep.*
		Sophist	*Soph.*
		Theaetetus	*Tht.*
		Timaeus	*Ti.*
Plutarch	Plu.	*On the E at Delphi (De E apud Delphos)*	*De E apud.*
		On Isis and Osiris (De Iside et Osiride)	*De Is et Os.*
		Platonic Questions (Quaestiones Platonicae)	*Quaest Plat.*
Plotinus	Plot.	*Enneads*	*Enn.*
Porphyry	Porph.	*Life of Plotinus (Vita Plotini)*	*V.Plot.*
		Life of Pythagoras (Vita Pythagorae)	*V.Pythag.*
		Letter to Anebo (Epistula ad Anebonem)	*Ep.Aneb.*
		On Abstinence from Eating Animal Food (De abstinentia ab esu animalium)	*Abst.*
		On Images (De Simulacris)	*Simulac.*
		Sentences (Sententiae)	*Sent.*
		To Marcella (Ad Marcellam)	*Marc.*
		Philosophy from Oracles (De philosophia ex oraculis haurienda)	*Phil.Orac.*
Publications			
		Papyri Graecae Magicae	*PGM*
		Agyptische Hymnen und Gebete	*ÄHG*
		Sonnenhymnen in thebanischen Griibe	*STG*
		Coffin Texts	*CT*

Introduction

This study investigates the connections between ancient Greece and Egypt and focuses on the cross-cultural exchange of religious and philosophical ideas during Late Antiquity (ca. 200-800CE). In antiquity, religion and philosophy were not always sharply distinguished intellectual domains, but rather a sliding scale of ideas about gods and humans. Consequently, we can use these labels to analyse the shifting notions of the divine and the intellectual pursuits of those who wished to study the various ways they could "return to God". When we examine both theology and ritual in conjunction with one another we see the human need to conceptualise, interact with and influence divine powers. Whether that was by *communicating* with the divine, or trying to *gain control* over the divine. Interestingly, this human need to understand and interact with divinity comes to the fore in the ways in which various cultures define and conceptualise magical, religious or theurgical rituals (a ritualistic method which aims at the return of the soul to god). Yet, at their core, magic, religion and theurgy are merely ritual acts aimed at connecting with divinity. The important question to consider, however, is who is deemed worthy of that connection and who has the power and authority to do so?

This study focuses predominately on Platonists of the third and fourth centuries CE who had close links to the East, due to either their birth or education. We shall study how these particular philosophers, and other Platonists more broadly, adopted and adapted Egyptian notions of the divine within a Platonic framework. The main figures for this period are Porphyry and Iamblichus who are ideal candidates (due to their eastern origins and connections to eastern thought) when discussing the cross-cultural exchanges and philosophical-religious adaptions of theology and ritual in the second and third generations after Plotinus. Unlike previous studies of Egyptian, philosophical and magical texts, this is the first study to examine and combine all three bodies of evidence: the Egyptian Leiden and Hibis hymns, Greek philosophical treatises and dialogues, and the Greek Magical Papyri. This thesis uses a multi-disciplinary framework by mixing anthropological (Ritual Mastery), post-colonial (Orientalism) and philosophical (Universalism) approaches to demonstrate that there is a distinct textual transmission of the Egyptian One God which is first found in the Egyptian New Kingdom hymns. I aim to show that within Platonists' literature' and, by extension the Greek Magical Papyri, an analysis will reveal that there is a continuation of ideas of the One God which is not coincidental.[1]

[1] This thesis uses the following English translations of ancient material: The Leiden hymns cited in this thesis are translated by Foster (2001). The study and translation of the hymns was first undertaken by Gardiner 1906 but the most authoritative study on the Leiden hymns is still the work of Zandee (1947). There are also two other translations of the Leiden hymns which I have consulted: Assmann, (1995) & Allen (1988). The Hibis hymns are translated by Klotz (2006) all translations of the *PGM* are from Betz (1986) English text. I have consulted multiple translations for the Greek philosophical texts and where applicable have referred to the original texts. However, for the works of Porphyry cited in

The Research Aims

This thesis has three aims. Firstly, to assess how Platonists defined themselves in relation to Egypt and how that is expressed in particular works on Egypt. Secondly, a large part of this thesis aims to explore the reception of New Kingdom Theban theology (1550-1070 BCE) during Late Antiquity (250- 325CE), and how Theban theology influences two intellectual communities: the Platonists and the ritualists of the Greek Magical Papyri. This thesis focuses on the two Egyptian manifestations of Amun: Amun-Re of Karnak found in the Leiden hymns (1198-1166 BCE) and Amun-Re of Hibis who is found in the Hibis hymns and selected Ramesside texts from New Kingdom Thebes (c. 518 BCE).[2] Thirdly, it examines Porphyry's and Iamblichus' discussions of theurgy versus magic. To achieve these broad aims I pursue the following objectives and questions:

(1) to assess why from Plato onwards we find particular Platonists competing for, or even asserting, the superiority of Greek philosophical knowledge and theurgy over Egyptian rituals and religion. Is this a form of cultural anxiety and orientalising of Egypt?

(2) to assess how similar the New Kingdom Theban theology is to religious ideas in the works of the Platonists and in the Greek Magical Papyri. This thesis contends that in both the Egyptian New Kingdom and Late Antiquity there is a rise in a textual discourse surrounding God in the singular. The core of this investigation asks the following questions: why do we find the same description of a Supreme Being in the theology of all these texts that are separated by thousands of years of history? Is this Supreme Being different or the same from its counterpart in Later Antiquity?

(3) to study the professionalisation of theology and the innovation of *sustasis* (divine contact/unification) rituals in later antiquity where the One God is mentioned or cited through the lens of Ritual Mastery. Why do followers, particularly the Neoplatonists and the ritualists of the papyri, aim to unite with this God and how is it achieved in both systems? Are the *sustasis* rituals the same or different? Also, how is the relation to God expressed in theurgy and magic and is the practice of theurgy any different to that of magic? More importantly, do the Platonists have a different conception of magic to the Egyptians and how is that expressed?

---

this thesis I have used the following English translations: *The Select Works of Porphyry* by Taylor (1823), *Letter to Anebo* by Taylor (1821); *On Abstinence from Killing Animals* by Clark (2000); *The Philosophy from Oracles* translation and commentary by O'Meara (1959); *Sentences* and *Commentary on Parmenides* by Dillon and Gerson (2004). For the English translations of Iamblichus *On the Mysteries* I have used Clark, Dillon and Hershbell (2003). For Plotinus' *Enneads* I use the recent English translation of Boys-Stones, Dillon, Gerson, Smith and Wilberding (2018).

[2] Where applicable I will state which Amun I am focusing on, such as Amun of Karnak or Amun of Hibis.

What this thesis does *not* do is assert that Greek philosophers stole their philosophy from Egypt as is suggested by George G.M James and antique scholars such as Eusebius.[3] Rather, in line with other modern scholars, I aim to demonstrate that the Greeks were indeed influenced by Egyptian philosophy and that they adopted and absorbed certain aspects that fit into the Platonic framework.[4] In doing so, this research fills a gap in the scholarship as there are currently no comprehensive comparative analyses of the Egyptian and Platonic texts.

In the third and fourth centuries CE and in the New Kingdom of Egypt there are descriptions of a divine Supreme Being who is referred to by a multitude of names: The One God, The Highest God, The Supreme Being (hereafter referred to as the One God). The One God sits at the top of a triad having emerged from the darkness and begetting both himself and *all* creation. The One God is also described as remote, hidden and obscure but *within* all life. Sometimes, the One God is given a traditional name, such as Zeus or Helios in the Greek, Amun or Amun-Re in the Egyptian, but no name is enough to encapsulate the mystery of this divinity according to those who write about Him. This divinity reappears in theological writings, hymns, spells, rituals, prayers and cosmogonies across thousands of years of time. Specifically, we see this divinity appear in variations in Platonic philosophy from Plato through to the Neoplatonists up to Proclus and in the magical papyri of Late Antiquity. However, the One God appears first in the Egyptian hymns of the New Kingdom. Despite the large time difference between Late Antiquity and the New Kingdom, the characteristics of this divinity in all three sources is strikingly similar and suggests a continuation of ideas surrounding God.

I argue that these similarities are not accidental or coincidental. I propose, instead, that there is a highly plausible link in the form of a shared theological system between Egyptian priests of the New Kingdom, ritualists of the magical papyri and Greek philosophers of Late Antiquity.[5] Moreover, while there are similarities in these sources, there are also instances of innovation and appropriation of the Egyptian New Kingdom theology. Therefore, an analysis of this material is necessary if we are to better understand intercultural contact and the exchange of ideas between these groups. More importantly, it also appears that in all three sources there is a certain type of person, a specialist, with the ability and the training to understand the One God and unite with him. This analysis is also vital in identifying how Platonists view Egyptian ritual and practices and how those same Platonists

[3] James (1954) work asserts that Greek philosophers stole their philosophy from Egyptian priests. Eusbeius, when referring to the philosophy of Porphyry, claims that the Neoplatonists' wisdom comes from the Orphic hymns which consequently come from Egypt. Therefore, the Greeks cannot claim that their knowledge is purely Greek. See Eusebius *Praep. Evang.* 9.3.

[4] Suggestions of Egyptian influence in Platonism has been indicated in the following works but a comparative analysis of the material has not yet been undertaken. See Fowden (1986); Klotz (2006) & (2012) & (2017); West (1999, 24-25); Assmann (2014, 44) & (2014b 17-19); Frankfurter (1998); Smith (2013, 319-325); Brisson (1987).

[5] Van Kooten (2014, 293-323) has suggested that the Greek term Father of All (πατήρ πάντων) and the description of Zeus as both creator and maker of the universe has its roots in Homeric literature which then allowed for a cosmological interpretation by philosophers such as Plato. However, his thesis completely ignores the obvious Egyptian parallels which use the same terms to describe Amun.

seek to assimilate Egyptian culture into their own philosophical teachings. This thesis is primarily focused on a comparative examination of the texts and this comparative analysis of Egyptian theology, magic and Greek philosophy will provide further insight into the exchange and appropriation of Egyptian ideas from one culture to another.

The Background: The Supreme Being, ritual acts, and power dynamics

The Supreme Being is first found in the Egyptian wisdom literature of the Old Kingdom (c. 2686–2181 BCE).[6] Egyptologist Jan Assmann argues that Egyptian wisdom literature is a precursor to moral philosophy and generally speaks of "God" instead of specific gods.[7] He uses the term One God to refer to this divine entity in the Egyptian texts. However, the One God of Egypt is not a part of a monotheistic religion, but rather as a henotheistic system where the polytheism of cult both coexists and complements the idea of One Supreme Deity.[8] The worship of the One God who reigns over all living and divine creatures was particularly prominent during the Amarna period of Egypt. The Amarna period is characterised by its monotheistic revolution (the complete worship of the Sun God Aten) implemented by the Pharaoh Akhenaten during his reign.[9] While Akhenaten's revolution did not endure for long, the Egyptians were now forced to deal with deep structural changes to their religion as they deferred back to Amun.

Assmann argues that the similarities between Amun and Aten allowed the theologians of Egypt to retain both the old and new aspects of their religion after Akhenaten.[10] Amun of Thebes, with his secret nature, remoteness, relation to the Sun and ability to manifest creation from *within* himself was much like Akhenaten's Sun God.[11] Assmann explains that not only did these particular characteristics become central to New Kingdom theology and its discourse but they are also found in Late Antique texts belonging to Neoplatonism, Stoicism, Hermeticism and related movements.[12] What is still missing, however, is a developmental account of the phenomenon of the One God and His reappearance in these texts. I further argue that we can extend this to the magical papyri. While there were many historical and cultural changes between both eras (the New Kingdom and Late Antiquity) an analysis of the texts from both periods reveals a remarkable consistency in the theological discourse of the One God. Consequently, both the Late Antique philosophical texts,

---

[6] Assmann (1995, 178-179).
[7] Assmann (2008, 23.) See also Lichtheim (1997) & Lepper (2013).
[8] For pagan monotheism see Frede (1999, 41-67) & Frede (2010). For scholarship on the Creator God in Platonism from 80 BCE-250 CE see Boys-Stones (2018, 147-155) and also the work of Mitchell & Van Nuffelen, (2010).
[9] Akhenaten reigned from 1353-1336 BCE. The worship of Aten is classed as a monotheistic religion with similarities to other monotheistic religions. See the work of Hoffmeir (2015, 210).
[10] Assmann (2014b, 17).
[11] Appendix B1.
[12] Assmann (2014b, 17).

magical papyri and New Kingdom hymns all describe the embodiment of a soul-like God and of God as a soul animating the world.

However, it must be stated that the overall purpose of this thesis is not to argue that the One God theology of the Neoplatonists, Egyptian priests of the New Kingdom and ritualists of the papyri are identical or that the historical conditions which created them are identical. Nor does this thesis argue that the ideas of the Neoplatonists and ritualists of the papyri surrounding the One God were directly referenced from Egypt, or that the Neoplatonists, ritualists and more broadly Platonists appropriated the Egyptian system. Rather, this study wishes to highlight how all three theologies, the Leiden and Hibis hymns, Neoplatonism and the Greek Magical Papyri, contain distinct similarities but express themselves in different ways and for different purposes.

Theology accompanied by ritual acts, such as we find in the papyri and the philosophical literature of the Neoplatonists, is intimately related to politics and power dynamics. Much like Dominic O'Meara and Heidi Marx's research, my thesis also wishes to make a case for a political reading of Platonist philosophy and ritual.[13] As my analysis of the Neoplatonic sources will demonstrate, only those who had the correct philosophical and ritual training were able to protect the empire, maintain the balance between good and evil and more importantly return their soul to the One God.[14] Neoplatonists in Late Antiquity were known to involve themselves in politics and would often advise the Emperor on matters of religion and spirituality.[15] The political motivation of Neoplatonists is especially pertinent when we analyse Platonist perceptions of Egyptian magic versus Neoplatonic theurgy. Why exactly do Neoplatonists coin this new term "theurgy" in Late Antiquity? And what is the motivation behind such an act?

The term theurgy, as argued by Naomi Janowitz, was used in a highly strategic way by Platonists.[16] Theurgy, unlike magic, spoke to a central religious concern in Late Antiquity: overcoming the gulf between humans and the divine.[17] Neoplatonists, like Porphyry and Iamblichus, needed a word that paralleled with theology but also had an implied efficacy that was unlike magic. Magic, at least in the Western perception of it, often carried negative associations of evil witches and magicians, hence the birth of "theurgy".[18] Essentially, what we find in the writings of Porphyry and Iamblichus is a self-conscious reflection on ritual. This reflection first began in the second century onwards but

[13] Both O'Meara and Marx go against the scholarly consensus that Platonists had no political motivation in their philosophical writings, see Marx (2010); (2012); (2018); (2016) & O'Meara (2007, 117-131). Other scholars such as Attridge (1986); King (2018); Kurlak (2016); Schofield (2006) have made similar arguments.
[14] For work on anti-magical discourse in Late Antiquity see Sanzo (2019). For magic and social tension and accusations against ritualists in the ancient world see Eidinow's concluding remarks (2019, 770-773).
[15] Platonist interactions with Roman Emperors are found in DePalma-Digeser's analyses (2012, 81). For the power of religious rituals in Late Antiquity, specifically, Neoplatonists discussions of ritual see also DePalma-Digeser (2009).
[16] Janowitz (2002, 17).
[17] Janowitz (2002, 17).
[18] Janowitz (2002, 17-18). For the development of the Greek concept of magic see Graf (1995, 29-42). Additionally, see Nagel (2019) for "counter-narratives" to witchcraft concepts in the Egyptian versus Graeco-Roman tradition.

eventually led to this innovative new term theurgy, Janowitz states that, "just as words about the divinity are called "theology", so too now actions that involve divinity can explicitly be referred to as "theurgy".[19] Yet, I would further suggest that what is more important than the term itself is the emphasis on *who* is performing "magic" or "theurgy".

Ritual acts —whether they are magical or theurgical— do not have any efficacy at all, unless those who perform them perceive themselves as highly trained for the task. A proponent of this particular theory is Catherine Bell in her work on ritual and power. In the eyes of philosophers such as Porphyry and Iamblichus, those who practised magic and not theurgy were deviants with the potential to disrupt the balance of good and evil in the Empire. As a result of this notion, Neoplatonists showed a great admiration for Egyptian ritual practices but were strongly opposed to the integration of Egyptian magic —a central element in Egyptian culture and religion— within Platonic theurgy and Platonist philosophy. For this reason, an analysis of theurgic rituals and ideas versus those of magical rituals can reveal various power dynamics of those who perform them or write about them.

The Sources

This thesis analyses three different primary sources which provide the core evidence in this investigation: the Egyptian hymns, Greek philosophical texts and the Greek Magical Papyri. These texts represent ideas of the One God through religious hymns, magical spells and the Neoplatonic texts on ritual and religion. Despite their differences, what all of these texts have in common is that they are products of their culture. Within these texts, we can see how writers establish their authoritative knowledge of divinity, in particular, knowledge of the One God. These texts and ideas are handed down from generation to generation. Apart from conceptions of the One God they also preserve ideas on ritual, specifically, rituals that enable a connection with the One God. These types of texts, however, are always subjected to radical editorial modifications in each culture and milieu.[20] Yet, despite some of the editorial modifications that we will see in these texts, they display a striking continuity with regard to ideas of the One God and how to commune with Him. The second and third primary sources will then be subjected to a comparative examination.

A comparison of the Leiden and Hibis hymns with selected Neoplatonic texts and the Greek Magical Papyri will reveal striking insights into parallels, echoes and deliberate adaptations of the One God. The justification for this comparison is simple: all of these sources are closely interrelated when we examine the tradition of invoking the One God in Late Antiquity in both theology and ritual. Moreover, the Egyptian hymns demonstrates the ongoing Graeco-Roman interest surrounding

[19] Janowitz (2002, 18).
[20] Assmann's (2006, 123-124) argument is relevant here when we examine cultural texts: "This is because, they [cultural texts] above all, are continually added to and accommodated because they have to be transported from one generation to the next and because they keep finding themselves in a changing environment…"

Theban Egypt and its priests.[21] For the Greeks and Romans, Thebes and their priests had a reputation for ancient and "arcane" wisdom which attracted many philosophers and educated elites to their temples. If a Greek philosopher wanted to learn more about the Egyptian One God, it is likely they would interact with Theban cosmogony due to both the popularity of Thebes and the popularity of Theban Amun. The best choice when examining One God theology is therefore the Leiden hymns as Amun is the most prominent deity and the patron of Thebes and because there are no single surviving texts which provides all the details of Theban theology.[22] The Leiden hymns are therefore the most comprehensive texts to study. So why also examine the Hibis hymns?

The Leiden hymns predate the Hibis Hymns by roughly six-hundred years and were composed during the period of Persian domination of Egypt.[23] However, many aspects of the One God Theban theology of Amun of Karnak are found in the Hibis Hymns, making them a continuation of the same religious and cultural ideas surrounding the One God. Therefore, the Hibis Hymns demonstrate the persistence of New Kingdom Theban theology in Egypt. Interestingly, three of the hymns from the north side of the Hibis temple (the Invocation Hymn, the Hymn to the Ba's of Amun, and the Liturgical Hymn) are all carved at the Karnak temple in Thebes and are strictly Theban in origin.[24] However, the Great Hymn of Amun and the Invocation Hymn are located on the south side of the temple and are addressed to Amun-Re of Hibis, but do not appear in Karnak. So, what is the significance of the two manifestations of Amun from two different locations but in the same temple?[25]

The displacement of Theban priests during the first Persian period of Egypt may explain why we have two manifestations of Amun from separate geographical locations in the Hibis temple. Despite Darius I's interest and promotion of Egyptian religion, theology and building activities of temples and regions in Saite, Hibis, Ghueita and el-Khargeh Oasis there are no records of the Persians in Thebes. Claude Traunecker has suggested that Darius I's distrust of the Theban clergy due to their association with rebellions against foreigners is the reason for the lack of evidence of Persians in Thebes.[26] Klotz also argues that:

> The sudden surge of Egyptians in el-Khargeh, together with the simultaneous disappearance of Egyptians from Thebes, strongly suggests an intentional displacement of Priests and workers from the Thebaid to Hibis, for political, religious or economic reasons. [27]

---

[21] Klotz (2012, 46-48).
[22] Klotz (2017, 136).
[23] Persian rule in Egypt begins in 525 BCE which is known as the Twenty-seventh Dynasty of Egypt.
[24] Klotz (2006, 11).
[25] Both Amun of Karnak and Amun of Hibis have different iconographies but almost identical characteristics: Amun of Karnak is often represented as entirely human whilst Amun of Hibis is a criocephalic (ram-headed).
[26] Traunecker (1981, 15) argues "probablement dicteé par une certaine mefiance a l'egard d'un clerge nationaliste".
[27] Klotz (2006, 8-9).

The two manifestations of Amun in one temple is rational when we take into consideration the displacement of Theban priests and the fact that Amun of Hibis, like Amun of Karnark, was the primary deity of the Hibis region and both deities complement one another.

More importantly, the composition of the Hibis Hymns also points to the significant cross-cultural exchanges between the Greeks and Egyptians. David Klotz, in his translation of the Hibis Hymns, illustrates the significance of these particular hymns in bridging the gap between Thebes of the New Kingdom and philosophical texts of Late Antiquity.[28] The Hymns predate the arrival of Herodotus by roughly a century as well as other notable Greek visitors such as Thales, Pythagoras and possibly Plato.[29] However, it would be near impossible for a non-native Egyptian who is not trained in hieroglyphic script to comprehensively understand Egyptian cosmogony and theology from the temple reliefs of Hibis alone. As Klotz further explains, our Graeco-Roman philosophers would have needed to speak with an actual Egyptian priest if they wanted a proper exegesis of Egyptian Amun theology which was available in both the Leiden and Hibis Hymns. The fact that many images, concepts and ideas regarding Amun of Thebes and Hibis reappear in Apocalyptic, Gnostic, Hermetic, Orphic, magical texts —in addition to the philosophies of Plato, Iamblichus, Porphyry, Plutarch and Plotinus—deserves serious scholarly attention.[30] Lastly, the Platonists and Greek Magical Papyri continuously assert Egyptian origin and authenticity: Plato's *Timaeus*, Iamblichus' *On the Mysteries*, Plutarch's *On Isis and Osiris* and various magical papyri. These attempts by these Platonists to connect themselves with either Egyptian priests or the antiquity of Egyptian esoteric wisdom does in fact reflect authentic Egyptian sources and ideas that we find in the Leiden and Hibis Hymns.[31] With this in mind, it is surprising that an in-depth analysis of these texts has not yet occurred in either religious, magical or philosophical studies.

The Greek Magical Papyri: Background and problems of authorship

Preisendanz's edition of the *Papyri Graecorum Magicorum* (hereafter known as the *PGM*) has provided scholars with a fascinating and informative source of ritual acts in Late Antiquity.[32] The papyri, as Richard Gordon points out, should be rightly renamed the "Late Egyptian Ritual Texts mainly in Greek and Demotic" —a more accurate and informative description.[33] The rituals are conceived as manuals with their cultural sources appearing to be Greek and Egyptian – or a hybrid of both, as is apparent from the use of both a Demotic and Greek script. David Frankfurter has argued

[28] Klotz (2006, 2).
[29] Klotz (2015, 2) and esp. (9-10) regarding Herodotus' description of Amun of Hibis and Amun of Karnak.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Klotz (2006, 2).
[32] The magical papyri were composed between the second century BCE and the fifth century CE, with a large proportion of the handbooks deriving from a single library in Thebes which were acquired by Anastasi. See Dosoo (2016, 699-716); Dosoo (2013) & Ritner (1995, 3361, n. 137). The most detailed bibliography of the papyri is that of Brashear (1995) and Clarysse (2009) provides an overview of Egyptian religion and magic found in the papyri.
[33] Gordon (2012, 147).

that the Egyptian Lector Priests (*ḫry-ḥb*)[34] were the authors of the papyri and sold these various magical rituals to prospective Graeco-Roman clientele.[35] Frankfurter has argued that the Egyptian priests sold their rituals in order to appropriate the stereotype of the foreign *magos* (magician) so as to gain political and economic advantage as the priesthood suffered a decline of power under Roman rule.[36] But his thesis has come under fire. Kyle Fraser disagrees with that notion and believes that Frankfurter's assumption is not entirely accurate. Fraser insists that the composers of the magical papyri defined themselves as magicians in order to construct an image of authority that was developed *within* Egyptian priestly circles themselves, a tactic which had its beginnings in the Ptolemaic period.[37] Gordon also rejects Frankfurter's thesis, reasoning that his theory of stereotype appropriation does not provide the entire picture. Gordon asserts that Egyptian priests were *not* forced to adopt this stereotype for political and social gain, but rather they created new and innovative rituals to continue their private use of magical power at a time when magical rituals were forced underground.[38] Nonetheless, it is likely that we will never know who the authors were.

Most scholars, however, now agree that the Egyptian temple scribes and the temple scriptorium priests were most likely the transmitters of the rituals in the papyri due to their training in the languages preserved in these documents: Demotic, Hieratic, Coptic and Greek.[39] Moreover, the *PGM,* while written mostly in Greek, preserves much older Egyptian rituals dating back to the Pharaonic period (c.2700 BCE).[40] Thus, the magical methods outlined in the *PGM* are mostly Egyptian which suggests that these spells survived without much Hellenic reworking for at least seven centuries. [41] Overall, the magical papyri's combination of scripts, manual format, explicit mentions of the Egyptian priesthood and elements of Egyptian magic, all point in one direction: the temple scriptorium of Egypt and most likely the Egyptian priesthood. I do not wish to comment further on this argument

---

[34] The translation of Lector Priests means "carriers of the scroll" and is a title attested from as early as the Old Kingdom of Egypt through to Late Antiquity (c. 2700 BCE- 500CE). These priests played an important role in reciting incantations, hymns and magical spells in both private and public temple rituals as well as other everyday religious and magical practices (divination, apotropaic, funerary rituals etc.). For the evolution of the role of the Lector Priests see the excellent work of Forshaw (2014) & Lucarelli (2016).

[35] Frankfurter (1997, 116) & Frankfurter (1998, 198-237).

[36] Ibid.

[37] Fraser (2009, 120-123).

[38] Gordon (2015, 71-76) & Gordon (2002). See also Philips (1991) for legal sanctions on magic in the Roman Empire.

[39] See Frankfurter (1998 198-217); Dieleman (2011, 94-95); Ritner (1995, 3362-3363).

[40] Dieleman argues that while the Greek part of the corpus was written with a particular readership in mind, the Demotic spells appear to be firmly rooted in the Egyptian temple scriptorium. However, the format of the spells is almost identical to that of the Egyptian *Coffin Texts* produced around 2100 BCE. See Dieleman (2011, 287-289); also, Ritner (1995, 3358-3371) for his comparison of the magical papyri to older Egyptian rituals found in the Pharaonic Period. However, Faraone (2017, 75) in his work on domestic protective statues in the *PGM* IV has also argued: "…more recent insights that the priests themselves were the implied audiences of these handbooks and that in many cases they were trying to recast Greek magical rituals in a form that they themselves could appreciate and understand".

[41] The first of the Demotic papyrus translated into English was published under the title *Demotic Papyrus of London and Leiden.* However, the decision to split the magical papyri into Greek (*PGM*) and Demotic (*PDM*) in Hans Betz' English translation ignores the fact that the Demotic manuals are intimately related to the Greek corpus in theme, chronology and archaeological dating. See Dieleman (2011, 95) & Skinner (2014).

or stake my claim as to who the authors were as their identity is not relevant to my investigation, but their adaptions and innovations of the Theban theology in the magical texts is pertinent to this study.

The *PGM* spells that are examined against the philosophical texts and the Leiden and Hibis hymns are the following:

PGM III.494-1114 = P. Lourve 2391

PGM IV.475-829 = P. Bibl. Nat.Suppl. 574

PGM IV. 475-829

PGM VII.505-28 = P. Lond. 121

PGM XIII.1-343 = P. Leiden I 395

All of the above papyri, with the exception of *PGM* VII and *PGM* III are from the Theban cache. Recent analysis on the sale and distribution of the papyri has revealed that *PGM* III and *PGM* VII are unlikely from the Theban collection.[42] In fact, Korshi Dosoo argues that *PGM* VII is possiblely from another archive known as the "Hermonthis Magical Archive".[43] The papyri analysed in this thesis were not chosen based on their geographical locations. Rather, these particular papyri were chosen because the theology and rituals found within them contain elements of Amun theology and this will be further explained in Chapter 3 of this thesis. Lastly, the above rituals are dated to the third and fourth centuries CE but dating of any of the papyri scrolls is a difficult task; scroll IV, while written in the early fourth century, contains characteristics found in texts composed two hundred years earlier.[44] Thus, dating of the papyri is not always accurate. Although, what this does demonstrate is that despite the difficulty of dating the persistence of Amun theology makes multiple appearances in the *PGM*.

Methodology

This study uses three different disciplinary perspectives: anthropology, philosophy of religion and postcolonialism. In concrete terms, this means it applies ideas originating in the theories of Ritual Mastery, Universalism and Orientalism respectively. We shall discuss these methodologies in more detail below. But first it is important to address the issue of labels. As we saw above, there is a

[42] There are no sales records to suggest that *PGM* III was owned by the discoverer of the papyri Jean d'Anastasy and despite the similarity in form and contents to the Theban cache the hand of this papyri is noticeably different. Moreover, *PGM* VII was purchased by the British Museum along with *PGM* VIII and *PGM* XIa but despite its similarity in content to the Theban cache there is no clear evidence in hand, form or content to suggest that it is connected. See Dosoo (2016, 264).

[43] Hermonthis is close to Thebes and Dosoo (2016, 266) further argues that the Hermonthis Magical Archive and the Theban Library should be kept separate as there is no reason to think that there was only one magical specialist in the Thebaid who owned every text in that region.

[44] Brashear (1995, 3419).

problem when trying to determine the authorship of the writers of the *PGM* and what we should label them: priests or magicians? Likewise, what should we call the philosophers who study and practice ritual? I propose an alternative label for the authors of the *PGM* and the Neoplatonists altogether: I think it is pertinent to simply call them "ritualists" or "Ritual Masters". The reason for using the term ritualists as opposed to magicians or priests in this thesis is strongly led by an anthropological framework proposed by Catherine Bell and her theories on "Ritual Mastery."[45]

Ritual Masters believed that their power was bestowed upon them by authoritative figures such as ancestors, religious establishments, philosophical schools or deities. For that reason, ritual power was seen as legitimate and accessible only to those in the appropriate offices. Ritual Mastery also involves a certain amount of social control on the community:

> … in a basic sense, when non-specialists' ritual participants are differentiated from ritual specialists, a differentiation displayed in and produced through ritual, lay participants lose direct control over a major medium of symbolic production and objectification. The result, of course, is that they can affect only indirectly the constructions of 'reality' or the 'ideal' objectification.[46]

The ritualists of the papyri and the Neoplatonists Porphyry and Iamblichus fit well into this framework when we observe how they (especially Porphyry and Iamblichus) define themselves in society and attack those who use magic. This is why I have chosen to examine both the theology of the One God and the ritual acts (the *sustasis* rituals) which accompany that theology, at least in Late Antiquity. The ultimate goal of ritual, according to Porphyry and Iamblichus, was to become a pure being and return their soul to the One God.[47] As will be demonstrated, several parallels exist between the *sustasis* rituals described in the magical papyri and Neoplatonic ideas of theurgy: firstly, the unification rituals in the magical papyri are strikingly similar to Porphyry's and Iamblichus' ideas of theurgic union with the One God. Secondly, the way Porphyry and Iamblichus draw their authority from other notable Platonists and define themselves in relation to Egypt is similar to how the ritualists of the papyri connect themselves to the Egyptian priesthood. As a result, the theory of Ritual Mastery also intersects with notions of Orientalism and Universalism when we analyse the following: how Platonists viewed the ritual practices of theurgy as different to magic, how they defined themselves in relation to Egypt and how they appropriated and innovated Egyptian theology.

Another point worth examining is the general conviction in Late Antiquity that one should express and/or invoke the One God in ritual and theology. Universalist notions of God often focus on the

---

[45] Additionally, this label of ritualists is important when considering the diversity of the papyri in terms of their locale, rituals and various cultural inputs. Ritualist is therefore more preferable than calling these authors "magicians" or "priests". See Dosoo (2014) & Bell (1992, 107-108; 214-216).
[46] Bell (1992, 214) & Bell (1997).
[47] Plot. *Enn.* 2.2.3; 4.8.

Christian and Islamic perspectives. Building upon the work of Assmann and his ideas on Universalism, Globalism and the evolution of monotheism, this thesis illustrates how different pagan groups across thousands of years have created a shared universal belief in the One God, much like their monotheistic counterparts.[48] Universalism is concerned with absolute Truth and therefore a more religiously and philosophically oriented doctrine. Universalism is also closely connected to the process of Globalism. Globalism is based on the notion that, although the Truth is hidden and obscure, the search for Truth is common throughout all human societies and cultures. Globalism, however, is also concerned with cultural techniques of the translation and cultural exchange of ideas which informs our socio-political views of the world and other cultures. As a qualification to what Globalism suggests I argue that Globalism and the cultural exchange of ideas produces moments of cultural appropriation and cultural anxiety, as is demonstrated by the various Platonists that this thesis examines. Platonists are never concerned with the Orient except as the first cause of what they say *or* how it supports their own argument and universalistic Truth of the One God.[49] This is a form of cultural appropriation on the part of the Neoplatonists. This thesis agrees with and also utilises Edward Said's theories on Orientalism and the appropriation of Egypt by the West when examining the relationship between Egypt and Greece.[50]

Orientalism, as Said explains, is premised upon exteriority and the notion of the other. Essentially, the Orientalist, poet, writer, or philosopher makes the Orient speak, describes the Orient and "renders its mysteries plain" *for* and *to* the West. Consequently, by speaking *on behalf of* the Orient, those who utilise the Orient render the natives of that land silent. As we will see in Chapter 1, the Platonists often silenced the native Egyptian priests as they attempted to combine Greek philosophical doctrines with Egyptian ideas and notions. Using Said's theories on Orientalist discourse I also examine how Platonists defined themselves in relation to Egypt in addition to discussing how the theology of the Egyptians and the Platonists are very similar.

Research on the relationship between Greeks and Egyptians is discussed in great detail in Phiroze Vasunia's *The Gift of the Nile: Hellenizing Egypt from Aeschylus to Alexander.*[51] For reasons not clear to us, Vasunia has demonstrated that Platonists, from the Hellenistic period onwards, show an admiration for Egypt that they do not afford the Persians or the Babylonians.[52] Throughout the history of Platonic philosophy, certain Platonists simultaneously *credit* the Egyptians for their knowledge and also try to *lay claim* to it—whether that is by showing how Greek knowledge is somehow "older" and therefore superior *or* by connecting themselves and their philosophical training to Egyptian priests. This attempt by one culture to connect itself and simultaneously

[48] Assmann (2008, 56-58) & Assmann (2014, 53-54).
[49] Said (2014, 21-22) & Veale (2013, 208-211).
[50] Said (2014).
[51] Vasunia (2001).
[52] Fowden (1993, 168-170).

dominate another calls out for an analysis.[53] I argue that this is a form of cultural anxiety by the Greeks and Hellenes over the antiquity and long history of Egypt and its culture. During the process of Globalism and cultural exchange in the ancient world the writers of the West realised they were not the oldest and biggest fishes in the pond.

By investigating philosophical literature, I will demonstrate that there is a sense of cultural anxiety and orientalising discourse which takes place in the history of Platonism. The Platonist discourse surrounding Egypt, invokes, creates and perpetuates various notions and stereotypes of Egypt which were far removed from the contemporary time. This is especially so in Late Antiquity as Egypt was under foreign rule for just over eight hundred years; the Egyptian temples had begun an era of decline in Late Antiquity. Egyptian religious practices were viewed as magical and forced underground and the Greek language far outweighed the traditional hieroglyphic texts once written by Egyptian priests. The Egypt that our Platonists referenced was not the Egypt of Antiquity but rather an idealised version of Pharaonic Egypt not based in reality.

Chapter Overview

Using the methodological framework of Orientalism, Chapter 1 studies how Platonist philosophers, from Plato through to Iamblichus, used the figure of the Egyptian priest to assert the religious and cultural superiority of Greece. The chapter argues that in the writings of Plato, Plutarch, Iamblichus and Porphyry there is a sense of cultural anxiety over the antiquity of Egypt and their religious practices. The chapter also illustrates that if cultural anxiety does not appear there is still a process of orientalising taking place when Egyptian priests are present in the text. The chapter begins with an overview of the cross-cultural connections between the Greeks and Egyptians and how Hellenic philosophers have used the figure of the Egyptian priests to further their own Greek philosophical arguments. Present within those arguments is a sense of cultural anxiety on the part of the Greeks over the antiquity of Egypt. However, we cannot find cultural anxiety in the writings of Porphyry and Iamblichus, but their techniques in the texts suggest that they are still orientalising the Egyptians and using them as personal rhetorical devices to further a predominantly Greek philosophical argument.

Chapter 2 illuminates the theological similarities, i.e., universal religious truths, between the Neoplatonists and the Theban New Kingdom theology of the One God. The chapter studies various Neoplatonic philosophical texts next to the Leiden hymns and Hibis hymns, a type of comprehensive analysis not yet attempted by scholars. Both texts share distinct similarities of the One God. That is, both our Egyptian and Greek sources describe a One God who is placed within a triad of two other gods in a henotheistic system. The comparative analysis will reveal that both the Egyptian and Greek

[53] Lefkowitz (1997, 249).

sources describe a One God who is the father and creator of the world and from within Him came all other gods. Lastly, both our sources also emphasise the idea that this One God is self-generated from the darkness, is hidden and remote, but He is within us all. The analysis of these texts indicates a continuation of Egyptian theological ideas in the works of the Neoplatonists and the Platonists more broadly despite over a thousand years of separation.

The final chapter of the thesis investigates the *sustasis* rituals with the One God in both the Greek Magical Papyri and in Neoplatonic theurgy. Using the methodological framework of Catherine Bell's Ritual Mastery theory, we begin by discussing Porphyry and Iamblichus' perception of magic as opposed to the Egyptian conceptions of magic *ḥkꜣ* (*Heka*).[54] As a result of their perceptions of magic, both philosophers perceived themselves as better Ritual Masters by practicing theurgy and *not* magic. Porphyry and Iamblichus accused those who practice magic, such as we find in the *PGM*, of being devious tricksters who could not reach unification with the One God through magic. Theurgy, unlike magic, did not coerce the One God but worked upon him. However, an analysis of five *sustasis* rituals in the papyri reveal no major differences between theurgy and magic nor the theology of the One God which exists in both texts. Essentially, all theological sources, the Leiden and Hibis hymns, Neoplatonic texts, and the *PGM* have relatively few differences in their conceptions of the One God. Finally, the conclusion will briefly summarise the results of the overall argument and clarify their significance.

[54] When Heka appears in italics in this thesis as *heka* I am referring to the concept of Egyptian magic and not the God of magic, Heka.

Chapter 1

Utilising Egypt: The value of Egypt and Egyptian Priests for the Hellenes

"But we may take it that whenever Greeks borrow anything from non-Greeks, they finally carry it to a higher perfection". [55]

Plato *Epinomis*, 987d

1.1 Introduction: Historical Context

The Greeks and Egyptians have a long history of cultural contact.[56] In Greek and Hellenistic literature, we find many Greek authors fascinated with Egypt and especially Thebes.[57] For example, book two of Herodotus' *Histories* offers a comprehensive account of Egypt including its history, religion and customs.[58] Hecateus of Miletus (c. 476 BCE) wrote a work on Egypt entitled *Periēgesis*. Hellanicus of Lesbos (480-395 BCE) travelled to Egypt and wrote a work on the Egyptian temples.[59] Then there is the work of Strabo (63 BCE-23 AD) whose seventeenth book on geography contains an extensive discussion of Egypt's systems of government, religion, culture and history.[60] Nonetheless, while these writers wrote of Egypt and its history, they also insisted on Greece's superiority over Egypt and would often attempt to connect Greece, its religion and philosophy, to the Egyptians. For instance, Hecateus and Herodotus' texts emphasised the priority of Greek myth which created an intellectual

[55] I am aware that the authorship of the *Epinomis* is debated. However, that dispute is not relevant to the overall aims of this thesis. Regardless whether the text is written by Plato or another Platonists, the belief that Greek philosophers are the "more advanced culture" is still present in the text.
[56] The earliest contact between Greeks (the Mycenaeans) and Egyptians from the Thebaid region is demonstrated by a large fragment of a faience plaque with a cartouche of Amenhotep III. This was uncovered within the Cult Centre at Mycenae and may be dated to the early fourteenth century BCE. The plaque reads: "the good god Neb-Ma'at-Re, son of Re Amenhotep, Ruler of Thebes, given life". Research on the plaque has demonstrated that it was likely to be a semi-official object of Egypt kept at Mycenae and perhaps set in a door of an "Egyptian Room" or treated as a valuable souvenir. See the work of Cline (1990) on this particular object.
[57] Fowden (1986, 168) has noted the importance of Thebes: "if Alexandria was in but not really of Egypt, Thebes distilled the country's very essence and focused the religious traditions for which the whole of Upper Egypt was renowned". This is reflected also in the Leiden Hymn X Appendix B1. However, this chapter does not focus exclusively on Thebes but rather Egypt more generally. Klotz (2012, 15-30) however, provides an excellent overview of the reputation of Thebes in various Greek authors as well as Roman visitors to Thebes. See also Lefkowitz (1997, 249).
[58] There is also the work of Hecateus of Abdera, who was invited by Ptolemy I (367/366- 283-282BCE) to Egypt, specifically Thebes, and composed a history of Egypt.
[59] This work now comes to us in fragments only. See Vasunia (2001, 289-294).
[60] Vasunia (2001, 289-305) has the fragmentary excerpts of these works in his book (including translations of these texts).

framework where Egypt's antiquity and influence was dependent upon Greece as its point of reference.[61] We find these same claims of dependency in the history of Platonism.

Beginning with Plato, the religion, culture, medicine and political systems of Egypt were the domains in which Platonists could disseminate Platonic epistemological ideas. Egypt was the epitome of everything to the Platonists and while they did discuss other cultures (such as Babylonian and Persian) it was the Egyptians that were usually at the forefront of their philosophical investigations.[62] This is especially the case with regard to the origins of Greek philosophy and religion in Plato's *Timaeus* and Plutarch's *On Isis and Osiris*, Porphyry's *Letter to Anebo* and Iamblichus' *On the Mysteries*. Through the eyes of the Greeks or those who were Hellenised (i.e., Porphyry and Iamblichus) Egypt was a place of sacred and mysterious wisdom. Yet, while Egypt was admired by the Platonists it was also othered and orientalised.[63] In the history of Platonism, Egyptian Priests would often occupy different and contradictory positions.[64] In one sweeping statement, an Egyptian priest can be accredited with knowledge of astronomy, medicine, science, philosophy and theology and in the same breath they are a magician, trickster, and conjurer who is not to be trusted. For example, figures such as Paapis, Pankrates, Zatchlas, Iachim, Necktanebo II and Kalasiris embodies the latter position of the Egyptian priest.[65] On the other hand, Chaeremon, Apion, Mantheo and Ptolemy, Hellenised Egyptian priests, occupied a place of admiration in Platonist literature.[66]

The list of Platonists who wrote on Egypt is extensive. Their writings focus mostly on religion and the role of Egyptian priests in Egyptian society. At the same time, however, many of these works written on Egypt are now lost or fragmentary.[67] The only complete philosophical works that have

[61] Vasunia (2001, 116). For Greek literature produced in Egypt see Bowerstock (1990).
[62] For Greek fascination and curiosity with Egypt see Assmann (2005b).
[63] The term Hellenised or Hellenistic and the issues of this binary term are a debated topic in scholarship. However, for the purpose of this thesis when I refer to those who are Hellenised or the Hellenes I am referring to the Greek usage (ἐλληνισμός/*hellēnismós*) which distinguishes the assimilation of non-Greeks to the Greek language and way of life such as education and religion (ἐλληνισταί/*hellēnistaí*). See also Purcell (2012, 367-390) who provides some interesting reflections on the significance of East and West relationships in the ancient world and how we label the people from those areas in today's contemporary scholarship.
[64] Vausina (2001, 2).
[65] Paapis is the evil Egyptian priest who appears in a 2nd CE work of Antonius Diogenes, *The Incredible Wonders Beyond Thule,* Photius: *Bibliotheca Codices* 166. Lucian's Pankrates appears in the satirical *Lover of Lies* (166-170CE). Lucian's Pankrates may be based on the Egyptian priests from the temple of Heliopolis Panchrates who is remembered in Papyrus. Paris Suppl. 574 2446ff which is dated to 130 CE. Panchrates impressed Emperor Hadrian in Rome with an array of magic and divination as well as being associated with the Cult of Isis. Zatchlas in Apuleius *Metamorphoses* (2.28) composed in 169 CE practices necromancy. Nektanebo II is the powerful magician and protagonist of the *Alexander Romance,* Krzysztof (2017, 25-26). Kalasiris is the Egyptian Priests of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika* produced in the Hellenistic era. See Escolano-Poveda (2020) and for a list of priestly Egyptian magicians and their origins see De Salvia (1987 343-365). For the magician as a literary figure in Ancient Egyptian texts see the work of Lucarelli (2016) & Wortley (2001).
[66] For recent work on Manetho and Chaeremon see Escolano-Povedo (2020, 92-105). Mantheo's fragmentary works on Egypt and Ptolemy's *Tetrabiblos* found in Waddell & Robbins (1954). The fragments of Chaeremon are translated by Willem van der Horst (1987).
[67] For example, there is Aristagroas who was a contemporary of Plato from Miletus, he composed a work on Egypt in 332 BCE. There is also Eudoxus of Cnidus (390-340 BCE) who lived on the coast of Asia Minor and was a student of Plato. According to Diogenes Laertius (8.86-91), Eudoxus travelled to Egypt and lived with Egyptian priests for one year and four months and he even shaved his beard and eyebrows and wrote his work on astronomy called *Octateris* and *Dialogue*

survived are Plato's *Timaeus*, Plutarch's *On Isis and Osiris* and Iamblichus' *On the Mysteries* which was a stylised response to Porphyry's *Letter to Anebo.* These works will be our primary focus in this chapter. The Platonic works discussed in this chapter deal extensively with Egyptian religion and pose theological arguments. The discussions in these texts range from trying to understand Egyptian Gods and their etymological origins to how Egyptian religion, rituals and practices (both cultural and political) differ from Greek and other Mediterranean cultures.

Unfortunately, there are scarcely any Egyptian texts that deal explicitly with Egyptian stereotypes from the point of view of the Egyptian priests.[68] While the Greeks were fascinated with the Egyptians, this feeling was not mutual. Greek Egyptology was not matched by any Greek studies on the part of the Egyptians. According to Assmann, the Egyptians did not designate the Greeks with a precise term and they are referred to in hieroglyphic texts as *ḥꜣ.w-nb.w* (those who squat in swamp holes).[69] However, the Egyptians fed this Greek curiosity and also perpetuated the stereotype of Egypt as the home of sacred mysteries. The Egyptians had propagandistic intentions and were motivated to present to foreign audiences, especially Greek writers, an impressive image of Egyptian culture.[70] Years of foreign domination resulted in Egyptian priests losing a substantial amount of political and social power. As a result, the Egyptian priests retreated to the only place they could still wield power, the Egyptian temple. The Egyptian religious landscape was altered throughout years of foreign rule as Egyptian priests now expanded their religious rituals, grammatology and education in the temple in an effort to assert their intellectual and spiritual prestige.[71]

Phiroze Vasunia argues that the Greek occupation of Egypt resulted in Greek writers promoting Egypt on account of its accomplishments but also rendering Egypt's accomplishments into a suitable format for Hellenic self-presentation.[72] As we will see, this is certainly the case in the writings of Plato and Plutarch. Building on Vasunia's arguments, this chapter demonstrates that this "rendering" of Egypt's accomplishments and knowledge continued on from Plato and Middle Platonism in the writings of Porphyry and Iamblichus in Late Antiquity. This analysis also uses Edward Said's work on Orientalism and Orientalist discourse and examines Platonists' utilisation of Egyptian Priests, or the figure of them, as mouthpieces, a source of information, a source of authority, as well as vehicles

---

of Dogs. This dialogue was supposedly written in Egyptian and then brought back to Greece and translated. See DeSantillana for the chronology of Plato and Eudoxus' works (1940).

[68] We know of only six complete monographs written on Egypt: The second book of Herodotus, *Euterpe*, the first book of Diodorus, *Bibl. Hist.* I, the seventeenth book of Strabo's *Geography*, Plut. *De Is. et Os*, Iambl. *De Myst.* and Horapollon of Nilotes, *Hieroglyphic*. Assmann (2005b, 37) argues that this list is just the tip of the iceberg and it is likely that more works are now lost to us. In regards to the Egyptian view of the Greeks and works written by Egyptians we have the works of Manetho, Apion and Chaeremon who participated in the Greek discourse on Egypt see n.63 above.

[69] Assmann (2005b, 41) states that "This is in reference to a half-mythical name for the inhabitants of the extreme north such as "ultima Thule" or Hyperboraens".

[70] Lloyd (2010, 1067-1085) discusses this in his work on the reception of Pharaonic Egypt in Classical Antiquity.

[71] For the discussion of the impacts on Egyptian religion see Assmann (2014 44-45). The foreign domination I am referring to is the conquest of the Persians in 525 BCE, 332 BCE by Alexander the Great and 30 BCE by the Romans.

[72] Vasunia (2001, 2).

to express platonic philosophy. This chapter will further demonstrate that Plato and Plutarch's texts display a cultural anxiety over the antiquity of Egypt. A close analysis of the texts shows that both philosophers compare Egypt to Greece's own history and religion and go to great lengths to repeatedly assert the superiority of Greek philosophical wisdom and history. However, unlike Plato and Plutarch, Iamblichus and Porphyry do not display this same sense of cultural anxiety but nevertheless orientalise Egypt and utilise the figure of the Egyptian priests for their own purposes. I use the term "cultural anxiety" with some apprehension due to its connotations with Jungian psychoanalysis. However, I do utilise the term "cultural anxiety" to refer to how one culture (the Greeks and Hellenes) defines their own culture and identity in the face of another (the Egyptians).[73]

The central aim of this chapter is to highlight how these discussions of Egypt and its relation to Greece contain an element of anxiety over the antiquity of Egypt and its history and their influence on Greek culture. This, I will argue, is prevalent in the works of Plato and Plutarch but does not appear in Iamblichus and Porphyry. Rather, Iamblichus and Porphyry's relationship to Egypt is ambivalent and this is because Porphyry and Iamblichus share a greater connection to the East by birth and upbringing than their Greek counterparts. To what extent this is because of Porphyry and Iamblichus' non-Greek origins and Hellenisation is an entirely separate question which falls outside the scope of this thesis. Nevertheless, the Platonists studied in this chapter, either Hellenised or of Greek origin, orientalise Egypt and feed into certain stereotypes of Egypt which are not based in reality. This orientalising discourse appears in Platonists' discussions of Greece as a superior culture or by using the figure of the Egyptian priests as a source of Platonic philosophical wisdom. This orientalising discourse, as I will argue, renders the voices of Egypt and Egyptian priests silent and is thus a form of Orientalism as is argued by Said.

1.2 Egyptian Mouthpieces: Plato and Egypt

Throughout the history of Platonism, the figure of the Egyptian priest is utilised by Platonists in two ways: either to assert the superiority of the Greeks or as an example of religious practices of purity and philosophy. What we also find is Platonist philosophers who have travelled (either literally or figuratively) to Egypt and studied with Egyptian priests and these Platonists then bring back to Greece their newfound knowledge of the mysteries of Egyptian religion and theology.[74] Ultimately this relationship forms a type of cultural dependency on Egypt. Mary Lefkowitz argues that the relationship between Greece and Egypt, for Plato, represents the teacher to pupil relationship.[75] In

[73] For "cultural anxiety" and the various manifestations of it see Grillo (2003, 158-159).
[74] For Greek philosophers' tourism of Egypt see Foertmeyer (1989, 159-207) also Bagnall and Rathbone (2004, 47-49). Both Porphyry's and Iamblichus' texts on Pythagoras detail his life in Egypt. Both claim that Pythagoras learnt his practices of purity from the Egyptians and then travelled back to Greece to teach philosophy. See Appendix A.9l; A.10d.
[75] There has been a substantial amount of research on this area, especially in regards to the Egyptian priest in Plato's *Ti* and *Crit.* Some of the notable studies on Platonist Orientalism can be found in Stephens (2016); Brisson (1987); Müller (1997); Smith (2013). For Hellenization of Egypt and Orientalism see Vasunia (2001); Said (1978).

addition, C.W. Müller contends that the Egyptian priest is also representative of the project of self-discovery for Greek origins.[76] However, a closer examination of Plato's text reveals that the Egyptian priest in the *Timaeus* is nothing but a hollowed-out character, a mouthpiece, not based in the reality of Egypt. The figure of this priest is there to advance Plato's argument that Greece, rather than Egypt, is the superior and older civilisation.[77] This is demonstrated in Plato's use of the priests and the archives of Egypt as the source of wisdom to claim the superiority of the Athenian civilisation.[78]

In the *Timaeus*, Critias tells us that on his travels to Egypt his grandfather Solon learnt of the greatest Athenian achievements, the Athenian defeat of Atlantis. This story is told to Solon in the Egyptian town of Saïs. Critias tells us that the founding divinity of this city (Neith) is the equivalent of the goddess Athena and that the inhabitants are "very pro-Athenian and claim somehow to be related to us".[79] However, the references to Saïs and Neith in the *Timaeus* indicate that Plato was not drawing on the Egyptians of real antiquity.[80] Rather, Plato presents a glimpse of a more recent tradition and history; Saïs only became the capital of Egypt in the 26th dynasty, i.e., 664-525 BCE. This period saw increased cultural contact between the Greeks and Egyptians and the founding of the Greek settlement Naukratis in Egypt.[81] What is most striking about the *Timaeus* is that Plato places the written records of proto-Athenian history in the hands of an Egyptian Priest in an Egyptian city.

In the dialogue, the Egyptian priest tells Solon that periodic years of destruction and floods meant that the Athenians lost the records of the founding of their city and its connection to the Egyptians.[82] The story of Atlantis and the greatness of proto-Athens was only known to the Greeks and passed down orally. The priest criticises Solon for his lack of knowledge regarding his own country's origins. The priest then replies that for the sake of the deity who connects and governs both lands (Athena) he will reveal to him that while Egypt is 8,000 years old, the city of Athens exceeds it by 1,000 years.[83] You do not need to be a historian, classicist, or Egyptologist to know that this is simply not true. After this remarkable revelation, the priest details how the social class system of Egypt, in particular the warrior class and political caste system, functions similarly in Greece, which of course, appeared first.[84] Consequently, the Egyptian pursuits of knowledge and intellectual attainments were because

---

[76] Lefkowitz (1997, 249); Müller (1997, 214).
[77] Vasunia (2001, 249).
[78] Pl. *Ti,* 22e-24a.
[79] Vasunia (2001, 233); Pl. (*Ti*, 21e).
[80] Vasunia (2001, 233).
[81] Ibid.
[82] Pl. *Ti.* 22e: "Here in Egypt, however, water never rains onto the fields from above — it never has, neither then, nor at any other time. Here it does the opposite: all our water rises up from below. This explains why the legends preserved here are the most ancient, even though the human race is actually continuous, in larger or smaller numbers, everywhere in the world where neither excessive cold nor excessive heat prevents human habitation…"
[83] See Ramage (1978, 19) who argues that Plato's statement at *Ti.*23d-24a regarding the age of Athens could not have possibly existed in 9500 BCE as Greece was in the late Palaeolithic period and settlement in Greece would not begin for another 3,000 years.
[84]Pl. *Ti.* 24b-d: "Then there's the warrior caste and, as I'm sure you've noticed, they're separated off from all the others, required by law to focus exclusively on military matters. Moreover, their weaponry consists of shields and spears, which

of the foundations that were laid not in Egypt but in Greece.[85] Greece, according to Solon (i.e., Plato), was an "even more stable culture than Egypt" and its excellence was unmatched.[86] Moreover, the story of proto-Athens and its triumph over the lost city of Atlantis, learnt by Solon and told by Plato, is not to be found in fifth century Greece but in Egyptian temples and written by Egyptian priests in Saïs. Yet, before this knowledge was destroyed, the Greeks were able to pass it down orally for over a thousand years. Egypt and its written history only become useful to the philosopher when it intersects with Greek experiences and Greek history.[87] As a result, Plato's *Timaeus* becomes a politically charged text in which Egypt is both admired and appropriated, as Plato attempts to persuade the reader of Greece's superiority.

Written history in the Egyptian tradition, as opposed to orally transmitted Greek history, is useful for Plato when demonstrating the greatness of Greek triumphs. Plato appears to be creating a paradoxical situation in the *Timaeus* where written history, when in the hands of the Egyptians, is not useful, but their use of writing records is superior when it supports the idea of Greece's superiority over Egypt. The paradox begins in the *Phaedrus* where Plato, when recounting the dialogue between Thamus and Theuth (Egyptian Thoth), details how the writing of the Egyptians is useless in comparison to the technique of oral history of the Greeks.[88] In the *Phaedrus*, Plato makes it a point to question Egyptian writing, and through the mouth of Socrates, declares writing a useless technique in comparison to Greek orally transmitted history.[89] But Solon, in the *Timaeus*, in order to understand the history of Athens, must travel to Egypt to listen to the history of Greece which survives in written records.[90] This written historical information is then brought back to Greece by Solon (most likely orally) which therefore makes it useful to the Greeks when trying to discover their history. This is indeed a paradox *or* a manifestation of cultural anxiety on the part of Plato over Egypt's antiquity. But why is there no reference to Egyptian history in the *Timaeus* or to the role the Egyptians played in the story of Atlantis?[91] Was Plato aware of any Egyptian history?

we were the first in Asia to adopt, following the example of the goddess,* just as you did first in those regions where you Greeks live."

[85] As Waterfield (2008, 124) notes, the idea that Athens had a climate which was conducive to "producing men of outstanding intelligence" became a common theme within Greek literature.

[86] Pl. *Ti.*24d.

[87] Vasunia (2001, 226).

[88] Socrates argues that the technique of writing will produce forgetfulness in the soul. Pl. *Phrd* 274c-275v: "O Theuth, the greatest master of technique, another is he who can produce a technique, another is he who can judge what is the lot of harm and usefulness to those who must use it. And now you, who are the father of writing, have given it, out of complacency, a power which is the opposite of that which it possesses. For this technique will produce forgetfulness in the souls of those who have learned it, because they will cease to exercise their memory: putting their trust in the written word, it is from the outside, through foreign imprints, and not from within, through themselves, that they will make an act of remembrance."

[89] Ibid.

[90] Brisson (1987, 161).

[91] Vasunia (2001, 225).

Luc Brisson has documented over twenty-two references to Egyptian society (some factual and some not) in Plato's surviving works.[92] In the *Menexenus*, Plato even refers to the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses in 525 BCE.[93] The reference in the *Menexenus* means that Plato purposely omits Egyptian history for what is most likely political reasons or arguably cultural anxiety over Egypt's long history. In short, in Plato's texts, we see a clear sense of cultural anxiety come through. As is demonstrated in the *Epinomis*, quoted at the beginning of this chapter, Greece was *always* the superior culture for Plato. As a result, the Egyptian priest is reduced to a mouthpiece, a source of information who provides a transference of written history to a Greek intellectual for the purpose of proving that Greece is an older and wiser civilisation. Consequently, Plato's idealised version of Egypt is not based in historical reality and how Plato defines Greece, in relation to Egypt, is centred around his claims that Greece is the older and superior civilisation. This argument can be further demonstrated by Plato's references to the Egyptian caste system.

The references to the Egyptian caste system in Plato's works is an idealised and orientalised system.[94] Plato's knowledge of the Egyptian system is fragmentary at best and fuelled by a general interest in Egypt's connection to Athens in the late fifth century.[95] This is demonstrated when Plato remarks on the political influence of Egyptian priests in *Statesman*.[96] Additionally, while Plato may admire the role of the priest in Egyptian society and their ability to pursue knowledge, science, and philosophy, he does not believe that they should be above a true philosopher.[97] For example, in both Plato's *Statesman* and *Laws* there is a sharp criticism of the Egyptian political system, specifically the idea of the Pharaohs' reliance on the priesthood for legitimacy: "… in Egypt a king cannot reign unless he has priestly dignity, and, if he has, by chance, been raised by force from another class, he must finally come to be admitted to the latter class".[98] Plato also regards Egyptian priests involvement in economy and mathematics as "cunning" and "greedy".[99] As far as the position of philosophy and authority is concerned, Plato maintains the refusal of any sort of priestly interference in the area of

---

[92] See Brisson's (1987) appendix.
[93] Pl. *Menex.* 241e. Plato's source for this is Herodotus *Hist* 3.1-13. see also Brisson (1987, 162).
[94] Indeed, there were some prominent Greek writers who were familiar with the Egyptian caste system, beginning with Herodotus. See Vasunia (2001, 227) & Herodotus *Hist*. 2.164-68, Aristotle *Politics* 1329a40ff; Aristagoras *FGrHist* 608 F1 which can be found in transl. in Vasunia (2001, 296-297) and of course Isocrates, *Busiris*, see the commentary by Livingstone (2001).
[95] Brisson (1987, 154).
[96] Pl. *Plt.* 290d9–e3. Also see Stephens (2016, 50) who notes that Egypt is not the only political state admired in the *Resp.* Plato also mentions the political systems of Crete and Sparta. However, the *Ti.* and the *Resp.* do exhibit a clear admiration for Egypt's political and priestly system. In particular, the description of the Egyptian Priestly caste system in which the priest who is both philosopher, administrator, ritualist and advisor to the Pharaoh is strikingly similar to Plato's Guardians in the *Resp.*
[97] Stephens (2016) has noted that ideal state, as sketched out in Plato's *Resp.* and briefly in the *Ti.,* was in fact inspired by Egypt and the Egyptian principal of Ma'at (divine justice) found in Egyptian philosophy.
[98] Pl., *Plt.* 290 *d-e.*
[99] Pl. *Lg*. 5.747a. "…otherwise you will find that you have unwittingly turned out a sharper, as we call him, instead of a sage: examples of this we can see today in the effect produced on the Egyptians and the Phoenicians and many other nations by the illiberal character of their property, and other institutions…".

politics.[100] Rather, in the *Laws* Plato argues that the members of the nocturnal council (the Guardians) who have received philosophical training are the supreme authority when it comes to political advisement as well as matters of art and religion.[101]

In other words, Plato's use of Egypt in his various works reveals a sense of anxiety towards Egyptian society and its influence on Greek culture. For Plato, Egypt is an idealised society onto which he imposes his own political philosophy and asserts the superiority of Greece. This is clear in the *Timaeus* where Plato uses Egypt as a way to find the lost origins of Greece and to authenticate his rewriting of history.[102] The Egyptian priests in Plato's texts are there to support the notion of the superiority of the Greeks and provide the Greeks with wisdom to bring back to their home country where it is reworked into a suitable Greek format. As we will see next, this approach continues in the work of Plutarch who is also anxious to insist on the Greek origins of philosophy. Like Plato, Plutarch simultaneously appropriates Egypt and distances himself from it.

1.3 A Greek Egypt: Plutarch's *On Isis and Osiris*

Plutarch's *On Isis and Osiris*, like Plato's *Timaeus*, is a culturally charged text which aims to demonstrate the superiority of Greek philosophy and knowledge over Egypt.[103] For example, Plutarch begins his book on the cult of Isis by insisting first upon the primacy of Zeus as a divinity who is the earlier born and therefore greater in his knowledge.[104] Interestingly, Plutarch also implies that the cult of Isis included a pursuit of the intellectual aspect of truth which culminates into knowledge of God and the *gnosis* of the Supreme God of Platonic thought.[105] Plutarch's statement regarding the supremacy of Zeus as an older deity implores the reader to think of Greece as superior and therefore contains a greater philosophical knowledge than their Egyptian counterparts. Plutarch makes this clear in his second chapter which delves into the etymological Greek connections and origins of the Egyptian goddess Isis. Much like Plato's story of proto-Athens as an older and more

---

[100] Brisson (1987, 163).
[101] Brisson (1987, 163) and Pl., *Lg.* 7.799a-800a.
[102] Vasunia (2001, 242).
[103] Pleše (2005, 370) in his article on Orientalism in Platonism, interprets Plutarch's treatment of Egyptian religion and culture as a respectful one. Pleše contends that Plutarch's exegetical program in *De Is. et Os.* amounts to "binding the theology of the Egyptians by ties of kindred (*sunoikeiountos*) with Plato's philosophy". He further argues that the point of Plutarch's essay is to address three crucial philosophical issues: the telos of philosophy, the means of attaining this telos and the importance of religious lore and characteristic metaphorical discourse in this philosophical enterprise. But these arguments ignore the orientalising discourse and cultural anxiety present within Plutarch's text. We must also take into consideration the circulation and reception of the text and its audience of mostly Greek philosophers and other elites. A more respectful treatment of Egypt, I would argue, is found in Apuleius. Finkelpearl (2011) argues unlike Plutarch, Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* does not attempt to erase or rationalise Egyptian cult. Yet, this does not mean that Apuleius does not 'orientalise' Egypt. His emphasis on the secretive and mysterious nature of the Cult of Isis makes his work similar to the Orientalism we find in Pl. *Ti.* and Plut. *De Is. et Os*
[104] Plut. *De Is. et Os.*, 351a.
[105] See the commentary of Griffiths (1970, 256).

advanced civilisation than Egypt, Plutarch's continuous Greek overlays upon the Egyptian goddess Isis is a deliberate and polemical assertion of the primacy of Greek culture.[106]

As early as Herodotus, the Greeks assumed that the gods of the Egyptians could be equated with their own.[107] This method, which Plutarch also utilises, was not an unusual one amongst both Platonist and Greek authors more generally. Plutarch, however, goes so far as to claim that "Isis is a Greek name".[108] Daniel S. Richter argues that we should be less concerned with Plutarch's historical account of the linguistics of Egyptian deities' names but rather Plutarch's definition of cultural hierarchies in which he *places* the Egyptian names.[109] I would further argue that Plutarch's situating of the origin of an Egyptian goddess firmly into the Greek tradition was an expression of cultural anxiety over the antiquity of the Egyptian religion. To illustrate, Plutarch's association of Isis and her proclivity towards wisdom, specifically Greek intellectual wisdom over Egyptian religious wisdom, comes at crucial points within the text. For example, at the beginning of the book Plutarch argues that the name of the sanctuary of Isis:

> ... proclaims both understanding and knowledge of reality. For it is called an *Iseion* to indicate that we shall know (είσομένων) the 'real' if we approach the sanctuaries of the goddess rationally and piously.[110]

Here we see how Plutarch is drawing a very long bow in his attempts to situate the cult of Isis etymologically within the Greek language.

Plutarch then argues that the goddess Isis, whom the Egyptians worship, is exceptionally wise and a lover of wisdom like Hermes and Prometheus; two Greek gods firmly associated with Greek wisdom.[111] Clearly, throughout his entire introduction to the text, Plutarch tries to demonstrate that the name Isis actually contains Greek cognates. Specifically, Plutarch associates the goddess with the Greek verbs and nouns for wisdom and knowledge of the divine such as οἶδα (*oida*), γνῶσις (*gnôsis*) and έπιστήμη (*epistêmê*).[112] Plutarch is therefore implying that the type of worship most welcoming to the goddess is intellectual, but not in a religious and cultic sense. Rather, it is philosophical

---

106 See also Smelik & Hemelrijk (1984, 1961): "Rationalistic and especially allegorical explanations had to make the Egyptian traditions more acceptable and meaningful to Plutarch and to his public. And in this method of interpretation the intrinsic Egyptian character of the tradition is lost." See also Griffiths' commentary (1970, 18-33).

107 Herodotus believed that Egypt was the source of Greek religion, he states this explicitly in 2.50. Herodotus *Hist,* 2.42, 46; 137; 144; 156.

108 Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 351a. Richter (2001, 196), see also Griffiths (1970, 256-260) who argues that Plutarch's etymological explanation of Egyptian names for Greek deities leaves "room for ambiguities". For instance, Plutarch's explanations of Isis at 375c, Sarapis 362c, 362d, Amenthes 362d, Osiris 355a and Typhon 371b.

109 Ritchter (2001, 197).

110 Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 352a.

111 Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 352a-b.

112 Richter (2001, 26) argues that Plutarch here introduces a third term for knowledge of the divine associated with Isis, which he translates "experiential knowledge". Whereas *oida* seems somewhat experiential and *gnôsis* evokes the context of the mysteries, *epistêmê* is associated with a certain ritual knowledge. Richter also translates *gnôsis* as "understanding," forms of *oida* with cognates of "knowledge," and *epistêmê* as "scientific knowledge."

knowledge, particularly Greek philosophical knowledge, which is most pleasing to Isis. In Plutarch's view, Greek *paideia* should be valued more highly than Egyptian cultic actions and beliefs when it comes to the worship of the Egyptian goddess. As a result, the importance of Greek philosophical knowledge over Egyptian cult is introduced at the onset of the text to demonstrate Greece's superiority. Two passages may further illustrate this aspect.

At 351e Plutarch argues Greek philosophy is a yearning for divinity that is that unlike Egyptian temple worship.[113] Plutarch then asserts to Clea, who is a priestess at Delphi, that the pursuit for sacred lore in philosophy is a holier task than all ceremonial purification and temple services.[114] For Plutarch, the ultimate goal of religious worship within the temple is meaningless if you are not trying to attain wisdom of the Platonist Supreme God: "Him, who is the First, the Lord of All, the Ideal One".[115] However, at the beginning of the text it is not entirely clear if Plutarch is implying that the Egyptians do not have this knowledge. Although, at passages 352a-d Plutarch implies that cultic actions are empty if they are not aligned with philosophical understanding of the gods, especially the Supreme God of Platonic thought. This becomes clear at 352c when Plutarch tells Clea that coarse cloaks do not make a philosopher and neither does dressing in linen and shaving your head, a dig at the Egyptian priests. Rather, a true votary of Isis is someone who "has legitimacy, received what is set forth in investigating and in studying the truth contained therein".[116] Moreover, Plutarch's statement that the wisest of the Greeks (Solon, Thales, Plato, Eudoxus and Pythagoras) travel to Egypt may at first seem supportive of barbarian wisdom.[117] However, these philosophers may have travelled to Egypt for wisdom of religious lore, but it is their Greek training in philosophy that has enabled them to "correctly" understand the mysteries of Isis.[118] Indeed, Plutarch's arguments in this text regarding Egypt and Greece turn political when he insists on the supremacy of Greece over Egypt. This can be further demonstrated in his interpretation of the Egyptian myths.[119]

Plutarch effectively transforms the Egyptian myths into a vehicle of Greek knowledge to be explained philosophically or by using Greek allegories with the support of Greek authors. For Plutarch, the dismembered Osiris represents Greek logos, which Isis, using her rational Greek philosophical wisdom, must restore him.[120] Additionally, Plutarch also narrates the wanderings of Isis as if they were those of Demeter (357b-d); he claims that some Egyptians call Isis Athena and then translates Athena as an Egyptian phrase "something like I came from myself" (375e); he offers continuous

---

[113] "Both, indeed, were in lineage one, and of the same country, yet Zeus the earlier born and his knowledge was greater" Plut. *De Is. Et. Os.* 351e.
[114] Plut. *De Is. et Os. 351e*.
[115] Plut. *De Is et Os.* 325a. Griffiths (1970) provides no commentary on this particular passage.
[116] Plut. *De Is. et Os* .352c and see Griffiths (1970, 268-269).
[117] Pleše (2005, 370).
[118] Ritcher (2001, 199-200) for a full list of the Greek canon in the *De Is. et Os*.
[119] Ritcher (2001, 202).
[120] Alston (1996, 103) explains that the goal of Plutarch's text is to provide an allegorical interpretation of the myth and cult of Isis which is in alignment with Plutarch's own middle-Platonic metaphysics.

remarks on Egyptian cult practices as empty and inferior without philosophical understanding; and last but not least, Plutarch overtly asserts Isis' Greekness (351e, 352c). Accordingly, with each retelling of Egyptian myths Plutarch divorces these myths from their original Egyptian context. [121]

To summarise, Plato and Plutarch's texts reveal that they often wanted to prove Greece's superiority over Egypt. This is shown in Plutarch's attempts to situate Egyptian deities into Greek moulds and ideas and by Plato's dialogues which try to prove that Greece is the older and wiser country when compared to Egypt. As this next section will show, our Eastern Neoplatonists, Porphyry and Iamblichus, do not insist on the Greek origins of Egyptian deities or try to argue that Greece is superior but instead participate in an Orientalist discourse of Egypt.

1.4 Orientalising discourse in Iamblichus and Porphyry

Porphyry's and Iamblichus' treatment of Egypt is different from that of Plato and Plutarch. However, Iamblichus and Porphyry are still participating in an Orientalist discourse on Egypt and this is evident in their exchange in the *Letter to Anebo and On the Mysteries*. The exchange is centred around Porphyry's statements of Egypt and its religion as well as the use of foreign symbols in theurgic ritual of which Iamblichus was a supporter. Iamblichus was well known for his fusion of Platonic philosophy with eastern rituals and his utilisation of theurgy. Porphyry questioned his former student's use of theurgy in a text called the *Letter to Anebo,* which was "sent" to an Egyptian Priest, Anebo. Iamblichus wrote his reply *On the Mysteries,* taking on the role of Anebo's teacher, another Egyptian priest, Abamon. This exchange will be discussed in greater detail below, but first it is helpful to examine the broader Orientalist discourse in Porphyry and Iamblichus.

In their exchange on Egypt and its religion and language, Porphyry and Iamblichus are participating in an Orientalist discourse where the figure of the Egyptian priests is utilised in order to facilitate an argument about Greek philosophical ideas.[122] The imagined Egyptian priests Anebo and Abamon are the Egyptian proxies for Iamblichus and Porphyry through whom they want to discuss and defend Platonic ideas. According to Edward Said's explanation of Orientalism, the use of an imagined Egyptian priest who argues a philosophical point, namely the defence of theurgy with its combination of Platonic wisdom and philosophy, is an Orientalist discourse.[123] Said has observed that for the

---

[121] Plutarch's insistence that Greek philosophical knowledge and understanding of the gods and its superiority over the Egyptians can be further demonstrated in his attack on Herodotus in *On the Malice of Herodotus*, 13. Here, Plutarch condemns Herodotus for daring to claim that the names of the Greek gods came from Egypt, branding Herodotus as a "lover of foreigners" (*philobarbaros*) for his preference for Egyptian knowledge over Greek.
[122] This particular type of genre of philosophical literature is known as *erotapokrisis* (questions and solution literature) see Addey (2016, 41).
[123] Said (2003, 23-24).

speaker (i.e., Iamblichus) the Orient serves as a personal rhetorical device. What happens when he uses this device is a process of orientalising, that is, the appropriation of another's culture.[124]

At first glance, Iamblichus' long reply to Anebo as Abamon seems to be supportive of the merits of Egyptian wisdom (as well as Babylonian).[125] Iamblichus' discussion of Egyptian hieroglyphics as symbols of the gods and his knowledge of the Egyptian theological system also seems supportive of Egyptian religion (Chapter 2.8).[126] However, Iamblichus' admiration of Egypt in *On the Mysteries.* does not change the undercurrent of Orientalist discourse.[127] Ian Moyer and Jeremy Schott suggest that in the case of esoteric knowledge and stereotypes, the original ideas of the speaker, that is Egyptian culture, religion and ritual, are transformed and distorted to suit the needs of the speaker who is *not* of that culture.[128] Iamblichus, in asserting the authority of Egypt to defend theurgic rituals that are based in Neoplatonic doctrines, is partaking in an Orientalist discourse and a form of cultural appropriation. For example, the authorial speech of the Egyptian Priest, Abamon, in *On the Mysteries.* becomes regularly unstable as he (Abamon) switches from first person plural (we, the Egyptians) to third personal plural (they, the Egyptians). This occurs four times in the text in the following passages:

1. "The Egyptians, however, who combine addresses to daemons with divine symbols, do sometimes use threats…" (VI.6-7)
2. "I would like to explain the mode of the theology of the Egyptians; for they…" (VII. 10-11)
3. "And thus, it is the doctrine of the Egyptians on the first principles, starting from the highest level…" (VIII.3)
4. "…the Good itself they [the Egyptians] consider…" (X.7-8)

In a modern sense, Iamblichus' attempts here to "go native", are a form of cultural appropriation as he pretends to be something he is *emphatically not*: an Egyptian priest.

Before moving on to discuss the exchange between Iamblichus and Porphyry on the use of foreign language in ritual it will be helpful to address the recent analysis of Aaron Johnson. Johnson's examination of Porphyry asks scholars to reassess the claim that the philosopher was a staunch defender of Hellenism who traded his Phoenician origins for a Greek identity.[129] Johnson has posed

---

[124] Said (2003 21-23). See also Veale and her arguments on Iamblichus and Orientalism (2013, 208-211).
[125] This is especially in the last few books as Iamblichus attempts to integrate Platonic theology with Egyptian religion and mythology which will be discussed in more detail in section 2.8 For Assmann's discussion of Iamblichus and his relationship to Egypt see Assmann (2014, 17-20).
[126] Assmann (2014, 44).
[127] Veale (2013) & Schott (2009).
[128] Moyer (2011, 268); Schott (2009, 857).
[129] Johnson (2013, 243).

the question: "has Porphyry's ethnic and cultural affiliations thrown out the Phoenician baby with the Bidez's Orientalising bathwater?".[130] Johnson's main thesis is that Porphyry was not as Hellenised as originally thought by Classicists. Rather, Porphyry's statements on Greek theological wisdom should be interpreted as an overt attack on the superiority of Greek thought.[131] Moreover, Johnson also contends that Porphyry went to great lengths in his work to accurately depict the varied voices of barbarian nations (which Johnson calls "ethnic doxographies") into his philosophical arguments by quoting verbatim native sources.[132] For example, in Book 4 of the *On Abstience.* when describing the vegetarian practices of other nations Porphyry cites Chaeremon, the Egyptian priest, as his source.[133]

Johnson is right to suggests that Porphyry's attempt to include native voices in his works is an admiration of Egypt and not an Orientalist discourse. However, Porphyry's cataloguing of different cultures and their "arcane" wisdom in *On Abstinence* makes Porphyry an active participant in an Orientalist discourse. I turn to Said's description of what a nineteenth century Orientalist philology is:

> what was the philologist on the other hand if not…a harsh divider of men into superior and inferior races, a liberal critic whose work harboured the most esoteric notions of temporality, origins and development, relationship, and human worth?[134]

Is Porphyry not similar to the philologist as he divides superior and inferior cultural practices of purity and vegetarianism? In the case of *On Abstinence* I would argue that Porphyry may be admiring Egyptian practices but at the same time he is also situating himself as the expert of Egypt and consequently making the "barbarian" the passive object of scholarly analysis and academic production. Additionally, Porphyry, in his description of Egyptian priestly practices is also using popular notions and stereotypes of Egypt drawn from Chaeremon's description so that he can further his *own* argument and anchor his *own* claims of philosophical superiority and vegetarianism.

1.5 Thinking with the Egyptians: The Egyptian priests in the exchange between Porphyry and Iamblichus.

Iamblichus and Porphyry, like their predecessors, use Egypt and Egyptian priests as tools to *think with*, making Egypt an intellectual playground for the Neoplatonists. Using the theories of Pierre Bourdieu, Schott demonstrates that Porphyry and Iamblichus are competing agents who are fighting

---

130 Johnson (2013, 243).
131 Johnson (2013, 247-255 esp. 252f.) discusses key works by Porphyry, including *the Ep. Aneb, Phil. orac, Simulac*, and *On Abst*. These works, he argues, question Greek superiority and theological wisdom.
132 Johnson (2013, 270).
133 Porphyry also uses Dicaearchus the Peripatetic for the Greek practices and Josephus for the Jewish practices as well as Bardaisan the Bablyonian for Indian practices as he received his information directly from a group of Indian ambassadors. See Book 4 of *On Abst.* for the full catalogue of native sources.
134 Said (2003, 133-34).

for symbolic capital and power in the Late Roman Empire.[135] Schott rightly maintains that there are homologies (power structures) between the practices of empire and the practices of philosophy: "…these Greek philosophers mill the raw material of Egyptian tradition into usable philosophical products, much as the grain of Egypt was milled to feed Rome…".[136] The question then arises, is there a sense of cultural anxiety in Iamblichus and Porphyry's work, like we found in Plato and Plutarch? And is the level of Orientalism the same? Simply put, the answer is complicated.

Both Porphyry and Iamblichus admire the practices of the Egyptian priests, specifically their piety and religious practices of purity (e.g., abstinence, hygiene, diet etc.). This is clear from Porphyry's description of Egyptian priests in Book 4 of *On Abstinence* (explained further below) and in Iamblichus' *On the Mysteries.*[137] Unlike Plato and Plutarch, Porphyry and Iamblichus do not go to great lengths to prove that Greece is older, wiser and more superior. However, Porphyry does assert, like Plutarch, that the Egyptians have a "material" religion which is not based in rational thinking of the gods.[138] I would argue that the reason Porphyry and Iamblichus do not assert Greek superiority in their texts is because they were not Greeks but Hellenes. I also partially agree with Johnson that the adoption of the Greek language and training in Greek literature, even of the most rigorous quality, does not entail a corresponding adoption of fully fledged "self-ascribed Hellenicity", as Johnson terms it.[139] Although, I think it is still reasonable to suggest that Iamblichus and Porphyry viewed the world through their Hellenic/hellenophone lenses.[140]

Both Porphyry and Iamblichus were completely immersed in Hellenic culture: they spoke Greek, worshipped Greeks gods and from a young age studied Greek literature and philosophy.[141] The crucial point to focus on, rather than their Hellenism, is how Porphyry and Iamblichus exploit an *imagined* Egypt and Egyptian theological ideas to further their own claims about the superiority of the Neoplatonic philosophical and religious systems. Like Plato and Plutarch, Iamblichus and Porphyry utilise the figure of the Egyptian priest (either real or imagined, i.e, Chaeremon in Porphyry's work) as a mouthpiece to discuss and defend their own philosophical ideas and maintain

---

[135] Schott (2009, 858) is referring to Pierre Bourdieu's theories on individuals creating cultural products (art and literature) in his work *The Field of Cultural Production* (1993). In this work, Bourdieu elaborates a theory of the cultural field which situates art and literature within the social conditions of their production, circulation and consumption. Bourdieu examines the individuals and institutions involved in making cultural products what they are and analyses the structure of the cultural field itself as well as its position within the broader social structures of power. See Schott (2009, 858).

[136] Schott (2009, 859).

[137] Iambl. *De Myst.* 10.7-8; Porph. *On Abst* 4.6.1.

[138] "And, in short, the Egyptians resolve all things into physical, and nothing into incorporeal and living essences. Most of them likewise suspend that which is in our power from the motion of the stars; and bind all things, though I know not how, with the indissoluble bonds of necessity, which they call fate. They also connect fate with the Gods; whom, nevertheless, they worship in temples and statues, and other things, as the only dissolvers of fate". *Ep.Anebo.* 13.

[139] Johnson (2013, 232).

[140] "…those who know how to Hellenize not only in words, but in thought (*gnome*)…" Eusebius *Praep. Evang* 1.21; also see Johnson discussion (2013, 238-245) regarding Porphyry and Hellenism.

[141] Johnson's (2013, 224) makes the same comparisons with Philo of Alexandria and Maximus of Tyre

power over the divine. For instance, the exchange between Porphyry and Iamblichus on the use of the Egyptian language in ritual is helpful for this discussion.

Porphyry's *Letter* echoes Plutarch's interpretation that the Egyptians have ancient wisdom on matters pertaining to divinity but have interpreted it incorrectly as they lack Greek philosophical training and rational thought.[142] For Porphyry, "barbarian" languages and symbols within ritual were irrational and deceiving to the gods.[143] Like his teacher Plotinus and his attack on the Gnostic use of incantations, breathings and hissings, Porphyry also viewed foreign words and deities in rituals, such as the Egyptian language and Gods, as works of deception and magic.[144] Porphyry argues that these "symbols" (i.e., Egyptian hieroglyphics) were used to deliberately attempt to trick the gods and unsuspecting people.[145] In the *Letter*, Porphyry questions the use of hieroglyphics by theurgists: "For if he who hears them looks to their own signification, it is sufficient that the conception remains the same, what the word may be used for…".[146] Consequently, theurgists must then assume that certain gods would only understand Egyptians and believing otherwise is an act of deception.[147]

In his rebuttal, Iamblichus argued that the Hellenic desire to translate everything into Greek contributed to the decline of ancient theurgical languages such as Egyptian hieroglyphics, prompting the theurgists to take up its rebirth.[148] Iamblichus emphasised the importance of Egyptian hieroglyphs because they "possess weightiness and great precessions… and are the most ancient and sacred".[149] Moreover, Iamblichus also supported foreign symbols and names in theurgic ritual by arguing that their use in ritual has come down to the Greeks via Plato and Pythagoras, who derived their knowledge and training from Egyptian priests.[150] Yet, Iamblichus is using the figure of an Egyptian priest (Abamon) to expound this particular Platonic dialogue in order to rebut Porphyry. Moreover, Iamblichus is defending the use of Egyptian hieroglyphics as a Hellenised Platonist by relating Egyptian ideas to Platonic concepts to a largely Greek audience. Like his predecessors, Iamblichus is emphasising and connecting himself to the "sacred" and "mystical" wisdom of the

[142] Porph. *Ep.Anebo*; See also Assmann's discussion (2014, 17-21) of the exchange between Porphyry and Iamblichus on the use of foreign symbols in ritual.
[143] Porph. *Ep.Anebo,* 3.
[144] Plot. *Enn* 2.9.14. The Greeks were aware of the three scripts used by the Egyptians: hieroglyphic, Hieratic and Demotic. The Greeks interpreted the hieroglyphic script as a symbolic script independent of language but instead used to convey sounds and symbols for the function of esoteric wisdom and communication with the gods. See Assmann (2014b, 20-23). For the use of these scripts in everyday language and writing during the colonisation of Egypt see Bagnall (1993); (2011).
[145] Plot. *Enn* 5.8.6.
[146] Porph. *Ep.Anebo.*, 3-4.
[147] Porphyry's statements in the *Ep.Anebo.* regarding the use of Egyptian symbols in theurgic ritual is based on his reading of Aristotle's theory of language in *On Interpretation*. According to Aristotle, certain words signify the mental images we form in our minds of a perceived object (this is called "conventionalist" language). The conventionalist language approach involves the view that the relationship between the signifier and signified depends only on the agreement of a community of language users—in our case, the Egyptians and their use of hieroglyphics. In contrast, Iamblichus uses a "naturalist" theory of language based on Plato's *Cratylus*. In this naturalist theory, different languages use different combinations of sounds and are therefore better equipped to form their own ideal signifiers. See the work of Schott (2009, 856-858).
[148] Schott (2009, 857); Iambl. *De Myst.* 7.4-12.
[149] Iambl. *De An.* 7. 4-5.
[150] Veale (2013, 208) & Armstrong (1987, 180) & Clark *et al.* (2003, xxxii-xxxiii). Also see Iambl., *VP. 17.*

Egyptians, while simultaneously dominating the discourse on Egypt as a non-native. Iamblichus asserts his authority by reinforcing incorrect Egyptian stereotypes on a foreign culture in order to argue *against* Porphyry.[151] Essentially, Iamblichus' defence of the use of Egyptian symbols in theurgic ritual is not because he values the Egyptian language itself. Rather, the words and sounds that are used are being removed from their ethno-cultural contexts in order to be situated within the Greek and Hellene theurgists' incantations.[152] Iamblichus is therefore depending on an imagined Egypt and the stereotype of Egyptian priestly wisdom in order to defend the inclusion of foreign symbols in theurgy.[153]

As a result, the exchange between Porphyry's and Iamblichus' regarding the use of Egyptian symbols in theurgic ritual is working in an imagined Egyptian past that has no basis in the contemporary Egypt of Late Antiquity. In Late Antiquity, the majority of Egyptian priests were not writing their rituals in hieroglyphic as Iamblichus and Porphyry's discussion would suggest. Instead, the majority of Egyptian rituals were written in predominantly Greek, Demotic or Coptic, as the *PGM* demonstrates.[154] Thus, Anebo and Abamon are the Egyptian surrogates used to solve a problem regarding the use of Egyptian hieroglyphics and language in Neoplatonic theurgic ritual. Iamblichus only values the use of Egyptian hieroglyphics as "ancient phonemes" which are then removed from their ethno-cultural context and placed into the hands of the theurgists. Likewise, Porphyry's questions about Egyptian theology and language are posed in Greek to his "Egyptian" addressee who then responds back to him in Greek.[155] Both philosophers are using Greek philosophical reasoning, through two fictional Egyptian priests, to discuss the Egyptian language; Egypt is used as a tool to *think with* by these philosophers. Conclusively, Iamblichus and Porphyry in their pursuit of ritual knowledge are removing the Egyptian language from its native and historical context and silencing the voices of natives by using Egyptian proxies for the purpose of a Greek philosophical argument.

1.6 Conclusion

The evidence presented in this chapter demonstrates that Platonists, in their pursuit of knowledge and wisdom, were utilising Egypt for their own gain in order to promote the superiority of Greece's philosophical wisdom. These same Platonists would connect themselves to the stereotype of Egypt as a place of ancient wisdom but at the same time they would remove Egyptian voices from their

[151] Schott (2009, 858) labels this type of a discourse as a "mining of Egyptian materials".
[152] Schott (2009, 858).
[153] The idea that hieroglyphics were a symbolic and divine language was a misunderstanding by Greek and other Western writers which, for a long time, stood in the way of efforts to decipher them. Assmann (2014, 31) tells us that is largely because of the pictorial quality of hieroglyphs which the Greeks interpreted as representations of metaphorical and metaphysical ideas.
[154] For bi-lingualism in Egypt from the time of early Greek settlement see Thompson (2009, 396-417). See also the work of Clarysse (1993, 1-19) who has demonstrated how dominant the Greek language was amongst the scribes of Egypt from the time of the Ptolemies onward.
[155] Schott (2009, 858).

native and historical context. Plato's *Timaeus* and Plutarch's *On Isis and Osiris* turn out to be politically charged texts where Egypt, its religion, and the figure of the Egyptian priests, is simultaneously appropriated and admired. These philosophers are anxious to insist on the superiority of Greece's philosophy and religion as they try to come to terms with the long history and influence of Egypt. This is evident from the competitive spirit with which they tell the story of Greece's older origins in comparison to Egypt. It is significant that the story is told by the Egyptian priest to Solon in the *Timaeus.* Plutarch's insistence on the Greek origins of the Egyptian goddess Isis and her particular proclivity towards Greek philosophical knowledge and worship continues this tradition. The insistence on Greek superiority is more prevalent in Plato's and Plutarch's works, but is not as prominent in Iamblichus and Porphyry. To what extent this is because of their eastern origins is yet to be decided. However, both Iamblichus and Porphyry still utilise the figure of the Egyptian priests when approaching problems in Neoplatonic philosophy. This is clear from their discussion of Egyptian hieroglyphics where they utilised Egyptian surrogates for the purpose of a Greek philosophical argument.

Chapter Two

Traces of Egypt: Theological Similarities between the New Kingdom and the Neoplatonists

"There is one belief, one account, on which every nation agrees; that there is one God who is father and king of all and with him many other gods, his children, who share in his sovereign power."

Maximus of Tyre Late 2nd Century CE, *Orations* 11.5

2.1 Introduction

In Late Antiquity and throughout the history of Platonism we find descriptions of a deity who is described as a Supreme Being placed at the top of a hierarchy. However, this is not a type of monotheism but rather a henotheistic theological system.[156] Henotheistic theological systems occurred in the New Kingdom of Egypt, but from Plato through to Iamblichus we also find descriptions of a One God, a Supreme Being, who creates *ex deo* (out of himself) and manifested the cosmos while himself remaining engendered. Following on from Plato's *Timaeus*, Late Antique Neoplatonic philosophers Plotinus, Porphyry and Iamblichus continued to theorise about the universe and how it was created by a Supreme Deity; these Platonists adapted and innovated Plato's cosmogony. This Supreme Deity was self-begotten and alone but at the same time created other deities and the rest of the universe. Essentially, humans, *daimones*, angels and other lesser deities were just extensions and manifestations of this One God. Likewise, this belief persisted in the cosmogonies of Porphyry and Iamblichus who also argued that the world is full of gods, but *all* gods and *all* creation originated from *only* One God. This One God (*aka* Supreme Deity, Highest God, the God of All and the One), is the bringer of life. He is both everywhere and nowhere at the same time, a self-generating god and father to all other gods.

But where did this notion of One God come from? Was this a purely Graeco-Roman invention? Surprisingly, we find a similar description of this same God in the theology of Egyptian priests in the Leiden Hymns of the New Kingdom of Egypt (1107-1078/77 BCE) and the Hibis hymns (ca. 518 BCE). Assmann argues that the origin of the Greek formula *Hen kai pan* 'One and All', a reference to the Supreme Deity of pagan philosophy, may have its clearest origins in Ancient Egyptian Ramesside theology of the New Kingdom period.[157]

---

[156] For Egyptian conceptions of poly-mono-henotheism see Hornung (1987, 230); for Henotheistic worship during the Ramesside period see Assmann (2014, 12-13). The term Henotheism, according to Versnel (1990, 35-38), is a modern formation of the Greek acclamation εἷς *ὁ θεός* (one is [the] god).

[157] Assmann (2008, 69) & Assmann (2014, 18).

Assmann is not the first scholar to investigate the influence of Egyptian theology within the Neoplatonic theological system.[158]Algis Uždavinys also contends that later Neoplatonists could easily find Pythagorean and Platonic principles in the Egyptian theologies surrounding the One God: "these theologies operated within the same systems of religious and philosophical translatability in addition to the plausible premise that Platonism itself (in its rather concealed essential form) directly or indirectly derived from Egyptian lore".[159] Andrew Smith concludes that Platonist connections to, and mentions of, Egypt throughout the history of Platonism are too strong to ignore which requires a new research approach when analysing Egyptian influence in Platonism.[160] Neoplatonists saw the value in the old Egyptian theological system which included notions of transcendent reality and wisdom which could be incorporated into the grander schemes of pagan religious and philosophical unity. Klotz's article is the only scholarly work so far that provides a comprehensive textual comparison of Egyptian theology with Platonist thinkers, but it does not discuss in depth the details of the Neoplatonic system.[161] In the conclusion to his article on this topic, Klotz suggests that Neoplatonist scholars investigating the One God must have inquired about the Egyptian Creator Gods, the most prominent of which was Amun. Hence why this thesis examines the Leiden and Hibis hymns as Amun is the most prominent God in Egyptian theological systems and in the hymns of the Theban area.[162]

Building on the existing scholarship, this chapter has two aims: firstly, to find traces of Egyptian influence in the theological discourse of the Neoplatonists' One God as is suggested by Assmann. Secondly, to demonstrate, in more depth, that the two systems contain distinct similarities. However, this chapter does not argue that Egyptian and Neoplatonist theologies were identical. Nor do I argue that Neoplatonists, and Platonists more broadly, "stole" the Egyptian theological system. Rather, a textual analysis of specific Egyptian hymns next to Neoplatonic theology shows some distinct similarities and Egyptian influence. As this analysis is the first of its kind, there is no framework to build upon. Therefore, we will begin this chapter by discussing the connections between the Leiden and Hibis hymns and the type of theology they represent (2.2). Then, we shall examine the history and evolution of the One God in Platonist writings and Egypt more broadly (2.3- 2.4), and the final sections of this chapter will investigate the distinct similarities between the Neoplatonic ideas of the One God in connection with Egypt (2.5-2.8).

2.2 Amun in the Hymns & Egyptian Theology

[158] Assmann (2014, 18).
[159] Uždavinys (2008, 25).
[160] Smith (2013, 34-325) also states that Egypt was an important source of religious experience and knowledge for Platonists.
[161] Klotz's(2017) article provides a concise overview of this topic but is by no means a comprehensive analysis.
[162] Thebes and its priests were of particular interest to the Greeks, especially to Platonists. See Klotz (2012, 35-48) where he examines the reputation of Thebes amongst Greek authors.

The Egyptians had many overlapping creation cosmogonies between each major city, but their deities were often assimilated into one another.[163] This is demonstrated by the two manifestations of Amun: Amun of Karnak found in the Leiden Hymns and Amun of Hibis in the Hibis hymns.[164] Amun was always a complex and mysterious god, which the Egyptians stressed by calling him "asha renu" (many in names). He was also commonly referred to as "hidden, covered, remote" (*'ỉmn', 'hꜣp', 'štꜣ'*). Kurt Sethe in his analysis of Amun as "the Hidden One" observes that Amun's additional epithet, "hidden of name" "clarifies the transcendence of Amun as both a *deus invisibilis* (invisible god) and *deus ineffabilis* (ineffable god)".[165] Indeed, Amun's main characteristics in the Egyptians hymns emphasise that he is hidden, unique, holy, engendered and the sole creator of the universe.

We find these particular descriptions of Amun in the Leiden Hymns which appear on a papyrus dated to the fifty-second regnal year of Ramesses II (1227 BCE). However, Amun's reputation as an incomprehensible and indomitable god persisted well into the Persian domination of Egypt with the rule of Darius I (525 BCE). Darius I was known for his efforts to rebuild and invest in Egyptian Temples such as the Hibis Temple (c. 518BCE). The Hibis hymns to Amun in the temple are representative of the hymns of the older Ramesside Theban New Kingdom period as we find three distinct temple reliefs which are dedicated to Amun of Thebes, not Hibis.[166] The Hibis hymns (or the papyrus copies) were particularly popular and the characteristics of Amun often reappear verbatim throughout the Graeco-Roman temples, especially at Esna, Kom and Ombo.[167]

The composition of the Hibis hymns also points to significant cross-cultural exchanges between Greeks and Egyptians. The Hibis hymns predate the arrival of Herodotus by roughly a century followed by other notable Greek visitors such as Thales, Pythagoras and possibly Plato.[168] The Hibis Temple would have provided knowledge of both Theban and Hibis theology if a Greek scholar were curious about Amun. However, it would be near impossible for a non-native Egyptian who is not trained in hieroglyphicscript to comprehensively understand Egyptian cosmogony and theology from these temple reliefs alone nor would they have access to these temples unless they were clergy.

---

[163] This will be explained in more detail in section 2.3.

[164] Unfortunately, there is no evidence which can tell us when Amun and Re were joined to form Amun-Re. Hoffmeier (2105, 48) argues that the union of Amun and Re may have been a way of revitalising the god Re to accommodate the new upstart Amun and the rise of Thebes as a place of political and religious importance during the New Kingdom. Amun-Re, according to Otto (1968, 80) may possibly mean "Amun who is in Re". Amun was also once a part of the Hermopolitan Ogdoad. In the Hermopolitan creation myth there were eight gods, four females and four males, who, when together, created the sun god from the primeval waters and fiery mound. The eight gods of the Hermopolitan myth are Nun and Naunet who represent chaos; Heh and Hauhet who represent infinity; Kek and Kauket which represent darkness and finally there is Amen (Amun) and Amaunent (the female form of Amun) who represent the eternal mound which is described as a "Mound of Flame" or "Isle of Fire" because it suddenly arises from dark waters or from the slime (black silt). From this black silt and from the blue lotus flower emerges the sun god who was created by the Ogdoad. The various creation myths of Egypt are summarised in Gahlin (2007, 296-309).

[165] See the discussion in Klotz (2006, 17-18) & Sethe (1929).

[166] For major studies of New Kingdom Amun-Re theology see Assmann (1969); (1979); (1995); (2001); Zandee (1948); There are helpful reviews of Zandee's work on the Leiden hymns by Allen (1997) & Murnane (1997). This thesis also heavily relies on the introduction of Klotz' (2006) translation of the Hibis hymns.

[167] Klotz (2006, 2).

[168] Klotz (2015, 2) and esp. (9-10) regarding Herodotus' description of Amun of Hibis and Amun of Karnak.

Therefore, our Graeco-Roman philosophers would have needed to speak with an actual Egyptian priest if they wanted a proper exegesis of Egyptian Amun theology as it is represented in both the Leiden and Hibis hymns.[169] Additionally, the survival of these hymns in papyrus form also suggests that these texts were quite popular and possibly widely circulated.[170]

The fact that many images, concepts and ideas regarding Amun reappear in Apocalyptic, Gnostic, Hermetic, Orphic, magical texts – in addition to the philosophies of Plato, Iamblichus, Porphyry, Plutarch and Plotinus – suggests that serious scholarly attention must be paid to the Egyptian influence in these texts which originate in the Leiden and Hibis hymns. Thus, an analysis of the Hibis hymns is necessary as it is likely that Greeks would have encountered both Amun of Karnak *and* Amun of Hibis. Essentially, the Hibis hymns bridge the gap between the theological knowledge of the New Kingdom Theban theology and the Graeco-Roman period.[171] This chapter focuses on these two Egyptian manifestations of Amun: Amun-Re Karnak found in the Leiden Hymns (1198-1166 BCE) and the Ramesside texts from New Kingdom Thebes and Amun-Re of Hibis who is found in the Hibis hymns (c. 518 BCE).[172]

In regards to the type of theology the Egyptian hymns represented both the Leiden and Hibis hymns would classify as an explicit and implicit theology. Explicit theology, as defined by Assmann, is a discourse about god and the gods which is mostly textual and can be independent of any cultic action. Essentially, explicit theology is how one *thinks* about the gods, or God in the singular. Egyptian theology, both explicit and implicit, and particularly from the New Kingdom onwards, can be characterised as a cosmogonic henotheism where the texts insist on the divine origin of the world and the "oneness" of its origins. On the other hand, implicit theology refers to theological concepts about the divine that presuppose cultic action.[173] Egyptian cosmogonic henotheism, both explicit and implicit, tells us that the world has originated from One God by a process of both emanation and creation which are complementary ways of emergence. Overall, the One God is the *only* god that has a real importance as a creator: everything else (including the other gods) depends on him. Creatorship (everything coming from One God) is the legitimising basis of sovereignty and creation and this generates a dependence of power on one divine entity. Essentially, both explicit and implicit

[169] Klotz (2006, 2) & Klotz (2017, 142-143); after an analysis of elements of Theban theology in Plutarch, Porphyry, Philo of Alexandria and Iamblichus, Klotz concludes that it is likely communication may have occurred between these men and Egyptian priests considering the Greeks' remarkable understanding of Egyptian solar theology which corresponded directly with contemporaneous Theban priests.
[170] Klotz (2006, 3).
[171] See introduction of this thesis (p. 9) regarding the usage of the Hibis hymns.
[172] Where applicable I will state which Amun I am referring too, such as Amun of Karnak and Amun of Hibis.
[173] Assmann (2008, 10): "there is no practice without theory and implicit theology is the theory implied in cultic practice".

theology, as we find in the Leiden and Hibis hymns, is completely free from traditional cultic action and created in a context of its own.[174]

The primacy of Amun in the Leiden and Hibis hymns, much like the Neoplatonic One God, lies in the fact that he himself was not created. Rather, His ability to engender Himself also enables him to generate creation out of himself. These characteristics suggest that the One God of Egypt had complete sovereignty over all other gods on account of his natural power of creation. Like Egyptian cosmogonic henotheism, the discourse about God in Neoplatonism can also be classed as both implicit and explicit theology. Many of the Neoplatonic texts, like the Egyptian hymns, centre around the nature of the One God and His place in the Triad of One-Being-Intellect. I would further argue that the Egyptian and Neoplatonic cosmogonic systems share a distinct textual tradition (i.e, religious texts that discuss God in the singular). The implication of this is that there appears to be a universalist notion of God between the two systems. The tradition begins in the New Kingdom with the Egyptians and continues into Late Antiquity in the cosmogonies of the Neoplatonists.[175] Interestingly, we find very similar universalist notions and characteristics of God described in Platonic sources:

> (1) In Plotinus' cultic description of the One God whose ability to manifest creation out of himself is comparable to Leiden Hymns LXXX and C which are devoted to Amun of Karnak as well as the Creator Hymn in the Hibis Hymn to Amun of Hibis.
>
> (2) In Porphyry's *Sentences* 31 and 12 where he speaks of the connection (*skhésis*) between Intellect and Being has similarities to the Ramesside 'Millions and Millions' formula and the Egyptian concept of (*bꜣ*=Ba) (roughly translated as part of the soul), also found in the Hymn to the Ba's of Amun.
>
> (3) Lastly, Iamblichus' *On the Mysteries.* uses the Egyptian theological explanation of the One God, specifically referring to Amun, and his various abilities in order to explain the Neoplatonic system and prove to Porphyry that the two systems have similarities.

Consequently, these three parallels seem to indicate that the two systems (Egyptian and Neoplatonic) share theological ideas, but are expressed in different languages and through different texts with distinct aims and purposes.

---

[174] Both Assmann (2008, 10-12) and Uždavinys (2008, 19) argue that Egyptian wisdom literature is a precursor to moral philosophy and generally speaks of "God" instead of specific gods. Yet, not in the monotheistic sense, but rather as henotheistic system where both the polytheism of cult coexists and compliments the idea of a Supreme Deity, a One God.
[175] Assmann (2008, 69).

2.3 The Evolution of the One God

In almost every cosmogony of Ancient Egypt we have evidence of a Creator God, a Supreme Deity, who emerged from a primeval dark chaos to create the world. In the case of the Heliopolitan myth it is through procreation that the One God creates the universe. Central to the Heliopolis myth is the idea of *ḫrp* (arise from/become) and alternatively *ḫprw* (embodiment/emanation)[176] where the lesser deities are extensions of Atum the Sun God. In the Memphis tradition the One God created the cosmos through his "heart and tongue" and all other humans, species, and deities within it.[177] Lastly, we have the Supreme Deity Amun of Thebes and Amun of Hibis who "made himself into millions" and from him emerged the universe and all other deities.[178] When examining the Egyptian cosmogonic systems, as with other religious systems, we must consider that these theologies and cosmogonies were not static. However, they were a result of a steady and continuous process of development extending from the earliest times of Egypt through to Late Antiquity. Politics, wars, social and cultural change can often alter the religious landscape. For instance, the idea of a centralised One God, like Amun, to which all others are subjugated, became more dominant in the New Kingdom of Egypt with the political importance of Thebes; but it was the violent monotheistic revolution of Akhenaten (1351-1334 BCE) which enabled the primacy of the One God.

Akhenaten's monotheistic revolution provided the theological grounds for the complete centralisation of this unique, self-created One God as we see in the Leiden and Hibis hymns. Akhenaten decreed that no other god, not even Amun or Re may be worshipped, and only the cult of Aten, the Sun God, was permitted. This type of universal solar monotheism oversaw the complete destruction of the Egyptian pantheon. In keeping with tradition, and understanding the political importance of Thebes, Akhenaten kept Thebes as the religious capital of Egypt and built a temple for Aten to rival that of Amun's at Karnak.[179] Even so, the worship of Aten by Akhenaten was not a sudden innovation. Rather, remnants of the One God who is associated with limitless power, creation and natural phenomena is found in the stela of the architect brothers Suti and Hor from the reign of Amenhotep III (1391-1351 BCE).[180] In this stela, the major themes of One God theology are represented: the sun, its light and its movement that are all generated by a self-created God who manifest himself and all creation:

Self-made you fashioned your body,

[176] Assmann (1995, 156).
[177] Kákosy (1980, 53).
[178] *STG* Text No. 148; *STG* Text no.43; *ÄHG* no.131,7. See also the selected Ramesside New Kingdom texts from the New Kingdom through to the late period that have been translated by Assmann (1995, 150) in Appendix D.3-5. The original sources which Assmann consults can be found in the same publication in footnotes 89-104.
[179] Despite the efforts to strip Akhenaten from the historical records there are still remnants of the temples to Aten, see Hoffmeier (2015, 94). Thebes during the first half of the Eighteenth Dynasty functioned as the undisputed centre of religion and power. See Morenz & Popko (2010).
[180] This was the father of Akhenaten.

Creator uncreated.

Sole one, unique one, who traverses eternity.

Remote one, with millions under his care.[181]

As stated above, theologies and cosmogonies, especially in the Egyptian tradition, are never static but always evolving. Therefore, the foundations for henotheism and One God theology were already laid and slowly evolving but the monotheistic revolution of Akhenaten's reign helped to establish the dominance of the One God Amun in the Egyptian system.[182]

After his death, Akhenaten's cult faded and his name, and that of his Sun God Aten, was struck from the historical record. This left the Egyptian theologians to deal with a deep cognitive crisis of the Gods as they merged the characteristics of Aten with Amun. This crisis resulted in what Assmann argues was a "radical de-temporisation of the relationship between god and the world".[183] The people of Egypt now turned back to their previous patron deity Amun of Thebes.[184] Assmann's preliminary summary of how theologians dealt with this change and the re-introduction of Amun-Re theology into the Egyptian system is summed up in the following points:

1. The emphasis on the oneness and hiddenness of the God;
2. The predication of the God as in a connection with the concept of hiddenness;
3. The formula of the "one who makes himself into millions" with all its variants;
4. The concept of the god dwelling in the world as "Ba", image and body who has created the world as earth, heaven and underworld for these three constituent elements of his self;
5. The theory of the "life-giving" elements i.e. the concept that god sustains and gives life to the world not only by, but also as, light, air and water
6. The idea of all-pervasiveness in the form of air. As is expressed in the formula *(Jmn) mnw m jht nbt* (Amun enduring in all things);
7. The role of this god as god of time and fate in connection with his personal aspect as "ethical authority". [185]

What emerges from Assmann's analysis is the overarching concept of the Oneness of God and the henotheism which occurs where multiplicity of other deities is not denied but they owe their creation to the One God. This next section will examine how certain characteristics of the One God Amun is found in the Leiden and Hibis hymns and continued in the One God philosophy of Neoplatonism and Platonism more broadly.

---

[181] The Suti & Hor: *Hymn to the Sun God*, first Hymn Stela, British Museum, 826 in Lichtheim (1975, 87).
[182] Assmann (2014, 66).
[183] Ibid.
[184] For the origins of Amun-Re and the merging of the two deities from the 18th dynasty onwards, Hoffmeier (2015, 47-61) provides a detailed background of his evolution.
[185] Assmann (1995, 133) and Dungen (2016): http://www.sofiatopia.org/maat/amun.htm

2.4 Comparing Cosmogonies: Egyptians and Neoplatonist

In the Leiden Hymns and the Hibis hymns there are five key descriptions of the One God which appears to have parallels with Egyptian One God theology of the Ramesside period and Platonic theology:

1. The Father and Creator (ποιητὴν καὶ πάτερα) of the cosmos is described as a craftsman of the universe and from him other gods and creatures both immaterial and material emerged.[186]
2. This Father and Creator of the universe emerged out of a "simple" primeval time.[187]
3. He is self-engendered.[188]
4. He is called the First God or the One.[189]
5. He is described as hidden and secret.[190]

On the basis of these similarities, it can be plausibly argued that Egyptian One God theology influenced Platonist conceptions concerning the First Creator. In Plato's *Timaeus* the Creator and Father (ποιητὴν καὶ πάτερα) is the creator of the universe and all other subsequent things, much like Amun.[191] The origin and purpose of the ποιητὴν καὶ πάτερα stays relatively the same in Plutarch, Apuleius and Maximus and echoes that of Plato's *Timaeus*. For example, Plato describes the Creator God as being able to "fashion the form and nature of his work" from himself into something that is fair and perfect.[192] Moreover, Plato also proposes that nothing can be created unless it is first created by something else, that is, the Creator God.[193] However, this Creator god is hidden and incomprehensible to humans. [194] These same concepts persist in Plutarch's *Platonic Questions*, Maximus' *Orations* and Apuleius' *Apology*. In these Middle Platonic texts, the One God continues to be described as a Father and Creator, who mixed his seed with nature, is the cause of all things, and who is also hidden and remote.[195] Apuleius affirms this view in *Apology*: "tongues cannot speak of him and eyes cannot see him".[196] Consequently, what is repeated throughout the texts is the notion

---

[186] Pl., *Ti.* 28a-b; 28c (Appendix A.2a-c); Plut, *Quaest. Plat.,* 1001b (Appendix A.3a); Apul. *On Pl.* 1.5.190; *De deo Soc.* 3.124; *Apol.* 64 (Appendix A.4a-c); Max, *Or.* 2; 11.5 (Appendix A.5a); Alcinous 9.163, 13-14; 15.171, 21, 14.169, 35-41 (Appendix A.6a-d); Numen. frag. 12-14 (Appendix A.7a-b); Porph. *Abst.* 1.57.3. 2.36.3; 2.37.3; 2.46.1; 2.49.1 (also see passages in Appendix A.9a-i); Iambl. *De Myst.* 7.2; 7.3 (Appendix A.10-a).

[187] Plut, *De E apud.* 393a-b; Iambl. *De Myst.* 7.2; Porphyry, *Sentq.* 12 (Appendix A.9a).

[188] Plot, *Enn.* 5.9.5 (Appendix A.8h) Pl., *Ti.*42e. Plut, *Quaest. Plat.,* 1001b; Apul. *Apolg*. 64; Iambl. *De Myst.* 7.2; 7.3. Plotinus does not use the phrase "Maker and Father" in the Enneads. See Vorwerk (2010).

[189] Plot, *Enn*, 5.4 (Appendix A.8c).

[190] Max, *Or.* 2; Numenius, *frag.* 12-14; 1-3. Pl., *Ti.*28c; Porph. *Abst.* 2.34.2; Iambl. *De Myst.* 7.4.

[191] How much of Plato's cosmogony was influenced by Pythagoras cannot be fully established. The Pythagorean One God is most likely responsible for the creation of time and is identified as the creator of the Cosmos. See Appendix A.1a. Bernabé & Mendoza (2013) have also noted some similarities between Pythagorean Cosmogony and Vedic Cosmogony.

[192] Pl. *Ti.* 29a-b.

[193] Pl. *Ti.*28 a-b.

[194] Pl. *Ti.* 28c.

[195] Plut *Quaest. Plat.,* 1001b; Maximus, *Or* 2; Apul. *Apol*. 64.

[196] Apul. *Apol.* 64.

of a One God as a producer and builder of life, a craftsman of creation, who does not procreate but manifests creation through his power. But most importantly, these concepts are, as we have just seen, found in Egyptian One God theology.

In Leiden Hymns C and XL, we are introduced to a God who is described as "master craftsman" that "mingled his god-seed with the inmost parts of His being" who then "fashioned himself to perfection'" in the intricate ways of the craftsman.[197] In these two hymns, the Egyptian Creator God, Amun of Karnak, bears a similarity to the Creator God of Platonism as illustrated above. When examined in this context, the Middle Platonic notions of the One God contain Egyptian influence and distinct similarities. That is, in both theologies, as described in Plutarch's *Platonic Questions*, Maximus' *Orations* and Apuleius' *Apologia*, we find a Supreme God who is described as a craftsman, who is self-engendered and appears to "mix" (κράσις) his divinity in order to create himself and other divinities.[198] Moreover, in both theologies, this One God is described as a King and a perfect being. Finally, these themes of creation through manifestation, i.e., the One God being able to "unfurl" the cosmos through his own divinity (*ex deo*), are also emphasised in later Neoplatonic theology. Strikingly, Porphyry, Plotinus and Iamblichus, like their Egyptian predecessors, focused on the creation of the universe by One God through his mixing of his own divinity.

So, we should now turn to an examination of the similarities between Plotinus' and Porphyry's doctrine of One (or Supreme Being, Intellect and Soul) with Egyptian Amun theology in the Leiden and Hibis hymns. Over the course of the next four sections of this chapter (sections 2.5-2.8), I will offer, for the first time, a detailed comparative analysis of the themes of creation and manifestation, the connection between the Soul of the One God and creation, the similarities of the One and All concept in both the Egyptian and Neoplatonic theologies and cosmogonies. The chapter will then end with an analysis of Egyptian theology in Neoplatonic language. This will assist in furthering the observations we have made so far regarding the connections between Egyptian theological ideas and late Platonist perspectives on cosmogony and theology.

2.5 Creation and Manifestation: New Sources Analysed

Plotinus' theology of the One God in the *Enneads* is formulated of three hypostases that came from the One, i.e., the Supreme Being: Being, Intellect and then Soul.[199] For example, we can find a distinct similarity to Egyptian theology in Plotinus' cultic description of the One God of Neoplatonism in *Enneads*. The One of Plotinus is described as utterly transcendent, ineffable, the source of all creation,

---

[197] Leiden Hymn XL & C; see Appendix B2 & B4.
[198] There is yet to be detailed scholarship on henotheism in Apuleius and Maximus, but analysis on Plutarch is found in Brenk (2012) & Lanzillotta (2012).
[199] Plot. *Enn.* 5 see Appendix A.8e. For creation cosmogony in Plotinus see Noble & Powers (2015).

engendered, lives in a primeval existence and is at the top of the hierarchy of the universe.[200] In the *Enneads*, Plotinus uses a cultic description when explaining how the One God of Neoplatonism is the creator of all other deities and through His power manifests their creation and the creation of the universe. The main theme in Plotinus' description of the One God is that other deities are just *expressions* of the One, much like in earlier Platonic cosmogony. In Plotinus theology of the One, the entire cosmos is ordered and sustained by the different intensities and expressions of the One God's manifestation.[201] Zeus and Kronos (Intellect and Soul) are not the offspring of Ouranos (the One) but are expressions (replicas) of his divine power.[202] Interestingly, the cultic description in Plotinus bears some similarities to how the One God of Egypt is described in the Great Amun Hymn and in the Leiden Hymns.[203]

The Hibis Hymn to Amun expresses that Re and Ptah are just expressions (or manifestations) of Amun.[204] Likewise, the Ouranos of Plotinus is comparable to the transcendent Amun and his limitless power. While Kronos is the manifestation of creation just as the God Re had emerged from Amun and finally Ptah is the "body" of Amun and so is Zeus (the demiurge) who owes his creation to his "father's father". In other words, Amun, Re and Ptah are transcended by "He who hides"; Re is the cosmic manifestation of the Supreme creator while Ptah is the body or image that represents the cult and Amun is the hidden force behind all.[205] These similarities indicate that both Plotinus and the Hibis Hymn to Amun share a distinct likeness in specific terms and epithets and in their metaphors of creation of the One God. In particular, both the Egyptians and the Neoplatonists are expounding a theology of manifestation in which all things are created as a result of the transcendent power of the One God who sits at the top of a hierarchical structure.

Before Plotinus uses this cultic description of the One God in the *Enneads,* he first explains how this One God can create without procreation. In the *Enneads* Plotinus states that the One God gives what it does not possess, and it is the most powerful of beings because it appeared first in the cosmos.[206] Comparatively, in Leiden Hymn LXXX we find a similar notion: "The Eight Great Gods were your first incarnation to bring to perfection this cosmos". However, this hymn is expressed in religious rather than metaphysical terms. Nevertheless, in the *Enneads* and Leiden Hymn LXXX, both texts express the idea that anything else generated from the One is not a direct imitation or diminished part of the One, but a full manifestation in different levels of reality.[207] For example, in Leiden Hymn LXXX Amun

---

[200] O'Meara (1995, 54).
[201] Shaw (2013, 285).
[202] Plotinus' use of cultic references in the *Enneads* is minimal and he tends to favour metaphysical over religious language.
[203] Appendix C.2.
[204] Appendix C.2: "… these (both) mean: your form in the initial moment, when you arose as Amun-Re-Ptah…"
[205] Assmann (2001, 13).
[206] Appendix A.8: passages a, b, c, d and j.
[207] Plot. *Enn.* 5.2.1.3-8 and 7.8.14-31-2. See Appendix B3 Leiden LXXX.

"unfolds the cosmos" but before Him there was nothing and the world lived *within* Him.[208] Through his unique power Amun had begun this act of creation and was then able create other deities after withdrawing to a remote heaven. Likewise, Plotinus tells us that the Supreme Being because of his perfect power *is not being* but the generator *of being* and when he pours forth, he is able to live and give life simultaneously.[209] As a result, the suggestions of both texts is that Amun of Egypt and the One God of Plotinus are "pouring out" their being in order to manifest creation. Plotinus describes this as the One "pouring out great power" whereas Leiden Hymn LXXX describes the event as an "unfolding of the cosmos … where world without end was in you and from you". To conclude, when examined in this context, an argument can be made that there are strong Egyptian antecedents in the work of Plotinus.

Moving on, in both the Egyptian and Neoplatonic systems, each deity is created from the One God and receives its gift from the One God. Plotinus explains this concept at *Enneads* 7 where he argues that the One is the cause of creation in two ways: as the casual origin of reality and as the universal object of desire, that is, as efficient cause and as final cause: "the source therefore of being and the why of being, giving both at once".[210] We find a similar concept of One God and all other deities as manifestations of Him in Leiden Hymn LXXX and CCC.[211] In both of these hymns, all other gods are expressed as names, manifestations, symbols and limbs of the Creator God, Amun. This is demonstrated by the repeated phrase: "God is three of all gods, Amun, Re, Ptah" which also appears in the Great Amun Hymn after the initial act of creation.[212] Like Plotinus' One God, Amun is not a god who creates in the biological sense but one who manifests creation through his person and powers.[213] Both express the notion that the One God came before all else, and that through its perfection it was able to create the universe and all other gods. This One God in both theologies *always* comes first in the hierarchical structure as was explained in Plotinus' cultic description. All other gods are just extensions and manifestations of the One God and through his being he unfolds the universe (*ex deo*).[214] An analysis of both texts therefore reveal that the One God of the Leiden and Hibis hymns and the One God of Plotinus appear to be all-encompassing, all-absorbing and omnipotent in relation to the other gods.[215]

---

[208] Appendix B3.
[209] Plot. *Enn.* 5.2.1.3-8; 5.2.1-14-18; 5.4.1 25-30. O'Meara (1995, 64-65) also outlines some of the problems of Plotinus' account of the One in *Enn* 5.
[210] Plot. *Enn.* 7.8.14.31-2.
[211] See Appendix B3 LXXX; Appendix B7 CCC.
[212] See n.190 above.
[213] Shaw (2015, 285) believes that Plotinus' solution to the Platonic problem of how the One can become many is Plotinus' assertion that the One "gives what it does not have", see Plot. *Enn.* 5.3.15.
[214] Assmann (2005a, 191) explains that Naming, in the Egyptian tradition, was a way of expressing power over something (human, divinity etc).
[215] Syncretism or assimilation of the One God with other gods appears to be a common feature of both Egyptian and Neoplatonic theology. See Assmann (2014a, 65) & Hornung (1982, 91).

Like his teacher Plotinus, Porphyry stayed close to the same ideas regarding the One God. And like his teacher, Porphyry retains traces of Egyptian theological concepts of the One God in his *Sentences*. In particular, the Egyptian concept of Ba (soul) which corresponds to the Neoplatonic idea of the One God's soul connecting with Intellect in order to manifest creation. These ideas are found in Porphyry's *Sentences* 12 and 31 as well as the *Commentary on Parmenides*, as we will see in the next section.[216] There we will examine the traces of Egyptian thought in Porphyry's philosophical texts, with a focus on the Hibis hymns of the Ten Ba's and the Ramesside One and All formula which, like Porphyry's conception of the Neoplatonic One God, expresses the idea of Amun uniting with other deities in order to manifest himself as well as creation.

2.6 Creation and the One God

In the Hymn to the Ba*'s* of Amun, we can observe how the Ba (*roughly* translated as soul) of the One God is described as having the ability to manifest creation *through* his Ba. Siegfried Morenz argues that the concept of Ba is a sort of vitality (divine substance) which has the ability to either give life to inanimate material or to give life to earthly creatures such as animals and humans.[217] However, Assmann contends that the situation is more complicated. According to Assmann, the Ba of the One God is also like an animating principle and that the One God not only has a Ba but is also the Ba of others the implication being that God, a life source, which is *within* us.[218] This is similar to how the concept of the One God in Neoplatonism who also has life giving properties within Him. This is further supported by the study of Louis Žabkar on the origins of the Egyptian concept of Ba in the *Pyramid Texts.* Žabkar demonstrates that the Ba that a god possesses is the manifestation of his power and when a god is the Ba of another god or being the Ba signifies a being who is the manifestation of that power of another being (such as Amun becoming Re).[219] The Ba of the One God allows Him to relate to both the individual body of humans and animals by imparting life (soul) onto them because it is the One God who is the origin of all creation. Essentially, his Ba is incorporated into the world like the human Ba is in a human body.[220] Assmann states that "God is the soul of the world and the world is the body of God. As the Ba, the soul animating the world, God is nameless he is a *deus absconditus* (hidden god)."[221] This particular notion appears in the Cult of the Ten-Ba's

[216] I am aware of the longstanding debate beginning with Pierre Hadot (1968) on authorship of this work and I agree with the analysis of Dillon & Gerson (2004, 205) that this is the work of Porphyry.
[217] Morenz (2004, 158).
[218] Assmann (2014a- 15-18); See also the conclusion of Žabkar (1970, 160) on the concept of the Ba from the Old Kingdom through to the end of the Amarna period.
[219] Žabkar (1970, 160) also states that, "The Egyptians conceived of the Ba both as an entity which a being is or becomes and as a quality or an entity which a being possesses. We cannot say whether one idea developed out of or subsequent to the other. When first met with, in the *Pyramid Texts*, the two ideas occur even in the same context, without evidence of a developmental link".
[220] Assmann (2014a, 16).
[221] Ibid.

which is found partially in the Hymn to the Ba's of Amun.[222] In this hymn, the Egyptian theologians use vivid imagery to demonstrate how it is the soul of Amun, his Ba and his power as a One God, that enables creation and thus brings life to the cosmos and to humans, animals and divinity. Remarkably, the Egyptian theology of the Ba bears a striking resemblance to the One God in Porphyry's *Sentences* and the *Commentary on Parmenides.*

Porphyry argues in both the *Sentences* and *Commentary on Parmenides* that there is life or a type of soul in the case of the Beyond, i.e., the Neoplatonic One God. [223]As a result, Porphyry indicates to us that the power of the soul of the One God is what allows Him to create humans and deities. As explained above, the Egyptians also used the concept of Ba (soul) to explain how the One God has the power of creation through its unique soul. This is prominent in the Second Ba and Third Ba of Amun of Hibis.[224] The Egyptian texts describe the power of Amun of Hibis, especially his soul, as having the ability to unite with all beings and give them life; a power that only Amun and his Ba have the capability to do. Similarly, Porphyry expresses the same notion that it is the One who is sharing its divinity (its soul) with Intellect and Soul in order to create both other deities and the universe. This is found in *Sentences* 12: "yet in the case of the Beyond [=the One] that too, after all has life, even if none of the things which come after it possess a life which is comparable to it".[225] Additionally, in Porphyry's theology in the *Commentary on Parmenides* Fr. 5 the One (or Intellect which represents the second hypothesis of Porphyry's Triad), both *is* and *is not* the same as the "pure" One, but is also connected to the One by uniting with it.[226] Both systems, such as we find in Porphyry and the Ba's of Amun, are therefore expressing a similar concept of the One God. Although, in trying to keep with the Plotinian structure of the One God (One-Intellect-Soul) Porphyry had to introduce some sort of formalisation to Plotinus' somewhat confusing and contradictory theology.[227]

John Dillon argues that this formulisation can be found in Porphyry's idea of a *skhesis* (connection), a connection which explains how the One and Being unite.[228] One way in which Porphyry formulated this connection between the One and Being was by introducing elements of the Chaldean Triad which is known for its Egyptian influence.[229] As a result, the One and Being in Porphyry's theology are not

[222] The cult of the Ten-Ba's is divided into two groups of five: the first five are the gods, the sun and the moon, Shu, Osiris, and Teftnut. The second set of five represents the living creatures of the world: humans, animals, scar beetles, snakes and the dead. The reason for the separation is that this theology distinguishes between cosmic and animal life. The first five Ba represent the primordial light where the creation of light (the sun) comes first along with water, time, and air. However, the second set of five Ba's is how the gods use their mediating powers to animate and sustain the world. Only three of the ten Ba's are preserved in the Hymn to the Ba's of Amun (see Appendix C1). See also Assmann (1992, 69); Klotz (2006, 15).
[223] Porph. *Sent.* 10. See also Dillon's (2010,29-30) analysis of this passage.
[224] Appendix C.1, the Ba's are marked in the appendix.
[225] Porph. *Sent.* 12.
[226] Transl. Dillon (2007, 55).
[227] O'Meara (1995, 65).
[228] Dillon (2007, 55).
[229] Both O'Neil (2016, 5) and Dillon (2007, 59) argue that Porphyry's conception of the One, while being firmly Plotinian in most respects, also contains Chaldean theology of Father, Potency (Life) Intellect. See also Edward (1990, 22) on Porphyry's perception of the Chaldean Oracles.

essentially different but *conceptually* different to that of Plotinus' One.[230] In Chaldean theology, Pure Being is joined with Oneness in much the same way that Amun is joined with Re through his Ba.[231] Furthermore, the soul of the One God, in Chaldean theology is also regarded as something indefinite. We see this notion expressed in Porphyry's *Commentary on the Parmenides* Fr. 9, where he states that:

> …the power too according to which that intellect sees, that is unable to enter itself must be other, differing from the thought process that distinguishes thinking and the intelligible and being beyond those in seniority and power.[232]

Thus, according to both Porphyrian and Chaldean principles, only after joining with the One, can something become potency (a life force) through the power of the soul of the One. In Egyptian theology, this is how Amun in the Second and Third Ba's uses his soul to manifest Re into being, who then, like Porphyry's One God, has the ability to give life to other beings due to his unique power.[233] Therefore, the Ba concept of the Egyptians as is represented in the Hymn to the Ba's of Amun and the *skhesis* of Porphyry in *Sentences* are fundamentally the same theological concepts, but expressed in different languages. The concept of Ba is expressed in a religious language that is typical of Egyptian theology, while the *skhesis* of Porphyry is expressed in a philosophical and metaphysical language, which is in alignment with Neoplatonic teachings.

The One in Porphyry's theology was, like Plotinus', an exclusive and ineffable Supreme Being.[234] Yet, Porphyry's One also shared its divinity with Intellect and Soul, and we see this most clearly in the *Sentences*. Moreover, like his teacher Plotinus, Porphyry conceived that all things (gods, humans and species) ultimately had their source from the One, a notion also found in the Egyptian Amun-Re theology.[235] For example, in *Sentences* 43 Porphyry argues that "Intellect is not the first principal of all things; for Intellect is many and prior to the many there must be the One", a Platonic preference for one and unity over many and diversity.[236] This notion is also present in Leiden Hymns XL, LXXX and C and in the Great Amun Hymn of Hibis where we also see the description of the One God as "mixing" or "sowing" his divinity in order to manifest creation *out of himself.*[237] In order for both Amun of Karnak and Amun of Hibis to create and bestow life, he uses his Soul, his Ba*,* in much the same way as the One God unites with Intellect using his soul and his unique power of creation. However, some scholars have noted how Porphyry's conception of the One God uniting with Intellect

---

[230] Appendix A.9a-i. see also O'Neil (2016) on Porphyry's reaction to the Plotinus' One God.
[231] For Chaldean cosmogony and the First Principles see Majerick (1989, 5-8).
[232] See Dillon transl. and commentary (2004, 211) the rest of the passage can be found in Appendix A.9f.
[233] Dillon (2016) referring to Chaldean Fr. 3 and Fr. 7.
[234] Porphyry also followed Plotinus' basic schema of One-Intellect-Soul, but made slight changes with regard to the creation of the universe from the One and the Demiurge. See Johnson (2013, 66).
[235] Dillon (2007, 58).
[236] Appendix A.9g.
[237] Appendix B2 B3; B4; Appendix C.2.

and Being is different from Plotinus' idea of the One which does not necessarily give what it possesses, (i.e its power of creation).[238] Porphyry therefore diverges from his teacher (and Middle Platonist views) in his assertion that life can give what it possesses, even in the case of the beyond where the One presides. The problem of how Being came into existence from the One which is *beyond* Being was a fundamental problem for all Platonists beginning with Plato in his discussion of the One (the Good) in the *Republic*.[239] Nevertheless, the core concept of Porphyry's ideas of the One God is how He creates life through uniting its soul with another being which is relatively the same in the Egyptian Amun-Re theology. Both texts emphasise that it is the One God who is at the top of the hierarchy and it is only through his power that creation was enabled.

There is another text of Porphyry's that bears a similarity to the Egyptian belief of the One God and the concept of creation. Porphyry's description of Zeus in *On Images* offers imagery which has some striking similarities to the Creator Hymn dedicated to Amun of Hibis.[240] In Plotinus' cultic description, Zeus appeared to have the role of the Demiurge and was placed lowest in the Neoplatonic system. However, in this fragment it appears as though Porphyry is using the cultic figure of Zeus in order to explain how the One God created the cosmos. This is similar to how the Egyptians used the cultic figure of Amun of Hibis to describe the mysterious ways of the One God in the Hibis Creator Hymn.[241] Both the fragment of Porphyry and the Creator Hymn are long and dense. So, for brevity's sake, we will focus on the two key aspects which bear some striking similarities: rulers of the earth through their power and their ability to "think" the cosmos into existence.

Firstly, Amun and Zeus are both described as coming "First before All" as rulers of the earth through their supreme and boundless power. Secondly, and most importantly, both gods are described as "thinking" the cosmos into existence. For example, Porphyry describes Zeus as the "first and last, the centre of all things' and the 'First cause of all'".[242] Similarly, Amun of Hibis is also described as a Sole God who "made himself into millions, whose length and breadth are without limits".[243] Both Gods are described as luminous and radiant and they are not only creators of the cosmos, but their bodies are

[238] Plot. *Enn.* 6.7.4; 17; 38, 3.13.9; 9; 17, 3.8.30, 10: 28-31.
[239] A report from Damascius (active ca. 480-538 CE) has caused some confusion amongst scholars and later Neoplatonists as to whether or not Porphyry was straying from Plotinus' One-Intellect-Soul with the introduction of Chaldean elements. This argument has been addressed in detail by Dillon (2007) and what is clear is that Porphyry does not diverge much from Plotinus' schema. See the report from Damascius (Damascius *Princ* I. 86,3-15) in Smith frag. 367 (2011, 438) and also Johnson (2013, 64 n. 66) who has also provided some new insight on this problem in his analysis. On Chaldean cosmogony in Porphyry see O'Neil (2016, 74-83).
[240] Appendix A.9h.
[241] Appendix C.3.
[242] "Zeus was the first, Zeus last, the lightning's lord, Zeus head, Zeus centre, all things are from Zeus. Zeus born a male, Zeus virgin undefiled; Zeus the firm base of earth and starry heaven; Zeus sovereign, Zeus alone first cause of all: One power divine, great ruler of the world, One kingly form, encircling all things here, Fire, water, earth, and ether, night and day…" Porph. *Simulac* in Euseb. *Praep. Evang* 3.9.
[243] Great, secret hymn to Amun-Re. The Ogdoad says: "Greetings, O sole god, who made himself into millions, whose length and breadth are [without limit, One powerful and skilled, who bore himself". See Klotz transl. (2006, 211).

themselves the very ground that humans walk on and the air that they breathe.[244] What we can also gather from the two texts is that both Amun of Hibis and Zeus "thought and spoke the world into existence" and after this act was completed, they were seated on their eternal thrones. In the case of Amun of Hibis, he has a falcon by his side whereas Zeus is described as having an eagle.[245] The falcon and eagle are representative of both gods' supreme and victorious images. In addition, earlier in the Creator Hymn, Amun, like Zeus, created his cult-image so that humans may imagine their Creator in a cultic form.[246] To summarise, in the *Sentences* Porphyry speaks of the One in an abstract metaphysical dialect. However, in *On Images*, which is a religious work, it is possible to see how both explanations of the One are more or less the same to the Egyptian hymns. That is, the One who takes the cultic form of Zeus, is described as a Supreme Being, a One God, who came first before all others, the King of all, and who with his mind thought the world into existence. This comparison shows that the Egyptians conceived of their first god Amun of Hibis in much the same way and that both texts express the same religious sentiment.

2.7 The One and All: New Evidence

There is a further set of Ramesside passages (translated by Assmann), which can add an extra dimension to our comparison of the two theologies of the One God. In these selected passages, there is a notion of the One God "mixing" and manifesting his divinity to create life. These passages represent the "One and All" formula which describes the One God as "manifesting himself into millions" when creating life.[247] These selected passages (Appendix D1-19) share some intriguing parallels with Porphyry's theological doctrines of creation in *Sentences* 31*.* However, it is important to distinguish first a contested issue in the scholarship regarding the primeval darkness in Egyptian religion and the concept of the One and All. The discussion centres around and the theological concept of "millions" (*ḥhw*) within the formula which could refer to both the totality of creation and *or* as a reference to the many gods of Egyptian theology.

The Egyptian primeval darkness, from which the creator Amun emerges, is a temporal space, not a physical realm. For the Egyptians, creation took place at the "first time" (*sp tpy*) and before creation there was only chaos (Nun).[248] Erik Hornung describes this relationship between Nun and the

---

[244] Klotz (2006, 219): "he distanced himself more than any other god, too distant and remote to ever reach him. (nonetheless), his rays tread all the way into the [earth…]." Whereas Porphyry describes Zeus as "...Zeus, therefore, is the whole world, animal of animals, and god of gods; but Zeus, that is, inasmuch as he is the mind from which he brings forth all things, and by his thoughts creates them. When the theologians had explained the nature of god in this manner, to make an image such as their description indicated was neither possible, nor, if any one thought of it, could he show the look of life, and intelligence, and forethought by the figure of a sphere" *Simulac*. in Eusb. *Praep. Evang* 3.9

[245] "For the creative mind is the sovereign of the world. And in his right hand he holds forth either an eagle, because he is master of the gods who traverse the air, as the eagle is master of the birds that fly aloft----or a victory, because he is himself victorious over all things" *Simulac.* In Eusb. *Praep. Evang* 3.9.

[246] Klotz (2006, 219).

[247] Assmann (1995, 150-151).

[248] Hornung (1987, 165); Appendix C3.

Creator God as never going beyond a spatial and temporal relationship.[249] Hornung maintains that the primeval darkness (Nun) exists and evolves on its own plane and that the creator (Amun) did *not* create the world (and himself) out of this chaos.[250] Rather, the Creator God "who begot himself" (*wtṯ sw ḏs.f)* or who "came into being by himself" (*ḫpr ḏs.f)* rises from the chaotic material and harnesses the power imbued within. After doing so, Amun can incorporate this power into his own being and begin the act of creation.[251] Hornung insists that this occurs as a result of cosmic evolution:

> …these powers had become given quantities which a doctrine of creation could not ignore, even though it was of an entirely different structure [the chaotic material], because it was a basic principle of Egyptian theology that no essential substance should be allowed to lie unused.[252]

However, Assmann disagrees with Hornung's interpretation, arguing that he does not consider how the opposing phrases in the Ramesside texts, such as "One" and "millions", are connected by the concept of self-transformation (*jrj sw*), "who made or makes himself into millions".[253] Assmann contends that the One God (Amun) making himself into millions from the primeval darkness is not creation in the biological sense or a harnessing of the primeval matter. Rather, all of creation came into being out of Amun or if we are examining the Neoplatonic material *out of* God (*ex deo*), the Supreme creator.[254] While we can never be certain how the Egyptians interpreted this phrase, I am more inclined to agree with Assmann's view as the texts studied in this thesis consistently emphasise the "million" in his body and "millions of millions" in Amun's name thus implying a type of transformation which correlates with Assmann's theories. By transforming himself into the million-fold reality, the Creator God Amun has not ceased to be a unity, but he is *both* One and millions, unity and plurality, the One before the Many.

The Egyptian concept of transformation and creation is also found in Porphyry's *Sentences 31.* In this text, Porphyry explains how the One God is both everywhere and nowhere, yet somehow "all things are produced through him and are contained in him because he is everywhere, but what he creates is not like him".[255] In one Ramesside text, we find a similar description of the One God who is hailed as "One god who made himself into millions whose length and breadth are without limits".[256] Additionally, in another Ramesside text, the One God is described as "Who came into being alone and

[249] Hornung (1987, 171).
[250] Ibid.
[251] Hornung (1987, 172).
[252] Hornung (1987, 172-173).
[253] Assmann (2014a 17).
[254] It should also be noted that the literal translation of (*nṯr wʿ*) is "Uniquely Single God" or "One God" rather than "oneness". See Assmann (2014a, 17). However, Assmann may be interpreting this in a more metaphoric way as the idea of being "uniquely single" and but also One can also imply aloneness.
[255] See Appendix A.9c for passage.
[256] Assmann (1995, 151) referring to PMag. Harris iv, 1-2 = *Hibis* 32, 1. Appendix D10.

gave birth to himself as millions".[257] This implies that like Porphyry's One God, the One God in the Egyptian texts is a limitless divine being capable of creation. This particular notion of transformation and creation is also present in Leiden Hymns LXXX:

> "You began the unfolding of cosmos,
> before was no being, no void;
> World without end was in you and from you, yours on that First Day."

The phrasing in these formulas is too close to be accidental, especially when we take into consideration that Porphyry's theological discourse believes in the idea that the One God is both everywhere and nowhere because he *is* Creation.[258] We can observe, then, that both texts contain a distinct sense of a One God who creates *ex deo*, out of himself. Although, as already stated, the difference in both texts is the way in which they are presented: the Neoplatonic Porphyry presents his idea as a metaphysical, abstract conception of God, whereas the Egyptians speak of the One and All in a religious and cultic language which emphasises the symbolism of Amun and his many manifestations.

This comparative analysis of Porphyry's notions of the One God and the Egyptian hymns and texts demonstrates that it is indeed highly plausible to claim Egyptian influence in the philosophers' works. We have seen the similarities between Porphyry's works and the Egyptian One God theology of Karnak and Hibis. For example, the notion of the One God creating himself and the universe, the cultic imagery of Zeus and Amun and the idea of the One God's appearance as the One and All, i.e., other divinities and forms of life. The differences seem to be a matter of language and expression, given that Porphyry often speaks about the One God in metaphysical Plotinian terminology whereas the Egyptian hymns are in a cultic dialogue when referring to Amun of Hibis and Karnak. However, in an interesting reversal, Iamblichus's *On the Mysteries* uses the Egyptian theological system to explain the concept of the Neoplatonic One God to Porphyry.

2.8 Egyptian Theology in Neoplatonic Terms

Iamblichus' *On the Mysteries* is a direct refutation of Porphyry's *Letter to Anebo*. In this section, we are concerned with the question of how Iamblichus refutes Porphyry's beliefs of Egyptian religion in this text. In his letter, Porphyry famously questions three areas: the validity of Iamblichus' beliefs regarding the effectiveness of theurgic ritual, theurgy's integration into Neoplatonism and the

[257] *STG* text no.149 in Asssmann (1983). See also Appendix D2 and see the discussion of Assmann (1995, 150-152).
[258] Porph. *Sentq*. 31: "alone everywhere but all things are produced through him and contained in him who also willed himself into being".

religious beliefs of the Egyptians.[259] Porphyry expresses strong doubts as to whether Egyptian theology is comparable to the philosophical wisdom of the Greeks. Porphyry argues that Egyptian religion is materialistic and not based in philosophical understanding of the gods.[260] As a response to this argument, Iamblichus dedicated Book 8 of his work to respond to Porphyry by explaining that the two theological systems, the Neoplatonic and the Egyptian, are similar, more so than Porphyry is willing to admit. As we will see below, Iamblichus' doctrine of the One God is a distinctly new theology, which uses Egyptian theology and concepts to explain the Neoplatonic ideas of the One God.

The discussion in this section will lead us into examining the philosophy of the One God within Neoplatonic religion rather than metaphysical ideas and abstract conceptions and language. While there is some metaphysical dialogue in Iamblichus' work, Iamblichus' manner of speaking about the One God is more tied to theurgic rituals than anything else. The text closely resembles Porphyry's *On Images*, but the philosophical-religious emphasis within the text is stronger. In addition, this section will also reveal that Iamblichus' knowledge of Egyptian religion, cosmogony and theology is at times striking in its accuracy. Moreover, Iamblichus' way of structuring the universe and his theology/cosmogony of the One God becomes more complex and hierarchical than Platonists before him as he attempts to mix and adapt Egyptian, Platonic, Babylonian and Chaldean concepts into his Neoplatonic system. The aim of the present analysis is to illustrate how Iamblichus uses the Egyptian theological system of the One God in order to explain his own theological system. We will analyse the Egyptian influences in Iamblichus' work and its similarity to the Hibis and Leiden hymns in his explanation of his theology. The bulk of the analysis will focus on Iamblichus' Book 8 of *On the Mysteries*. It would take us too far beyond the scope of the present thesis to reference Iamblichus' theology of the One God in all his works. Therefore, we will only focus on Iamblichus' *On the Mysteries.* in this chapter.

In Book 8, Iamblichus argues that there are two One Gods within the hierarchy of the universe. As far as we know, Iamblichus is the first Platonist to postulate the idea of two Supreme Beings.[261] Iamblichus' doctrine of the One God is quite different, in most respects, from Porphyry and Plotinus. Iamblichus' description of these two One Gods has more in common to the way in which Amun is joined with Re in the Hibis and Leiden hymns than the traditional Neoplatonic school of thought.[262] For example, the One God of Plotinus and Porphyry sits within a triad and the One is the "Father of

---

[259] Dodds (1951, 287) labelled the *De Myts.* as a "manifesto of irrationalism". However, Dodd's assessment is now considered outdated and most scholars agree that the text is a masterful attempt to combine the teachings of revelation literature next to Neoplatonic philosophy, effectively giving theurgic rites a philosophical basis.

[260] Porph. *Ep.Anebo.*

[261] Our evidence of this difference is found in Damascius where he cites Book 28 of Iamblichus' lost work *Chaldean Theology*: "see Dillon (1973, 31).

[262] Leiden Hymn CCC Appendix B7 and the first lines of the Great Hymn to Amun Appendix C.2: "…transforming into Re, having been ma[de as the god] who came about by himself…"

All" which unites with Being (the Demiurge). From the Demiurge we have the world-soul in which we find our physical reality. Iamblichus, however, conceived of the following hierarchy which he lays out in Book 8 in four distinct points:

> (i) Prior to the true beings and to the universal principles there is the one god, prior cause even of the first god and king remaining unmoved in the singularity of his own unity. For no object of intellection is linked to him nor anything else. (ii) He is established as a paradigm for the self-fathering, self-generating and only fathered God who is true Good; for it is something greater and primary and fount of all things, and basic root of all the first objects of intellection, which are the forms. (iii) From this One there has autonomously shone forth the self-sufficient god, for which reason he is termed "father of himself" and "principle of himself"; for he is first principle and god of gods, a monad springing from the One, pre-essential and first principle of essence. (iv) For from him springs essentiality and essence, for which reason he is termed "father of essence", he himself is pre-essential being, the first principle of the intelligible realm, for which reason he is "termed principle of intellection.[263]

From this passage it appears that there are two Ones in Iamblichus' system. There is the (i) "One god, prior cause of the first god" who appears first in the hierarchy. Like Plotinus and Porphyry's One, Iamblichus' One is also a supreme entity that has no links to anything else and is unlike anything else. However, this One is not like the Ineffable One that we saw in Plotinus and Porphyry. Rather, it is the second One, (ii) "the self-fathering, self-generating and only fathered God") which is the equivalent of Plotinus and Porphyry's One that appears first in their triad but is placed secondary in Iamblichus' paradigm.

As with Plotinus, Iamblichus' mystical language can leave the reader frustrated and confused with regard to the identity of the One. However, a description of Iamblichus' system from Damascius may help to clarify this issue. In his commentary, Damascius proposes that Iamblichus conceived of a dyad between the Second One and the First One.[264] Damascius' commentary reveals that Iamblichus described how a Second One acts as a "mixing" agent of sorts, while the First One sits above it in the primeval realm.[265] This particular concept is also found in the Hibis and Leiden Hymns and the idea of "mixing" and the One before the All which comes out of Chaos (Nun) has already been noted in section 2.7.[266] One of the core concepts of Theban theology was that Amun must come first and from him comes unity with Re and then after the multiplicity of the other gods and creation. Iamblichus

---

[263] Iambl. *Myst* 8.2-3 transl. Clark, Dillon and Hershbell (2003, 307-309).
[264] Dillon (1973, 33) & Greig (2020).
[265] Dillon (1973, 33).
[266] See Appendix D1-19 and the opening lines of the Hymn to Ba's of Amun in Appendix C1: "You are Amun, You are Atum, you are Khepri, you are Re, Sole one who made himself into millions…". In this Hymn we see the merging of Amun with several manifestations of himself, one of them being Re.

appears to express this same sentiment and understanding of Egyptian theology when he argues that the One always comes before the All:

> the doctrine of the Egyptians on first principles, starting from the highest level and proceeding to the lowest, begins from unity and proceeds to multiplicity, the many being governed by a unity...[267]

Here, Iamblichus is both using Egyptian principles to explain his Neoplatonic system and also asserting that all things are dominated by the "causal principle which unifies all things" i.e. the One and All.[268] In their translation of the text, Clark, Dillon and Hershbell comment that this system is Pythagorean in nature, but has elements of Speusippus' system in terming the first principles "One and Multiplicity".[269] I would like to suggest that this formula also has its origins and takes influence from the Ramesside One and All formula and the theologies of Amun-Re in the Leiden and Hibis hymns.

After describing the One God in Neoplatonic terms, Iamblichus provides a second explanation in response to Porphyry, this time focused on the "correct" version of Neoplatonic theology. In his explanation, Iamblichus utilises Egyptian theology and epithets to prove that the two systems are related and influenced by one another. According to Iamblichus, Kmeph[270] is the leader of the celestial gods, who is described as "intellect thinking himself and turning his thoughts towards himself" (8.3). This could be the equivalent of the Second One of Iamblichus' paradigm. Iamblichus is correct in identifying Kematef (Kmeph) as the first principle of Egyptian Amun-Re theology and also the notion of the god, who through his intellect, is able to create himself and others—a concept that is present in both the Leiden and Hibis hymns as well as the Ramesside texts.[271]

So why does Iamblichus refer to Amun as Kmeph? Amun is often spilt amongst his various avatars and Kematef, according to both Klotz and Thissen, is technically only an epithet of Amun and never a separate deity.[272] In light of this observation, Kematef, or as Iamblichus calls him Kmeph, is one of the many epithets used to describe Amun.[273] Kematef's most important attribute in Egyptian theology is the act of creation, specifically, his successor Irita, who is the demiurge.[274] Irita and Kematef were epithets of Amun and are therefore able to appear as hypostases within the same text. For example, in another text from the east of Karnak, Amun is known as both "he who created Nun and he who arose from within it while the land was mixed with darkness."[275] Additionally, in the

---

[267] Iambl. *De Myst.* 8.3.
[268] Iambl. *De Myst.* 8.3.
[269] Iambl. *De Myst.* (313 n. 420) of Clarke, Dillon and Hershbell (2003) transl.
[270] See Clark, Dillon and Hershbell (2003 n.407) regarding the etymology of Kmeph.
[271] Appendix D.6: "Khepres who merged as millions".
[272] Klotz (2012, 134).
[273] See Klotz's commentary (2003, 138; 144) on the Creator Hymn of Amun.
[274] For Irita and Kematef's place in the Theban Pantheon see Klotz (2012,121-15; 133-142).
[275] Klotz (2012, 135).

Creator Hymn from the Hibis temple, Amun of Hibis is also described as Khepri who "begets manifestations" and, while thinking and consulting his heart, founded the "two lands beneath the throne". [276] Consequently, there is no relation or known epithet of an Egyptian god called Kmeph. Kematef was known to the Greek tradition as the primal cosmic serpent with his tail in his mouth. Kematef and Irita are also both associated with the ouroboros and the act of creation.[277] Iamblichus may very well be drawing on a more recent tradition. Nonetheless, Iamblichus is citing traces of accurate Egyptian theological ideas and notions which demonstrates not only an understanding of the Egyptian system but how it is also similar to Neoplatonic conceptions of the One God. However, Iamblichus then claims that Eikton, an unknown god in both the Egyptian and Greek systems, is prior to Kmeph.

Iamblichus claims that within Eikton resides in the primal intelligising element and primal object of intellection that can only be worshipped by means of silence.[278] Eikton is therefore the First One in Iamblichus' paradigm. Iamblichus then explains that the Neoplatonic demiurge (the One Existent) is called Amoun, i.e., Amun, in the Egyptian context. With Amun's light, he creates the "visible power of the hidden reason principles … expertly brings into perfection each thing in accordance with truth, he is termed Ptah".[279] This is another perceptive analysis on the part of Iamblichus, as Amun is another manifestation of Ptah.[280] Yet, Iamblichus' assertion that Eikton is prior to Kmeph, and is the "first product'" complicates matters. The name Eikton does not appear to represent any known Egyptian god. Both Klotz and Dennis C. Clark argue that the word is a possible scribal error for Eirton (=Irita).[281] Recent analysis, however, by Elsa Oréal has identified Eikton in its Hellenised form as Heikton, allowing an equation with the Egyptian god of magic, Heka.[282]

The possibility that Heikton may represent the Egyptian Heka, the god of magic, answers a long-standing problem, starting with Marsilio Ficino's translation of the *Mysteries*. Oréal's analysis may also help us to understand why Iamblichus was "glossing" Neoplatonic philosophy by using Egyptian theology. For example, in Iamblichus' doctrine of the One God, Heikton is described as "first product" and "primal object of intellection" who can only be worshipped in silence and is the One Existent. We find a similar description of Heka in a spell from the *Coffin Texts* 261 of the First Intermediate period

[276] Klotz (2006; 214; 219).
[277] Betz (1987, 134).
[278] Iambl. *De Myst.* 8.3.
[279] After this statement Iamblichus then goes on to describe how Osiris is the productive force of goods and "acquires other epithets in accordance with other powers and activities" *De Myst.* 8.3. Why Iamblichus decided to include these five Egyptian gods in this structure is not clear. However, there are also references to Osiris found in both Plutarch and Porphyry. See Plut., *Is. Os.* 359d; Porphyry, Fr. 360.3 in Smith (2011) and for the analysis of Osiris' role in Iamblichus theology see Clark (2018, 173).
[280] "These (both) mean your form in the initial moment, when you arose as Amun-Re-Ptah" Klotz' commentary Klotz (2003, 123) on the text is as follows: "This statement combines the Memphite, Heliopolitan and Theban cosmologies into one composite image: Amun-Re/Ptah/Tatene. See also Cruz-Uribe (1994) & Mosher (1992) for analysis on these cosmogonies.
[281] Klotz (2017, 141) Clarke (2008,173).
[282] Oréal (2003, 281-82) see also Clarke, Dillon and Hershbell commentary (2003, 311 n.409).

(2181-2055 BCE).[283] In this spell, Heka is associated with creation of the cosmos before the creation of Amun. Heka is then described as coming into being by himself through his own power.[284] Furthermore, in this spell, Heka is characterised as having a "dual" and self-generated nature. It is unlikely that Iamblichus had access to these texts but the description of Heikton in Iamblichus' *On the Mysteries* as the "First principle" who contains duality and is worshipped in silence is consistent with the earlier conceptions of Heka in the *Coffin Texts*. Heka, in early Egyptian cosmogony, comes before all other gods and is representative of a magic that is of a higher order. This type of magic was crucial for the application of power that Amun needs in the act of creating the cosmos.[285]

Klotz, however, does not agree with Oréal's argument and contends that while Heka is undoubtedly important to Egyptian theology, this god does not feature in cosmogonies of the Graeco-Roman period, especially in relation to Kematef.[286] Against this objection, I would argue that Iamblichus' preference in placing Heikton at the top of the hierarchy is an appropriate choice if we examine the overall theme of *On the Mysteries*. The entire text is a defence of theurgic ritual and a plea to incorporate Chaldean and Neoplatonic theology.[287] For instance, in the Chaldean Oracles, Hekate, like Heka, is also associated with creation, specifically the act of "ensouling the world" and, like Irita, is also connected with the symbol of the snake.[288] Hekate's name may also have its etymological origins in the Egyptian frog Goddess *Hqt*, who was also associated with magic.[289] With these points in mind, it is plausible, as Oréal argues, that Iamblichus referred to a deity that has a closer association with magic in both the Egyptian and Greek/Chaldean systems (or what Iamblichus would refer to as theurgy) rather than Irita. As a result, Iamblichus may be providing an innovation or adaptation of an already known system to further his own philosophical argument.

In all fairness, we will never know from where Iamblichus received this information which contains many links to Egyptian theology. Iamblichus may have obtained his sources on Egyptian theology from a lost source of Egyptian literature. For example, Iamblichus states that Porphyry does not understand the Hermetic writings in the same way that he does: "those documents after all, which

---

[283] *CT.* 261 see Ritner (1997, 17). The *Coffin Texts* are a collection of funerary spells and are in part also derived from the *Pyramid Texts.* James P. Allen (1988, 36-37) provides an excellent commentary of this ritual where he argues that magic (heka) is what allows the God Amun to create and produce the world from the primordial Monad which means that it is magic which brought about the existence of all the forces and elements that developed from that original source.
[284] Ibid.
[285] Clark (2018, 176).
[286] Klotz (2012, 404 n.6).
[287] Clark (2018, 176).
[288] Lewy's work (1975,91, n.96) has highlighted how Proclus, in a hymn addressed to Artemis-Hekate, describes Hekate as "snake that terrifies with fire"; she that is girdled with snakes". Porphyry also calls Hekate the "ensouler of the cosmos". See Johnson (2009, 110). For Hekate's role in the Chaldean Oracles and related literature see Johnston (1990).
[289] The only connection that we have for this association comes from Aristophanes' *The Frogs*, where the chorus condemns those who defile Hekate's shrine; the chorus of frogs appear while the travellers are crossing to Hades on Kharon's ferry. In a similar fashion, in the *Coffin Texts* of the Middle Kingdom Sokar's ferry to the underworld was reported to have "her bailers [as] the frog goddess *Hqt* at the mouth of her lake". See Bernal (2008, 133); Cheak (2004) has also analysed the linguistic origins of the word magic in Greek, Egyptian and Sanskirt and has noted the linguistic similarities between all three cultures which further supports Bernal's thesis.

circulate under the name of Hermes, contain Hermetic doctrines, even if they often employ the terminology of the philosophers”. [290] As far as we know, there is no parallel in the *Hermetica* to the Egyptian hierarchy that Iamblichus provides in his work. Iamblichus’ source, therefore, is most likely some lost Egyptian wisdom literature texts or some other works that are similar to the *Book of Thoth*.[291] Alternatively, it is possible that Iamblichus may have visited Egypt and spoke with Egyptian priests from the Theban or Hibis area. Where Iamblichus received his Egyptian knowledge is difficult to ascertain without evidence. What is clear, however, is that Iamblichus himself saw how the two theological systems, that of Egypt and Neoplatonism, bear similarities to one another.

Iamblichus wanted to prove to Porphyry that Egyptians did not view the universe and its creation in purely material terms.[292] In Iamblichus’ defence of theurgic ritual he saw how the two systems, both Egyptian and Neoplatonic, could be synthesised.[293] The additional explanation of the two One Gods, told in Egyptian terms, is to prove to Porphyry that Neoplatonism contains similar metaphysical elements and is therefore not just a “material” religion as Porphyry claims. Moreover, Iamblichus clearly has a firm grasp of Egyptian theology, in particular that of Amun-Re. The Egyptian pantheon Iamblichus discusses is slightly misguided, but it still resembles the basic structure and core concepts of Egyptian theology found in the Leiden and Hibis hymns. Furthermore, in Egyptian theology Amun-Kematef functions primarily as an omniscient, transcendent Creator God. To Greek authors, like Iamblichus, Kematef would have represented the eternal and noetic divinity, the Supreme Being who created the cosmos.[294] As a result, these choices by Iamblichus could be intentional as he was trying to adapt many religious beliefs (Chaldean, Neoplatonic, Babylonian and Egyptian) into his defence of theurgy.

2.9 Conclusion

This chapter set out with two aims: to find traces of Egyptian influence in the Neoplatonists Plotinus, Porphyry and Iamblichus and to demonstrate that the two systems (Egyptian and Neoplatonic) contain similarities to the Amun-Re theology in the Leiden and Hibis hymns. Through a comparative analysis of the Egyptian and Neoplatonic material we can now uphold the view that certain elements of the Leiden and Hibis hymns are present in the works of these particular Platonists. For example, both the One God of the Leiden Hymn LXXX and the One God of Plotinus appear to be all-encompassing, all-absorbing and omnipotent in relation to the other gods. In Porphyry there are similarities between his select works and Egyptian theology such as the notion

[290] Iambl. *De Myst* 8.4. There were many Ancient libraries in Egypt and the Mediterranean that may have contained these particular books. See the work of Ryholt (2013, 23-38).
[291] Clark (2008, 172).
[292] Clark (2008, 171).
[293] Clark (2008, 172).
[294] For Greek authors see Klotz (2012, 142 n. 827).

of the One God creating himself and the universe, the cultic imagery of Zeus and Amun and the idea of the One God's appearance before the Many, i.e., other divinities and forms of life. Lastly, the discussion of Iamblichus has revealed that the philosopher had a clear understanding of Egyptian theology. Moreover, the connections between Heka and Iamblichus' Heikton have revealed that Iamblichus was providing an innovation of Egyptian theology in his defence of theurgy. Lastly, while Iamblichus' structuring of the Egyptian religion was misguided it may have been an intentional decision as he attempted to explain the "true" Neoplatonic One God to Porphyry.

Chapter Three

Platonists, Ritualists and Egypt: Ascending to the One God

"For the theurgists do not fall into the herd that is subject to fate…"

Chaldean Fr. 153

Introduction

In the previous chapter we examined the utilisation of Egypt and its priests by the Platonists and the reception of Amun theology in the works of Plotinus, Porphyry and Iamblichus. This chapter now turns to the world of ritual and examines the strong competitive rivalry for religious and intellectual leadership in the third and fourth centuries CE. This rivalry became most visible in the conflict between prominent Platonists of this era and ritualists from Egypt, that is, between religious rationalists inspired by Plotinus and those who used rituals which included magical practices. The rivalry arose amidst the rise of Christianity and the pressures this development put on existing religious practices and attitudes. The growing tensions can be observed in everyday interactions as well as the polemical tone in written works.

This chapter will focus especially on the evidence from the Platonist side which offers rich pickings in polemical passages, including internal clashes between Porphyry and Iamblichus (sections 3.2-4). The evidence for the ritualists is found in the *PGM* and this chapter continues the argument from Chapter 2 that Amun theology is found in particular rituals of the papyri (3.5-6). This argument further supports both the theories of Klotz and Assmann that Amun theology reappears in magical literature of Late Antiquity of which the One God plays an important role. Furthermore, this chapter develops the second aspect of my overall aim which uses an anthropological approach to ritual theory; leading to a new interpretation of the rivalry between ritualists (referred to as the authors of the *PGM*) and Ritual Masters (Porphyry and Iamblichus).

3.1 Communing or Coercing? Ritual Mastery and Magic

Porphyry and Iamblichus would often level accusations against ritualists and claim that the latter *coerced*, not *communed with*, the gods. I would suggest that this accusation arises from their philosophical understanding of magic which is fundamentally different to the Egyptian conception

of *heka* (magic) which operates in the *PGM*. Porphyry and Iamblichus viewed interactions with the gods, and especially the One God, as a theurgic or religious ritual which was not to be associated with magical rituals. Porphyry and Iamblichus describe these users of magic as social deviants, wonder workers and tricksters who are in league with evil *daimones*.[295] These statements are bound up with the fact that Iamblichus and Porphyry viewed themselves as Ritual Masters with special access to the One God. The accusations against the "wonder-workers" arose from two considerations that can be gleaned from an analysis of Porphyry's and Iamblichus' texts. Firstly, Porphyry and Iamblichus saw themselves as superior to the magical ritualists (such as we find in the *PGM*) regarding unification with the One God, mainly because of their own philosophical training. Porphyry held the view that theosophy, backed by philosophical training and ritual, made him "better" than other ritualists. Secondly, for Iamblichus, it was theurgy, *not* magic, that granted him the "true" and real connection to the One God which was nothing but a mirage when practised by magical users. However, in the *PGM* we find numerous spells that are similar to theurgic rituals and enable the ritualists to make contact and unite with the One God. These rituals are often referred to as a *sustasis* (coming together) which will be explained further below.

Iamblichus and Porphyry's comments against magical practitioners will make more sense when discussed in the context of their perception of magic versus that of the Egyptian magic present in the *PGM.* Like Plato before them, Porphyry and Iamblichus held the view that magic was distinct from religion and that magic was viewed as evil. This in turn was due to their understanding of philosophy and theurgy, and how theurgy was distinct from Graeco-Roman ideas of magic.[296] The subsequent sections (3.5-3.6) will then analyse some of the *sustasis* rituals in the papyri and how they are similar to the One God found in the Leiden and Hibis hymns as well as Neoplatonic writings. In addition, where applicable, we will also examine how some of the practices in the *PGM* are similar to theurgic practices proposed by Iamblichus.[297]

Before examining Porphyry's and Iamblichus' views on theurgy and magic it will be useful to frame the discussion with Catherine Bell's interpretation of Ritual Authority and Mastery. This anthropological approach is a superior analysis as opposed to the magic versus religion debate.[298] The reason for approaching Iamblichus and Porphyry through the lens of this interpretation (explained in 3.2), rather than cast it as a debate between religion vs. magic, is that the latter dichotomy involves a methodological issue. Using the terms "religion" and "magic" does not create a sharp enough distinction as *all* rituals are emphatic ways of communicating with the divine and *all*

[295] See the work of Blazevic (2020, 78-82) and her analysis of the apotropaic strategies against evil *daimones* in Porphyry and Iamblichus.
[296] For Plotinus' conceptions of magic see Helleman-Elgersma (2010).
[297] We have little evidence of how theurgic ritual operated. Most of what has survived comes in fragments or is found in Iambl. *De Myst.* However, Johnston (2019, 694-719) has provided a detailed reconstruction of what theurgic ritual may have looked like based on the surviving evidence.
[298] Bell (2009, 116).

rituals aim to cause an effect.[299] The notion that magical acts are harmful and manipulative and distinct from religious acts that are defined as "superior" and communicative has a long history in Western thought and the history of Platonism beginning with Plato.[300]

Plato was never able to accurately define what magic is but in several of his works he argues that it is both manipulative and harmful. In numerous works, Plato mentions how magicians could perform the following: *katádesis* (binding spells) with *goêteia* (magic); make objects appear as an illusion; draw or allure a person to them; know what *pharmaka* (drugs) to put into food to affect the mind; reduce men by *epôdai* (incanations) and, finally, call up the dead from the underworld.[301] Plato argued that magic was viewed as a social deviancy because it was performed by the individual and *for* individual needs. Religious rituals, however, were performed by the community and *for* the community.[302] Ultimately, this division of ideology and the differences between religion and magic meant that philosophers became the enemies of the manipulative "magician" (ritualist) whom they deemed inferior. As a result, from the fifth century BCE onwards and persisting into Late Antiquity with Iamblichus and Porphyry, educated men in the Greek world viewed users of magic as socially deviant and corrupt.[303] Consequently, this viewpoint influences their perceptions of themselves as superior ritualists.

Broadly speaking, ritual practices, whether they are "magical" or "religious", produce and negotiate power relations.[304] Ritual can be an effective means of social control by those whom Catherine Bell calls "Ritual Masters."[305] According to Bell's theory, Ritual Masters believed that their power was bestowed upon them by authoritative figures, such as ancestors or deities. For that reason, power was seen as legitimate and accessible only to those in the appropriate offices and with the right kind of knowledge.[306] Bell's criteria for ritual and power dynamics will therefore facilitate a better understanding of the ritualists of the *PGM* and the Neoplatonists than the unhelpful dichotomy of religious rituals (taken as communicative) versus magic rituals (taken as manipulative).[307] Moreover, Porphyry and Iamblichus as well as the ritual experts of the *PGM* can be applied to Bell's analysis. Both groups drew their "power" from positioning themselves as priests and philosophers (or priestly-philosophers) with extensive knowledge of the divine and how to unite with the One God

[299] Thomassen (1997, 62).
[300] Graf (1995, 40).
[301] See Dickie (2003, 44) and Pl. *Lg.* 933a2-5; *Soph* 234c2-7, 235a1, 241b6-7; *Plt*. 303c1-5, *Euthyd*. 288b7-8, *Rep.* 380d1-6; *Phlb.* 44c8, *Grg*, 483e5-6, *Menex.* 80a1-8; *Lg.* 909b3-5.
[302] See Pl., *Rep.* 364b and *Symp.* 202e. This same notion can also be found in ps-Hippocrates, *De morbo sacro* 3-4. And Heraclitus, *Fragments* CXV, CXVII.
[303] These statements are found in Porphyry's *On Abst.* 2.41-2.45; Iamblichus makes most of his statements against magical users in Book 3 of *De Myst.* 3.13-14; 3.27-31; 3.31-32 and also 1.8. Athanassiadi (1993, 120) explains that: "Iamblichus devotes much effort to combating the common belief – abundantly illustrated through the magical papyri – that in Theurgy the operant uses his knowledge of cosmic structures in order to bring down the god and obtain oracles."
[304] Bell (2009, 196).
[305] Bell (2009, 116).
[306] Bell (2009, 211).
[307] For the discussions regarding magic as a manipulative act versus religion which is seen as a communicative act see the work of Durkheim (1995, 429) See also Frazer (1983, 65-69).

through their expertise. For example, the ritualists of the papyri drew their authority and knowledge from old ritual practices of Egyptian magic and priestly training or by attributing their spells to well-known magicians or kings and the authority of Egypt as a place of magic.[308] For Porphyry and Iamblichus, knowledge of the One God and how to unite with Him came from philosophical and ritual training, pursued in a long line of philosophers, such as Pythagoras and Plato.[309] Both groups, therefore, were in the perfect position to act as Ritual Masters or view themselves as such in Late Antiquity. And yet, the ritualists of the *PGM* had very different ideas surrounding magic and how it is used to unite with the One God from those of Porphyry and Iamblichus.

Egyptian magic, unlike Graeco-Roman magic, was not viewed as socially deviant nor as an act of illegality.[310] As we saw in Chapter 2.7, *heka* is described as a life-giving force and a vital energy which permeates the cosmos and enables the cycle of nature, animating all living creatures.[311] *Heka* is also referred to as a life force, the *Ka*, or as the Ba which is the physical manifestation of the Sun God.[312] In fact, the role of those who practiced *heka* in Egypt did not defy social norms, as Plato would argue, but fulfilled them.[313] Furthermore, *Heka,* permeated the gods and especially the One God. As Jacco Dieleman explains, all deities are in possession of *heka* and this vital life force resides within their bellies and in their utterances.[314] Dieleman further clarifies that since the First Creation (i.e. when the Sun God begets himself) other deities would draw upon h*eka* as a life force to regenerate creation or bring about a change of events at will.[315] For instance, according to the *Teaching to Merikare*, humans could also use *heka* when they felt they had to intervene in the course of nature during times of crisis.[316] *Heka* i.e magic was given by the Egyptian One God to humans when he created the world: "he made them *hekau* as a weapon to ward off the blow of events".[317] Therefore, *Heka* in this text is

---

[308] For example, *PGM* IV.2967-3006 begins the ritual with "among the Egyptians herbs are always obtained like this"; *PGM* XII.401-44: "Interpretations which the temple scribes employed from the holy writings in translation". Also see the following spells that are dedicated to a number of figures associated with magic and kingship: *PGM*. I.42-195 The spell of Pnouthis the sacred scribe; *PGM* IV.154-285 spell that calls upon Nephotes to Psammetichos the immortal king of Egypt; *PGM* IV.850-929 Charm of Solomon; *PGM* IV. 1716-1870 Sword of Dardanos who was believed to have founded the mysteries of Samothrake; *PGM* IV.1928-2005 Spell of Attraction of King Pitys; *PGM* IV.3007-86 a tested charm of Pibechis a legendary magician from Egypt. Dieleman (2005, 255) argues that these are marketing statements and are aimed at rendering the recipe beyond all doubt and critique.

[309] Later Platonists (first century CE onwards) claimed their knowledge from Plato and the semi-divine Pythagoras, whereas for the Egyptians, the knowledge was the result of the long-established Egyptian priesthood. See O'Meara's discussion (1989, 9-52) & Afonasin (2012) on the Pythagorean way of life & for Betegh (2013) for comparisons between the Pythagoreans Cosmogony and its similarities to the Derveni Papyrus. For the various roles of Egyptian priests and their duties from the Old Period to the Ptolemaic Period see the work of Forshaw (2014, 59-68).

[310] For Greek conceptions of magic see Dickie (2003, 19-45).

[311] Heka is also the embodiment of a god and a deity in their own right, and during the Ptolemaic period of the Mammisi in the Temple of the Philae it is Heka the god who proclaims the enthronement of the son of Isis and who symbolically represents the pharaoh himself as the ruler of Egypt. See the entry for Heka as a god in Hart (2005, 66).

[312] The *Ka* (kꜣ) represents the vital essence of the body (physical life force of the body).

[313] Ritner (1995, 3354).

[314] Dieleman (2019, 101), also Allen's (1989, 38) remarks regarding the importance of Annunication *(ḥw)* as a divine principle of creative speech which allows magic to come into existence.

[315] Dieleman (2019, 89-91).

[316] Dating of this hymn is difficult as the text is preserved in three fragmentary papyri from three different periods of the Eighteenth Dynasty. See Lichtheim (1975, 91, vol.1) transl.

[317] Transl. Dieleman (2019, 89).

understood as the mobilisation and application of *heka* in ritual which is usually rendered as "magic" in English.[318] However, *heka* as emphasised in this text, is not accessible to just any human but is a divine force that requires certain skills and special knowledge, such as the training of the Egyptian Lector Priest. The priests would need to know how to both harness and control *heka* so that the user does not disturb the natural order of the universe. So, could Heka be evil?

Evil *heka* was understood as the intrusion of demons which can attack or enter a victim. There are many amulets and spells in the Egyptian tradition which were created to prevent this intrusion of evil *heka*.[319] Interestingly, the One God also appears in rituals such as necromancy and binding spells (see Appendix E Table 1). These spells imply that *heka* is needed no matter if it is used for good or evil and also suggests that the One God did not have a choice in who could utilise his power. This is validated in the *Book of the Heavenly Cow* of the New Kingdom where the One God himself warns against these ritualists who mobilise *heka* as an intrusive force: "Beware of ritualists who know their spells because Heka himself (i.e the God Heka) is in them".[320] In fact, the Egyptian priests of the New Kingdom were well aware of this problem and would actively work against those who would use *heka* as a destructive force.[321] However, where the Greek philosophers would resort to labels such as "witch" and "sorcerer", terms that often denote an evil person, the Egyptian priests would use *heka* to expel demons, foreigners from Egypt or the dangerous dead both in private and state rituals.[322] Unlike the Greeks, the Egyptians had no concept of black vs. white magic and nor was there such thing as "evil" magic, only evil people. However, Porphyry and Iamblichus, as we will see, capitalise on the idea that those who practice magic are not able to unite with the One God or commune with Him, because their Hellenic viewpoint has taught them that ritualists who practice magic are filled with vulgar passions and impiety. In addition, building on the ideas of Plato, both philosophers argue that these ritualists do not have the proper theurgical and philosophical knowledge of the One God so therefore any attempts to unite with Him through magic and not theurgy or philosophy is based in falsehood.

3.2 Theurgy, Theosophy and Ritual Authority

In Chapter 1 we examined how Iamblichus and Porphyry were part of a long tradition in which Greek religious men used and admired Egyptians for their practices of purity and religious knowledge. However, magical rituals and magic itself, both core components of Egyptian religion, were regarded

[318] Dieleman (2019, 91).
[319] Ritner (1993, 21) states that when *heka* is marked as evil it appears like this: *ḥkꜣ ḏw ḥkꜣ bín or ḥkꜣ* written with an evil determinative (a stick) which is the Hieratic variant of the hieroglyph representing a bound or slain enemy.
[320] Transl. Dieleman (2019, 98).
[321] See the examples of the textual amulets designed to repel evil *heka* in (Dieleman 2019, 98-99) & for Egyptian curses and ritual authority see Frankfurter (2005).
[322] In the Demotic *Adventures of Setne Khamwas and his son Si-Osire* (Sente II) a Nubian sorcerer returns to Egypt after 1500 years to challenge the court magicians to a magic contest, but he is defeated by the Egyptian Si-Osire. See the transl. of Ritner (2003, 470).

as incompatible with the Greek philosophical and religious traditions. From the time of the Roman occupation of Egypt, magic was deemed illegal and anti-social. As a result, what was once a public ritual practice was now forced into the private sphere and protected by secrecy.[323] Theurgy, however, according to Porphyry and Iamblichus, was neither anti-social nor illegal. Ritualists, like those in the magical papyri, worked upon the One God, whereas theurgy enabled Porphyry and Iamblichus to be worked upon *by* the gods.[324] George Luck defines theurgy as an activity, operation or technique associated with worshipping the gods in which a ἱερατικὴ τέχνη (divine art) provides a direct path of salvation for the soul from Fate.[325] This enabled the masses of humanity that were subject to Fate to cleanse their soul of its terrestrial and corporeal pollution.[326] Theurgic rituals are thus seen as capable of purifying one's soul and raising it up to union with the gods, or in our case, the One God, and separate the soul from the body and advance the soul into the divine realm.[327]

So how did Porphyry and Iamblichus distinguish between theurgy and magic? Majercik's four major distinctions between theurgy and magic will help to further clarify this issue:

1. Magic has a profane goal, i.e., influencing a lover, coercing the gods etc., while theurgy has a salvific end (purification and return to god);
2. Magic is inherently coercive, while theurgy is passive;
3. Magic is non-sacramental; theurgy is "sacramental" (it works with the gods through the act alone);
4. Magic functions in a utilitarian manner within the practitioner's immediate environment; theurgy is based on an emanationist view that posits a "sympathetic" link between all aspects of the cosmos. [328]

While Majercik's distinctions are illuminating, she seems to overlook one fundamental point: both magic and theurgy are at their core ritual acts. The problem with separating magic from theurgy is that *all* rituals are emphatic ways of communicating with the divine and *all* rituals aim to cause an effect whether they are theurgic or magical.[329] In other words, it is their fundamental closeness that can confuse the uninformed observer; therefore making it a problem of perception. This problem explains why Porphyry and Iamblichus make such an effort to distinguish themselves as ritual practitioners of theurgy in opposition to magic. As we shall see in Section 3.6, there are relatively few differences between theurgic and magical unification rituals. In light of this fact, the questions how

[323] On this see Frankfurter (1998, 178-217).
[324] On the idea of the subjugation of the divine in theurgy see Cain (2009).
[325] Luck (1989, 52).
[326] Simmons (2015, 89) & Luck (1989, 189).
[327] Simmons (2015, 46; 205).
[328] Simmons (2015, 45) & Majercik (1989, 22ff).
[329] Thomassen (1997, 66-67).

and why both men believed that they were superior Ritual Masters with a better connection to the One God than the ritualists of the papyri becomes more urgent. Answering it requires us to distinguish theurgy from theosophy in Porphyry and Iamblichus.

Unlike Iamblichus' works, which show him to be a practitioner of theurgy, Porphyry's works do not allow us to determine with ease whether or not he was also a supporter of theurgic ritual, given the contradictions in his works and his avoidance of the term "theurgy". Andrew Smith rightly notes that Porphyry, in contrast to Iamblichus, represents the traditional way in which philosophers accommodated religion, accepted that it was of importance, and that, in some undefined way, religious rituals had efficacy.[330] However, the practice of theurgy posed a problem for Porphyry who grounded himself in the traditional philosophical way of approaching problems. From the start, theurgy was a philosophical-religious construct which took its goals from Platonism *and* religion.[331] Thus, for a man like Porphyry, who had a profound respect for religious rituals, theurgy was able to offer the possibility of reaching the same goal as the philosopher by means of ritual.[332] Therefore, with the right training, anyone could practice theurgy and also unite with or commune with the One God.

The idea that anyone could practice theurgy and interact with the One God raised a methodological question for Porphyry. Porphyry was a supporter of the idea of divine causation in ritual, that is, only immaterial things such as silence and prayer allowed communication with the One God and this, in Porphyry's view, was more demanding and explicit than traditional religion.[333] In order to solve this problem, Porphyry persisted and reasserted the pre-eminence of the philosophical way as opposed to theurgy which was too much like magic.[334] This is demonstrated in Augustine's commentary on the *Philosophy from Oracles* where he states that even Porphyry claims that theurgic ritual was nothing but a deception on the part of *daimones* who promised a return of the soul to the One God.[335] Porphyry advised that theurgy alone does not allow a return to the One God and for Porphyry, the theurgic art came too close to the practice of magic.[336] Porphyry's resistance to theurgy can be further explained by his preference for theosophy (knowledge of the gods). The following analysis will demonstrate how theosophy accommodates Porphyry's already established views and enables him to stay clear of theurgy and its association with magic.[337]

---

[330] Smith (2016, 4).
[331] Ibid.
[332] Smith (2016, 4-5).
[333] This is a contested issue as Porphyry is also a supporter of traditional religious rites as is demonstrated in the *Phil Orac*. However, it is very clear from *On Abst* 2.34-35 that silence and contemplative thought is what allows a union with the One God of Platonism.
[334] Smith (2016, 4) citing August. De *Civitate Dei* X.9f.: "quam vel magian vel detestabiliorem nominant goetian vel honorabiliorem theurgian vocant".
[335] Porph. *Abst* 2.40.3 *Ep. Anebo*. 2. See also Sodano's commentary (1964, 16.7-17.6).
[336] Simmons (2015, 44); Johnson (2013, 143).
[337] According to Simmons (2015, 45) and Van Liefferinge (1994, 183) Porphyry does not often use the term theurgy but instead uses terms such as γοητεία (witchcraft), κακότεχνος (wicked art) and θεοσοφία (theosophy).

3.3 Knowledge of the Gods: Porphyry the High Priest of Philosophy

Michael Simmons and Carine Van Lieffering suggest that Porphyry used a system of theurgy without explicitly naming it.[338] This is plausible when we consider Porphyry's dislike of users of magic in Book 2 of *On Abstinence* his statements in this work of the importance of knowledge of the gods and which are also found in *To Marcella* through the lens of ritual authority. In these works, Porphyry's preference for theosophy rather than theurgy becomes clear. Theosophy is knowledge of the gods and therefore knowledge of religious ritual and the proper way to commune with the gods, especially the One God.[339] However, while Porphyry may have avoided using the term theurgy in his works much of what he proposes in the *Philosophy from Oracles* operates like a theurgic ritual.[340] Could this be a strategic decision by Porphyry? I would argue that by avoiding the term theurgy, Porphyry is avoiding the label of magician — a label that was often levelled against those who practiced theurgy because of its similarity to magic.[341] Instead, Porphyry chose to assert the authority of religious rituals over theurgic. By rejecting theurgy and utilising a term that encompassed his idea of philosophical and religious thinking, he had to come up with a new term; he chose theosophy.

Porphyry's defined himself as a "High Priest of Philosophy" and therefore a Ritual Master with the proper knowledge of the gods. This evidence comes to us from a fourth century Christian author Lactantius (c. 250-325 CE) . In Lactantius *(Instit. Div.* 5.2-4), he speaks of a man whom he met, when he was teaching rhetoric in Bithynia. This man called himself the "High Priest of Philosophy".[342] According to Lactantius, this same man was a teacher of abstinence, parsimony and poverty, but was also known to be addicted to vice and extravagant living:

> …vomited forth three books against the Christian religion and name; professing above all things, that it was the office of a philosopher to remedy the errors of men, and to recall them to the true way, that is, to the worship of the gods, by whose power and majesty, as he said, the world is governed; and not to permit that inexperienced men should be enticed by the frauds of any, lest their simplicity should be a prey and sustenance to crafty men.[343]

Most scholars agree that this philosopher is indeed our Porphyry.[344] If we are to take Lactantius commentary as true, and also follow Bell's analysis cited at the beginning of this chapter, Porphyry

[338] Simmons (2015, 44) & Van Lieffering (1999, 179).
[339] Smith (2016, 5).
[340] August. *Civitas Dei* 10.9 and Fr. 286 Smith (1993) for Porphyry's use of the term theurgy.
[341] See Eunapius' accounts of magic accusations against Platonists who practiced theurgy in *Lives of the Sophist.*
[342] Lactantius also states, "quorum alter antistem se philosophiae profitebatur" ("of whom the other declared himself the High Priest of philosophy"; the Latin *antistem* can be translated as either High Priest or Master (of an art). See the full transl. Simmons (2015, 41) and Lactantius, *Divinarum Institutionum* 5.2-4.
[343] Transl. Simmons (2015, 41).
[344] As Simmons argues, since Wilken's analysis many other scholars have agreed that this probably refers to Porphyry. See Simmons (2015, 41-45) for further literature. See Wilken (1979 and 1984 p.135f). Additionally, Simmons also notes that Schott (2008) and Beatrice (2009) do not analyse nor cite the important passages in *Abst.* 2.49 and 2.50: "ὁ φιλόσοφος καὶ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἱερεὺς".

viewed himself as a Ritual Master. In addition to Lactantius' commentary, Porphyry's remarks in *On Abstinence* (2.35) and *To Marcella* (11) further allude to the idea that Porphyry viewed himself as a Ritual Master.[345] In these passages, Porphyry attempts to alleviate himself and his status by demonstrating the way other philosophers and priests have failed in their understanding of the gods, but he, the High Priest of Philosophy, has not.

For instance, in Porphyry's description of Egyptian priests he notes that by "living always with divine knowledge" you are able to move beyond all greed and passion.[346] However, this divine knowledge only comes with a life of restraint, self-control and perseverance.[347] Furthermore, in *To Marcella* Porphyry tells his wife that God only gives the correct authority to the "wise man" because he is purified by the knowledge of God and issuing from God he follows after righteousness.[348] Thus, theosophy, for Porphyry, is everything; not only is theosophy the key to the door of the divine realm, but it is knowing how the lock operates, what the door is made from and how to step over the barrier safely. But the recent claim by Simmon's analysis of *Philosophy from Oracles* that Porphyry did not practice theurgic rituals does not automatically follow.[349] We must also consider how Porphyry perceived the importance of theosophy before enacting those rituals. On this point, Porphyry's work *On Abstinence* can help us.

In *On Abstinence,* Porphyry distinguishes between the rituals of the masses and the rituals of the philosopher and he implies that only the philosopher knows how to unite with the One God.[350] Porphyry then devotes multiple sections to attacking those who practice magic. He first argues that the One God can only be worshipped in pure silence and pure thoughts and that the passions of the soul are contaminations. He goes on by saying:

> We must, then, be joined with and made like him, and must offer our own uplifting as a holy sacrifice to the god, for it is both our hymn and our security. This sacrifice is fulfilled in dispassion of the soul and contemplation of the god.[351]

---

[345] Porphyry, *Marc.* 11: "To the wise man God gives the authority of a God. And a man is purified by the knowledge of God and issuing from God he follows after righteousness." The *Phil. Orac.* states that the "Greeks have gone astray" which I would argue implies that Porphyry knows better. See Appendix A.9j. According to Clarke's translation Porphyry's usage of "wise about the gods" translates as *theosophoi*. See *On Abst* 2.35.1; 2.45.1.

[346] *On Abst.* 4.6.

[347] *On Abst.* 4.3-6. He also states in *Marc. 9*: "Now education does not consist in the absorption of a large amount of knowledge, but in the casting off the affections of the soul. Now the passions are the beginning of diseases. And vice is the disease of the soul; and every vice is disgraceful and is opposed to the good."

[348] *Marc* 17. See also *Marc* 31 in the same text where Porphyry states that "But wisdom and knowledge have no part in chance. It is not painful to lack the gifts of chance, but rather to endure the unprofitable trouble of vain ambition. For every disturbance and unprofitable desire is removed by the love of true philosophy. Vain is the word of that philosopher who can ease no mortal trouble. As there is no profit in the physician's art unless it cure the diseases of the body, so there is none in philosophy, unless it expel the troubles of the soul. These and other like commands are laid on us by the law of our nature."

[349] Simmons (2015, 35-42).

[350] *On Abst.* 2.34.2. For silent worship and "pure speech offerings", see also the *Hermeticum* 1.31; 13.17-21.

[351] *On Abst* 2.34.3. This is also repeated in *Marc.* 19: "it is not sacrificing that honour the god, nor a multitude of offerings that enhance him, but thought full of god and well established that joins us to god; for like must necessarily go to like".

Porphyry then distinguishes what can be sacrificed to the One God and to his "offspring", the intelligible gods and they required hymn singing to be added. Porphyry states that many who are committed to philosophy do not do this, yet they frequent the shrines, not even bothering to ask those who are *theosophoi*.[352] Porphyry clearly sees himself at the top of this food chain, a notion further alluded to in the next paragraph of the passage when Porphyry derives his authority from the Pythagoreans.[353] The following passages of Book 2 of *On Abstinence* then become an attack on the "knowledge" of sorcerers regarding the One God. Porphyry makes it very clear that enchantment literature (i.e., spells and rituals) have confused the masses. In fact, throughout Book 2 of *On Abstinence* Porphyry is unwavering in his argument that magical users do not know how to enact the proper worship of the One God in religious ritual.[354]

For instance, in passages 2.41-49, Porphyry repeatedly alludes to his own ritual authority when he argues that the purity of sorcerers is not effective, because only godly men can achieve the purity needed to commune with the divine. According to Porphyry, the High Priest of Philosophy does not feed on impurities but on the wisdom of the gods.[355] The following section then attempts to draw a connection to the authority of the Egyptian priests and Egyptian temples where even footwear must be clean before entering.[356] Subsequently, Porphyry then creates a hierarchy of authority by stating that the theologians were right to be concerned with abstinence in ritual.[357] Interestingly, the theologians (likely the Pythagoreans) are placed *before* Porphyry's comments on the purity practices of the Egyptian priests. It emerges that, while theurgy is not directly mentioned, theosophy –or wisdom of the gods– is the most important aspect of ritual before abstinence and purity requirements. If one does not have theosophy, drawn from authority and philosophical knowledge, one cannot practice either theurgy or any type of ritual practice. Consequently, if the One God rules everything and all is descended from Him and you attempt to unite with Him by using inaccurate theosophy which is *not* based in philosophical understanding, the result is that you will not be united with the One God, but with something else, most likely evil deities or *daimones*.[358] This next section demonstrates that Iamblichus' views are similar to Porphyry. However, Iamblichus places a greater emphasis on the ritualist having a proper understanding of ritual and a rare noetic soul that enables him to connect with the One God.

3.4 Ritual Mastery and the Rare Soul: Theurgy and Iamblichus

[352] *On Abst.* 2.35. In Pl., *Meno* 81A, those "wise about divine matters" are priests who understand the meaning of their rites. In Plotinus, *Enn.* 6.9.11.27-30 the "wise priest" enters the sanctuary to contemplate the divine, not the image.
[353] *On Abst.* 2.36.
[354] *On Abst.* 2.41-49.
[355] *On Abst.* 2.43.2.
[356] *On Abst* 2.45.
[357] On *Abst.* 2.47-48.
[358] On *Abst*, 2.41 & 2.45.

There is no direct evidence to suggest that Iamblichus calls himself a Ritual Master or a High Priest of Philosophy as we find in Porphyry. However, a new interpretation using Bell's framework can reveal that Iamblichus does in fact imply that he defines himself as a ritual master. The first instance is in Book 5 of the *On the Mysteries.* In this book, Iamblichus explains that unification with the One God of Neoplatonism only comes later in life. [359]His statement suggests that Iamblichus experienced this unification with the One God himself.[360] The second instance can be gleaned from Iamblichus' *Letter to Asphalius on the virtue of Wisdom*. In this letter, Iamblichus asserts that it is reasonable to believe that wisdom renders those who possess it to become like a god".[361] Thus, Iamblichus can be thought of as a Ritual Master for the following reasons.

Firstly, he supports the idea that we all practice a form of theurgy and worship to the gods, but believes that only a special kind of person can ascend to the One.[362] Secondly, ascent to the One God required a virtue that was only found in truly unique souls who were not subject to fate. Unlike magic, theurgic rites are not designed to combat fate but their overall purpose is to return to the One God. Theurgists who can achieve this return make use of intellectual activity and have easy access to the One God, and the rest of humanity who are subject to nature are touched by the One God but never can ascend to Him.[363] The reason for this is that those who possess a "natural soul", i.e., a soul that is tied to the material world and the impurities that come with it (passion, lust, greed etc.) are subject to fate and therefore incapable of theurgic salvation, which is tied to the immaterial world.[364] A theurgist with a divine soul possesses the hieratic virtue which exists in the "godlike" aspect of the human soul.[365] All of humanity is born with this godlike aspect of their soul, but only a certain type of person can *access* this part of the soul.

To summarise, Bell argues that ritual masters often attempt to connect themselves with authority figures so that their knowledge would not be brought into question. As discussed in Chapter 1, Iamblichus wrote *On the Mysteries.* pretending to be an Egyptian priest in order to connect himself to the wisdom and authority of Egypt. Therefore, Iamblichus would have perceived himself as a

[359] Iambl. *De Myst.* 5.20.
[360] Iamblichus argues in response to Porphyry that the highest purpose of theurgy is to ascend to the One. However, "that does not come about except at a very late stage and to very few individuals, and one must be satisfied if it occurs even in the twilight of one's life." (5.22). The *De Myst.* is dated to after the death of Porphyry in 304 CE. Iamblichus would have been around 60 years of age. Eunapius in his *Lives of Philosophers and Sophists* (ca. 395 CE) also catalogues various incidents of Iamblichus' supposedly "wonderous" powers such as summoning deities, levitating and radiance as well as sensing death. See Wright transl. (1921, 367-373).
[361] Iambl. *De Myst.* 5.1: "For if the essence and accomplishment of all good is encompassed by the gods and their primal power and authority, it is only with us and those who are similarly possessed by the greatest kinds and have genuinely gained union with them that the beginning and the end of all good is seriously practised."
[362] For example, Iambl. *De Myst.* 5.22 where he argues that union with the One, even for those with these rare souls, happens late in life and or very rarely. Additionally, Porphyry wrote in the *Vit. Plot.* 10 that Plotinus experienced this type of rare noetic soul later in his life as is demonstrated by his interaction with the Egyptian priests in Rome at the temple of Isis where he summoned his personal daemon which was in fact a god.
[363] Finamore (2012, 118).
[364] Iambl. *De Myst.* 2.11 & 2.5-6.
[365] Iambl. *De Myst.* 5.20-21.

Ritual Master for the following reasons: he possesses a unique soul and this enabled him to unify with the One God, he connects himself to the authority of the Egyptians, he argues that wisdom makes you become like a god. Additionally, in the *Life of Pythagoras* and *On the Soul* Iamblichus allies himself to other authoritative figures such as Plato and the Pythagoreans when expounding his philosophical doctrines.[366] What is also of interest to us is how Iamblichus argues that attempts by magicians or philosophers to unite with the One God were useless without the correct virtue i.e., a hieratic/ theurgic soul.[367] I will now further demonstrate how Iamblichus' support of theurgic ritual as opposed to magic is further evidence to support the idea that Iamblichus defined himself as a ritual master.

For Iamblichus, the One God was the most divine being in the cosmos and only a theurgic ritual allowed a *sustasis* to occur.[368] *Sustasis* rituals, such as those we find in the *PGM*, involved a process of purification and knowledge like those proposed by Porphyry and Iamblichus.[369] After the ritualists performed ritual acts of purity (abstinence from sex and meat for a certain period of days) unification with the Supreme Deity (One God) could be accomplished, the ritualist then assimilates the god's powers and was elevated to a semi-divine status.[370] Once the link to the Supreme Deity was established and the god's power assimilated into the ritualists, they attained an open line of communication or unification (*sustasis*) with the Deity. This enabled them to perform various rituals of divination and access transcendent levels of knowledge of the One God.[371] However, the process of purification and seclusion performed by the ritualists of the *PGM* were not merely completed to attain transcendent levels of knowledge and the unification with the Supreme God. Rather, the ritual acts of purity and seclusion were also a means to avoid invoking or angering the evil *daimones* and gods during the ritual – something that Porphyry is also aware of. [372] This is similar in the Chaldean Oracles which also warns theurgists to beware of the "demonic dogs" of Hekate.[373] Like the ritualists of the *PGM*, those who practiced theurgy were also confident that they had the right knowledge to enact the ritual and avoid this evil interference.

---

[366] Iambl. *VP 1* & *De An.* 7 where Iamblichus is referring to the doctrine of the Soul as an incorporeal essence: "It is these doctrines to which Plato himself and Pythagoras and Aristotle, and all the ancients who have gained great and honourable names for wisdom are completely committed…" also *De Myst.* 1.1-2.

[367] "The Gods habituate the souls of the theurgist whilst still in bodies, to be detached from their bodies and be led round to their intelligible and eternal root" Iambl. *De Myst.* 1.12-13; See the discussions in Shaw (1985, 19) and Finamore (2012, 129-130).

[368] Shaw (1985, 20) and Iambl. *De Myst.* 1.21-22; 1.3-4.

[369] Blazevic (2020) has shown that the process of purification against evil *daimones* (and in most ritual practices such as *sustasis* rituals) in Porphyry and Iamblichus are similar if not identical to the ritualists of the papyri.

[370] *PGM* IV.475-829, line 741; *PGM* IV. 154-285, lines 215-221.

[371] For the divination rituals of "magicians," see Gordon (1997, 65-93); Graf (1997, 83-118).

[372] Porph. *On Abst.* 2.45

[373] Johnston's (2019, 702) discussion of Chaldean Oracles Fr.87 & 91.

Yet, Iamblichus argues that the *sustasis* rituals performed with magic are nothing but trickery and wonder working.[374] As Gregory Shaw illustrates, Iamblichus is of the opinion that theurgic rituals subordinated man to the will of the gods, whereas magical rituals subordinated the gods to man.[375] However, as we will see below, there is no conceptual difference between theurgic and magical rituals. [376] Furthermore, the idea that magical rituals subordinated the gods to man is emphatically opposed to how *heka* operates in Egyptian culture. The surviving iconography of the god Heka demonstrates that He is indispensable in the preservation of the cosmic order and the life-death cycle that governs nature.[377] During the solar cycle and the successful merging of Re and Osiris at night, it is Heka who fights the snake Apep, the representation of chaos. Heka paralyses this enemy with his force and provides a safe passage for the One God (or the Sun God) through the underworld.[378] As we saw earlier in this chapter, the One God of Egyptian religion bestowed *heka* onto the people in order to deal with the vicissitudes of life. But Heka's accompaniment of the Sun God in the iconography also demonstrates to us that *heka* (magic) was also used to unite with the One God. We have to infer, then, that Iamblichus ignored or misunderstood that, according to the Egyptians, *heka* is a part of the soul (Ba) and bound up with the idea of fate, like the theurgists.[379]

To conclude this section, Porphyry and Iamblichus both claim that there is a difference between theurgy and magic and how theosophy interacts with both notions. For Iamblichus, all demonstrations of power by any individual are only allowed if the One God permits it.[380] From his own point of view, then, Iamblichus practiced a form of religious ritual that in his perception was legitimate, pious, and very different from rituals that used magic to unite with the One God. Like Porphyry, Iamblichus also emphasised that morality, virtue, and proper piety must be practiced by the individual to access power and communicate with the One God. However, Porphyry placed a higher importance on theosophy for performing religious ritual, especially when attempting to unite with the One God. Interestingly, like Porphyry and Iamblichus, the ritual experts of the *PGM* also regarded themselves primarily as followers of the Supreme Deity with the same special access to Him; furthermore, their connection and knowledge of the Supreme Deity granted them consecrated power. One of the ways in which the ritualists of the magical papyri appropriated this power was through the rite of *sustasis*, a divine encounter of sorts.[381]

[374] Iambl. *De Myst.* 9.1 and esp. 3.25-26: "And do not, furthermore, compare the clearest vision of the gods to images produced artificially from magic, for these have neither the energy nor the essence of things seen, nor truth, but present mere images, reaching only as far as appearance." See also Shaw (2003) on Iamblichus' conceptions of different types of divination and divine possession.
[375] Shaw (1985, 1-3).
[376] Radcliffe (2019) has also produced an analysis on theurgy vs. magic and come to the same conclusion.
[377] Dieleman (2019, 90).
[378] Dieleman (2019, 91 n.11).
[379] On the concept of Ba and its association with Heka the deity and *heka* as magic see Ritner (1993, 23).
[380] See Iambl. *De Myst.* 1.21.66; 2.11.95–99; 3.1.100–101; 3.18–19; 3.22.153–154; 3.31.178–179.
[381] Fraser (2009, 136).

The overall aim of this next discussion (3.5-6) is to show that the One God of the papyri is similar to the Neoplatonists' in terms of His characteristics, but also that there are no inherent differences between theurgic rituals and magical rituals. Specifically, the analysis will show that notions of the One God are not just found in philosophy or religious hymns but also in magical texts such as the *sustasis* rituals. This reveals an uninterrupted textual tradition of the One God from the Leiden and Hibis hymns into the Late Antique magical rituals. Where applicable, I will also try to show the similarities between theurgic rituals and magical rituals in the *sustasis* rituals.[382]

3.5 The One God in the *sustasis* rituals of the *PGM*

The *PGM* is not often considered an appropriate source when analysing theological ideas of God as it incorporates gods from various Mediterranean and Egyptian cultures. However, a closer analysis of *sustasis* rituals within the *PGM* reveals a different type of "magical theology" and these rituals have much to offer when examining how someone can connect with the One God. In addition, the *PGM* can throw further light on the continuity and nature of theurgy and magic. There are several spells in the *PGM* that possess the same distinct characteristics of the One God that we find in both the Hibis and Leiden Hymns and Neoplatonist philosophical texts. Of course, the way in which these magical spells were used and circulated is very different to theological writing and or philosophical treatises. Assmann contends that the use of theology in a magical context in Egyptian texts is exceptionally rare.[383] However, the spells analysed in this chapter disprove that theory. These particular *sustasis* rituals were written as instructional guides, with accompanying theology, for how to unite with the One God. This is of course different to how Porphyry and Iamblichus study the One God and argue about Him in their philosophical texts. Moreover, in comparison to the Leiden and Hibis hymns, these rituals are different in their functionality i.e., they are practical not theoretical.[384] Nevertheless, if we are to follow the consensus amongst scholars that Egyptian priests wrote the *PGM*, then we must also assume that the One God mentioned in the Hibis and Leiden hymns would make an appearance in the *sustasis* rituals. Therefore, not only does the One God have a place in theology but also in ritual. As it turns out, this assumption can be validated to some degree.

Building on the work of Korshi Dosoo and Stephen Skinner, as well as my own examination of the papyri, I have identified a number of spells in the *PGM* which are of great relevance to our investigation.[385] One interesting finding is that several different spells which were written for

[382] For discussions on theurgic rituals see: Struck (2001 25-38); for definitions of theurgy see Edmonds (2019, 314-377); see Johnston (2019) for the discussions of theurgy in the Chaldean oracles. Athanassiadi (1999, 149-184) also provides an excellent overview of the transmission of the Chaldean Oracles. See also Finamore's (1999) excellent analysis of magic versus theurgy according to Plotinus and Iamblichus. Shaw (1995) provides the most detailed discussion of theurgy and Iamblichus.
[383] Assmann (1997b, 3-4).
[384] For works on the papyri in terms of their function see Gordon (2012, 1997), Ritner (1995), Frankfurter (1998).
[385] Dosso (2014) and Skinner (2014).

various ritual purposes mention the One God (Appendix E Tables 1, 3 and 4). In these spells, we find similar characteristics of the One God found in Neoplatonic philosophy and the Leiden and Hibis hymns. The One God, however, is featured primarily in the *sustasis rituals* found in the papyri. In the *PGM,* the arrival of a god in ritual is often referred to as *sustasis* (σύστασις 'introducing or coming together'; in the Demotic it is known as *pḥ- nṯr* a "the arrival of the god"). Although, the term *sustasis* can also represent something broader such as communication or contact with a god. Skinner arranges the different types of *sustasis* rituals into three distinct but interrelated categories: *sustasis,* invocation of a god, invocation of the Bear goddess and the *autoptos* ritual which is a known as a "face to face encounter with a god".[386] The literal translation of *autoptos* is "self-revealed".[387]

The term *autoptos* is found in the *PGM*, the Chaldean Oracles and cited in Porphyry and Iamblichus. Porphyry refers to the term when describing the summoning of a *daimon* by an Egyptian priest in his *Life of Plotinus* and in his criticism of *autoptos* rituals in the *Letter to Anebo*.[388] In his response to the letter, Iamblichus frequently uses the term *autoptos* but does not give a clear definition.[389] Instead he uses it to reference the apparitions of deities whose characteristics are visible to the practitioner.[390] Chaldean Fr. 190 describes *autoptos* as a manifestation and guidance of the gods that lead the soul upward.[391] Modern scholars sometimes categorise both *sustasis* and *autoptos* as "revelation magic".[392] Both rituals (*sustasis* and *autoptos*) can also be labelled as "ritual of apparition", a term introduced by Dosoo in his analysis of the papyri.[393] Expanding on this definition and its place in the scholarship of ritual, Dosoo argues that *sustasis* and *autoptos* are often labelled as "divination" which is too broad of a category and often ignores the important distinction between a unification with a god and communing with a god.[394] Labelling these rituals accurately is not a straightforward task when they contain so many activities and materials. Dosoo is right to contend that "no emic term" can adequately cover the full range of ritual practices used by ritualists of the papyri when trying to connect with a deity or deities.[395] Nevertheless, I will refer to these rituals as *sustasis or autoptos* rituals until a more definitive term can be agreed upon.

At the beginning of Chapter 2.3 it was demonstrated that there are five distinct similarities of the One God between the Leiden and Hibis hymns and the Platonic texts.[396] These same characteristics

---

[386] Skinner's reasoning for including the invocation of the Bear Goddess as a subcategory for *sustasis* rituals is not entirely clear. Skinner (2017, 273).
[387] For example, *PGM* VII. 7.335.
[388] "Κληθέντα δὲ είς/αύτοψίαν τὸν δαίμονα θεὸν ἐλθεῖν" (*V. Plot.* 10.21-22); "... οὕτω γάρ φασιν αύτοπτεῖσθαι" (*Ep. Aneb.* 2.9a.3-5).
[389] Iambl. *De Myst.* 2.3.63, 2.4.44, 2.6.27, 2.7.2, 2.10.23, 2.10.49-50, 2.10.90, 2.10.90, 7.3.24.
[390] Dosoo (2014, 266).
[391] Chaldean Fr. 190 transl. Majerick (1989, 121).
[392] Dosoo (2014, 221).
[393] Dosoo (2014) is building on the work of Swartz (2005, 242-243) and his analysis of a ritual from the Cairo Genizah, a collection of 300,000 Jewish manuscript fragments.
[394] Dosoo (2014, 221).
[395] Dosoo (2016, 270).
[396] See (2.3, p. 43) of this thesis.

also appear in selected rituals of the papyri and are listed below. In addition, the table below displays, in separate columns, the purpose of the rituals, terms used, line numbers and gods who are dedicatees in each ritual. As the reader will notice, different labels such as *sustasis and autoptos* can be applied to the various rituals which aim to have contact with the One God in the *PGM*. However, it should be noted that most of the *sustasis* rituals analysed have a common purpose, that is, the ritualist wishes not only to meet a god, but also to communicate with it, unite with it, or in some cases, even control it.[397] When the *sustasis* ritual is performed correctly, the ritualist is able to force the deity into "speaking plainly" and appearing in a human form.[398] In a similar fashion, the *autoptos* rituals are used by the ritualist so that the god can answer pertinent questions or become a permanent helper. The following table offers an overview of the instances of *sustasis* in the *PGM* where the One God is mentioned or alluded too:

> Characteristic 1: X is described as a Creator God of earth, humans or deities or affiliated with creation from the beginning.
>
> Characteristic 2: X is described as "hidden" and possess secret and many "holy" name/s.
>
> Characteristic 3: X is described as God of Gods, Lord of All and head of a hierarchy or a Supreme God.
>
> Characteristic 4: X is "self-born" or "Begotten" in the sense of self creation.
>
> Characteristic 5: X is described as "mixing himself" with the universe.

Σύστασις in *PGM*

Ritual	No. of Lines	Greek terms used	Category	Ritual purpose	Gods dedicated
***PGM* II.64-183**	121	συνίστα δὲ σεαυτὸν τῷ θεῷ; ἄλλως ποιήσις[399]	C2; C3	Dream revelation compulsive formula with consecration of the doorpost and the figure of the Headless one with a Dismissal formula	Apollo paian, Titan, Zeus, Muses, Phoibos, Moirai (Klotho, Atropos, Lachis) Sesengen bar Pharanges, Io, Erbeth, Sabaoth, Adonai, Kommes, Apollo of Klaros, Abraxas, Michael, Damnameneus
***PGM* III.187-262**	76	ἡ σύστασις τῆς πράξεως	C1; C3; C4.	Revelation by invocation of Helios and use of the tripod. With illustration of two snakes (?) Contains a hymn to Helios and a dismissal formula (απόλυσις)	Helios [King] Semea, Abrasax Scarab, [Khepera] Zeus, Michael, Sese[ngen] b]ar Pharaggges Sabaoth, Adonai, Akrammach[ari] Apollo, Phoibos.

[397] Skinner (2014, 270).
[398] Skinner (2014, 270).
[399] Alternative procedure connected to *PGM* II. 1-64 which is another dream revelation.

PGM III.494-611	118	Συστασι; Ευχης.[400]	C1; C2; C3; C4	*Sustasis* ritual	Helios
PGM IV.930.1114	185	Σύστασις; ἔχε συνεστάμενον; φωταγωγία; τὸν θεαγωγὸν λόγον; θεαγωγὸς; τὸ είπεῖν τὴν φωτα|γωγίαν	C1; C3; C4	*Sustasis* ritual; the ritual, however, is also described as an αὔτοπτος.[401]	Lailam, Iao, Sabaoth, Baiinchoooch, Albala, Sensengen bar Pharagges, Ablanathanabla, Akrammachamari, Horos, Harpokrates, Abraiaoth, Balsames, Barbarial
PGM IV.475-829	348	ἡ δὲ τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ σύστασίς; μυστηρια; Μυσται	C4; C3	Mithras Liturgy (mysteries initation ritual) *sustasis* here may refer to a preliminary procedure. [402]	Helios, Mithras, Psyche
PGM VII.505-528	505	Συστασις	C5	Meeting with your own *daimon*, a form initiation	
PGM XIII.1-343	343	Συνιστάνου; τῇ καθολικῇ συστάσε	C1; C3; C4	Initiation ritual; a sacred book called Monad or Eighth Hidden Book of Moses version A	Zeus, Ares, Helios, Aphrodite, Hermes, Selene, Aion, Iao, Sabaoth, Zagoure, Adonai, Lailam, Anoch, Abrasax, Apollo, Achebyrkrom, Phos-Auge, Nous, Phrenes, Semesilam, Moira, Kairos, Psyche, Aphyphis, Christ.

According to Skinner, the papyri contain a total of fourteen strictly *sustasis* rituals, and seventeen invocations to a god/goddess, but only five invocations to the Bear goddess. The overall percentage of these specific rituals and their appearance in the papyri is relatively small when viewed in relation to the other rituals in the papyri, as this table shows:

PGM	Proportion	Lines of total	Avg. no. of lines
Love spells	15.9%	12.3%	19
Sustasis rituals	6.2%	10.4%	42
autoptos	0.7%	1.7%	n/a

The percentage of lines for the *sustasis rituals* is 10.4% with the average number of lines coming to 42 in the *sustasis rituals*. This is an intriguing finding, because in comparison to the love spells, which dominate the *PGM*, the average line length for a love spell of attraction only comes to 19, which

[400] The Greek term here means "prayer".
[401] Dosoo (2014, 260) states that the αὔτοπτος is referring to the apparition ritual while σύστασις refers to the conjunction ritual and the φωταγωγία is the initial act of bringing the light, which is followed by the κάτοχος τοῦ φωτὸς to keep the light, and finally by the θεαγωγὸς, who brings the god into the light.
[402] This spell is an ἀναγωγή, a ritual known as the Mithras Liturgy. The Greek headwords are also "mysteries" and "initiate".

implies that only specialists used these rituals.[403] To conclude, a cursory glance at the *sustasis* rituals where the One God appears reveals that these spells are complex. Each ritual contains a set of detailed instructions, ingredients, hymns, mythology and theology in order for the ritualists to communicate effectively with the One God. Clearly the *sustasis* rituals are complicated and detailed and this implies that they were used only by those who had experience in this particular area, i.e., Ritual Masters.

3.6 The reception of the One God in selected papyri

When we consider the papyri for the analysis of rituals aimed at unifying with, communicating with, or seeing the One God, five cases are worth studying more closely.[404] These particular cases show that there are both characteristics of the One God found in both Neoplatonism and Egyptian theology *and* similar ideas regarding theurgic rituals found in Porphyry and Iamblichus Moreover, while these rituals refer to many gods, they share one purpose, that is, unification with, or communication with, the One God who is a key player and often mentioned at the beginning of the ritual thus implying that there is a hierarchy if the ritual wishes to have efficacy.

I have selected rituals in which the One God appears alongside the term *sustasis: PGM* II.64-13; III.187-262; 494-611; 475-829; VII.505-528; XIII.1-343. *PGM* IV.930-1114 is also classed as both an *autoptos* and *sustasis* ritual. Furthermore, the majority of the spells fit with more than three characteristics of the One God with the exception of *PGM* VII.505-528. It should be noted that the One God also appears in a number of rituals designed for a myriad of purposes implying that the One God is needed in order for "magic" and ritual efficacy to take place, see Appendix E. In (2.3) it was revealed that the One God in the Leiden and Hibis hymns was described as a "Lord of Lords, Supreme God". This Supreme God divided himself after creating himself and then the universe. This was also a prominent characteristic in Iamblichus', Porphyry's and Plotinus' Neoplatonic doctrines of the One God. In the following discussion of these five spells (Sections 3.4.1–5), a brief summary of content is followed by a comparison with the Neoplatonist ideas on the One God in order to emphasise the strong resemblance between the two bodies of evidence.

3.6.1 *PGM* III.494-611: Rite to Establish a Relationship with Helios

PGM III.494-611 is a rite to establish a relationship with Helios. In this ritual, there is a hymn to be spoken that mentions a One God who is described as the "Holy Spirit", a founder of the world and a

[403] On the other hand, the *autoptos* rituals only comprise 0.7% of the *PGM* and 1.7% of the linage. Skinner (2014, 268-269) argues that this ritual is only so that the user can see the god but not communicate with them. Skinner has also noted that there are only five spells in the papyri with the Greek headword *autoptos: PGM* IV.930-1114; *PGM* V.54-69; Va.1-3; *PGM* VII.319-334; *PGM* VII.727-739.

[404] The rituals studied in this chapter and their selected lines which contain characteristics of the One God can be found in Appendix F.

Supreme God. The language of the preliminary ritual that is offered after the hymn (see Appendix F) gives thanks to a Supreme God who granted humans the power of intellect, knowledge and speech so that "we may know you".[405] In a similar fashion, the end of Leiden XC also mentions how the One God offered life to all men, he loosened speech so that words may flow and shattered the silence of the world. [406]The One God of Leiden XC also "taught men to know the Way, the path they each must go, hearts rejoiced and come alive when they see him".[407] Consequently, not only is *PGM* III.494-611 similar to Leiden XC, and indeed the majority of the Leiden hymns (with the exception of X), but it also resembles Iamblichus' description of "hieratic ritual" in *On the Mysteries*.[408]

As demonstrated in 2.8, Iamblichus was well aware of similarities between Egyptian ideas and his own. In his explanation of Egyptian theological principles in Book 8 of the *On the Mysteries* Iamblichus contends that the Egyptians recognized a Creator God in which all things were created, and this god transcends the heavenly realms in much the same way as the Neoplatonic One God. He then goes on to argue that if one wanted to ascend to this One God, they must practice this through the act of theurgy and hieratic rituals: "For they in fact recognise many principles, and relative to many sorts of essence, including supracosmic powers, which they worship by means of hieratic ritual".[409] Iamblichus claims that this information was bestowed by Hermes to the Prophet Bitys who, after finding this information and discovering the name of God in hieroglyphics in a temple in Sais, gave the interpretation to "King Ammoun".[410] Iamblichus also states that there are many other treatises on the subject. It would seem then that *PGM* III.494-611 is the same ritual that Iamblichus would label hieratic and theurgic however it appears in the *PGM*. Additionally, the hymn and the preliminary spell contain descriptions of a Creator God that appears to sit above Helios. This ritual also enables the ritualists to establish a relationship with Helios or the One God after citing the various astrological hours and symbols that are connected to Helios. In order for the ritual to have efficacy, the ritualists must request the permission and gratitude of the Creator God in order for the ritual to take place. Essentially, the theology present in this ritual demonstrates that theological knowledge of the One God is important for ritual efficacy when encountering divinity as we find in both Porphyry and Iamblichus' philosophical texts.

3.6.2 *PGM* IV.475-829: The Mithras Liturgy

PGM IV.475-829, known as the Mithras Liturgy, is a detailed initiation ritual containing several references to the One God. In addition, this ritual has many Chaldean elements and contains a

[405] *PGM* III. 494-611, Lines 590-598.
[406] Appendix B4.
[407] Appendix B4.
[408] Iambl. *De Myst.* 8.4-5 and Shaw (2013, 131).
[409] Iambl. *De Myst.* 8.5.
[410] Iambl. *De Myst* 8.3.

theurgic ritual action of inhaling light which is also cited in Iamblichus.[411] After the One God has revealed himself through the rays of sunlight, the user of the ritual must greet this god first identified as Helios (Appendix F). In this greeting, Helios is asked to introduce the user to the Supreme God, the begotten god, who created Helios. This implies the demiurgic hierarchy that we have seen so often, not only in the Neoplatonist writings, but also in the Leiden and Hibis hymns. However, what should also be noted regarding this ritual is the technique that is needed to meet the One God.

The Mithras liturgy asks the ritualists to remake the human body into a cosmic vehicle by inhaling divine light. This is similar to Plotinus' notion of the ascent of the soul as a journey that is taken up into oneself and beyond the bounds of mortality and fate.[412] The ritualist asks to "draw in breath from the rays", a technique that Sarah Johnston has analysed in the theurgic rituals of the Chaldean Oracles and Iamblichus. According to Johnston, the drawing in of light by the theurgist is based on the metaphysical principle that the Father's light constitutes the essence of divinity: it is through this particular medium that divinity can interact with the material world, therefore requiring the theurgist to incorporate that light as well.[413] Johnston claims that, unless the technique described in the Mithras Liturgy is older than the papyrus, we can assume that the technique of inhaling light to meet with the Father (the One God) was invented by theurgists and that the ritual experts who cite this technique adopted and adapted a theurgic ritual.[414] Johnston's analysis of this technique and the liturgy may be in need of reassessment when we dig further into the Egyptian antecedents within this ritual, the location of the papyri and the scribe/s who wrote it.

The "inhaling" of the rays and the association of the One God and fire is not purely a Chaldean/theurgic concept. Johnston tells us that in Chaldean Fr. 123 the *angeloi* illuminate the soul by making it less dense with their "warming" breath. At line 510, the ritualists ask that the sacred spirit will "breathe in me". Breath, especially breath of the gods, is an important concept in the Hibis and Leiden hymns. For instance, throughout the Hibis hymns we find the idea of Amun and his fiery breath bringing life notably in the Hymns to the Ba's of Amun.[415] This theme of Amun breathing into other gods is quite common and this action is often attributed to Amun-Re as a solar deity throughout the Solar Hymns and Netherworld books of Ancient Egypt.[416] However, the author/s of the Hibis hymns saw this idea as part of the wind-like aspect of Amun, specifically the manifestation of the Ba (soul) of Shu within Amun.[417] Eventually, both concepts united into one to express how Amun had

[411] Iambl. *De Myst*. 3.11, 125.5; 3.14, 132.10; 5.26.
[412] Janowitz (2019, 691).
[413] Johnston (2019, 712-713) bases her analysis on the following Chaldean fragments: 122; 123; 130 and Julian *Orationes* 4.142a. See also Johnston's later research (1997) on theurgic ascent in the Chaldean Oracles.
[414] For a more recent analysis of the Mithras Liturgy see Janowitz (2019, 690-693). For initiation rites in the *PGM* see Pachoumi (2017b).
[415] Klotz (2006, 36); see Appendix F for the third prayer and the association of fire.
[416] Ibid.
[417] Klotz (2006, 64).

the ability, through the rays of the sun, to allow the deceased to breathe.[418] In addition, throughout the Mithras Liturgy, the One God is described as a fiery god and a light giver with fiery breath. This characteristic of fiery breath thus clearly draws on Ancient Egyptian theology.

Further evidence of the Egyptian antecedents in this ritual is available, for instance, in the fact that the ritual claims the One God is seen through the "disk of god". Once the various "magical phrases" (*voces magicae*) have been spoken during this ritual, the author then tells the ritualist to look into the centre of the rays and you will see the One God before you (Appendix F). Assmann argues that the Egyptian One God's remoteness is the condition of his visibility and that the radiant brilliance that veils him is the condition of his physical presence a sort of *parousía*.[419] Likewise, in the Creator Hymn we find the same concept where Amun-Re is one "who illumines by means of his flame".[420] In addition, the speech of the Egyptian sun god can be assimilated with fire and light such as in the Tomb of Rameses VII: "His word is light, those among whom he is breathe by means of his voice".[421] This description of the One God, who is surrounded by flames, and who breathes life into other beings with his rays, reflects the theological interpretation of light as a form of physical presence of god in which he reveals himself. Therefore, Johnston's interpretation of the Mithras Liturgy is not incorrect in assuming that it is a theurgic ritual as the dating of the Mithras Liturgy is the 4th century CE and the Chaldean Oracles dated to the 1st CE. Still, we have now seen that the same concepts are found far earlier in the theology of the Egyptians in the New Kingdom. [422]

3.6.3 *PGM* IV.930-1114: God as Self-Engendered

PGM IV.930-1114 contains a detailed *sustasis* ritual with three categories that closely match the Hibis, Leiden and Neoplatonic ideas of the One God.[423] The One God is alluded to and mentioned directly several times.[424] For example, the ritual begins by citing the prayer for the ritualists and this

418 Klotz (2006, 63) and Darnell (2004, 100–1, 213–14); cf. also Assmann (1995, 74).
419 *Parousia* is translated in Greek as presence or arrival and as Assmann (1995, 74) elaborates, in the Egyptian context it is the physical presence of the divinity of the One God which is a characteristic of New Kingdom Solar theology.
420 Klotz (2006, 141). See also the hymn in Appendix C3.
421 Ibid.
422 I would further argue against Johnston's claims (2008, 473-474) that the Egyptian "Opening of the Mouth ceremony", which may have been a model for theurgic rituals such as we find in Iamblichus', should *not* be minimised until further comparisons between Egyptian texts and Neoplatonic texts can be completed.
423 Dosoo (2014, 260) states that the αὔτοπτος is referring to the apparition ritual while σύστασις refers to the conjunction ritual and the φωταγωγία is the initial act of bringing the light, which is followed by the κάτοχος τοῦ φωτὸςto keep the light, and finally by the θεαγωγὸς, which brings the god into the light.
424 *PGM* IV.1596-1715, a spell that is a consecration ritual for a stone, ring and phylactery also contains descriptions similar to those in *PGM* IV.930-1114, where Helios is also invoked as the living god. Eleni Pachoumi (2017a, 67) argues that both of these spells are distinctly Jewish as Helios is described as a "living god' in contrast to the 'dead' pagan gods". However, while the title of the *PGM* IV.1596-1715 and its reference to Helios makes it clearly attributed to that god, that does not account for lines (1596-1615) and (1705-1714) that have the distinct features of the One God Amun-Re in the Hibis and Leiden hymns. In addition, in the Creator Hymn (Appendix C3) the One God is described as "August Falcon, dappled of plumage, Falcon-image who rests upon Maat". This is similar to the description of Helios at line 1680 of *PGM* IV.1596-1715 where he is described as having the form of a falcon at the 9th hour.

prayer describes a god that is self-engendered and self-begotten and is associated with the Ancient Egyptian scarab (the symbol of the sun). The preceding spells speak of a god that is:

> Living god, Invisible begetter of light (line 960)
>
> A god that illumines the whole world, the greatest god, the benefactor who "handles the steer and tiller" (lines 985-91)
>
> A god that is seated on top of the world and judges the universe (line 1111-15)
>
> This lord is in each human's heart (line 1020)

The ritual contains a charm of compulsion in case the One God does not manifest Himself willingly. The charm of compulsion describes the living god as the one who commands and lives for eons and eons, who shakes, thunders and created every soul and race. This charm is noteworthy in that the Greek reads: λόγον τῆς θεολογίας, literally translating to "word/account of the theology".[425] Analysing Egyptian theological lore in the papyri, Giulia Sfameni Gasparro argues that if we take the literal meaning of λόγον τῆς θεολογίας, it is not only expressing an incantation, but also conveying a "discourse of a divinity". [426] Moreover, if we interpret the primary meaning of *logos* in the context of this ritual as "pronounced word or authoritative saying", it implies theological knowledge on the part of the ritualists.[427] Therefore, the charm of compulsion is not just a ritual, but also represents a theology so powerful that it can command the One God to appear. Once this "divine word" has been spoken, the ritualist will open their eyes and be greeted by a god who is seated on a lotus, decorated with rays, and holding his right hand up in greeting and in his left hand holding a flail. This god is also surrounded by twelve rays and is being carried by two angels. The image of the god, who sits on the lotus flower is representative of the earth's creation by the Sun God emerging from the primordial waters, as cited throughout the Leiden and Hibis hymns. While there are many components to this ritual, what becomes clear is that the ritualist must contact the One God, if they want to have the right theological knowledge and materials for the ritual to have efficacy.

3.6.4 *PGM* VII.505-28: Meeting your own daimon

PGM VII.505-28 contains some striking parallels to the theology of the One God found in the Hibis and Leiden Hymns as well as Neoplatonic doctrines.[428] Specifically, the idea of the One God "mixing"

---

[425] Or "science of things divine": Pl., *Rep*. 379a; Philodemus, *De Pietate* 72; Porph. *Marc* 15; Iambl. *De Myst*. 1.1 etc.; title of an Orphic work, ap. Damasc. *Principles* 124.
[426] Gasparro (2016, 115).
[427] Ibid.
[428] This concept is also reflected in *PGM* IV.3086-3124 *The Oracle of Kronos*. In this spell, Aion is replaced by the Greek deity Helios: "you whom Helios bound with adamantine fetters lest the universe be mixed together". See Appendix E table 4 for ritual details.

himself with nature to cause creation.[429] As we saw in Chapter 2.1, the Neoplatonists from Plotinus onwards, described the One i.e. the First Principle, as the Father of Fathers, as "mixing" his nature with the universe in an act of creation so that the One becomes the All. Eleni Pachoumi argues that this particular philosophical concept of the Creator God and His assimilation with Aion and Helios in *PGM* VII.505-28 has its parallels in Plotinus' doctrine of the One in its manifold forms.[430] In addition to citing Plotinus' doctrine of the One, Pachoumi explains that this concept of the One God is also found in Iamblichus' philosophy as well as the *Hermetica* and the *Orphic Hymns*.[431] However, I want to take issue with Pachoumi's further claim that the Egyptian influence in these particular spells can only be seen through the transformations of Helios and Aion into various animal and human forms with animal heads which she states "was a major characteristic of the Egyptian religious personification of the divine".[432] While Pachoumi's point is basically correct, I would nuance her analysis in the following way.

As we saw in the previous chapter, we find similar ideas of the One God that becomes many (in Egypt, literally millions *ḥhw*) by mixing himself, as found in the Ramesside texts of the New Kingdom. For example, in Leiden hymn XL, the One God is described as "mingling" his heavenly god seed to create himself. We find this same concept in the Creator Hymn to Amun-Re: "O Sole God, who made himself into millions".[433] This idea of a One God who has the ability to "mix" his own nature in order to beget the world whether that is of the universe, human or divine life, is present from the New Kingdom through to the *PGM* and in the philosophies of the Neoplatonists. Accordingly, Egyptian influence in *PGM* VII.505-38 is not just the personification of the gods into various animal and human forms but also contains elements of the One God theology found in the Hibis hymns and Leiden hymns. Lastly, the argument that the personification of deities as animals is a major characteristic of Egyptian religion is similar to Porphyry's statements that the Egyptians only thought in "material" terms. These types of statements completely ignore that like Neoplatonism Egyptian religion also had many metaphysical and abstract interpretations of divinity.

3.6.5 *PGM* XIII.1-343: A Sacred Book called "Unique" or Eight Books of Moses

PGM XIII.1-343 is the beginning of a complex ritual containing four parts (1-343; 343-646; 646-734; 734-1077). This ritual contains many different gods and cultures. Importantly, this ritual includes a hierarchy of divine beings in which the One God outranks all others.[434] In comparison to *PGM* IV.930-

---

[429] *PGM* VII.505-28 "father of the reborn Aion ZARACHTHO; you are the father of awful nature Thortchophano; you are the one who has in yourself the mixture of the universal nature and who begot the five wandering stars".
[430] Pachoumi (2017a, 103).
[431] Pachoumi (2017a, 103) cites Plot. *Enn* 6.2.2.2-3; Iambl. *De Myst.* 7.4.267.2; *Corp. Herm*. Fr. XXIII.10; Orphic Hymn "To Helios".
[432] Pachoumi (2017a, 103).
[433] Klotz (2006, 211).
[434] Todd E. Klutz (2013) has provided a new translation of this ritual including all of its parts and has noted that the ritual is riddled with Egyptian references.

1114 and *PGM* III.494-611, *PGM* XIIII.1-343 reads more like the Leiden and Hibis hymns than the other rituals. Leiden Hymn LXXX starts by telling us that the Eight Great Gods were the first incarnation of the One God, who is alone and secret "from even the oldest divinities".[435] Helios and Selene in *PGM* XIII.1-343 owe this mysterious and self-created God their powers and glory which help direct the cycle of the sun and moon. Likewise, in Leiden LXXX, the One God had hidden himself as Amun from other gods, entered his form into Ta-tenen and earth "rose from the chaos bearing the primal deities".[436] The beginning of Leiden hymn CC also mimics lines 69 of *PGM* XII.1-343, asserting that the Creator God emerged from the darkness and bestowed his power to Selene and Helios, like Amun gave his powers to Re and Ptah.[437] Furthermore, Leiden hymn CC's "But one alone is the hidden God, being behind these appearances, veiled even from gods, His nature cannot be known. Not all gods in concert discern His true features" is very similar to lines 72-73 of *PGM* XII.1-343, which also describe the hidden form of the Creator God whose "true form none of the gods can/see; who changes into all forms, You are invisible." Even if the phrasing of the hymn and the ritual are different, the core concept of Amun theology remains the same; that is, both express the idea of a Creator God emerging from a mysterious darkness and manifesting into many forms in order to begin creation. In fact, this same pattern is repeated in Leiden hymns XC, C, CC and CCC. Regarding the Hibis hymns, we also see this pattern and ideas of creation and manifestation reflected in The Great Amun Hymn, The Creator Hymn and The Hymn to the Ba's of Amun. Likewise, this is also reflected in Plotinus, Porphyry's and Iamblichus' conceptions of the One God and creation; that is, the One God of Neoplatonism is also a hidden Supreme Deity and it is because of this deity that all other deities owe their power. Such far-reaching similarities can no longer be considered accidental.

3.7 Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to establish whether or not there was characteristics of Amun theology in the *PGM.* The selected *sustasis* rituals analysed in this chapter have demonstrated that not only is there a continuation of One God theology in the magical papyri but that the papyri also contain similarities with the Neoplatonists Porphyry and Iamblichus. The papyri share parallels with the Neoplatonists in terms of the theology of the One God; but specific theurgic rituals such as inhaling light has its roots in Ramesside Egypt. Moreover, using an anthropological approach the discussion surrounding theurgy vs. magic has revealed that Porphyry and Iamblichus viewed themselves as superior Ritual Masters when it comes to understanding, connecting and communing with the One God. However, these arguments also reveal that Iamblichus and Porphyry did not understand how important *heka* was for the Egyptians and how integral it is to the balance of the universe. Whether or not this is intentional or unintentional is still to be discovered. However, considering that

[435] *PGM* XIII.1-343, Lines 65-70.
[436] Lines 65-70.
[437] Appendix B6

Iamblichus and Porphyry share a distinct view of magic that is coloured by their Hellenistic education I think it is highly likely that they intentionally viewed Egyptian magic as something only practiced by deviants and corrupted individuals.

Epilogue

This study set out to examine the shared similarities and theological discourse surrounding the One God of Late Antiquity and New Kingdom Egypt. As a result, this study has found concrete evidence that both the Leiden and Hibis hymns, Neoplatonist philosophy and the *PGM* share distinct universalist similarities and conceptions of the One God. An examination of the Egyptian hymns in comparison to the Neoplatonic texts reveals a distinct Egyptian influence despite the difference in language and time. Although, it is clear that the Neoplatonists made some adjustments and innovations to the Egyptian system. Likewise, the examination of the *PGM* also revealed similarities to both the Neoplatonist conceptions of the One God and the New Kingdom Egyptian hymns. Thus, not only is there a distinct textual tradition of the One God but universalist notions of Him in texts that are conceptually very different. However, like the Neoplatonic material there are also clear adaptions and novelties in the papyri that is obviously not found in the New Kingdom Egyptian material.

Reflecting back on Edward Said's notions of Orientalism in Chapter 1, it is clear from the evidence in this thesis that Platonists, for a long time, used particular stereotypes and ideas of Egypt in order to disseminate Platonic epistemological and theological ideas. What occurred in the texts studied in Chapter 1 was a process of orientalising and a distinct sense of cultural anxiety. Plato and Plutarch's works show us how Egypt was, on the one hand, admired and appropriated. On the other hand, Egypt could not claim superiority over Greece and Egypt, its gods and religion were rendered into a suitable format for Hellenic self-presentation. However, the process of orientalising in Iamblichus and Porphyry is distinctly different to their predecessors. Whether this is due to Porphyry's and Iamblichus' eastern origins is still to be investigated. Nevertheless, it was demonstrated that while Porphyry's and Iamblichus' texts did not display an overt sense of cultural anxiety over Egypt, both philosophers still used the figure of the Egyptian priests and the stereotype of Egypt and its wisdom in order to discuss Greek/Hellenic philosophical ideas. Egypt, for the Platonists, was not the Egypt of reality but rather a playground to disseminate their own philosophy. As a result, the Egyptian native is rendered silent, a hollow mouthpiece, a vehicle for the philosopher to assert his own superiority. This tactic is no different to how Porphyry and Iamblichus assert their superiority, i.e Ritual Mastery in regards to the *sustasis* rituals of the One God and their discussions of theurgy vs. magic.

The analysis of the *sustasis* rituals in the papyri in conjunction with Porphyry and Iamblichus' notions of magic vs. theurgy revealed several new insights into how these philosophers viewed themselves compared to magical users. Firstly, there is clear evidence to suggest that both Porphyry and Iamblichus, to a certain extent, viewed themselves as superior ritualists because of

their training in philosophy. Magic, according to Porphyry and Iamblichus, was a deviant practice and anyone that practiced magic was morally corrupt. Yet, the *sustasis* rituals revealed little difference in how magic operates in comparison to theurgy and religion. The *sustasis* rituals have the same core components: theological knowledge, an expert user or creator of the ritual who has special access to the Supreme Being and a thorough understanding of how divinity operates and the theology behind it. Therefore, the way that Porphyry and Iamblichus identify themselves in relation to other ritualists is important when assessing their conceptions of divinity and ritual and who has the right to connect with the divine.

The anthropological approach used in this thesis has revealed that magic, religion and theurgy are not easily defined. More importantly, it may be more helpful when analysing these areas to not try to define them but try to understand how people and cultures understood them. Porphyry and Iamblichus' understanding of magic is rooted in Western conceptions of magic as an evil and manipulating force. As a result, both philosophers reveal their prejudice and misunderstanding of Egyptian conceptions of magic and then insist upon their own superiority. Moreover, while Porphyry and Iamblichus place various degrees of importance on theurgy and theosophy, their discussions and debates reveal that power, and power over the *divine*, whether it was magical, theurgic or religious, in the realm of ritual was important when maintaining the balance of the universe.

Conclusively, this thesis has demonstrated, to a high degree, that the origin of the Greek formula Hen kai pan "One and All", the Greek the reference to the Supreme Deity of Platonism, does indeed have its origins in Ancient Egypt. We can now also extend the notion that One God Egyptian theology also reappears in not only philosophy but magical texts as we see it in the *sustasis* rituals of the *PGM*. While this thesis has only examined the Leiden and Hibis hymns in comparison to the Neoplatonic philosophical texts and the *PGM*, I would argue that further analyses would come to the same conclusion, that is, that Greek philosophy and other magical texts of Late Antiquity, were influenced by Egyptian One God theology. To what extent this is due to the Greek interest in Theban Amun and Thebes' reputation for Ancient Egyptian wisdom requires further analysis. Nevertheless, the comparative analysis of this thesis clearly shows that there are distinct similarities and universalistic ideas of divinity, between Platonist conceptions of the Supreme Being, the *PGM* and the Amun of Thebes. If we conclude the long debate that Egyptian priests were indeed the authors of the *PGM* then it is easy to deduce how they would have accessed Amun theology. However, how Platonists were able to consume these particular Egyptian hymns is another question entirely. There must have been either a written tradition, now lost to us, as Iamblichus tells us with his reference of the "thousand books of Hermes", or an oral tradition passed down from Egyptian bilingual priests to their Greek visitors. What is clear, however, is that within Neoplatonism and the *PGM* the One God remains as a persistent and mysterious figure.

Appendix A: Selected Platonist Texts (600 BCE-500 CE)

[1] Pythagoras of Samos (c. 570-495 BCE)

a) "… We must not either keep the Pythagoreans in the background, who say: "God is one; and He is not, as some suppose, outside of this frame of things, but within it; but, in all the entireness of His being, is in the whole circle of existence, surveying all nature, and blending in harmonious union the whole,—the author of all His own forces and works, the giver of light in heaven, and Father of all,—the mind and vital power of the whole world,—the mover of all things." (Fr. in Clement of Alexandria *Exhortation to the Greeks* 6.72.4)

[2] Plato of Athens (c. 428-348 BCE)

a) "…Now everything that becomes or is created must of necessity be created by some cause, for without a cause nothing can be created. The work of the creator, whenever he looks to the unchangeable and fashions the form and nature of his work after an unchangeable pattern must necessarily be made fair and perfect" (*Ti.* 28a-b)

b) "…Now that which is created must as we affirm of necessity be created by a cause, but the father and maker of all this universe is past finding out". Now to discover the Maker and Father of this universe is past finding out and even if we found him to tell of him to all men would be impossible" (*Ti.* 28c)

c) "…When the creator had made all these ordinances he remained in his own accustomed nature, and his children heard and were obedient to their father's word and receiving from him the immortal principal of a mortal creature, in imitation of their own creator they borrowed portions of fire, earth and water and air from the world" (*Ti.* 42e)

[3] Plutarch of Chaeronea, Boeotia (c.46 BCE-119CE)

a) "… also in the case of a maker, such as a builder is or a weaver or one who produces a lyre or a statue, his work when done is separated from him, whereas, the principal or force emanating from the parent is blended in the progeny and cohibits its nature which is a fragment or part of the procreator. Since then the universe is not like products that have been moulded or fitting together but has in it large portion of vitality and divinity, which god sowed from himself in the matter and mixed with it, it is reasonable that since the universe has come into being a living thing, god be named at the same time father and maker of it" (*Quaest. Plat.*, 1001b)

b) "… But if necessary to say it, god exists; and he does not exists in time, but for eternity- which does not admit of movement or time or deviation and to which nothing is prior or posterior, or future, or post or older or younger. He is one and fills eternity in a single moment; he alone really exists and does not change. [B] He has not come to be, he is not going to be, he does not begin or end. (*De E apud.* 393a-b)

[4] Apuleius of Madaurus, Numidia (c. 124-170 CE)

a) "… Producer and builder of all things…" (*On Pl. 1.5.190)*

b) "… the Father who is the ruler and creator of all things" (*De deo Soc.* 3.124)

c) "All is connected to the King of All, and all exists because of him- exactly who that 'king' is, the cause, reasons and prime source of all nature, the sublime progenitor of soul, the eternal saviour of living beings, the tireless craftsman of the universe, who yet crafts without toil, preserves without anxiety fathers without generation, limited neither by space, time nor the least change, and so conceivable by only a few, expressible by none." (*Apol.* 64.6-8)

[5] Maximus of Tyre late (c.2nd CE)

a) "For God, Father and Creator of all that exists, is greater than the sun and the heavens, mightier than time and eternity and the whole flux of nature; legislators cannot name him, tongues cannot speak of him and eyes cannot see him" (*Or.* 2.)
b) "There is one belief, one account, on which every nation agrees; that there is one God who is father and king of all and with him many other gods, his children, who share in his sovereign power" (*Or.* 11.5)

[6] Alcinous (Second c. CE)

a) "Matter constitutes one principle, but Plato postulates others also, to wit, the paradigmatic, that is the forms, and that constituted by God, the father and cause of all things. Form is considered in relation to God, his thinking, in relation to use the primary object thought ..." (*De doct Pl.* 9.15)
b) "The primary god, then, is eternal, ineffable, 'self-perfect' (that is, deficient in no respect), 'ever-perfect' (that is, always perfect), and 'all-perfect' (that is, perfect in all respects); divinity, essentiality, truth, commensurability, (beauty), good. I am not listing these terms as being distinct from one another, but on the assumption that one single thing is being denoted by all of them." (*De doct Pl.* 9.30-35).
c) "Also, God does not create the soul of the world, since it exists eternally, but he brings it to order, and to this extent, he might be said to create it, by awakening and turning towards himself both its intellect and itself, out of some deep coma or sleep, so that by looking towards the objects of intellection, inherent in him it may receive the Forms and shapes, through striving to attain to his thoughts." (*De doct Pl.* 14.35-40)
d) "God is in fact himself, the creator of the universe, and of the gods and daemons, and by his will this universe admits of no dissolution. The rest is ruled over by his children, who do everything that they do in accordance with his command and in imitation of him. From them derive omens and presages, dreams and oracles, and all artificial divination performed by mortals" (*De doct Pl.* 15.2)

[7] Numenius of Apamea (late 2nd. CE)

a) "... Just so the creator, having bound matter together in a harmony that it cannot knock or slip away from, is himself seated above it, as above a ship on the sea. And he directs the harmony, steering by the forms,; and instead of the heavens, he looks to the god above who draws his eyes to him; and he takes his faculty of judgement from that contemplation, and his faculty of impulse from his yearning." (*On the Good* 6.18 in Eusebius *Praep. Evang* 11. 18.24)

b) Numenius raises a hymn to three gods. He calls the first father, the second maker and the third, artefact – for according to him the cosmos is the third god. According to him, then, the creator is double, the first god and the second, while what is created is the third. It is better to put it like this than to use his own rather dramatic language: ancestor, offspring, descendant. In saying this, he errs first of all in reckoning the good among these causes. It is not the kind of thing to be bound up with others, or to hold second rank to anything. (*On the Good* 6. 21 in Proclus, in *Tim. I*)

[8] Plotinus of Lycopolis, Egypt (c.204/5-270CE)

a) "How then do all things come from the One which is simple and has in it no diverse variety, or any kind of duality? It is because there is nothing in it that all things come from it: in order that being may exists the One is not being but the generator of being" (*Enn.* 5.2.1.3-8)
b) "Now [intellect], being like [the One], produces similar effects, pouring out great power—this is a form of it—just as what is prior to it poured forth. And this activity coming from being is of soul, which becomes this while [intellect] stays [the same]. For intellect is also generated without the One changing" (*Enn.* 5.2.1-14-18)
c) "How, then, does it come from that which is first? If that which is first is perfect, that is, the most perfect of all things and the first power, it must be the most powerful of all things, and the other powers imitate it as much as they are able. In the case of other things, we see whatever comes to perfection, generating, and not holding *Ba*ck so as to remain self-contained, but rather making something else" (*Enn.* 5.4.1 25-30)
d) "Thus we have here one identical Principle, the Intellect, which is the universe of authentic beings, the truth: as such it is a great god or better not a god among gods but the Godhead entire. It is a god, a secondary god manifesting before there is any vision of that other, the Supreme which rests over all, enthroned in transcendence upon that splendid pediment, the nature following close upon it" (*Enn.* 5.3.3)
e) "Zeus (Universal Soul) is in this a symbol of him [the One], Zeus who is not content with the contemplation of his father (Kronos, divine intellect) but looks to that father's father (to Ouranos, the Transcendent) as what may be called the divine energy working to the establishing of real being…" (*Enn.* 5.3.3)
f) "There must be something simple before all things, and this must be other than all the things that come after it, existing by itself, not mixed with the things which derive from it and all the same able to be present in a different way to these other things, being really one and not a different being and then one…" (*Enn.* 5.4.1.5)
g) "…applying the same method to the total of things, here too we discover the Intellectual-Principle and this we set down as veritably the maker and creator of the All." (*Enn* 5.9.3)
h) "Further if the Intellectual Principle is to be the maker of this All" it cannot make by looking outside itself to what does not yet exists. The Authentic Beings must then exists before this All, no copes made on a model but themselves, archetypes, primal and the essence of the Intellectual-Principle" (*Enn.* 5.9.5)
i) "…so by mixing the genera all of them together with each other each with those under these do we accomplish the whole" (*Enn*. 6.2.2 ff.)

j) "…the source therefore of being and the why of being, giving both at once…" (*Enn.* 7.8.14.31-2)

[9] Porphyry of Tyre (c. 234- 305 CE)

a) "Life has one meaning in the case of a plant, another in the case of an animate being and another in the case of an intelligent being; one is the case of nature, another in that of soul, another in that of intellect, and another yet in the case of the Beyond (i.e. the One). That too, after all has life, even if none of the things which come after it possess a life which is comparable to it." (*Sentq.* 12)

b) "Intellect is not the principle of all things; for intellect is many things; but prior to the many, it is necessary that there should be the one. It is evident, however that intellect is many things. For it always understands its conceptions, but they are many, intellect also will be many things. But they are many, intellect will [or the objects of its intellect] may be thus demonstrated…. But the one subsists prior to the many; so that it is necessary that the one should be prior to intellect" (*Sentq.* 15)

c) "…God is everywhere because he is nowhere, and this is also true of intellect and soul: for each of these is everywhere because each is nowhere. But God indeed is everywhere and now here with respect to all things which are posterior to him; and he alone is such as he is, and such as he wills himself to be. Intellect is in God, but is everywhere and now where, with respect to the natures posterior to it. And soul is in God and intellect, and is everywhere and nowhere, [or with respect to] body… For if indeed he was alone everywhere, he would be all things and in in all, but since he is also nowhere, all things are produced through him, and are contained in him, because he is everywhere. They are however different from him, because he is nowhere….and soul is neither body nor in body, but is the cause of body because being everywhere it is also nowhere, with respect to body, and this progression of things in the universe extends as far as to that which is neither able to be at once everywhere nor at once nowhere but partially participates of each of these…". (*Sentq.* 31)

d) "…but since it is from that, it is on the one hand certainly One, too; but because it is not that, this whole thing is One Being, whereas that is One alone. For how could One change into One unless the one were pure One and the other not pure? For this reason, the latter both is and is not that [sc. The first One] at the same time, because that which comes after something and is derived from something is, in a way, that from which and after which it is and is also something else, which is not only not that from which it is but may also be seen as possessing the contrary attributes…". (*Commentary on Parmenides* Fr. 5)

e) "…so just as sight is not capable of grasping the audible; or hearing the visible; or either of them, the tasteable; and as each does not even know that it is different from the other and that the audible is different from the visible, still there is another power transcending these, which distinguishes between them and knows their identity and difference and substance and condition and can grasp them all and employ them as instruments by reason of its being superior to and transcending them; even so, the power too— according to which that intellect sees, that is unable to enter itself—must be other, differing from the thought

process that distinguishes thinking and the intelligible and being beyond those in seniority and power…". (*Commentary on Parmenides* Fr. 5)

f) "…even so, we lack any faculty for the apprehension of god (even if those who produce any sort of representation of him try to explain to us through reasoning how it is possible to attain an understanding of him) since he remains superior to any reasoning and any conception, in his view of the ignorance of him in which we are placed. If this is indeed so, then those who, in the quest for knowledge of him, give precedence to what he is not are better advised that those who inquire into what he is, even if what the latter say is true, since we are incapable of understanding what is being said, for even if we understand something about him with respect to what they declare to be his attributes and rise to some conception of him by grasping or otherwise taking on board examples taken from this world, these same people then turn around and give it as their view that we should not understand what they have said in a literal sense but should distance ourselves from the sew characterizations and, in general, from an understanding of god based on such concepts;… (*Commentary on Parmenides* Fr. 9)

g) "…though being One and simple 'this itself' nevertheless differs from itself in act and existence, and it is thus One and simple in one aspect but differs from itself in another, for that which differs from the One is not One, and that which differs from the simple is not simple…" (*Commentary on Parmenides* Fr. 6)

h) "Porphyry says in the fourth book of his History of Philosophy that Plato speaks about the Good as follows: " From this, in a manner incomprehensible to humans, there derives Intellect as a whole and self -substantiated, in which are to be found true beings and the whole substance of beings. It is this that is the primarily beautiful and the Beautiful Itself, having the Form of Beauty derived from itself, and it has proceeded preeternally taking its start from god as a cause, being self-generated and father of itself; for it was not by reason of the former's [that is, the One's] motion towards the generation of the latter that the procession came about, but through this latter's coming forth self generatively from god, though coming forth not at any point in time (for time did not yet exist) but even when time did come into existence, it was still of no relevance to it, for Intellect is always timeless and uniquely eternal. And even as the first god remains one and alone always, even if all things derive from him, by neither being counted with them nor allowing their value to be ranked with his mode of existence, so also Intellect, which is solely eternal and came to exist non temporally, is itself the time of all things that have their being in time while remaining in the identity of its own eternal existence." (*On the Return of the Soul* Fr. 223 *Smith in Cyril, C. Iul. I 32cd, 552B1-C8*)

i) "…Zeus, therefore, is the whole world, animal of animals, and god of gods; but Zeus, that is, inasmuch as he is the mind from which he brings forth all things, and by his thoughts creates them. When the theologians had explained the nature of god in this manner, to make an image such as their description indicated was neither possible, nor, if any one thought of it, could he show the look of life, and intelligence, and forethought by the figure of a sphere…But they have made the representation of Zeus in human form, because mind was that according to which he wrought, and by generative laws brought all things to

completion; and he is seated, as indicating the steadfastness of his power: and his upper parts are *Ba*re, because he is manifested in the intellectual and the heavenly parts of the world; but his feet are clothed, because he is invisible in the things that lie hidden below. And he holds his sceptre in his left hand, because most close to that side of the body dwells the heart, the most commanding and intelligent organ: for the creative mind is the sovereign of the world. And in his right hand he holds forth either an eagle, because he is master of the gods who traverse the air, as the eagle is master of the birds that fly aloft----or a victory, because he is himself victorious over all things." (*Simulac.* in Euseb, *Praep. Evang* 3.9)

j) "I likewise wish you to unfold to me, what the Egyptians conceive the first cause to be; whether intellect, or above intellect? whether alone, or subsisting with some other or others? whether incorporeal, or corporeal; and whether it is the same with the Demiurgus, or prior to the Demiurgus? Likewise, whether all things are from one principle, or from many principles? whether the Egyptians have a knowledge of matter, or of primary corporeal qualities; and whether they admit matter to be unbegotten, or to be generated? For Chaeremon, indeed, and others, do not think there is any thing else prior to the visible worlds; but in the beginning of their writings on this subject, admit the existence of the Gods of the Egyptians, but of no others, except what are called the planets, the Gods that give completion to the zodiac, and such as rise together with these; and likewise, the sections into decans, and the horoscopes. They also admit the existence of what are called the powerful leaders, whose names are to be found in the calendars, together with their ministrant offices, their risings and settings, and their significations of future events. For Chaeremon saw that what those who say that the sun is the Demiurgus, and likewise what is asserted concerning Osiris and Isis, and all the sacred fables, may be resolved into the stars and the phases, occultations and risings of these, or into the increments or decrements of the moon, or into the course of the sun, or the nocturnal and diurnal hemisphere, or into the river [Nile]. And, in short, the Egyptians resolve all things into physical, and nothing into incorporeal and living essences. Most of them likewise suspend that which is in our power from the motion of the stars; and bind all things, though I know not how, with the indissoluble bonds of necessity, which they call fate. They also connect fate with the Gods; whom, nevertheless, they worship in temples and statues, and other things, as the only dissolvers of fate." (*Ep Aneb.* 12-14)

k) "Have you heard how much pains have been taken that a man may offer the sacrifices of purification for the body, to say nothing of finding the salvation of the soul? For the road to the gods is bound with brass, and steep, and rough, and in it Barbarians found many paths, but Greeks went astray, while those who already held it even ruined it; but the discovery was ascribed by the testimony of the god to Egyptians, Phoenicians, and Chaldeans (for these are Assyrians), to Lydians, and to Hebrews." (Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 14.10)

l) "In Egypt he lived with the priests, and learned the language and wisdom of the Egyptians, and three kinds of letters, the epistolic, the hieroglyphic, and symbolic, whereof one imitates the common way of speaking, while the others express the sense by allegory and parable. In Arabia he conferred with the King. In Babylon he associated with the other

Chaldeans, especially attaching himself to Zabratus, by whom he was purified from the pollutions of this past life, and taught the things which a virtuous man ought to be free. Likewise, he heard lectures about Nature, and the principles of wholes. It was from his stay among these foreigners that Pythagoras acquired the greater part of his wisdom." (*Vita. Pytha*g. 12)

[10] Iamblichus of Chalcis (c. 245-325 CE)

a) "Prior to the true beings and to the universal principles there is the one god, prior cause even of the first god and king remaining unmoved in the singularity of his own unity. For no object of intellection is linked to him, nor anything else. He is established as a paradigm for the self-fathering, self-generating and only fathered God who is true Good; for it is something greater, and primary, and found of all things and basic root of all the first objects of intellection, which are the forms. From this One there has autonomously shone for the self-sufficient god, for which reason he is termed "father of himself" and "principle of himself"; for he is first principle and god of gods, a monad spring from the One, pre-essential and first principle of essence. For from his spring's essentiality and essence, for which reason he is termed "father of essence"; he himself is pre-essential being, the first principle of the intelligible realm, for which reason he is termed "principle of intellection." (*De Myst. 8.2*-3)

b) "Following another system of ordering, he gives the first rank to Kmeph, the leader of the celestial gods, whom he declares to be an intellect thinking himself, and turning his thoughts towards himself, but prior to him he places the indivisible one and what he calls the "first product", which he also calls Ikton. It is him that there resides the primal intellgising element and the primal object of intellection, which, it must be specified, is worshipped by means of silence alone. In addition to these, other rules have been set over the creation of the visible realm. For the demiurgic intellect, who is master of truth and wisdom, when he comes to create and brings into the light the invisible power of the hidden reason-principles, is called Amount in the Egyptian tongue, when he infallibly and expertly brings to perfection each thing in accordance with truth he is termed Ptah (the Greeks translate Ptah as Hephaistos, concentrating only on his technical ability, when he is productive of goods he is called Osiris, and he acquires other epithets in accordance with other powers and activities…." (*De Myst.* 8.3)

c) "In Sidon he met the descendants of Mochos the natural philosopher and prophet, and the other Phoenician hierophants, and was initiated into all the rites peculiar to Byblos, Tyre and other districts of Syria. He did not, as one might unthinkingly suppose, undergo this experience from superstition, but far more from a passionate desire for knowledge, and as a precaution lest something worth learning should elude him by being kept secret in the mysteries or rituals of the gods. Besides, he had learnt that the Syrian rites were offshoots of those of Egypt, and hoped to share, in Egypt, in mysteries of a purer form, more beautiful and more divine. Awestruck, as his teacher Thales had promised, he crossed without delay to Egypt, conveyed by Egyptian seamen who had made a timely landing on the shore below Mount Carmel in Phoenicia, where Pythagoras had been spending most of his time alone in

the sanctuary. They were glad to take him on board, hoping to exploit his youthful beauty and get a good price if they sold him." (*VP* 13)

Appendix B: The Leiden hymns

This is the translation of John L. Foster, 2001. 'From "The Leiden Hymns"' in *Ancient Egyptian Literature: An Anthology*, Texas: University of Texas Press, 176–95.

[1] Leiden Hymn X

The legend of Thebes exceeds any city.

In the Beginning

hers were the waters and dry land;

Then sands came to mark off fields,

to form her foundations on that high hill

back when the world came to be;

And then there were faces of men

to establish the cities, each with its calling;

And all have names after their natures

by order of Thebes, God's Eye over Egypt.

The Majesty of Thebes came down as His salvation

to draw the world, through her, to the Spirit of God,

Pleased to dwell by the waters of Asheru

in the likeness of Sakhmet, Mistress of Egypt.

How strong she is! without contender,

she honors her name as Queen of the Cities.

Sharp-sighted, keen as God's protector,

Right Eye of Rê,

disciple facing her Lord,

Bright with the splendor of God,

wise upon her high throne,

she is Most Holy of Places,

a mecca the world cannot parallel.

Each city stirs into life at the breath of invisible God,

burns to be great. Like Thebes:

hers is the light of perfection.

[2] Leiden Hymn XL

God is a master craftsman;

yet none can draw the lines of His Person.

Fair features first came into being

in the hushed dark where He mused alone;

He forged His own figure there,

hammered His likeness out of Himself—

All-powerful one (yet kindly,

whose heart would lie open to men).

He mingled His heavenly god-seed

with the inmost parts of His being,

Planting His image there

in the unknown depths of His mystery.

He cared, and the sacred form

took shape and contour, resplendent at birth!

God, skilled in the intricate ways of the craftsman,

first fashioned Himself to perfection.

[3] Leiden Hymn LXXX

The Eight Great Gods were your first incarnation
to bring to perfection this cosmos.
You were the alone;
Secret your image from even oldest divinities:
you had hidden yourself as Amun from faces of gods.

You entered your form as Ta-tenen, and earth rose from chaos
bearing the primal deities back in your elder time;
Erect grew your charms as Kamutef,
life force, lusty son of his mother;
You withdrew to the midst of heaven, and distance was born,
endured in the sun, forming time,
Returned as the father gods, and they begat sons,
beginning the generations, creating
a heritage fit for your progeny.

You began the unfolding of cosmos,
before was no being, no void;
World without end was in you and from you,
yours on that First Day.
All other gods came after.

[4] Leiden Hymn XC

The Nine Great Gods were drawn from your person,
and in each you shadowed your features;
But it was you shone first
when you fashioned the world long ago,
O unseen God
who hides Himself from all others.

Ancient of ancients,
elder even than they,
earth god who fashioned Himself into Ptah,
The very parts of whose body are primeval gods;
who rose as the Sun amid chaos
To betoken rebirth
and the rhythms of resurrection;
Sowed the seed of the cosmos as Atum, the Old One,
from whose godhead were moisture and air,
Shu and Tefnut, the primordial couple.

He ascended in splendor His throne
as His heart had determined,
by His power, alone, overruled all existence,
United Himself and kingship forever
to remain, to the end of days, sole Lord.

But in the Beginning, Light!
Light was His first incarnation;
and the incipient world lay hushed
waiting in awe of Him

And He cried the glad cry of the Great Cackler
over the nomes of His new creation
while He was still alone.

He loosened speech:
words flowed in the chambers of silence;

He opened each eye

that it might behold and be gladdened.

Sounds of the voiceless world began with Him:

the victory shout of unparalleled God

shattered silence and circled the world.

He nurtured to birth all things

that He might offer them life, and he taught men to know the Way,

the path they each must go.

Hearts come alive when they see Him,

for He is our Procreator, the Power

who peopled the dark with His children.

[5] Leiden Hymn C

When Being began back in days of the genesis,
it was Amun appeared first of all,
unknown His mode of inflowing;
There was no god became before Him,
nor was other god with Him there
when He uttered himself into visible form;
There was no mother to Him, that she might have born him His name,
there was no father to father the one
who first spoke the words, "I Am!"
Who fashioned the seed of Him all on his own,
sacred first cause, whose birth lay in mystery,
who crafted and carved His own beauty—
He is God the Creator, self-created, the Holy;
all other gods came after;
with Himself He began the world.

[6] Leiden Hymn CC

Dark be the changes, and dazzling the incarnations
of God, God of wonders, of the two firmaments,
God of the myriad visible forms.
All gods boast they share in His nature—
but to heighten themselves,
borrowing splendor on splendor
from the terrible power of His godhead.

Rê himself joins to shine in God's visible form,
and God is that Craftsman praised in the City of Sun;
What is said of the earth god in truth pictures Him;
and when Amun emerged from out the ur-waters,
it was God's image strode over them.
He flowed forth again as the Eight of Hermopolis,
procreated the primal deities, was midwife to Rê,
Perfected Himself in Atum—one flesh together;
and He alone, Lord of all things at creation.

His soul, they say, is that One above,
and He is the one in halls of the underworld,
foremost of those in the eastern dwelling;
His soul rests in heaven, His earthly form in the West,
and His image in Thebes—for worship
when He shows Himself among men.

But, one alone is the hidden God,
being behind these appearances,
veiled even from gods,
His nature cannot be known;
He is more distant far than heaven,
deeper profound than the world below,
not all gods in concert discern His true features.
No likeness of Him is sketched on papyri,
no eye-witness tellings to picture Him.

God is loath to release His full glory,

great beyond questioning, potent beyond all belief:

Dead on the instant in pain is that unfortunate god

who utters—even in innocence—God’s hidden Name.

No god draws forth godhead by this means;

God is final, ineffable Spirit,

past knowing His Name and His mystery.

[7] Leiden Hymn CCC

God is three of all gods,

Amun, Rê, Ptah—these are preeminent:

Past knowing His nature as Amun, the hidden,

He is Rê in His features, in body is Ptah.

Their cities on earth endure to eternity,

Thebes, Heliopolis, Memphis, forever;

Word from heaven is heard in the City of Sun,

told in Ptah's temple to the Handsome of Face,

Who shapes it in signs for Thoth's books of wisdom;

thus Amun's city records the gods' histories.

For God's judgment is rendered from Thebes:

when decision emerges, it comes through the Ennead;

Since each move of His lips is most secret,

gods carry out what He commands.

God's Word, it can kill or perpetuate,

life or death for all men unfolds by means of it;

And He opens His countenance as Rê, Ptah, or Amun,

a trinity of unchanging forms.

Appendix C: Selected Hibis hymns

This is the translation of Klotz, David. 2006. *Adoration of the Ram: Five Hymns to Amun-Re from Hibis Temple* Edited by John Darnell Coleman and William Kelly Simpson. Yale Egyptological Studies 6. New Haven, CT: Yale Egyptological Seminar.

[1] Hymn to the Ba's of Amun

First Ba
You are Amun,
you are Atum,
you are Khepri,
you are Re.

Sole one who made himself into millions,
Tatenen who came about in the beginning.

You are the one who built his body with his own hands,
in every form of his desire.

You are the great winged-scarab within Nut,
who protected heaven and earth in their entirety,
while rising from Nun within the primeval mound.

The Ogdoad rises [for him in] jubilation when he appears,
they seeing by means of his [his first] manifestation as Horus-who-illumines,
whose entire circuit is in the spit-fi re and [torch-fi re] of his eyes,
having illumined the circuit of heaven with his great double-plumes.

His daily-course is successful,
having already remained and endured,
He shall not perish for many millions of eternities,
while sailing the heavens,
and going through the Netherworld daily,
(from) the desire to unite with Osiris as Ruler of Igaret,
while renewing his body again within his shrine,
so that the mother of his son, Horus, is pleased.

His existence is his rising and setting every day,
while he is in heaven, illumining the two lands for her son,
who directs the living, (as he) lives eternally.

O Amun, Ba inside his right-eye,
within his solar-disk in heaven during the day,
Lord of cyclical-eternity,
You shall <not> perish eternally, while rising and setting.

Second Ba
You are Amun,
you are Atum,
you are Osiris in the front of his left -eye, in that which Thoth restored,
you are his disk during the night,
whose births are renewed.

Then he traverses Nut every day together with Akhti,

in order to create the seasons according to his movements against (those of) Re.
There is nothing [of heav]en which equals him,
up to the union of gods.

The beneficent god, valiant in listening, who pleases their hearts,
for whom they rejoice more than (for) the sun, each time he comes to them,
as he is [one who respects the sons] of the great,
who befriends the sons of the lowly,
presiding over the life, prosperity, and health of his son,
who is upon his throne in his palace,
whose lifetime shall be called eternity,
rising and setting [without cease, living] eternally.

Amun, the Ba within his left -eye,
Moon during the night, who rules the living-stars,
in order to divide the seasons, months, and years when he comes,
who lives eternally while rising and setting.

Third Ba
[Yo]u are Amun,
you are Shu,
you are the highest of gods,
you are "Sacred of Manifestations" as the four winds of heaven,
so (you) are called, when they come forth from the mouth of his majesty.

The Ba of Shu, who bends the winds, who traverses heaven daily,
Who lives as the Supports of Shu, unto the limit of the heavenly circuit.

He enters into every tree,
with the result that the branches come alive:
His power is more cutting than any powerful lion.

He makes the sky rage,
and he stirs up the sea:
It is (only) through his calming that they settle down.

The one who is most manifest of manifestations.
He makes Hapi fl ood according to his will,
and he makes flourish (?) the fields according to his desire:
nobody else being as p[owerful] besides him.

His voice is heard, but he is not seen,
while letting every throat breathe.
The one who reassures the pregnant concerning her children,
so the newborn which comes from her lives.

He who goes around the mysterious-regions for [W]eary-of-Heart,
existing as the sweet, northern wind.
It was to let him have use of his body
that he filled his nose by means of all of his scents, at all times, every day,
while 29 arriving at his time, without cease in his action,
In his name of Horus Valiant of Arm,
who protects Shentayt,
so that her son might endure upon the throne of his father,
may he live eternally.

Amun, the Ba of Shu,
Who travels 30 inside a cloud,
while separating earth from heaven,
as he endures in all things.
The Life-force from whom one lives, eternally.

[2] Great Amun Hymn

Then says the Great Ogdoad of the initial moment,
as they respect the god who is between [th]em,
the one most-secret of visible-forms,
in his manifestations of Re.

Transforming into Re,
having been ma[de as the god] who came about by himself.

Whose bones are silver,
whose skin is gold,
whose hair is true lapis-lazuli,
whose teeth are likewise of turquoise.

The good god,
who put himself into his body,
who bore himself,
being unable to emerge from the womb which emerged *for him* equipped,
he having already illumined the two lands.

The ennead praises to his face:

It is to the heights of heaven that they acclaim him,
[they] worshipping he who bore […] ,
his children directing mysteries 3 for him.

Just as they make music for him bearing their divine-harps,
so do they utter praises for his *Ka*,
[th]ey worship him with […] praise […]
[…the l]ips in their [mouths]

They worship him because of the works of his hands.
It is as their lord that they recognize his majesty,
as he respects them entirely.

[His] titulary is from the mountains to the sea as Amun-who-endures-in-everything,
this noble god who began the world through his plans.

Tatenen, most distinguished of the gods,
old one who becomes young,
who traverses eternity,
mysterious of faces, sharp of eyes,
who radiates his brilliance.

His body is of air,
the sky is over his head,
Nun bears his mysterious image,
and the falcon atop the serekh is his pure priest.
He has true winds to sail to Manu,
when he travels to the mysteries of the netherworld.

Th e Ogdoad says:

O Amun-Re,

who hides himself in his iris!

Ba who illumines by means of his oracular *wedjat*-eyes,
who manifests a manifestation:
sacred one, who cannot be known.

Brilliant of visible forms,
who hides himself with his mysterious *akh*-eyes:
mysterious one, whose secrets cannot be known.

Hymns are made to you at the womb of Nut!
It is so that Maat might unite with you at your secret chamber
that your divine children direct you,
as your daughters, your Merti, transfi gure you.
It is at dawn that your rays leap up for you,
so you might encircle the two lands with your radiance.
When you set (yourself) upon this mountain of Igaret
the Datians glow in your rays.

The corporation of jackals accepts you,
as they tow <you> in your bark from the hidden/western mountain,
The baboons, the eastern Ba's, worship you
they jubilating to you because of the rays of your Aten.
Th e *Ba*'s of Pe and Nekhen gesture for you,
your illuminations shining in their faces.

It is without your enemy that you traverse your two heavens,
your fiery breath having blazed against the two dangerous ones.
Just as the red fish in the water of your bark are aware,
so do the Abdju fish warn you of Wenti,
so that Horus might cut him with his arrows,
Heaven and earth quake in fear for him in his stormcloud,
his magic being powerful in repelling his enemy,
and this harpoon piercing into Webenra.
Aker rears himself up, making his protection,
forcing [him back into his hole]

His eye [devours] him,
with the result that it becomes effective over him,
and that the *wnm*-flames devour him with the *nbi*-flame.
You pass by the sandbank,
your crew having perfect, good winds,
the Lake of Two-Knives being [in] peace [beneath you,
That your bark rejoices,
is with your ways widened,
since] you bound that *ḏw-qd*-snake.
The Indefatigable and Imperishable stars bring you to land in justification.

Just as Mesqet receives you,
so does [your mother] embrace you.

[Just as you pass through the western Akhet,
so does the earth spread its arms] to receive you,
with the result that all who exist praise you.

You set in the Netherworld in the hour of the evening glow,
so you might awaken Osiris with your rays.

It is above the heads of the cavernous ones that you rise […
…] [over] those who are beneath their slaughtering places.
Those hidden of condition help create you through acclamation,
while your own solar-disk illumines you.
The recumbent serpents stand up for you upon their sides.

[Imehet is] opened [for you] in the deep night,
Your left -eye is the substitute-disk in the night.

It is through the east of Heaven that you rise in the morning,
having (re)-created yourself in your disk in Anp[et
Your right-eye sees that which you created,
You having ascended] from the depths of your mysteries.

Just as you have come from there,
so have you illumined in here,
having protected these ones like those upon earth.

[Your manifestations are more mysterious than any god],
you are august,
you are great in the Ennead,
without a god begotten of your color,
without any object that might resemble your form.

You are [the majesty …] all that you have ruled.
[heaven and earth are under your designs,]
[the gods are in] your hands,
mankind beneath your feet.
Who is the god of your likeness?
You are Re, chief of the gods,
who appears, sweet of love.

O Ba […awesome of] your two disks,
high of horns, sharp of tips,
with radiant beard, electrum wedjat-eyes,
scintillating of adornments, turquoise of radiance,
and gold of body.

It from the desire to aggrandize your name
that you established your throne in every place you desire;
Cities and nomes carry your sacred-bark,
without grain lacking beneath your image.

Your ancient throne is the mound of Hermopolis,
it is from the lake of Two Knives that you reach land.

It is from the water surface that you appear in the hidden egg,
Amunet being with you.

Just as you have alighted upon the Heavenly Cow,
while grasping her horns,
So have you swam upon Mehet-Weret (Methyer),

without any lotus-roots, from his *tmꜣ* while the earth was in Nun,
you reached up to the mountains.

You land at the city of Herakleopolis Magna,
so you might travel thence to the 21st UE.
Your image there is Harsaphes,
your noble *bꜣ*-ram in the 21st Upper Egyptian nome,
which stays in the ten-thousands and thousands of gods who came from you.

Just as you spit out as Shu,
so do you expectorate as Tefnut,
in order to create the Ennead for you at the beginning of existence.
You are the lion,
your offspring are the two lions.

Just as you assembled the Corporation of the Ennead,
so did you divide the two lands beneath their Ka's,
with the result that they celebrate for you in their temples.

Your *bꜣ*-ram is in Mendes,
assembled from the four gods in Anpet:
Ithyphallic-scarab,
Lord of the Gods,
Kamutef, who rejoices inside his (Heavenly) Cow,
husband who procreates through his phallus,
you leading her to anywhere you please,
(namely) to your shrine in the Neith nome.

It is in the *biti*-temple that your image rests,
in the nest of the Lord of Sais,
Your mother, Neith, embraces you as a child, sweet of love,
clothing your body with red cloth in the Southern and Northern Neith chapels,
your *mnḫ*-clothing being upon the arms of the two crocodiles.

Just as you passed through the marshes,
So did you alight at Che[mmis],
your heart alighting upon the Lower Egyptian roads.

Uto greets you in Dep,
the Mehenet-serpent is upon your head in Pe,
you having united the two lands beneath [your] throne [being upon your

[Your pure place is] within *ḥw.t-nh.t,*
your pillared-hall in Ta-Bener,
your kingship is in the Xoite nome,
with gods and goddesses in your service.

It is so your Ba might become satisfied in Hetepet
that you have come here to Iousaas .

You are Nun the Elder, Amun the Elder
who is in the sanctuary in the Great Temple in Heliopolis.

It is via the sunbeams of Heliopolis that you enter the sky,
so you might behold your children in Menset.

It is with your children, the remaining gods, surrounding you,
and those who are in your service protecting you,
that offerings are consecrated to you <in> Shetaset.

Your images from Heliopolis and your secret temple are in the crypt of Kheraha.
Your children are [as thousands] before you,
your bow and your *ʾms*-sceptre being there for your protection,
in order to trample your enem(ies) as execration figures.

It is in order to raise Nun from his cavern
that you have opened the southern Imehet of Sepa.
Just as you divided the two lands in Memphis
as Tatenen, eldest of the primeval ones,
so did you establish your throne in Ankhtawy,
as Amun-Re, Ba Lord of the firmament,

These (both) mean: your form in the initial moment,
when you arose as Amun-Re-Ptah.

It is in your city, Thebes, that your heart is content.
Your uraei, your eyes, your *ḏʿm*-scepter and your *ʾms*-scepter,
Opener of the "doors of heaven" in Karnak,
Shu, Tefnut, Mut and Khonsu.

Your cult image(s) are within your Opet are manifestations of Min:
Upraised of Arm, Tall of Plumes, King of the Gods.
Upraised of Arm, Lord of the double-crown,
Mighty of prestige and Lord of respect.
Kamutef, foremost of his fi elds,
vaunted of his "beauty," Lord of the Phallus.
Turquoise and black of beard,
with sparkling faces, the Meriti,
lord of the wedjat-eyes, equipped [with] amulets.
He of Coptos, foremost of the garden,
He of Achmim, who is upon his platform.

Atum the great, lord of creation,
(that means Khepri who came about at the first instant).
Montu-Re in Th ebes,
(that means the strong bull, who smites the disaffected).
Nehi-Ptah in Th ebes,
Amun-Re, lord of all eternity.

You are Tatenen,
your manifestations are in Hapi and earth,
eldest and greatest of the gods.

You are Nun the Great,
who settles upon the fi elds,
letting the earth live with your waters.

Yours is the sky,
yours is the earth,
yours is the netherworld,

yours are the waters,
and yours are the air which is within them.
That which is made acclaims you,
 without tiring:

O protector of that which is and that which is not,
You support them as you create them,
 (thus) their tribute is apportioned for your Ka.

O Amun-Re, lord of everything that is,
strong of heart, festive of chest.

May you establish your son who is upon your throne,
may you rejuvenate his body upon earth,
may you fashion his image,
and cause him to appear,
 assuming your offices and your beneficent image.

It is with your perfect son doing that which you love,
 that you rise as Re,
  thus conferring to him victory in his actions,

The King of Upper and Lower Egypt, the Son of Re, 43 Darius I, may he live eternally,
heir of Amun-Re,
protector of those within Thebes,
the Son of Re, Darius I, may he live eternally.
The Merti sing four times:

O Amun-Re, lord of the thrones of the two lands, foremost of Karnak,
O Amenebis, valiant of scimitar,

As for the Son of Re, Darius I, may he live eternally,
Horus, son of Isis, son of Osiris, beloved of Amun,
may you save the Son of Re, Darius I,
 from every knife and every arrow!

May you place fear of him,
 respect of him,
  and terror of him in the hearts of all men,
 like the terror of you,
 the fear of you,
and the respect of you (which is) in the hearts of gods and men!

[3] The Creator Hymn

Great, secret hymn to Amun-Re.

The Ogdoad says:
Greetings,
o Sole God, who made himself into millions,
whose length and breadth are [without limit,
One powerful and skilled,
who bore himself.
Serpent, giant of fire, great of mag]ic.
One remote of visible forms, the Mysterious Ba.

He for whom respect was made,
who is acclaimed,
who is glorious,
who is most distinguished of the gods[…]

[…] his disk illumines Egypt.

Just as he ripped out the Netherworld,
so did he open upon earth […]

[…]after he appeared,
always being seen by his children.

His *tkꜣ*-flame is distant,
while his *nsr*-flames illumine the earth,
he having surrounded his throne with fi re.

He distanced himself more than any other god,
too distant and remote to ever reach him.
(Nonetheless), his rays tread (all the way) into the [earth…]
driving away st[orms and clouds].

The one great of strength:
Just as he lift ed the sky,
so did he extend heaven and the entire earth.

Just as he assembled the heavens entirely,
so did he direct the stars [at] his side,
while making judgement […].

He […] everyone on that which he made.

He [came forth?] as a child who rejuvenates himself at his proper time
As a youth [who b]ore the Ogdoad,
a baby who radiates [morning-light?],
who shines in his *mḥn.t*-serpent which encloses him.

He who smells sweet as a god,
who magnified his cult-image in order to carry his “perfection,”
having crafted his form to his desire.

He made himself gracious through the charm of his love,

his prestige, splendor, and dignity are in excess of all the gods.

He created himself through that which he created himself,
he conceived himself as the great composite image:
    fatherless, his (own) phallus engendered (him);
    motherless, his (own) seed was pregnant with him,
The august winged-scarab, who made himself emerge as a god.
Father of fathers, mother of mothers.

He preconceived respect for himself through his Great Name,
he protects […] within it.
It is in order to guard them and protect them,
    that they recall him,
        in his Great Name: "Sacred of manifestations,"
Iri-ta who began creation,
    before any form had come into existence.

Established of understanding,
who is all-knowing,
    he cannot be ignorant of things eternal.

Just as he consulted his heart while planning this,
so did he design heaven and earth by himself,
    while thinking what would come into existence,
    and founding the Two Lands beneath his throne.

Hu and [Sia?] establish his commands […]
    and his […]
        through the command of this remote god,
        via his oracle: that the Two Lands would be established.

He began, then, to determine its fate,
and it was his plan that realized it,
by that which he said to his heart […]

Just as he seized that which exists,
so did he raise the heavens,
    so it was established upon its four (pillars),
    the Djed-pillar existing beneath his solar-disk.

He [founded] this great land,
    with Nun, the Great Circular Sea and the Surrounding Seas surrounding it.
He built people, livestock, birds, fish, and all snakes.
Just as he made bulls fertile in order to impregnate the cows,
so did he open their bodies to give birth,
    the bulls impregnating the cows,
    while creating their semen,
        which they ejaculate from bones.
He made flourish for them whatever lives in their lands (=livestock),
    through the "wood-of-life" which comes forth from him.

Just as he separated the Two Lands,
so did he assign their boundaries.
It is from the food which he made that they eat,
    while the lands of the Phoenicians have their rations.

Their outward appearances were distinguished from one another,
he having overturned their [forms?].
Just as he colored their skin,
so did he distinguish their tongues,
in order to interact.

Just as he opened their noses,
so did he let their throats breathe.
He created a path from the mouth to the rectum,
the eyes […] creating the heart […] upon their arms.

He let the geese fly upon the supports of Shu,
while they alight within the breath of his mouth,
He plunged the fish within the *nt*-water surfaces,
having enlivened [their] no[strils] in the water […]

[…] he put himself in the heavens.

It was with the result that one sees through his seeing,
that he beheld creation.

He is distant in the *ḥꜣw* like that which is in this earth.
His Wedjat-eyes [shine] in the wadis,
the great lotus that is in his mat,
it is his shining that fashions the heart of the distant lands,
Predatory falcon who illumines through his fl ame,
who sails within his wedjat-eyes.

It is in the radiance of his sun-disk which shines every day
that he has distanced himself.

His *Bꜣ* belongs to the sky when he rises from the Akhet,
having cared for the heavens, earth and underworld.
The morning becomes pregnant in order to birth him in the morning,
at his moment of yesterday.
He who enters in the mouth and emerges from (between) her thighs,
who straddles the back of his mother,
who rises without ever tiring,
having illumined the banks beyond the Isles.

Runner who runs eternally,
shining everyday without cease.

He who appears upon earth at the Lake of Two-Knives.
who sails the heavens in the morning and evening
as a living child of the Heh-gods,
who rests upon Maat,
who brightens the day and dispels darkness.

Horus who illumines,
lord of the night-bark,
Sovereign,
lord of the day-bark,
Shining of manifestations in the bark of millions,

whom the two sister-companions raise up,
Behdetite who shines in the horizon upon the arms of Heh and He[het],
who opens the potter's wheel according to the mysteries,
who directs himself upon the ways of Nut.

"Lord of the course,"
who surrounds himself with his own wings,
(that is) the air of the fiery blast which comes forth from his mouth.

He made the heavens under the throne upon […]
in order to illumine the earth with his birth.

Just as he sails north, so does he sail south,
viewing that which he made
his two divine-eyes illuminating the two lands:

His left eye is the Monthly One while he is the moon,
in order to divide the seasons, months, and years.
His solar-disk is in the day, his moon is in the night,
without ever drying out throughout eternity.
He has been chief of millions upon millions,
and he shall rule the limits of cyclical eternity.

The one whom Hapi brings,
having opened the two caverns,
having shot out Nun-waters from his grotto.

Just as he swells, so does he recede,
according to his volition.
Just as he spits out, so does he imbibe,
according to his desire.

Just as the north-wind goes south,
So does the south-wind go north,
(likewise) the west and east winds, from within him.

Just as the storms have their days,
So are the stars upon their circuits,
through the decree of this noble god.

The King of Upper and Lower Egypt,
Amun-Re, who came about [himself,
Akhty, Horus of the Eas]t,
who rises at dawn, and who is more luminous and radiant than gods or people.

Just as he hid himself in his name of Great Amun,
so did he represent himself in his manifestations of his solar-disk.

Just as he flies up as a falcon,
do does he approach Nut,
having burst forth from the mountain of Bakhu.

The Akh […]
having healed his body/corpse with transfiguring spells.

Mysterious Ba,
ram-headed with four faces on one neck,
with 777 ears,
with millions upon millions of eyes,
with myriads of horns.

The Sole Lord has come,
The one mighty of respect,
More kingly than gods or men,
August falcon, dappled of plumage,
Falcon-image who rests upon Maat,
Khepri who begets manifestations,
Mysterious Ba among the gods,
having ordered *nhh*-eternity,
and planned *ḏ.t*-eternity,
his efficacy being superior to any efficacy.

Appendix D: Selected Ramesside Texts

The following selected New Kingdom formulas come from the Theban area and are translated by Assmann in Assmann, Jan. 1995. *Egyptian Solar Religion in the New Kingdom*. London and New York: Kegan Paul International, 150-151.

Ramesside texts
(1) Wannafre, you lord of eternity and everlastingness you One god who made himself into millions
(2) Who came into being alone and gave birth to himself as millions
(3-5) One god who made himself into millions
(6) Kheprer who merged as millions
(7) Hail to you, who brought himself forth as one and who created millions in their abundance
(8) The One Alone whose body are millions
(9) Who came as One god and [made himself into] millions
(10) Hail to you, One god who made himself into millions Whose length and breadth are without limits
(11) The one who made himself into millions
(12) Who being one makes himself into million
Late Period Texts (selection)
(13) Who came as One and distinguished himself as millions
(14) The One who made millions
(15) You started becoming as One who made millions Hundreds of thousands came forth from his two divine eyes
(16) That One who made himself into millions
(17) He is the One god who created millions and hundreds of thousands
(18) Big Lotus, father of fathers, who created himself who rose as one and brought forth millions
(19) One god who made millions. Whose length and breadth are without limits who initiated becoming, there being none besides him

Appendix E: *PGM* tables and characteristics of One God

Legend

C. = Characteristic of One God

Characteristic 1: X Described as a Creator God of earth, humans or deities or affiliated with creation from the beginning.

Characteristic 2: X Is "hidden" and possess secret and many holy name/s.

Characteristic 3: X Is described as God of Gods, Lord of All and head of a hierarchy or Supreme God.

Characteristic 4: X Is "self-born" or "Begotten" in the sense of self creation.

Characteristic 5: X Is described as "mixing himself" with the universe.

Table 1: The One God cited in rituals for other magical purposes: necromancy and a ring ritual.

Scroll	Lines	Headwords	C.	Ritual Purpose	Gods Dedicated
PGM.IV 1928-2005	78	ἀγωγὴ Πίτυος βασιλέως/ ἐπὶ παντὸς σκύφου; περὶ ὀνειραιτησίας; ἀνάκρισις	C3; C4	King Pitys' first rite of attraction via necromancy using a dead man's spirit as a familiar. The process of questioning the invoked daimōn is referred to as an ἀνάκρισις.	Adonai, Helios, IAO, Horus, the Moirai, Pitys, the Thessalian (King).
PGM IV. 2006-2125	120	Πίτυος ἀγωγή; νεκυδαιμων; τῶν σκύφων ἀνακρίσεως Κατοχος.[438] ; ὀνει/ραιτητεῖ	C1; C3	King Pity's necromancy rite (version 2) given Ostanes. Gives dreams revelations. A chthonic daemons acts as an assistant. The process of questioning the invoked daimōn is referred to as an ἀνάκρισις.	Osiris, Pitys, the Thessalian King, Ostanes (King).
PGM XII. 201-69	69	Δαιτυλιδιον[439]; *w' gswr;* [440]στοιχεια[441]	C1; C3; C4	A ring for favor and victory "useful for every magical operation" Engraved on a jasper.[442]	Abraxas, Ouroboros, Helios, Selene, IAO, Sabaoth, Abrasax, Chrates [Sokrates], Nemesis, Phoinix, Aphrodite, Typhi, Kronos, Osiris, Isis, Esenephys, Souchos, Agathos Daimon, Aion, Adonaie, Sabaoth, Ouerto.

[438] Binding
[439] Ring
[440] Ring in Demotic.
[441] *Stoicheia*, may refer to an image rather than a magical statue.
[442] *PGM* XII.270-269 is an older version of the spell.

Table 2: The One God in *Sustasis* rituals

Scroll	Lines	Greek Headwords	C.	Ritual purpose	Gods dedicated
PGM II. 64-183	121	συνίστα δὲσεαυτὸν τῷθεῷ ; αλλως ποιησις[443]	C2; C3	Dream revelation compulsive formula with consecration of the doorpost and the figure of the Headless one with a Dismissal formula	Apollo paian, Titan, Zeus, Muses, Phoibos, Moirai (Klotho, Atropos, Lachis) Sesengen bar Pharanges, Io, Erbeth, Sabaoth, Adonai, Kommes, Apollo of Klaros, Abraxas, Michael, Damnameneus
PGM III. 187-262	76	ἡ σύστασις τῆς πράξεως	C1; C3; C4.	Revelation by invocation of Helios and use of the tripod. With illustration of two snakes (?) Contains a hymn to Helios and a dismissal formula (απολυσις)	Helios [King] Semea, Abrasax Scarab, [Khepera] Zeus, Michael, Sese[ngen] b]ar Pharaggges Sabaoth, Adonai, Akrammach[ari] Apollo, Phoibos.
PGM III. 494-611	118	Συστασι; Ευχης.[444]	C1; C2; C3; C4	*Sustasis ritual*	Helios
PGM IV.930.1114	185	Σύστασις; ἔχε συνεστάμενον; φωταγωγία; τὸν θεαγωγὸν λόγον; θεαγωγὸς; τὸείπεῖν τὴν φωτα/γωγίαν	C1; C3; C4	*Sustasis ritual*; the ritual, however, is also described as an αὔτοπτος.[445]	Lailam, Iao, Sabaoth, Baiinchoooch, Albala, Sensengen bar Pharagges, Ablanathanabla, Akrammachamari, Horos, Harpokrates, Abraiaoth, Balsames, Barbarial
PGM IV. 475-829	348	ἡ δὲ τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ σύςτασίς; μυστηρια; Μυσται;	C4; C3	Mithras Liturgy (mysteries initation ritual) Σύστασις here may refer to a preliminary procedure. [446]	Helios, Mithras, Psyche
PGM VII.505-528	505	Συστασις	C5	Meeting with your own daimon, a form initiation	??

[443] Alternative procedure connected to *PGM* II. 1-64 which is another dream revelation
[444] Prayer
[445] Dosoo states that the αὔτοπτος is referring to the apparition ritual while σύστασις refers to the conjunction ritual and the φωταγωγία is the initial act of bringing the light, which is followed by the κάτοχος τοῦ φωτὸς to keep the light, and finally by the θεαγωγὸς, who brings the god into the light. See Dosoo 2014, 260.
[446] This spell is ἀναγωγή ritual known as the Mithras Liturgy. The Greek headwords are also mysteries and initiate.

PGM XIII1-343	343	Συνιστάνου ; τῇ καθολικῇ συστάσε;	C1; C3; C4	Initiation ritual: a sacred book called Monad or Eighth Hidden Book of Moses version A	Zeus, Ares, Helios, Aphrodite, Hermes, Selene, Aion, Iao, Sabaoth, Zagoure, Adonai, Lailam, Anoch, Abrasax, Apollo, Achebyrkrom, Phos-Auge, Nous, Phrenes, Semesilam, Moira, Kairos, Psyche, Aphyphis, Christ.

Table 3: The One God in the Egyptian *pẖ- nṯr* rituals

Scroll	Lines	Headwords	C.	Ritual Purpose	Gods Dedicated
PDM XIV. 117-49	33	*pẖ- nṯr; sn....hbs*	C1	Invocation of the Invocation of the Bear Goddess using Evocationary lamp Skyring	Agathodaimon, Moses, Peteri.
PDM XIV. 150-231	82	*pẖ- nṯr*	C1	Evocationary Lamp skyring, which can also be used to compel a gods arrival	Anubis the drowned One. Osiris, Re-Kepre-Atum, Amoun, Isis, Nephthys, Pre, Sakhmet, Hike i.e Heka, Horus, Aniel, Sisihyt, Eresghingal Lion Ram

Table 4: The One God cited in divination, prayer, dream requests and other rituals

μαντικῶ = divination broadly					
Ritual	**Lines**	**Headwords**	**C.**	**Ritual purpose**	**Gods dedicated**
PGM I. 262-347	329	περὶ μαντείας	C1; C4	Apollonian invocation in an Evocationary Lamp Skyring, with a touch of necromancy??	Apollo, Zeus, IAO, Michael, Gabriel, Abrasax, Adonai, Aion, Pakerbeth, Adonaios, Thotho, Eloaios, Moirai, Hades
PGM III. 282-409	128	Προμα [ντευόμενος]; πάν[των] τῶν τοιούτων μαντικῶ	C1	Foreknowledge operation uses a Magical table of practice for invocation, a floor circle and a tripod, gold lamella with hour attributions	Phoibos, Gabriel, Michael
PGM IV. 3086-3124	31	μαντία Κρονικὴ	C1; C5	Although called “oracle of Kronos or the little Mill it is an invocation of the God Kronos	Kronos, Helios, Zeus.

PGM V. 1-53	80	μαντ(εῖον) Σαραπιακὸν/ [ἐπὶ] παιδός ἠμαντεία	C3	Evocationary Lamp Skyring but called an Oracle of Sarapis with Dismissal	Zeus, Mithra [Mithras] Sarapis, Iao, Meliouchos, Bainchoooch.
PGM XIII. 734-1077	344	αὐτο/<το>ψίας ; τελετη [447] είσοπτρομαντιῶν; ἡλιομαντιῶν	C2; C3	Tenth Hidden Book of Moses. Also Refers to uses to procedures for which a boy seer can be used after using the specified formula on him.	Agatho Daimon, Ogdoas, IAO, Amoun, Anoch, Ieou, Outhro, Ablanathanalba, Ereschigal, Sabaoth, Adonai, Michael, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Aion, Zeus, Aphrodite, Kornos, Ares, Selene.
PGM IV. 1596-1715	120	Μυστηια[448]...παντων τελετη φυλακτηπιω τελουμενω	C1; C2; C3	Phylactery to consecrate a stone and ring utilising the 12 gods of the hours via Helios Invocation	Helios, Zeus Serapis, Agathos
PGM V.459-89	31	Αλλως	C1; C3;	All-purpose invocation of Zeus to loosen shackles, grant invisibility, send dreams and gain favour	Aion, Adonai, Iao, Sabaoth, Iaoth, Ablanathanalba, Lailam.[449]
PGM IV. 1162-1226	60	[σ] Τηλη προς παντα ευχρηστος [450]	C1; C3	Stele (talisman) for all things, addressed to Aion the four elements and the aerial spirits uses a gold leaf stele.	Helios [Aion]
όνειραιτητὸν = dream request					
PGM VII. 795-845	51	όνειραιτητὸν Πυθαγόρο	C1	Pythagoras request for a dream revelation and Demokritos' dream divination. This ritual uses the secrete names of the zodiac and the angel Zizaubio from the Pleiades	Pythagoras, Demokritos, Pleiades
Ευχη= Prayer					
PGM VII. 756-94	39	Ευχη [451]	C1; C2;	Prayer to Mene. With 14 magical sounds like popping, crocodile and hissing (snakes)	Mene, IAO.
Μυστηια = mysteries					
PGM IV. 1596-1715	120	Μυστηια...παντων τελετη φυλακτηπιω τελουμενω	C1; C2; C3	Phylactery to consecrate a stone and ring utilising the 12 gods of the hours via Helios Invocation	Helios, Zeus Serapis, Agathos

[447] Mystery Initiation
[448] Mystery
[449] *PGM* 5.459-489 the deity is both a δαίμων (l.465) and a θεός (l.465); again,
[450] Stele useful for all things
[451] Prayer

Αλλως = other					
PGM V.459-89	31	Αλλως[452]	C1; C3;	All-purpose invocation of Zeus to loosen shackles, grant invisibility, send dreams and gain favour	Aion,Adonai, Iao, Sabaoth, Iaoth, Ablanathanalba, Lailam.[453]
ευχρηστος = Stele					
PGM IV. 1162-1226	60	[σ] Τηλη προς παντα ευχρηστος	C1; C3	Stele (talisman) for all things, addressed to Aion the four elements and the aerial spirits uses a gold leaf stele.	Helios [Aion]
No headwords or specific terms found:					
PGM I. 195-222	195	??	C1; C3; C4	Invocation (not prayer) of Helios	Helios
PGM XXI.1-29	29	??	C1; C2;	Invocation to a lord whose name consists of 7 letters.	Muses, Amoun, Io, Agathos Daimon
PGM CV. 1-15 SM 87	15	??	C2	Invocation of Zeus, Iao-Zen- Helios	Zeus,-Iao-Zen Helioas, Isaac, Sabaoth, Abraham, Jacob.

[452] According to Skinner 2014, 279, this does not appear to refer to the immediately preceding passage but may apply to *PGM* V. 370-446.
[453] *PGM* 5.459-489 the deity is both a δαίμων (l.465) and a θεός (l.465); again,

Appendix F: *PGM sustasis* rituals metadata and translations

Scroll	Headwords	C.	Ritual purpose	Gods dedicated
PGM III. 494-611	Συστασι; Ευχης.	C1; C2; C3; C4	Sustasis ritual	Helios

Lines: 550-559

Come to me in /your holy circuit of

the Holy spirit, founder of the world,

O god of Gods, lord of the world, who have

divided by your own divine spirit

the universe, first from the firstborn you

appeared, created carefully from water

that's turbulent, who founded all the world:

Abbyss, earth/fire/water, air and in turn Ether and roaring rivers, red-faced moon,

heavens starts, morning stars, the whirling planets.

Tis by your counsels they attend all things.

Lines: 566-574: "Hear me, Lord, me, NN graciously, gladly and for a blessing, from every element from every wind, today with your happy face in the prest hour, because /I invoke your holy name from every side. You where were begotten in every human body, inspire us."

Lines: 591-599: "We give thanks with every soul and heart stretched out to [you[, unutterable name honoured with [the] appellation of god and blessed with the appellation of father, for to everyone and to everything you have shown fatherly/goodwill, affection, friendship and sweetest power, granting us intellect [speech] and knowledge; intellect so that we might understand you, speech so that we might call upon you, ‚knowledge so that we might know you."

Scroll	Headwords	C.	Ritual purpose	Gods dedicated
PGM IV. 475-829	ἡ δὲ τοῦ μεγάλου θεο ῦ σύςτασίς; μυστηρια; Μυσται;	C4; C3	Mithras Liturgy (mysteries initiation ritual) Σύστασις here may refer to a preliminary procedure.	Helios, Mithras, Psyche

Lines: 489-495: "First origin of my origin, AEEIOYO, first beginning of my beginning, PPP SSS PHR[E], spirit of my spirit, the first of the spirit/in me, MMM, fire give by god to my mixture of the mixtures in me, the first of the fire in me, EY EIA EE, water of water, t he first of the water in me, OOO AAA EEE, earthly material, the first of the earthly material in me, /YE YOE, my complete body"

Lines: 496-497: "...and an incorruptible right hand in a world without light and yet radiant, without soul and yet alive with soul, YEI AYI EYOIE: now if it be your will...

Lines: 585-603: "At once close your eyes and recite the following prayer. The third prayer: "Give ear to me, hearken to me, NN, whose mother is NN, 0 lord, you who have bound together with your breath the fiery bars of the fourfold / root,

0 Fire-walker, PENTITEROUNI,

Light maker (others: Encloser), SEMESILAM,

Fire-breather, PSYRINPHEU, Fire-feeler, IAO,

Light-breather, OAI, Fire-delighter,

ELOURE, Beautiful light, AZAI,

Aion, ACHBA,

/ Light-master, PEPPER PREPEMPIPI,

Fire-body, PHNOUBNIOCH,

Light-giver, . . .

Fire-sower, AREI EIKITA,

Fire-driver, GALLARALBA,

Light-forcer, AIOI,

Fire-urhirler, PYRICHIBOOSEIA,

Light-mover, SANCHEROB,

Thunder-shaker /, IE OE IOEIO,

Glory-light, BEEGENETE,

Light-increaser, SOUSINEPHIEN,

Fire-light-maintainer, SOUSINEPHI ARENBARAZEI MARMARENTEU,

Star-tamer…"

Lines 634- 646: "When you have said this, the rays will turn toward you; look at the center of them. For when I you have done this, you will see a youthful god, beautiful in appearance, with fiery hair, and in a white tunic and a scarlet cloak and wearing a fiery crown." At once greet him with the fire greeting: "Hail, O Lord, Great Power, Great Might/ King, Greatest of gods, Helios, the Lord of heaven and earth, God of gods: mighty is your breath; mighty is your strength, O, Lord. If it be your will, announce me to the Supreme God, the one who has begotten and made you: that a man – I, NN whose mother is NN…"

Scroll	**Headwords**	**C.**	**Ritual purpose**	**Gods dedicated**
PGM IV.930.1114	Σύστασις; ἔχε συνεστάμενον; φωταγωγία; τὸν θεαγωγὸν λόγον; θεαγωγὸς; τὸείπεῖν τὴν φωτα/γωγίαν	C1; C3; C4	Sustasis ritual; the ritual, however, is also described as an αὔτοπτος.	Lailam, Iao, Sabaoth, Baiinchoooch, Albala, Sensengen bar Pharagges, Ablanathanabla, Akrammachamari, Horos, Harpokrates, Abraiaoth, Balsames, Barbarial

Lines: 939-945

"hail, serpent, and stout lion, natural

Sources of fire. /And hail, clear water and lofty-leafed tree

And you who gather up

Clover from golden fields of beans, and who

Cause gentle foam to gush forth from pure mouths.

Scarab, who drive the orb of fertile fire, O self-engendered one, because you are Two-syllabled, AE, and are the first- Appearing one,/nod me assent, I pray Because of your mystic symbols I declare" **Lines: 960-971** "I call upon you, the living god,/fiery, invisible begetter of light, IAEL PEIPTA PHOS ZA PAI PHTNENTHA PHOSZA PYRI BELLA IAO IAO EYO OEE A OY EOI A E E I O Y O give your strength, rouse your daimon/enter into this fire, fill it with a divine spirit and show me your might. Let there be opened for me the house of the all powerful God ALBALAL, who is in this light. Let there be light, breadth, depth, length, height, brightness and let him who is inside shine through the lord…" **Line: 986-1004** "I call upon you, the greatest god, sovereign HOROS HARPOKRATES ALKIB HARSHAMOSI IAAI DAGENOUTH RARACHARAI/ABRAIAOTH, you who enlighten the universe and by your own power illumine the whole world, god of gods, benefactor AO IAO EAEY you who direct night and day, AI AO handle and steer the tiller, restrain the serpent/ you Good, holy Daimon, whose name is HARBATHANOPS IAOAI, whom sunrises and sunsets hymn when you arise and set. You who are praised among all gods, angels and daimons, come and appear to me god of gods…" **Lines 1010:** "you who are seated on the top of the world and judge the universe surrounded by the circle of truth and honesty **Lines 1020:** "enter in, appear to me/ lord, you who have a great name, you whom we all have each in our own heart;" **Line: 1037** "The Great living god commands you, he who lives for eons of eons, who shakes together, who thunders, who created every/soul and race IAO AOI OIA AIO IOA OAI" **Line: 1109** "Then you will se the god/seated on a lotus, decorated with rays, right hand raised in greeting and left [holding] a flail while being carried in the hands of 2 angles with 12 rays around them"

Scroll	**Greek Headwords**	**C.**	**Ritual purpose**	**Gods dedicated**
PGM VII.505-528	Συστασις	C5	Meeting with your own daimon, a form initiation	n/a
Lines 509-520: "Hail, Helios, for you are the one who has established yourself in invisible light over the holy firmament / ORKORETHARA. " You are the father of the reborn Aion ZARACHTHO; you are the father of awful Nature Thortchophano, you are the one who has in yourself the mixture of universal nature and who begot the five wandering stars, which are the entrails of heaven, the guts of the earth, the fountainhead of the waters and the violence/ of fire AZAMACHAIR ANAPHANDAO EREYA ANEREYA PHENPHENSO IGRAA; you are the youthful one, highborn, scion of the holy temple, kindsman to the holy mere called Abyss which is located beside the two pedestals SKIATHI AND MANTO and the earth's 4 basements were shaken, O master of all,/ Holy Scarab"				

Scroll	**Greek Headwords**	**C.**	**Ritual purpose**	**Gods dedicated**

PGM XIII.1-343	Συνιστάνου ; τῆ καθολικῆ συστάσε;	C1; C3; C4	Initiation ritual; a sacred book called Monad or Eighth Hidden Book of Moses version A	Zeus, Ares, Helios, Aphrodite, Hermes, Selene, Aion, Iao, Sabaoth, Zagoure, Adonai, Lailam, Anoch, Abrasax, Apollo, Achebyrkrom, Phos-Auge, Nous, Phrenes, Semesilam, Moira, Kairos, Psyche, Aphyphis, Christ.
Line 63: "The text of the sacred stele to be written in the natron is: I call on you, who are greater than all, the creator of all, you, the self-begotten, who see all and are not seen. For you gave Helios the glory and all the /power, Selene [the privilege] to wax and wane and have fixed courses, yet you took nothing from the earlier-born darkness, but apportioned things so that they should be equal. For when you appeared, both order arose and light appeared. All things are subject to you, whose true form none of the gods can /see; who change into all forms. You are invisible, Aion of Aion"				

Works Cited Primary

Alcinous (1993) *Alcinous: The Handbook of Platonism*. Translated by J. M. Dillon. Oxford: Claredon Press.

Allen, J. P. (1988) *Gensis in Egypt: The Philosophy of Ancient Egyptian Creation Accounts*. Edited by W. K. Simpson. New Haven, CT: Yale Egyptological Studies 2.

Apuleius (2017) *Apologia, Florida, De Deo Socratis*. Translated by C. P. Jones. Massachusetts, Cambridge: Harvard University Press (Loeb Classical Library).

——, (1994) *The Golden Ass: Being the Metamorphoses of Lucius*. Translated by P. G. Walsh. Oxford: Oxford University Press (Oxford World's Classics).

Athanassakis, A. N. (1977) *The Orphic Hymns*. Montana: Scholar Press.

Betz, H. D. (tran.) (1987) *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation: Volume One: Texts*. 2nd edn. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bunker, J. M. and Pressler, K. L. (2020) *The Coffin Texts Resurrected: An English Translation with Hieroglyphic Text, Volume 1*. Bunker Pressler Books.

Clement of Alexandria (1919) *The Exhortation to the Greeks. The Rich Man's Salvation. To the Newly Baptized*. Translated by G. W. Butterworth. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (Loeb Classical Library).

Damascius (2010) *Problems & Solutions Concerning First Principles*. Translated by S. Ahbel-Rappe. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dillon, J. and Gerson, L. (2004) *Neoplatonic Philosophy: Introductory Readings*. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hacket Publishing.

Diogenes Laertius (1972) *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Translated by R. D. Hicks. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. (Loeb Classical Library).

Eunapius (1921) *Philostratus. Lives of the Sophist. Eunapius. Lives of Philosophers.* Translated by W. C. Wright. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (Loeb Classical Library).

Eusebius (1903) *Praepartatio Evangelica*. Translated by Tr. E. H. Gifford. Ipswich, UK: n.d.

Foster, J. L. (2001) 'From "The Leiden Hymns"', in *Ancient Egyptian Literature: An Anthology*. Texas: University of Texas Press, 176–195.

Hamilton, E. and Cairns, H. (eds) (1961) *The Collected Dialogues of Plato Including the Letters*. Translated by L. Cooper et al. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press (Bollingen Series, 71).

Heraclitus (2001) *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus: an edition of the fragments with translations and commentary*. Translated by C. H. Kahn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Herodotus (2013) *The Histories*. Translated by T. Holland. London: Penguin Classics.

Heliodorus (1587) *From The Æthiopica: "Heliodorus - An Aethiopian Romance"*. Translated by T. Underdowne and F. A. Wright. London/New York: Routledge & Sons Ltd. Available at: http://www.elfinspell.com/HeliodorusTitle.html.

Horapollo (1993) *The Hieroglphics of Horapollo*. Translated by G. Boas. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Iamblichus (1973) *Iamblichi Chalcidensis: In Platonis Dialogos Commentariorum Fragmenta*. Leiden: Brill (Philosophia Antiqua: A Series of Monographs on Ancient Philosophy).

——, (1989) *On the Pythagorean Life*. Translated by G. Clark. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press (Translated Texts for Historians).

——, (2003) *On the Mysteries*. Translated by Emma C. Clark, John M. Dillon, and Jackson P Hershbell. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

——, (2009) *Iamblichus of Chalcis: The Letters*. Translated by J. M. Dillon and W. Polleichtner. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

——, (2002) *Iamblichus De Anima. Text, Translation and Commentary*. Translated by J. Dillon and J. Finamore. Leiden Boston: Brill (Philosophia Antiqua).

Klotz, D. (2006) *Adoration of the Ram: Five Hymns to Amun-Re from Hibis Temple (2006)*. Edited by J. Darnell Coleman and W. K. Simpson. New Haven, CT: Yale Egyptological Seminar (Yale Egyptological Studies 6).

Lichtheim, M. (1975) *Ancient Egyptian Literature Volume 1: The Old and Middle Kingdoms*. Berkley, California: University of California Press.

——, *Ancient Egyptian Literature Volume 2: The New Kingdom* Berkley, California: University of California Press.

——, *Ancient Egyptian Literature Volume 3: The Late Period* Berkley, California: University of California Press.

Lactantius (2003) *Divine Institutes*. Translated by A. Bowen and P. Garnsey. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press (TTH, 40).

Lucian (1921) *The Dead Come to Life or The Fisherman. The Double Indictment or Trials by Jury. On Sacrifices. The Ignorant Book Collector. The Dream or Lucian's Career. The Parasite. The Lover of Lies. The Judgement of the Goddesses. On Salaried Posts in Great Houses*. Translated by A. M. Harmon. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Majerick, R. (1989) *The Chaldean Oracles: Texts, Translation, And Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.

O'Meara, J. J. (1959) *Porphyry's Philosophy from Oracles in Augustine*. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes.

Petty Dale, R. (1993) *The fragments of Numenius: text, translation and commentary*. University of California.

Plato (2008) *Timaeus and Critas*. Translated by R. Waterfield. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——, (1961) *The Collected Dialogues of Plato Including the Letters*. Edited by E. Hamilton and H. Cairns. Translated by L. Cooper et, al. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Plotinus (2018) *The Enneads*. Edited and translated by L. P. G. Gerson. Translated by G. Boys-Stones et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Plutarch (1935) *Plutarch's Moralia: On Isis and Osiris, The Obsolescence of Oracles, The Oracles at Delphi*. Translated by F. C. Babbitt. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (The Loeb Classical Library).

——, (1965) *Moralia Volume XI: On the Malice of Herodotus, Causes of Natural Phenomena*. Translated by L. Pearson. Massachusetts, Cambridge: Harvard University Press (Loeb Classical Library).

——, (1970) *Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride edited with an introduction and commentary by J. Gwyn Griffiths*. Translated by J. G. Griffiths. Cambridge: University of Wales Press.

Porphyry (1823) *Select Works of Porphyry Containing His Four Books on Abstinence from Animal Food; His Treatise on The Homeric Cave of Nymphs; and His Auxiliaries to the Perception of Intelligible Natures translated from the Greek*. Translated by T. Thomas. London: J. Moyes.

——, (1964) *Porphyrii in Platonis Timaeum Commentariorum Fragmenta*. Edited by A. R. Sodano. Italy: Instiuto della Stampa.

——, (2000) *On Abstinence from Killing Animals*. London: Duckworth.

——, *Life of Pythagoras (1920).* Translated by Kenneth Sylvan Guthrie. Available at: http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/porphyry_life_of_pythagoras_02_text.htm

Preisendanz, K. and Heinrichs, R. A. (1973) *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri. 2 vols*. 2nd edn. Stutgart: Teubner.

Scott, W. (1993) *Hermetica: the writings attributed to Hermes Trismegistus*. 2nd edn. Avon, Bath: SOLOS PRESS.

Simpson, W. K. *et al.* (2003) "The Teaching of Merikare" in *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: An Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry*. New Haven, UNITED STATES: Yale University Press.

Smith, A. (1993) *Porphyrius: Fragmenta*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Siculus, Diodorus (1935) *Library of History*. Translated by C. H. Oldfather. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (Loeb Classical Library).

Strabo (2014) *The Geography of Strabo*. Translated by D. W. Roller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Horst, P. W. (1987) *Chaeremon, Egyptian priest and Stoic philosopher: the fragments*. Leiden: Brill.

Waddell, W. G. and Robbins, F. E. (1954) *Mantheo & Ptolemy Tetrabiblos*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (Loeb Classical Library).

Works Cited: Secondary

Addey, C. (2016) *Divination and theurgy in Neoplatonism: Oracles of the Gods*. Oxon: Routledge

Afonasin, E. (2012) 'The Pythagorean Way of Life in Clement of Alexandria and Iamblichus"', in Dillon, J., Finamore, J., and Afonasin, E. (eds) *Iamblichus and the Foundations of Late Platonism*. Leiden: Brill, . 14–35.

Allen, J. P. (1997) 'Review of Der Amunhymnus des Papyrus Leiden I 344, Verso. Three Volumes', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 117(1):155–160.

Alston, R. (1996) 'Conquest by text: Juvenal and Plutarch on Egypt', in *Roman Imperialism: Post-Colonial Perspectives*. Leicester: University of Leicester School of Archaeological Studies, 99–110.

Armstrong, H. A. (1987) 'Iamblichus and Egypt', *Les Études Philosophiques* 2(3), 179–88.

Assmann, J. (1969) *Liturgische Lieder an den Sonnengott, Untersuchungen zur altägyptischen Hymnik*. Berlin: Bruno Hessling (MÄS, 19).

——, (1983) *Sonnenhymnen in thebanischen Gräbern*. P. von Zabern.

——, (1995a) *Egyptian Solar Religion in the New Kingdom*. London and New York: Kegan Paul International.

——, (1995b) *Egyptian Solar Religion in the New Kingdom: Re, Amun and the Crisis of Polytheism*. Translated by A. Alcock. London: Kegan Paul International.

——, (1997) 'Magic and Theology in Ancient Egypt', in Schäfer, P. and Kippenberg, H. G. (eds) *Envisioning Magic: A Princeton Seminar and Symposium*. Leiden: Brill (Studies in the History of Religions), 1–19.

——, (1999) *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag (Orbis biblicus et orientalis: Sonderband).

——, (2001) *The Search for God in Ancient Egypt*. Translated by D. Lorton. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

——, (2005a) *Death and Salvation in Ancient Egypt*. Translated by D. Lorton. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

——, (2005b) 'Periergia: Egyptian Reactions to Greek Curiosity', in Gruen, E. S. (ed.) *Cultural Borrowings and Ethnic Appropriations in Antiquity*. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag (Oriens et Occidens, 8).

——, (2006) *Religion and Cultural Memory*. Translated by R. Livingstone. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

——, (2008) 'All Gods are One: Evolutionary and Inclusive Monotheism', in *Of God and Gods: Egypt, Israel and the Rise of Monotheism*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

——, (2014a) *From Akhenaten to Moses: Ancient Egypt and Religious Change*. Cairo/New York: The American University in Cairo Press.

——, (2014b) *Religio Duplex: How the Enlightenment Reinvented Egyptian Religion*. Translated by R. Savage. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Athanassiadi, P. and Frede, M. (1999) *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Athanassiadi, P. (1993) 'Dreams, Theurgy and Freelance Divination: the Testimony of Iamblichus', *The Journal of Roman Studies* 83, 115–130.

Attridge, H. W. (1986) 'The Philosophical Critique of Religion under the Early Empire', in Temporini, H. and Haase, W. (eds) *Aufstieg Und Niedergang Der Römischen Welt*. Berlin, New York: W. De Gruyter (Heidentum: Römische Religion Allgemeines [Forts.], 16.1).

Bagnall, R. S. (1993) *Egypt in Late Antiquity*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

——, (2011) *Everyday Writing in the Graeco-Roman East*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Bagnall, R. S. and Rathbone, D. W. (eds) (2004) *Egypt: From Alexander to the Copts*. London: The British Museum Press.

Beatrice, P. F. (2009) 'The Oriental Religions and Porphyry's Universal Way for the Soul's Deliverance', in *Les religions orientales dans le monde grec et romain: cent ans après Cumont (1906-2006)*. Brussels and Rome: IHBR (IHBR), 343–369.

Bell, C. and Bell, C. (1997) *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. Cary: Oxford University Press, Incorporated.

Bell, C. M. (1992) *Ritual theory, ritual practice*. Oxford; Oxford University Press.

Bernabé, A. and Mendoza, J. (2013) 'Pythagorean Cosmogony and Vedic Cosmogony (RV 10.129). Analogies and Differences', *Phronesis*, 58(1), 32–51.

Betegh, G. (2013) *Pythagoreans and the Derveni Papyrus*. Routledge Handbooks Online.

Bernal, M. (2008) ‘Egyptians in the Hellenistic Woodpile: Were Hekataios of Abdera and Diodoros Sikeliotes Right to See Egypt in the Origins of Greece?’ in (eds) McKechnie, P. and Guillaume, *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World*, *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World*. P. Leiden/ Boston: Brill, 117-120.

Blazevic, T. (2020) ‘How to Deal with the Evil *Daimones*. Apotropaic Rituals of the Third and Fourth Centuries CE according to Porphyry, Iamblichus, and the Greek Magical Papyri’, in (ed) Fabrizio Conti, *Civilizations of the Supernatural: Witchcraft, Ritual, and Religious Experience in Late Antique, Medieval, and Renaissance Tradition.* Budapest: Trivent.

Bowersock, G. W. (1990) ‘Greek Literature in Egypt’, in *Hellenism In Late Antiquity*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 55-69.

Boys-Stones, G. (2018) *The Creator God’, in Platonist Philosophy 80BC to Ad 250: An Introduction and Collection of Sources in Translation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brashear, W. M. (1995) ‘The Greek Magical Papyri: An Introduction and Survey’, in *Aufstieg Und Niedergang der Romischen Welt*. Berlin, New York: W. De Gruyter, 3380–3684.

Brenk, F. E. (2012) ‘Plutarch and “Pagan Monotheism”’, in Lanzillotta, L. R. and Gallarte, I. M. (eds) *Plutarch in the Religious and Philosophical Discourse of Late Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 74–84.

Brisson, L. (1987) ‘L’Égypte de Platon’, *Les Études philosophiques* 2(3), 153–168.

Brisson, L., O’Neill, S. and Timotin, A. (2018) *Neoplatonic Demons and Angels*, *Neoplatonic Demons and Angels*. Leiden: Brill.

Cheak, A. (2004) ‘Magic through the Linguistic Lenses of Greek Magos, Indo-European mag(h)-Sanskirt maya and Pharaonic Egyptian Heka’, *Journal for the Academic Study of Magic* 2 260–286.

Clark, D. C. (2008) ‘Iamblichus’ Egyptian Neoplatonic Theology in *De Mysteriis*’, *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition* 2, 164–205.

Clarysse, W. (1993) ‘Egyptian Scribes Writing in Greek’, *Chronique d’ Égypte: bulletin périodique de la Fondation égyptologique,* 68, 186–201.

——, (2009) ‘Egyptian Religion and Magic in the Papyri’, in Bagnall, R. S. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 561–589.

Cline, E. (1990) ‘An Unpublished Amenhotep III Faience Plaque from Mycenae’, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 110(2), 200–212.

Cruz-Uribe, E. (1994) ‘The Khonsu Cosmogony’, *Journal of the American Research Centre in Egypt* 31, 169–189.

Darnell Coleman, J. (2004) *The Enigmatic Netherworld Books of the Solar-Osirian Unity: Cryptographic Compositions in the Tombs of Tutankhamun, Ramesses VI and Ramesses IX*. (Academic Press Fribourg) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

DePalma-Digeser, E. (2009) ‘The Power of Religious Rituals: A Philosophical Quarrel on the Eve of the Great Persecution’, in Cain, A. and Lenski, N. (eds) *The Power of Religion In Late Antiquity*. Surrey, England: Ashgate, 81–92.

——, (2012) *A Threat to Public Piety: Christian Platonists, and the Great Persecution*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

De Santillana, G. (1940) ‘Eudoxus and Plato. A Study in Chronology’, *Isis* 32(2), 248–262.

Dickie, M. (2003) *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World*. London and New York: Routledge.

Dieleman, J. (2005) *Priests, Tongues, and Rites: The London-Leiden Magical Manuscripts and Translation in Egyptian Ritual (100-300CE)*. Leiden: Brill.

——, (2011) 'Scribal Practices in the Production of Magic Handbooks', in Bohak, G., Harari, Y., and Shaked, S. (eds) *Continuity and Innovation in Magical Tradition*. Leiden: Brill, 85–118.

——, (2019) 'Egypt', in Frankfurter, D. (ed.) *Guide to the Study of Ancient Magic*. Leiden Boston: Brill, 87–114.

Dillon, J. (2007) 'Porphyry's Doctrine of the First Principal', in George Karamanolis and Anne Sheppard (eds) *Studies on Porphyry*. University of London: Institute of Classical Studies, 51–61.

——, (2010) 'Intellect and the One in Porphyry's Sententiae', *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition* 4, 27–35.

——, (2016) 'The Early History of the Noetic Triad', *Colloque Paris*.

Dosoo, K. (2013) 'Magical Discourses, Ritual Collections: Cultural trends and Private Interest in Egyptian Handbooks and Archives', in *Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Papyrology*. Warsaw: The Journal of Juristic Papyrology, 699–716.

——, (2014) *Rituals of Apparition in the Theban Magical Library*. Macquarie University.

——, (2016) 'A History of the Theban Magical Library', *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 53, 251–274.

Dungen, W. V. D. (2016) *Amun, the Great God: Hidden, One and Millions*. Available at: http://www.sofiatopia.org/maat/amun.htm.

Durkheim, É. (1995) *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Translated by K. Fields. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Edwards, M. J. (1990) 'Porphyry and the Intelligible Triad', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 110, 14–25.

Eidinow, E. (2019) 'Social Knowledge and Spiritual Insecurity: Identifying "Witchcraft" in Classical Greek Communities', *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft*, 14(1), 62–85.

Faraone, C. (2017) 'Protective Statues for Home and Workshop: The Evidence for Cross-Cultural Contact in the Greek Magical Papyri', in Crippa, S. and Ciampini, E. M. (eds) *Languages, Objects, and the Transmission of Rituals: An Interdisciplinary Analysis on Ritual Practices in the Greaco-Egyptian Papyri (PGM)*. Digital Publishing: Antichistica.

Finamore, J. (1999) 'Plotinus and Iamblichus on Magic and Theurgy', Dionysius 17: 83-94.

——, (2012) 'Iamblichus on the Grades of Virtue', in *Iamblichus and the Foundations of Late Platonism*. Leiden: Brill, 113-132.

——, (2013) 'Iamblichus Theurgy and the Soul's Ascent', in *Philosophy and Salvation in Greek Religion,* Berlin: W. De Gruyter, 343–355.

Foertmeyer, V. A. (1989) *Tourism in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Ph.D. Princeton University.

Forshaw, R. (2014) *Origin and Evolution of the Role of the Lector Priest*. Oxford: Archaeopress Egyptology.

Fowden, G. (1986) *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——, (1993) *Empire to Commonwealth*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Frankfurter, D. (1997) 'Ritual Expertise in Roman Egypt and the Problem of t he Category of the "Magician"', in Scäfer, P. and Kippenberg, H. G. (eds) *Envisioning Magic: A Princeton Seminar and Symposium*. Leiden: Brill (Studies in the History of Religions), 115–136.

——, (1998) *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

——, (2005) 'Curses, Blessings, and Ritual Authority: Egyptian Magic in Comparative Perspective', *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 5(1), 157–185.

Fraser, K. A. (2009) 'The Contested Boundaries of "Magic" and "Religion" in Late Pagan Monotheism.', *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft* 4(2), 131–151.

Frazer, J. G. (1983) *The Golden Bough: a Study in Magic and Religion*. London: Macmillan Press.

Frede, M. (2010) 'The case for pagan monotheism in Greek and Graeco-Roman antiquity', in Mitchell, S. and P. V. Nuffelen, (eds) *One God: Pagan Monotheism in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 53–81.

Gahlin, L. (2007) 'Creation Myths', in Wilkinson, T. (ed.) *The Egyptian World*. New York: Routledge.

Gasparro, G. S. (2015) 'Egyptian Theological Lore in *PGM* IV: a religious-historical commentary', in Czerner-Bakowska, G., Roccati, A., and Swierzowska, A. (eds) *The Wisdom of Thoth: Magical Texts in Ancient Mediterranean Civilisations*. Oxford: Archaeopress Archaeology, 111–119.

Gordon, R. (1997) 'Reporting the Marvellous: Private Divination in the Greek Magical Papyri', in Schäfer, P. and Kippenberg, H. G. (eds) *Envisioning Magic: A Princeton Seminar and Symposium*. Leiden: Brill (Studies in the History of Religions), 65–92.

——, (2002) 'Shaping the text: Innovation and Authority in Graeco-Roman Egypt', in Horstmanshoff, H.F.J et al.,(eds) *Kykeon: Studies in Honour of H.S Versnel.* Leiden: Brill, 69–111.

——, (2012) 'Memory and Authority in the Magical Papyri', in Dignas, B. and Smith, R. R. R. (eds) *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World*. Oxford: Oxford Scholarship Online, 146–180.

Graf, F. (1995) *Magic in the Ancient World*. Translated by F. Philip. Massachusetts, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

——, (1995) 'Excluding the Charming: The Development of the Greek Concept of Magic', in Meyer, M. W. and Mirecki, P. (eds) *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*. Leiden, New York: Brill, 29–42.

Greig, J. (2020) *The First Principle in Late Neoplatonism: A Study of the One's Causality in Proclus and Damascius*. Leiden: Brill

Grillo, R. (2003) 'Cultural Essentialism and Cultural Anxiety', *Anthropological Theory - ANTHROPOL THEORY* 3, 157–173.

Hadot, P. (1968) *Porphyre et Victorinus, Volume 1 Études augustiniennes*. Paris: Études augustiniennes.

Hart, G. (2005) *The Routledge Dictionary of Egyptian Gods and Goddesses*. 2nd edn. London and New York: Routledge.

Helleman-Elgersma, W. (2010) 'Plotinus and Magic', *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition* 4, 114–146.

Hoffmeir, J. K. (2015) *Akhenaten and the Origins of Monotheism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hornung, E. (1982) *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many*. Translated by J. Baines. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

James, G. G. M. (1954) *Stolen Legacy: Greek Philosophy is stolen Egyptian Philosophy*. USA: n.d.

Janowitz, N. (2002) *Icons of Power: Ritual Practices in Late Antiquity*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania state University Press.

——, (2019) 'The Magical Elements of Mysticism: Ritual Strategies for Encountering Divinity', in Frankfurter, D. (ed.) *Guide to the Study of Ancient Magic*. Leiden Boston: Brill, 678–693.

Johnson, A. P. (2013) *Religion and Identity in Porphyry of Tyre: The Limits of Hellenism in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Greek Culture in the Roman World).

Johnston, S. I. (1990) *Hekate Soteira: A Study of Hekate's Roles in the Chaldean Oracles and Related Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——, (1997) 'Rising to the Occasion: Theurgic Ascent in its Cultural Milieu', in Schäfer, P. and Kippenberg, H. G. (eds) *Envisioning Magic: A Princeton Seminar and Symposium*. Leiden: Brill (Studies in the History of Religions).

——, (2008) 'Animating Statues: A Case Study in Ritual', *Arthusa* 41(3), 455–477.

——, (2019) 'Magic and Theurgy', in Frankfurter, D. (ed.) *Guide to the Study of Ancient Magic*. Leiden Boston: Brill, 694–719.

Kakosy, L. (1980) 'A Memphite Triad', *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 66, 48–53.

King, D. (2018) 'Ancient Philosophy Transformed: The Religious Turn in Philosophy', in Lössl, J. and J.N Baker-Brian (eds) *A Companion to Religion in Late Antiquity*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Klotz, D. (2012) *Caesar in the City of Amun: Egyptian Temple Construction and Theology in Roman Thebes*. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers.

——, (2017) 'Elements of Theban Theology in Plutarch and his Contempories', in Erler, M. and Stadler, M. A. (eds) *Platonismus und spätägyptische Religion: Plutarch und die Ägyptenrezeption in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Berlin: W. De Gruyter.

Klutz, T. (2013) 'The Eighth Book of Moses: A New Translation and Introduction', in Bauckham, R. J. and Davila, J. R. (eds) *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Non-Canonical Scriptures*. Grand Rapids: Erdmans Publishing Co, 189-235.

Krzysztof, N. (2017) *The Alexander romance by Ps.-Callisthenes: a historical commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
Krulak, T. (2016) 'Defining Competition in Neoplatonism', in DesRosiers, N. P. and Vuong, L. C. (eds) *Religious Competition in the Greco-Roman World*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Lanzillotta, L. R. (2012) 'Plutarch's Idea of God in the Religious and Philosophical Context of Late Antiquity', in Lanzillotta, L. R. and Gallarte, I. M. (eds) *Plutarch in the Religious and Philosophical Discourse of Late Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 138–150.

Lefkowitz, M. (1997) 'Some Ancient Advocates of Greek Cultural Dependecy', in Coleman, J. E. and Walz, C. A. (eds) *Greeks and Barbarians: essays on the interactions between Greeks and non-Greeks in antiquity and the consequences for Eurocentrisim*. Bethesda: CDL Press.

Lepper, V. M. (2013) 'Ancient Egyptian Literature: Genre and Style', in Enmarch, R. and Lepper, V. M. (eds) *Ancient Egyptian Literature: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 211–226.

Lewy, H. (1978) *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes.

Lichtheim, M. (1997) *Moral Values in Ancient Egypt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Orbis biblicus et orientalis, 155).

Livingstone, N. (2001) *A Commentary on Isocrates' Busiris*. Leiden: Brill.

Lloyd, A. B. (2010) 'The Reception of Pharaonic Egypt in Classical Antiquity', in *A Companion to Ancient Egypt*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 1065–1085.

Lucarelli, R. (2016) 'The Magician as a Literary Figure in Ancient Egyptian Texts', in *Cult Practices in Ancient Literatures: Egyptian Near Eastern and Graeco-Roman Narratives in a Cross-Cultural Perspective. Proceedings of a Workshop at the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World*. Institute for the study of the ancient world: ISAW Papers 18.

Lucia Gahlin (2007) 'Creation Myths', in Toby Wilkinson (ed.) *The Egyptian World*. London and New York: Routledge.

Luck, G. (1989) *Arcana Mundi: Magic and the Occult in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A Collection of Ancient Texts*. Baltimore, UNITED STATES: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Marx, H. (2010) 'High Priests of the Highest God: Third Century Platonists as Ritual Experts', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 4(18), 481–513.

—— (2012) 'A Case Study in the Late Roman Appropriation of the Classical Greek Patrimony: Images of the Ideal Philosopher among Third-Century Platonists.', in Kirby, T., Acar, R., and Bas, B. (eds) *Philosophy and the Abrahamic Religions: Scriptural Authority and Theories of Knowledge*. New Castle on Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press, 57–68.

——(2016) *Spiritual Taxonomies and Ritual Authority: Platonists, Priests, and Gnostics in the Third Century CE*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press (Divination Series).

——(2018) 'Philosopher-Priests and Other Ritual Experts in Later Antiquity: Some Additional Reflections', *Journal of Gnostic Studies*, 3, 247–254.

Merkelbach, R. (1994) 'Immortality Rituals in Late Antiquity', *Diogenes*, 42(165), 85–109.

Mitchell, S. and Van Nuffelen, P. (eds) (2010) *One God: Pagan Monotheism in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morenz, L. D. and Popko, L. (2010) 'The Second Intermediate Period and the New Kingdom', in *A Companion to Ancient Egypt*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 101–119.

Morenz, S. and Keep, A. E. (2004) *Egyptian Religion*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press

Mosher, M. (1992) 'Theban and Memphite Book of the Dead Traditions in the Late Period', *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt*, 29, 143–172.

Müller, C. W. (1997) 'Fremderfahrung und Eigenerfahrung. Griechische Ãgyptenreisende von Menelaos bis Herodot', *Philologus* 141(2), 200–214.

Murnane, W. J. (1997) 'Der Amunhymnus des Papyrus Leiden I 344, Verso. Vols. 1-3. J. Zandee', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 56(4), 306–306.

Nagel, S. (2019) 'Narrations of Magical Power in Ancient Egypt: A Counter Narrative to "Witchcraft" Concepts', *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft* 14(1), 11–36.

Noble, C. I. and Powers, N. M. (2015) ‘Creation and divine providence in Plotinus’, in Marmodoro, A. and Prince, B. D. (eds) *Causation and Creation in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 51–70.

O’Meara, D. J. (2003) *Platonopolis: Platonic Political Philosophy in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Claredon Press.

O’Neill, S. (2011) ‘Porphyry’s The Apostate: Assessing Porphyry’s Reaction To Plotinus’ Doctrine of the One’, *The Heythrop Journal* 52, 1–11.

Otto, Eberhard, (1968) Egyptian Art and the Cults of Osiris and Amon, London: Thames and Hudson,

Pachoumi, E. (2017a) *The Concepts of the Divine in the Greek Magical Papyri*. Tübingen, GERMANY: Mohr Siebeck.

——, (2017b) ‘The magicians and their assimilation with the initiated into the mysteries in the Greek magical papyri from Greco-Roman Egypt.’, in Suárez, E. et al. (eds) *Magikè téchne: formación y consideración social del mago en el Mundo Antiguo*. Madrid: Dykinson, 149–158.

Philips, C. R. (1991) ‘Nullum Crimene sine Lege: Socioreligious Sanctions on Magic’, in Faraone, C. A. and Obbink, D. (eds) *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 260–276.

Pleše, Z. (2005) ‘Platonist Orientalism: Plutarch and Numenius’, in Jimenez, P. A. and Titchener, F. (eds) *Historical and Biographical Values of Plutarch’s Works. Studies devoted to Professor Philip A. Stadter by the International Plutarch Society.* Malaga-Utah: I.P.S, 355–382.

Purcell, N. (2013) ‘On the significance of East and West in today’s “Hellenistic” history: reflections on symmetrical worlds, reflecting through world symmetries’, in Prag, J. R. W. and Quinn, J. C. (eds) *The Hellenistic West: Rethinking the Ancient Mediterranean*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 367–390.

Ramage, E. S. (1978) *Atlantis: Fact or Fiction?* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Richter, D. S. (2001) ‘Plutarch On Isis and Osiris: Text, Cult and Cultural Appropriation’, *Johns Hopkins University Press* 131, 191–216.

Ritner, R. K. (1993) *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*. University of Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

——, (1995) ‘Egyptian Magical Practice Under the Roman Empire’, in *Aufstieg Und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. Berlin, New York: W. De Gruyter (Heidentum: Römische Religion Allgemeines [Forts.], 2).

Ryholt, K. (2013) ‘Libraries in ancient Egypt’, in Köing, J., Oikonomopoulou, K., and Woolf, G. (eds) *Ancient Libraries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 23–37.

Sanzo, J. E. (2019) ‘At the Crossroads of Ritual Practice and Anti-Magical Discourse in Late Antiquity: Taxonomies of Licit and Illicit Rituals in Leiden, Ms. AMS 9 and Related Sources’, *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft* 14(2), 230–254.

Scäfer, P. and Kippenberg, H. G. (eds) (1997) *Envisioning Magic: A Princeton Seminar and Symposium*. Leiden: Brill (Studies in the History of Religions).

Schofield, M. (2006) *Plato: Political Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schott, J. (2008) ‘Christianity, Empire, and the Making of Religion in Late Antiquity’, in Boyarin, D. (ed.) *Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

——, (2009) ‘Philosophies of Language, Theories of Translation, and Imperial Intellectual Production: The Cases of Porphyry, Iamblichus, and Eusebius’, *American Society of Church History* 78(4), 855–861.

Sethe, K. (1929) *Amun und die Acht Urgötter von Hermopolis, Eine Untersuchung über Ursprung und Wesen des ägyptischen Götterkönigs*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlarg: APAW (Philosophisch-historische Klasse).

Shaw, G. (1985) ‘Theurgy: Rituals of Unification in the Neoplatonism of Iamblichus’, *Traditio* 41, 1–28.

——, (1995) *Theurgy and the Soul: The Neoplatonism of Iamblichus*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania state University Press.

——, (2003) ‘Containing Ecstasy: The Strategies of Iamblichean Theurgy’, *Dionysius* 21, 53–88.

——, (2013) ‘Theurgy and the Platonists Luminous Body’, in DeConick, A. D., Shaw, G., and Turner, J. D. (eds) *Practicing Gnosis: Ritual Magic, Theurgy and Liturgy in the Nag Hammadi, Manichaean and Other Ancient Literature.* Boston: Brill, 537-557.

——, (2015) ‘Platonic Siddhas - Supernatural Philosophers of Neoplatonism’, in Kelly, E. F., Crabtree, A., and Marshall, P. (eds) *Beyond Physicalism: Toward Reconciliation of Science and Spirtuality*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

——, (2016) ‘The Neoplatonic Transmission of Ancient Wisdom’, in DesRosiers, N. P. and Vuong, L. C. (eds) *Religious Competition in the Greco-Roman World*. Williston, United States: Society of Biblical Literature, 107-118.

Simmons, B. M. (2015) *Universal Salvation in Late Antiquity: Porphyry of Tyre and the Pagan-Christian Debate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skinner, S. (2014) *Techniques of Graeco-Egyptian Magic*. Singapore: Golden Hoard Press.

Smelik, K. A. D. and Hemelrijk, E. A. (1984) ‘knows not what monsters demented Egypt worships?’ Opinions on Egyptian Animal Worship in Antiquity as Part of the Ancient Conception of Egypt’, in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. Berlin, New York: W. De Gruyter, 1852–2000.

Smith (2013) ‘The Image of Egypt in the Platonic Tradition’, in Koenen, L. D., Karfik, F., and Song, E. (eds) *Plato Revived: Essays on Ancient Platonism in Honour of Dominic J. O’Meara*. Berlin: De Gryter Inc. (Beiträge Zur Altertumskunde Ser.), 319–325.

——, (2016) ‘Religion, magic and theurgy in Porphyry’ in *Plotinus, Porphyry and Iamblichus: Philosophy and Religion in Neoplatonism*. New York: Routledge (Variorum Collected Studies Series), 1-10.

Stephens, S. (2016) ‘Plato’s Egyptian Republic’, in Rutherford, I. (ed.) *Greco-Egyptian Interactions: Literature, Translation and Cultures, 500BCE-300CE*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 41–60.

Swartz, M. D. (2005) ‘Understanding Ritual in Jewish Magic: Perspectives from the Genizah and Related Sources’, in Shaked, S. (ed.) *Officina magica: essays on the practice of magic in antiquity,* Leiden: Brill.

Thomassen, E. (1997) ‘Is magic a subclass of ritual?’, in Jordan, D. R., Montgomery, H., and Thomassen, E. (eds) *The world of ancient magic: papers from the first international Samons Eitrem Seminar at the Norwegian Institute at Athens*. Bergen: Norwegian Institute, 55–66.

Thompson, D. J. (2009) 'The Multilingual Environment of Persian and Ptolemaic Egypt: Egyptian, Aramaic and Greek Documentation.', in Bagnall, R. S. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*. Oxford; Oxford University Press, 395–417.

Traunecker, C., Le Saout, F. and Masson, O. (1981) *La Chapelle d'Achôris à Karnak II: Texte*. Paris: ADPF (Recherche sur les grandes civilizations, Synthesis, 5).

Uždavinys, A. (2008) *Philosophy As A Rite of Rebirth: From Ancient Egypt to Neoplatonism*. Gloucestershire, UK: The Prometheus Trust.

Van Liefferinge, C. (1994) *La Théurgie des Oracles Chaldaïques.* Liège: Presses universitaires.

Van Kooten, G. H. (2014) 'The Divine Father of the Universe from the PreSocratics To Celsus: The Graeco-Roman Background to the "Father of " in Paul's Letter to the Ephesians.', in Albrecht, F. and Feldmeier, R. (eds) *The Divine Father: Religious and Philosophical Concepts of Divine Parenthood in Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 293–324.

Vasunia, P. (2001) *The Gift of the Nile: Hellenizing Egypt from Aeschylus to Alexander*. California: University of California Press.

Veale, S. (2013) 'Orientalism in Iamblichus' The Mysteries', *The Pomegranate* 15(1), 202–222.

Versnel, H. S. (1990) 'Henotheism' in *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion, Vol. I: Ter Unus - Isis, Dionysus, Hermes. Three Studies in Henotheism.* Leiden: Brill

Vorwerk, Matthias (2010) 'Maker or Father? The Demiurge from Plutarch to Plotinus', in *The Whole Universe: Plato's Timaeus Today, One Book, The Whole Universe*. Las Vegas, United States: Parmenides Publishing, 79–100.

Wilken, R. L. (1979) 'Pagan Criticism of Christianity: Greek Religion and Christian Faith', in *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition in Honorem Robert M. Grant*. Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 117–34.

——, (1984) *The Christians as the Pagans Saw Them.* New Haven: YUP.

Wortley, J. (2001) 'Some light on magic and magicians in late antiquity' Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*; Duke University Libraries* 42, 289–307.

Žabkar, L. V. (1970) *A Study of the Ba Concept in Ancient Egyptian Texts*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Zandee, J. (1948) *De Hymnen aan Amon van Papyrus Leiden I 350*. Leiden: Brill.