

Appeals to the Intercessions of Mary in Greek Liturgical and Paraliturgical Texts from Egypt

Egypt¹ has yielded a rich harvest of textual and material evidence of Christian reflection upon and devotion toward Mary in late antiquity.² This bounty is not merely due to an environment conducive to the preservation of materials, important as this has undoubtedly been. There is more going on. But exactly what is going on is harder to determine than at first sight. Several elements of the cult of Mary in Egyptian Christianity become less certain when they are examined more closely. This may be illustrated by considering questions associated with early oblique indications of devotion toward Mary in Egypt, focusing on the epithet *Theotokos*, which inevitably figures in discussions of the origins of the cult of Mary in late antiquity.³ As is well known, the epithet is indisputably attested by Alexandrian writers in the fourth century, and in fact by writers around the eastern Mediterranean irrespective of doctrinal allegiance.⁴ Whereas the epithet apparently required explanation in the third century,⁵ fourth-century writers use it incidentally and without comment, suggesting that the term had been accepted into

¹ I gratefully acknowledge support for the research of this paper in the form of a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and release from teaching from the Faculty of Arts in the University of Ottawa. I have benefitted from comments offered at colloquia and conferences where portions of this paper have been read at various stages its development, including the Centre for Early Christian Studies in Australian Catholic University; the North American Patristics Society; and the Fourth Annual Coptic Studies Symposium in Canada; and the Sixteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies. I wish to thank Pauline Allen in particular for encouraging me to pursue this inquiry, and Leena Mari Peltomaa for inviting me to contribute a paper to this volume. The responsibility for the paper is, of course, mine.

References to papyrological editions are abbreviated according to J.F. Oates, R.S. Bagnall, S.J. Clackson, A.A. O'Brien, J.D. Sosin, T.G. Wilfong, and K.A. Worp, *Checklist of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, <http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html>, September, 2008. In addition, the following abbreviations are used: *PGM* = K. Preisendanz, E. Heitsch, and A. Henrichs (eds.), *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*, 2nd ed., 2 vols (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1974); *Suppl. Mag.* = R.W. Daniel and F. Maltomini (eds.), *Supplementum Magicum*, 2 vols (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1991–1992); *SB* = *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten* (1915-); *BL* = *Berichtungsliste der griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten* (1922-).

² While G. Gamberardini, *Il culto mariano in Egitto*, vol. 1 (Pubblicazioni dello Studium biblicum franciscanum analecta 6; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1975) conveniently presents much of the evidence, it must be read critically and supplemented by more recent finds and studies.

³ To cite only several recent examples: J.M. McGuckin, "The Early Cult of Mary and Inter-Religious Contexts in the Fifth-Century Church," in C. Maunder (ed.), *The Origins of the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (London and New York: Burns and Oates, 2008), 1–22 at 9–10; R.M. Price, "The *Theotokos* and the Council of Ephesus," in Maunder, *Origins of the Cult*, 89–103 at 89–90; M.E. Johnson, "*Sub tuum praesidium*: The *Theotokos* in Christian Life and Worship before Ephesus," in B.D. Spinks (ed.), *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer: Trinity, Christology, and Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2008), 243–67. I thank Peter Galadza for bringing this last reference to my attention.

⁴ M. Starowieyski, "Le titre θεοτόκος avant le concile d'Éphèse," *Studia Patristica* 19 (1987), 236–42 at 237–39; T. Klauser, "Gottesgebälerin (θεοτόκος)," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 11 (1981), cols 1071–103 at 1074–77. The earliest undisputed instance is in a letter of Alexander of Alexandria, *ep. ad Alex. Const.* 1.12 (PG 18, col. 568C). Peter of Alexandria, *frag.* 7 (PG 18: 517), cited as the first instance by Gamberardini, *Il culto mariano in Egitto*, 1, 111–13, is disputed; cf. M. Geerard, *Clavis patrum graecorum*, 5 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974–2003), 1, 206, no. 1640. Patristic texts referring to Mary are conveniently collected in S. Alvarez Campos (ed.), *Corpus Marianum patristicum*, 5 vols (Burgos: Ediciones Aldecoa, 1959).

⁵ Socrates, *HE* 7.32 (PG 67, 381B), referring to a discussion, no longer extant, of the epithet by Origen in his commentary on Romans; cf. C. Vagaggini, *Maria nelle opere di Origene* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 131; Rome: Pontificium Institutum orientalium studiorum, 1942), 105–7. G. Gamberardini, "Il 'Sub tuum praesidium' e il titolo 'Theotokos' nella tradizione egiziana," *Marianum* 31 (1969), 324–62 at 351–53 and 360–61, argues that the epithet is derived from Egyptian expressions, preserved in both hieroglyphic and Coptic, for "Mother of God." According to Gamberardini, the traditional Egyptian connotations of this expression, associated with Isis, would have obliged Origen to explain how Mary could properly be considered "God-bearer." The arguments are reproduced in Gamberardini, *Il culto mariano*, 1, 111–22. Starowieyski, "Le titre θεοτόκος," 240–41, accepts this hypothesis, rejecting, as does Klauser, "Gottesgebälerin," 1076–77, that Origen was the author of the title. The remarks of McGuckin, "The Early Cult of Mary," 9–10, are suggestive. On later usage see D.F. Wright, "From 'God-Bearer' to 'Mother of God' in the Later Fathers," in R.N. Swanson (ed.), *The Church and Mary* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004), 22–30.

theological usage by then.⁶ The devotional value of the epithet in the third and fourth centuries is less clear, however. Although Cyril of Alexandria comes to its defence for soteriological reasons,⁷ he is not particularly concerned with the epithet prior to the controversy with Nestorius.⁸ Nor does he appeal to its cultic significance when he takes up its cause,⁹ although in his homilies at Ephesus Mary is hailed as the one through whom salvation has come and creation has been restored.¹⁰ It has been suggested that the epithet was first used in hymns.¹¹ But if this is so, we do not know whether these hymns were addressed to Mary; they are more likely to have been theological or christological in nature.¹² Much has been made of *P.Ryl.* III 470, which preserves an early witness to the antiphon *Sub tuum praesidium*, a prayer for protection addressed directly to the *Theotokos*.¹³ But it is less certain now that this papyrus should be assigned to the fourth century,¹⁴ let alone the third century;¹⁵ it probably belongs to the sixth or seventh century,¹⁶ or even later,¹⁷ though scholars of the cult of Mary have been either unaware of, or slow to accept, recent paleographical examinations of the papyrus.¹⁸ The most common name for churches or other sites dedicated to Mary in Egypt is “holy Mary,” an expression that appears from the fifth century onward.¹⁹ Considerably fewer sites are dedicated to the *Theotokos*, a name that first appears in the sixth century.²⁰ In fact,

⁶ R.M. Price. “*Theotokos*: The Title and its Significance in Doctrine and Devotion,” in S.J. Boss (ed.), *Mary: The Complete Resource* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 56–73 at 56–57; Price, “The *Theotokos*,” 90.

⁷ B. Studer, “Il concilio di Efeso (431) nella luce della dottrina mariana di Cirillo di Alessandria,” in S. Felici (ed.), *La mariologia nella catechesi dei padri (Età postnicena)* (Biblioteca di scienze religiose 95; Rome: LAS, 1991), 49–67; A. Atanassova, “Cyril of Alexandria and His Contribution to Mariology,” *Studia Patristica* 42 (2006), 29–44; A. Atanassova, “Did Cyril of Alexandria Invent Mariology?,” in Maunder, *Origins of the Cult*, 105–25.

⁸ P. Imhof and B. Lorenz, *Maria Theotokos bei Cyrill von Alexandrien. Zur Theotokos-Tradition und ihrer Relevanz* (Munich: Gerhard Kaffke, 1981), 41–44; L.R. Wickham (ed.), *Cyril of Alexandria: Select Letters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 11 n. 10; Studer, “Il concilio di Efeso,” 54.

⁹ Studer, “Il concilio di Efeso,” 55.

¹⁰ Atanassova, “Cyril of Alexandria and His Contribution,” 40–43; Atanassova, “Did Cyril of Alexandria Invent Mariology?,” 114–16.

¹¹ Price, “The *Theotokos*,” 90.

¹² As are two fourth-century hymns referring to Mary: *P.Köln* IV 172 (cf. intro. and l. 1 comm.) and P.Monts. Roca inv. 149b–153 (cf. A. Emmett, “A Fourth Century Hymn to the Virgin Mary? Psalmus Responsorius: P.Bar. 149b–153, in *Proceedings of the XIV International Congress of Papyrologists* [Graeco-Roman Memoirs 61; London: Egyptian Exploration Society, 1975], 97–102, and “A Fourth-Century Hymn to the Virgin Mary?,” in G.H.R. Horsley (ed.), *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, 2 [Sydney: The Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1982], 141–46, no. 92).

¹³ *P.Ryl.* III 470; P.F. Mercenier, “L’antienne mariale grecque la plus ancienne,” *Le Muséon* 52 (1939), 229–33; O. Stegmüller, “*Sub tuum praesidium*: Bemerkungen zur ältesten Überlieferung,” *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 74 (1952), 76–82; G. Giamberardini, “Il ‘*Sub tuum praesidium*’, 324–62; H. Förster, “Zur ältesten Überlieferung der marianischen Antiphon ‘*Sub tuum praesidium*’,” *Biblos* 44 (1995): 183–92. For a review of studies that discuss the papyrus see A.M. Triacca, “‘*Sub tuum praesidium*’: nella ‘lex orandi’ un’anticipata presenza della ‘lex credendi.’ La ‘teotologia’ precede la ‘mariologia’?,” in S. Felici (ed.), *La mariologia nella catechesi dei padri (Età prenicena)* (Biblioteca di scienze religiose 88; Rome: LAS, 1989), 183–205 at 184–90.

¹⁴ As initially proposed by Roberts on terminological grounds (*P.Ryl.* III 470 intro.); cf. also Stegmüller, “*Sub tuum praesidium*,” 78 and 82.

¹⁵ As initially proposed by Lobel on paleographical grounds (*P.Ryl.* III 470 intro.); cf. Giamberardini, “Il ‘*Sub tuum praesidium*’,” 348–62.

¹⁶ Förster, “Zum ältesten Überlieferung,” 183–92.

¹⁷ H. Förster, “Die älteste marianische Antiphon ein Fehldatierung? Überlegungen zum ‘ältesten Beleg’ des *Sub tuum praesidium*,” *Journal of Coptic Studies* 7 (2005), 99–109.

¹⁸ Förster’s article of 2005 has, to my knowledge, not been considered in any of the more recent studies of the origins of the cult of Mary. Some studies also do not take his article of 1995 into account, e.g., Johnson, “*Sub tuum praesidium*,” 254–55; Price, “The *Theotokos*,” 89 n. 4 (corrected in Price, “*Theotokos*: The Title,” 56 n. 1, but without substantial discussion). A full consideration of Förster’s arguments is beyond the scope of this paper; I hope to discuss them elsewhere. Suffice to say, however, that any argument for a third- or fourth-century date for the antiphon must take as its point of departure the paleographical considerations of Förster (as well as Stegmüller) allowing for a later date for *P.Ryl.* III 470. Lobel’s brief paleographical remarks in *P.Ryl.* III 470 intro. cannot remain the principal basis for assigning the papyrus an early date. The issue is now no longer whether a prayer referring to *Theotokos* can be assigned to the third century; Roberts’ argument on that point has, obviously, been refuted. The issue is whether an antiphon whose earliest witnesses may be assigned to the sixth or seventh centuries or later originated in the third century. Cf. now also the second witness to the antiphon in K. Treu and J. Diethart (eds.), *Griechische literarische Papyri christlichen Inhaltes II* (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek Neue Serie XVII; Vienna: Brüder Hollinek, 1993), 56, no. 29.

¹⁹ A. Papaconstantinou, “Les sanctuaires de la Vierge dans l’Égypte byzantine et omeyyade. L’apport des textes documentaires,” *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 30 (2000), 81–94 at 92.

²⁰ Papaconstantinou, “Les sanctuaires de la Vierge,” 93.

the predominance of “holy Mary,” a form of regard used for other saints as well,²¹ has prompted the suggestion that Mary was revered as one saint among many others in Egypt.²² Indeed, at Oxyrhynchus in the early sixth century, liturgies were celebrated either more frequently or as frequently at churches dedicated to several other saints than at the church dedicated to Mary.²³

I do not mean to suggest by this litany that there is no evidence of devotion to Mary in Egypt in the third or fourth centuries. I merely wish to emphasize that closer scrutiny of the evidence may lead one to qualify the inferences one draws from or between early oblique indications of a cult of Mary. This paper on the intercessory function of Mary in Egypt therefore focuses on only a portion of the evidence: (mainly) Greek liturgical and paraliturgical texts from Egypt.²⁴ I must leave it to others to consider theological treatises, homilies, hymns, iconography, vestments, ecclesiastical and monastic architecture and inscriptions. The main question I pursue is the following: in what form and at what time did appeals to the intercessions of Mary appear in eucharistic liturgies and individual prayers for healing and protection in Egypt?²⁵ To answer this question I turn to recent scholarship on Egyptian eucharistic anaphoras, and to my own research into Greek amulets from Egypt containing Christian elements.²⁶ In both cases – the anaphoras and the amulets – we are fortunate to have some important early evidence, thanks, as I have already noted, to the Egyptian environment. But the evidence is fragmentary and sporadic, sometimes difficult to decipher and hard to date, leaving us to propose hypotheses where we might prefer to establish conclusions.

EUCCHARISTIC LITURGIES

Since eucharistic liturgies present more or less authorized formulae of invocation used by the church, they are a useful point of departure. However, liturgies are living expressions of local devotion; they vary between regions and develop over time. The study of their development and variations, particularly in the early centuries of Christian worship, is a complex undertaking, as any foray into liturgical scholarship will show.²⁷ I will focus on early witnesses to the principal eucharistic liturgies in Egypt in late antiquity – the liturgies of St Mark and St Cyril, St. Basil, and St Gregory – and in particular on the commemorations, the section of the anaphora that over time came to include an appeal to the intercessions of Mary or the saints.²⁸

We have many early, if fragmentary, witnesses of the anaphora of the liturgy of the patriarchate of Alexandria,²⁹ which goes by the names of St Mark and St Cyril.³⁰ (We are less well served with regards to the pre- and post-anaphoral portions of the Alexandrian liturgy, where we must rely on later medieval manuscripts in Greek,

²¹ A. Papaconstantinou, *Le culte des saints en Égypte des Byzantins aux Abbassides. L'apport des inscriptions et des papyrus grecs et coptes* (Paris: CNRS Éditions, 2001), 240–45.

²² Papaconstantinou, “Les sanctuaires de la Vierge,” 93.

²³ A. Papaconstantinou, “La liturgie stationnale à Oxyrhynchus dans la première moitié du 6^e siècle. Réédition et commentaire du POxy XI 1357,” *Revue des Études Byzantines* 54 (1996), 135–59 at 152–55. See further at p. 12 below.

²⁴ I discuss texts in Coptic only insofar as they bear directly on the liturgical or paraliturgical texts under consideration.

²⁵ The bibliography of marian studies is enormous. A few studies have investigated specifically the intercessory function of Mary in the patristic period: G. Bardy, “La doctrine de l’intercession de Marie chez les Pères grecs,” *La Vie Spirituelle*, 56 Supplément (1938), 1–37; M. Jourjon, “Aux origines de la prière d’intercession de Marie. Le témoignage des Pères des cinq premiers siècles,” *Bulletin d’études mariales* 23 (1966), 38–42.

²⁶ For an overview see T.S. de Bruyn and J.H.F. Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets and Formularies from Egypt Containing Christian Elements: A Checklist of Papyri, Parchments, Ostraka, and Tablets,” *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists*, 48 (2001), 163–216.

²⁷ For an overview see P.F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy* (2d ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

²⁸ Johnson, “*Sub tuum praesidium*,” 247–49, which came to my attention after I had substantially completed this section of the paper, covers some of this material, but does not refer to the most recent critical editions.

²⁹ For an overview of the eucharistic liturgy of Alexandria, see M.E. Johnson, *Liturgy in Early Christian Egypt* (Cambridge: Grove Books, 1995), 17–34. For a review of scholarship on all aspects of Alexandrian and Egyptian liturgies, see H. Brakmann, “Zwischen Pharos und Wüste. Die Erforschung der alexandrinisch-ägyptischen Liturgie durch und nach Anton Baumstark,” in R.F. Taft and G. Winkler (eds.), *Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872–1948)* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 265; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2001), 323–76.

³⁰ The Alexandrian liturgy was used by adherents of Chalcedon under the name of St Mark and by opponents of Chalcedon under the name of St Cyril; see H. Brakmann, “Das Alexandrinische Eucharistiegebet auf Wiener Papyrusfragmenten,” *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 39 (1996), 149–64 at 152–53. Today in the Coptic Orthodox church the liturgy is rarely used; see J. Henner, *Fragmenta Liturgica Copta* (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 5; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 22–23.

Coptic, and Ethiopic.) One of the earliest witnesses to the Alexandrian anaphora, the Strasbourg papyrus gr. inv. 254,³¹ has been assigned to the fifth or even fourth century,³² but preserves a text that may go back to the late second or early third century.³³ In its commemoration of the dead and the living in the presence of the offering, it refers to the prophets, apostles, and martyrs, and to their intercessions.³⁴ The text is fragmentary at this point, and difficult to reconstruct,³⁵ but it makes no mention of Mary. In this regard the Strasbourg papyrus resembles the account of the anaphoral intercessions in the late-fourth-century *Mystagogical Catecheses*.³⁶ There the saints are remembered so that through their prayers and intercessions God may receive the supplications of the faithful,³⁷ but Mary is not mentioned.³⁸ (The *Mystagogical Catecheses* distinguishes between remembering the saints and praying for the rest of the dead in the presence of the offering;³⁹ other fourth-century accounts, such as the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the sermons of John Chrysostom, reflect an older tradition of remembering, or praying for, all the dead, as well as the living, without discrimination in the presence of the offering.⁴⁰) In later manuscripts of the anaphora of St Mark, on the other hand, Mary is singled out for commemoration by the priest,⁴¹ without, however, appealing to her intercessions.⁴² The form of this commemoration – referred to as the *Theotokos* ekphonesis because it was chanted aloud by the presiding celebrant – resembles that introduced around 470 by bishop Genadius into the liturgy at Constantinople immediately before the diptychs of the dead recited by the deacon.⁴³ This

³¹ M. Andrieu and P. Collomp, “Fragments sur papyrus de l’anaphore de saint Marc,” *Revue des sciences religieuses* 8 (1928), 489–515; J. Hammerstaedt, *Griechische Anaphorenfragmente aus Ägypten und Nubien* (Papyrologica Coloniensia 27; Opladen, Westdeutscher Verlag, 1999), 22–41.

³² Andrieu and Collomp, “Fragments,” 490–91.

³³ For a review of scholarship see W.D. Roy, “The Strasbourg Papyrus,” in P.F. Bradshaw (ed.), *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997), 39–56 at 39–44. For a late-second or early-third century date see G.J. Cuming, “The Anaphora of St. Mark: A Study in Development,” *Muséon* 95 (1982), 115–29 at 121–22, reprinted in Bradshaw, *Essays*, 57–72.

³⁴ τῶν / ἁγίων σου προφητῶν ἀποστόλων κ[αὶ] μ[αρ]- / τύρων · τὰς πρεσβείας αὐτῶν τ[] . [...] η. The categories of saints named in Eastern anaphoral commemorations are usefully compared at H. Engberding, “Das anaphorische Fürbittebet der byzantinischen Chrysostomusliturgie (Fortsetzung),” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 46 (1962), 33–60 at 34–35.

³⁵ See Hammerstaedt, *Griechische Anaphorenfragmente*, 40–41, ll. 20–24 comm. Regretably, another early witness to this same text, *P.Lit. Lond.* 232 *recto*, assigned to the sixth or seventh century, breaks off at a point several lines before the Strasbourg papyrus; see now Hammerstaedt, *Griechische Anaphorenfragmente*, 42–50.

³⁶ The authorship and date of the *Mystagogical Catecheses*, attributed both to Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem from approximately 351 to 387 CE, and to his successor John, have been a subject of ongoing debate. A. Piédagnel, “Introduction” and “Appendice I,” in *Cyrille de Jérusalem: Catéchèses mystagogiques* (SC 126 bis; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1988; repr. 2004), 18–40, 177–87, reviews the discussion up to 1987. A.J. Doval, *Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogue: The Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2001), concludes after a systematic examination of the evidence that the lectures are the work of Cyril and were delivered toward the end of his episcopate.

³⁷ *Catech. myst.* 5.9 (SC 126 bis: 158): Ἐἴτα μνημονεύομεν καὶ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, πρῶτον πατριαρχῶν, προφητῶν, ἀποστόλων, μαρτύρων, ὅπως ὁ Θεὸς εὐχαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ πρεσβείαις προσδέξῃται ἡμῶν τὴν δέησιν.

³⁸ The formulaic conclusions of fourth-century sermons and treatises also invoke the prayers and intercessions only of the saints; cf., e.g., Evagrius of Pontus, *cap. pract.*, epilogue, l. 7 (SC 171, 712; cf. 713–14); Gregory of Nyssa, *Steph.* 2 (G. Heil, J.P. Cavanaugh, and O. Lendle (eds.) *Gregorii Nysseni sermones, Pars II* [Gregorii Nysseni Opera 10.1; Leiden: Brill, 1990], 105); John Chrysostom, *hom. 1 in Gen.* (PG 53: col. 26); John Chrysostom, *In illud: Hoc scitote quod in novissimis diebus* (PG 56, col. 278).

³⁹ Cf. *Catech. myst.* 5.9 n. 1 (SC 126 bis 158–59); R.F. Taft, “Praying to or for the Saints? A Note on the Sanctoral Intercessions/Commemorations in the Anaphora,” in M. Schneider and W. Berschin (eds.), *Ab Oriente et Occidente (Mt 8, 11). Kirche aus Ost und West. Gedenkschrift für Wilhelm Nyssen* (St Ottilien: Verlag Erzabtei, 1996), 439–55 at 443, 450–51. I thank Peter Galadza for bringing this reference to my attention.

⁴⁰ Taft, “Praying to or for the Saints?,” 446–69; cf. G. Winkler, “Die Interzessionen der Chrysostomusanaphora in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung (I. Teil),” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 36 (1970), 301–36 at 306–7; H. Engberding, “Das anaphorische Fürbittebet der byzantinischen Chrysostomusliturgie,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 46 (1961), 20–29 at 26–27.

⁴¹ G.J. Cuming, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 234; Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 29–31; cf. H. Engberding, “Das anaphorische Fürbittebet der griechischen Markusliturgie,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 30 (1964): 398–446 at 427–28.

⁴² Cuming, *Liturgy*, 114.

⁴³ The innovation is reported by Theodore Lector, *HE excerptum* 395 (GCS 52, 111) and Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IV.11 (CSCO 83, 185); cf. J. Declerck, “Le patriarche Gennade de Constantinople (458–471) et un opuscule inédit contre les Nestoriens,” *Byzantion* 60 (1990), 130–44 at 141–44. On the original placement and form of the ekphonesis, see R.F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. 4. *The Diptychs* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 238; Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1991), 100–2, 119–20. Taft accepts at face value Pseudo-Zachariah’s explanation for the innovation. See now, however, P. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491): de l’histoire à la géo-ecclésiologie* (Rome: École française de Rome, 2006), 454–55 with 170 n. 375, and

specific commemoration of Mary was an innovation – previously only categories of saints (patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, etc.) were mentioned – and initially only she was named, without further mention of other individual saints (John the Baptist, etc.).⁴⁴

According to Robert Taft, the *Theotokos* ekphonesis was inserted into the anaphora of St John Chrysostom in imitation of the anaphora of St Basil.⁴⁵ The early history and transmission of this anaphora is complex.⁴⁶ It exists in two families: a shorter Egyptian form attested in Sahidic (ES-Basil), Bohairic (EB-Basil), Greek (EG-Basil), and Ethiopic (Eth-Basil) versions; and a longer form found in Armenian (Arm-Basil), Syrian (Syr-Basil), and Byzantine (Byz-Basil) versions.⁴⁷ The question of the language and provenance of the anaphora at each of the key points in its development – the original form of the anaphora (Ur-Basil), the form from which the Egyptian versions derive (E-Basil), and the form from which the Armenian, Syrian, and Byzantine versions derive (Ω-Basil) – is not settled.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, it is generally agreed, with some recent qualifications, that the Egyptian versions originated earlier than and developed independently of the Armenian, Syrian, and Byzantine versions.⁴⁹ Some have proposed that the Egyptian form of the anaphora originated in Egypt; others have argued that it originated outside of Egypt, either in Cappadocia or Syria.⁵⁰ The current view is that the anaphora came to Egypt from Syria in the sixth or seventh century (at the latest) as non-Chalcedonians looked to Syria for liturgical models after the breach with the Chalcedonian church.⁵¹

The Sahidic version is shorter than the other Egyptian versions. Like the Bohairic version, it was initially translated from the Greek version. However, because the use of Sahidic in the liturgy was limited to upper Egypt and was eventually abandoned, the Sahidic version did not undergo the sustained development of the Greek and Bohairic versions, which were used throughout Egypt, the one earlier, the other later.⁵² The Sahidic version is

G. Greatrex (ed.), *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor: Church and War in Late Antiquity* (Translated Texts for Historians 55; Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011), 153 n.117. Blaudeau dates the innovation around 470, near the end of Gennadius' episcopate.

⁴⁴ Winkler, "Die Interzessionen der Chrysostomosanaphora (I. Teil)," 309–10.

⁴⁵ R.F. Taft, "St. John Chrysostom and the Byzantine Anaphora that Bears His Name," in Bradshaw, *Essays*, 195–226 at 203 n. 19. Earlier versions of this article – R.F. Taft, "The Authenticity of the Chrysostom Anaphora Revisited: Determining the Authorship of Liturgical Texts by Computer," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 56 (1990), 5–51, reprinted in R.F. Taft, *Liturgy in Byzantium and Beyond* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1995) – do not treat the intercessions. Taft, "Praying to or for the Saints?," 440, stated that the *Theotokos* ekphonesis was interpolated into both anaphoras under Gennadius.

⁴⁶ On the attribution to Basil of Caesarea see now A. Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilius-Anaphora. Text – Kommentar – Geschichte* (Jerusalem Theologisches Forum 7; Münster: Aschendorff, 2004), 568–77.

⁴⁷ The point of departure for the analysis of the transmission of St Basil remains H. Engberding, *Das eucharistische Hochgebet der Basileiosliturgie. Textgeschichtliche Untersuchungen und kritische Ausgabe* (Theologie des Christlichen Ostens, Texte und Untersuchungen I; Münster: Aschendorff, 1931), whose findings are summarized and evaluated in G. Winkler, *Die Basilius-Anaphora. Edition der beiden armenischen Redaktionen und der relevanten Fragmente, Übersetzung und Zusammenschau aller Versionen im Licht der orientalischen Überlieferung* (Anaphorae Orientales 2, Anaphorae Armenicae 2; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2005), 9–21. For the Egyptian versions of St Basil, see now Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilius-Anaphora*, but cf. the review of G. Winkler, *Oriens Christianus* 89 (2005): 264–75, substantially reproduced in Winkler, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 30–37.

⁴⁸ Gabrielle Winkler has recently argued that the original form of the anaphora (Ur-Basil) was likely Syrian, and that the form from which the Armenian, Syrian, and Byzantine versions derive (Ω-Basil) was certainly Syrian; see Winkler, "Zur Erforschung orientalischer Anaphoren in liturgievergleichender Sicht II: Das Formelgut der Oratio post Sanctus und Anamnese sowie Interzessionen und die Taufbekenntnisse," in Taft and Winkler, *Comparative Liturgy*, 407–93 at 486–91. She thus breaks with the view of Engberding that Ω-Basil was a revision by Basil of Caesaria of a pre-existing Greek anaphora from Cappadocia (Ur-Basil); see Engberding, *Das eucharistische Hochgebet*, lxxxiv–lxxxvi; Winkler, "Zur Erforschung II," 408–11; Winkler, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 16, 20. However, Winkler's arguments have not proven to be conclusive; see A. Budde, "Typisch syrisch? Anmerkungen zur Signifikanz liturgischer Parallelen. Der Ursprung der Basilius-Anaphora in der Diskussion," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 45 (2002), 50–61.

⁴⁹ See Winkler, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 15, 876–77.

⁵⁰ The literature after Engberding's edition is summarized, with some omissions, in Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilius-Anaphora*, 20–34; cf. Winkler, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 34–37. See now also A. Budde, "Wie findet man 'ägyptisches Heimatgut'? Die ägyptische Ursprung der Basileios-Anaphora in der Diskussion," in Taft and Winkler, *Comparative Liturgy*, 671–88, a reply to T.E. Johnson, "Recovering ägyptisches Heimatgut: An Exercise in Liturgical Methodology," *Questions Liturgiques* 76 (1995), 182–98. D.R. Stuckwisch, "The Basilian Anaphoras," in Bradshaw, *Essays*, 109–30 at 114–19, while useful, is incomplete; it does not take into account the critical review by G. Winkler of J.R.K. Fenwick, *The Anaphoras of St Basil and St James: An Investigation into their Common Origin* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 240; Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientale, 1992) in *Oriens Christiana* 78 (1994), 269–77.

⁵¹ See H. Brakmann, "Zu den Fragmenten einer griechischen Basileios-Liturgie aus dem koptischen Makarios-Kloster," *Oriens Christianus* 66 (1982), 118–43 at 118–19; Brakmann, "Zwischen Pharos und Wüste," 357–58; Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilius-Anaphora*, 578–82.

⁵² Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilius-Anaphora*, 104; cf. Fenwick, *Anaphoras*, 52–53.

preserved in a number of witnesses which vary one from another,⁵³ suggesting that they were prepared independently from the Greek in different linguistic contexts.⁵⁴ One of the earliest and most complete, MS Lefort copt. s. n., is written in a hand that could be assigned to the eighth or ninth century, but preserves a text dated to the seventh century on internal evidence.⁵⁵ In this source Mary alone is named in the commemoration of the dead, in the phraseology of the *Theotokos* ekphonesis: “vouchsafe to remember ... all the righteous who are perfected in the faith, especially the ever-virgin, the holy and glorious Mary, the God-bearer.”⁵⁶ Moreover, it is her prayers alone that are mentioned as benefitting the saints: “and have mercy on us all through her prayers.”⁵⁷ Two other later witnesses to the Sahidic version of the anaphora similarly remember Mary alone: Cod. Vat. copt. 103,2,⁵⁸ a fragment assigned to the eleventh century,⁵⁹ and Cairo, Catalogue général 9260 (Coptic Museum 3911),⁶⁰ an unnumbered sheet from the Great Euchologion of the White Monastery,⁶¹ a collection of prayers from about the tenth or eleventh century.⁶² In the former, the commemoration of Mary breaks off in mid-sentence.⁶³ In the latter, she alone is named, but the appeal for intercession is in the plural, referring not only to her but to the aforementioned patriarchs, prophets, etc.⁶⁴ In naming Mary alone – a feature, as we have seen, of the earliest commemoration of Mary in the anaphora of St John Chrysostom⁶⁵ – the Sahidic version of the anaphora differs from all subsequent versions of St Basil, both Egyptian and non-Egyptian. All other versions of the anaphora – EB-Basil, EG-Basil, Eth-Basil, Syr-Basil, Arm-Basil, Byz-Basil – also name John the Baptist, Stephen the first martyr, and other saints, bishops, and monks.⁶⁶

While the Great Euchologion of the White Monastery is a later witness to the Sahidic version of the anaphora of St Basil, it is in fact an early witness to Sahidic versions of many other named anaphoras.⁶⁷ The diversity of anaphoras, known and unknown, included in this collection is itself noteworthy.⁶⁸ Its texts of the anaphoras of St Cyril, St Severus, and several unknown anaphoras include the commemoration of the saints.⁶⁹ Achim Budde has compared the sequence of elements in the *Theotokos* ekphonesis in these Sahidic anaphoras (including the Sahidic versions of the anaphora of St. Basil) with the sequence of elements in later Bohairic and Greek anaphoras.⁷⁰ In the Sahidic anaphoras the ekphonesis includes fewer epithets: “God-bearer” (five witnesses), “our Lady” (four witnesses), “ever-virgin” (three witnesses), “most glorious” (three witnesses), “all-holy” (two witnesses). Moreover, their placement varies and their translation is not standard. Thus while the principal epithets applied to Mary

⁵³ Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora*, 94–104; Henner, *Fragmenta Liturgica Copta*, 26–32.

⁵⁴ Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora*, 104.

⁵⁵ J. Doresse and E. Lanne, *Un témoin archaïque de la liturgie copte de S. Basile* (Louvain: Publications universitaires, 1960), 3–5 (8th or 9th century); Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora*, 95–96 (9th century).

⁵⁶ Doresse and Lanne, *Un témoin archaïque*, 26; Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora*, 180 (v. 145): ⲛⲉⲟⲩⲟ ⲗⲉ ⲧⲓⲛⲁⲣⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲱ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲗⲁⲓⲃⲓ ⲗⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲁⲉⲟⲩ ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲗ ⲧⲣⲉϥⲛⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲩⲧⲉ.

⁵⁷ Doresse and Lanne, *Un témoin archaïque*, 26; Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora*, 188 (v. 161): ⲛⲓⲛⲗ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲧⲏⲣ ⲉⲧⲓⲛ ⲛⲉϥⲧⲱⲃⲉ

⁵⁸ H. Quecke, “Ein sahidisches Fragment der Basiliosliturgie (Cod. Vat. copt. 103,2),” in W. Nyssen (ed.), *Simandron. Der Wachklopfer. Gedenkschrift für Klaus Gamber (1919–1989)* (Koinonia-Oriens 30; Cologne: Luther-Verlag, 1989), 137–47.

⁵⁹ Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora*, 97–98.

⁶⁰ H. Munier, *Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, nos. 9201–9304: manuscrits coptes* (Cairo: Imprimerie de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale, 1916), 85–87, no. 9260.

⁶¹ The text is reproduced with French translation in E. Lanne’s collection of the scattered sheets of the Great Euchologion, *Le Grand Euchologe de Monastère Blanc* (PO 28.2; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1958), 384–87.

⁶² Henner, *Fragmenta Liturgica Copta*, 12; Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora*, 98–99.

⁶³ Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora*, 180, apparatus to the Sahidic version at v. 145, siglum γ: ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲗⲁⲓⲃⲓ ⲧⲉⲧⲟⲩⲗⲁⲓⲃⲓ ⲉⲧⲙⲉⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲧⲉ [...].

⁶⁴ Munier, *Catalogue général*, 86, ll. 8–12, and Lanne, *Le Grand Euchologe*, 386, ll. 9–11; cf. Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora*, 180 and 188, apparatus to the Sahidic version at vv. 145 and 161, siglum δ: ⲛⲓⲛⲗⲟⲩ ⲗⲉ ⲛⲓⲛⲗⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲧⲉⲧⲁⲉⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲩⲥ ⲧⲏⲣⲓ ⲧⲉⲟⲩⲗⲁⲓⲃⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲗ ⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲁϥⲛⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲓⲛ ⲛⲉϥϥⲟⲩⲥ ⲉⲕⲉ ⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲧⲏⲣⲓ.

⁶⁵ Cf. n. 44 above.

⁶⁶ Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora*, 178–89 (vv. 146–60, noting the absence of Sahidic witnesses), 487; cf. Engberding, “Das anaphorische Fürbittgebet der byzantinischen Chrysostomusliturgie (Fortsetzung),” 39; Fenwick, *Anaphoras*, 218–19.

⁶⁷ For an overview see Henner, *Fragmenta Liturgica Copta*, 19–35.

⁶⁸ For an overview see Henner, *Fragmenta Liturgica Copta*, 12–19.

⁶⁹ Lanne, *Le Grand Euchologe*, 292, ll. 7–31 (St Cyril); 300, l. 1–12 (unknown); 320, l. 13–322, l. 5 (St Severus); 340, l. 25–342, l. 14 (unknown).

⁷⁰ Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora*, 487–90.

are well-attested, their exact rendering is still flexible as late as the tenth or eleventh century – even, as Budde has remarked, in a single collection of anaphoral prayers from a major liturgical centre in Egypt.⁷¹

Since Mary is followed by other saints in these commemorations, they conclude with an appeal to the intercessions of all those named, not just of Mary alone. This is true of the anaphora of St Cyril⁷² – a departure from the practice of the anaphora of St Mark.⁷³ It was probably also true of the anaphora of St Gregory. The anaphora of St Gregory in the Euchologion unfortunately does not include the commemoration of the saints.⁷⁴ Nor does an earlier sixth-century fragment, P.Vindob. K. 4854.⁷⁵ Belonging to the Syrian-Antiochene tradition,⁷⁶ this anaphora probably originated in the fifth century,⁷⁷ and was introduced into Egypt somewhat later. Like the anaphora of St Basil, it is attested in Sahidic, Bohairic, and Greek versions; the Sahidic version was based on the Greek, the Bohairic derived from the Sahidic.⁷⁸ Also like the Bohairic and Greek witnesses of the anaphora of St Basil, the Bohairic and Greek witnesses of the anaphora of St Gregory commemorate a series of saints, beginning with Mary, and appeal to the intercessions of them all.⁷⁹

In short, most of our early witnesses to Egyptian anaphoras derive from a period when Mary was commemorated along with other saints, all of whose intercessions are sought. In the earliest of these witnesses – the text of the anaphora of St Basil found in MS Lefort copt. s. n. – Mary alone is named and her intercessions alone are invoked. This text is assigned on internal evidence to the seventh century, but is based on a prior Greek version that probably arrived in Egypt in the sixth century. The form of the commemoration is that of the *Theotokos* ekphronesis introduced into the diptychs in Constantinople toward the end of the fifth century. We do not know exactly when this commemoration came to be associated with an appeal for intercessions or when it was first employed in Egypt. But if one grants that the conjunction of remembering Mary and appealing to her intercessions was already present in the Greek version of the anaphora of St Basil that lies behind the earliest Egyptian versions, the practice would appear to date from the sixth century.

We must bear in mind, however, that the great anaphoral traditions capture only a portion of the liturgical production of Egypt, which varied by settings (in the community and in monasteries) and by region (in Alexandria and in north and south Egypt).⁸⁰ Intercessory litanies could occur in several places in the eucharist, as well as in the monastic cycle of daily prayer.⁸¹ We possess a number of liturgical lists or litanies from Egypt whose affiliation or purpose is not always clear, but which nevertheless expand our sense of the scope of liturgical expression.⁸² Several of these refer to Mary. They include an intercessory fragment assigned to the second half of the sixth century that begins by praying for “the graces of the holy virgin mother Mary and the holy disciples and apostles and evangelists”;⁸³ a seventh-century diptych that commemorates “the all-holy and glorious *Theotokos* and ever-virgin Mary”;⁸⁴ an idiosyncratic eighth-century litany that opens by appealing to “the intercessions and petitions

⁷¹ Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora*, 488–89.

⁷² Lanne, *Le Grand Euchologe*, 292, ll. 22–31.

⁷³ Cf. n. 42 above.

⁷⁴ For an overview of Sahidic witnesses to this anaphora, see Henner, *Fragmenta Liturgica Copta*, 32–35.

⁷⁵ Newly edited with a commentary in Henner, *Fragmenta Liturgica Copta*, 36–77.

⁷⁶ A. Gerhards, *Die griechische Gregoriosanaphora. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des eucharistischen Hochgebets* (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 65; Münster: Aschendorff, 1984), 168; Henner, *Fragmenta Liturgica Copta*, 32.

⁷⁷ Gerhards, *Die griechische Gregoriosanaphora*, 245–47; Henner, *Fragmenta Liturgica Copta*, 33.

⁷⁸ See now Henner, *Fragmenta Liturgica Copta*, 71–77.

⁷⁹ Gerhards, *Die griechische Gregoriosanaphora*, 46, ll. 362–76; E. Hammerschmidt, *Die koptische Gregoriosanaphora. Syrische und griechische Einflüsse auf eine ägyptische Liturgie* (Berliner Byzantinistische Arbeiten 8; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957), 58–61, ll. 298–307.

⁸⁰ Cf., e.g., H. Brakmann, “Neue Funde und Forschungen zur Liturgie der Kopten,” in M. Rassart-Debergh and J. Ries (eds.), *Actes du IV^e Congrès copte*, 2 vols (Publications de l’Institut orientaliste de Louvain 40–41; Louvain-la-Neuve: Université catholique de Louvain, Institut orientaliste, 1992), 2, 419–35 at 419; H. Brakmann, “Neue Funde und Forschungen zur Liturgie der Kopten (1992–1996),” in S. Emmel, M. Krause, S.G. Richter and S. Schaten (eds.), *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit. Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses*, 2 vols (Sprachen und Kulturen des christlichen Orients 6; Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1999), 451–64 at 451–52.

⁸¹ See Taft, *Diptychs*, 23–27, 80.

⁸² Taft, *Diptychs*, 79–94.

⁸³ G. Bastianini and C. Gallazzi, “P.Cair.10395A: Frammento liturgico,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 58 (1985): 99–102 at 101: [τῶν] χαρισ[μάτων] / [τῆς] ἁγίας μη[τρο-] / παρθένου Μα[ρίας] κτλ. Cf. Taft, *Diptychs*, 81.

⁸⁴ W.E. Crum, “A Greek Diptych of the Seventh Century,” *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 30 (1908) 255–65; *SB III* 6087: τῆς παναγίας ἐνδόξου θεοτόκου καὶ / ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας. Cf. Taft, *Diptychs*, 83–85.

of the spotless and undefiled and holy and barren virgin mother Mary, the *Theotokos* and protector of our spirit”;⁸⁵ and a corrupt eight- or ninth-century Coptic Greek litany.⁸⁶ Interestingly, though this small sample is evidently not enough to go by, the later the text, the more developed the series of epithets. None of these texts, however, takes us into the fifth century or earlier. Some amulets, on the other hand, do.

AMULETS

Amulets were widely employed in antiquity to obtain protection from adversity, relief from sickness, or help in daily affairs. As the position of Mary in the devotion and reflection of the church became more prominent and established, one would expect amulets to appeal to her, directly or indirectly, for help. Among the many amulets containing Christian elements that have been found in Egypt,⁸⁷ there are three that appeal to Christ through the intercessions of Mary and several others that appeal directly to her.

PGM P5b,⁸⁸ found folded and tied with a string in Oxyrhynchus, has been assigned to the fifth century. It appeals to Christ to heal and protect a certain Joannia “through the prayers and intercessions of our Lady the *Theotokos* and the glorious archangels, and the holy and glorious apostle and evangelist and theologian John, and the holy Serenus and the holy Philoxenus and the holy Victor and the holy Justus and all the saints.”⁸⁹ The presence of several saints in addition to Mary is of interest. In Oxyrhynchus there were churches or martyria dedicated to each of the saints named in the amulet. The sites are mentioned in a liturgical calendar from the town for the period from 21 October 535 to Easter 536,⁹⁰ as well as in other fifth- or sixth-century documents.⁹¹ Oxyrhynchus is the only town in Egypt that is certain to have had a church dedicated to John the Evangelist.⁹² Local devotion to him would explain why he, rather than John the Baptist, is named after Mary. (John the Baptist usually follows Mary in prayers⁹³ and anaphoral commemorations.⁹⁴) Justus, Serenus, and Philoxenus were also important local saints;⁹⁵ Victor, on the other hand, was honoured throughout Egypt.⁹⁶ As we have already noted, Oxyrhynchus also had a church dedicated to Mary.⁹⁷ Interestingly, although the amulet refers to her as *Theotokos*, the church was named simply “holy Mary.” We are reminded that different types of sources, considered independently, offer only a partial view.

PGM P18,⁹⁸ a papyrus assigned to the fifth or sixth century, appeals to Christ to “[h]eal also her who wears this divine amulet of the disease afflicting her, through the prayers and intercession of the ever-virgin mother, the

⁸⁵ *P.Bad.* IV 65.1–5, modified: *πρεσβιας* (read: *πρεσβεΐας*) *κὲ* (read: *καὶ*) *ετιας* (read: *αἰτίας*) *τῆς ἀσπίλου καὶ / ἀχράντου καὶ αἰου* (read: *ἀγίας*) *καὶ ἀπ[ι]φόρου* (read: *ἀφόρου*?) *παρθ(ενο)- / μνλωτος* (read: *μήτρος*) *Μαρία<ς>* *πρὸς τῆς* (read: *τοῦ*) *ἡμῶν <<τῆς / ἡμῶν τῆς>>* *π<<η>>ν(εύματος) θεοδόκου καὶ ἀντιλήμ- / πτορος.*

⁸⁶ *P.Grenf.* II 113.

⁸⁷ Unless otherwise indicated, the provenance within Egypt of the items discussed below is not known and their date has been assigned on paleographical grounds.

⁸⁸ *P.Oxy.* VIII 1151; *PGM P5b*; D. Hagedorn, “Bemerkungen zu Urkunden,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 145 (2003), 224–27 at 226 (revised reading of lines 38–39).

⁸⁹ *P.Oxy.* VIII 1151.38–51, with Hagedorn, “Bemerkungen zu Urkunden,” 226: *ευχες* (read: *εὐχαΐς*) / *καὶ πρεσβιας* (read: *πρεσβεΐας*) *τῆς / δεσποίνης ἡμῶν, τῆς / θεοτόκου καὶ τῶν / ἐνδόξων ἀρχαγγέ- / λων κ(αὶ) τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐν- / δόξου ἀποστόλου κ(αὶ) εὐαγγελιστοῦ κ(αὶ) θεο- / λόγου Ἰωάννου κ(αὶ) τοῦ ἁγίου Σερήνου κ(αὶ) τοῦ ἁγίου Φιλοζένου κ(αὶ) τοῦ ἁγίου Βήκτωρος κ(αὶ) τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰουστοῦ κ(αὶ) πάντων [τῶ]ν ἁγίων.*

⁹⁰ *P.Oxy.* XI 1357; Papconstantinou, “La liturgie stationnale,” 135–59.

⁹¹ Papaconstantinou, *Le culte des saints*, 115–16 (John the Evangelist), 187–88 (Serenus), 203–4 (Philoxenus), 62–68 (Victor).

⁹² Papaconstantinou, *Le culte des saints*, 116.

⁹³ E.g., *P.Leid.Inst.* 74.3–4 (cf. n. 155 below); *SB XXII* 15209.1–3 (cf. n. 156 below). *PGM P12.1–4*, a prayer of Severus of Antioch against poisonous bites, on the other hand, invokes the name of Mary, John the Baptist, and John the Evangelist; see now C.E. Römer, “Gebet und Bannzauber des Severus von Antiochia gegen den Biss giftiger Tiere, oder: Maltomini hatte recht,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 168 (2009): 209–12, uniting *P.Vindob. G 29508* and *G 329*.

⁹⁴ For an overview see Engberding, “Das anaphorische Fürbittgebet der byzantinischen Chrysostomusliturgie (Fortsetzung),” 39; G. Winkler, “Die Interzessionen der Chrysostomusanaphora in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung (II. Teil),” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 37 (1971), 333–83 at 337–41.

⁹⁵ Papaconstantinou, *Le culte des saints*, 204.

⁹⁶ Papaconstantinou, *Le culte des saints*, 255–56, 262–63.

⁹⁷ Papaconstantinou, “La liturgie stationnale,” 140–41, 146; Papaconstantinou, “Les sanctuaires de la Vierge,” 84.

⁹⁸ G. Vitelli, *Bulletin de la Société Archéologique d’Alexandrie* 23 (1928), 287–302 at 300–1; M. Naldini, “Due papiri cristiani della collezione fiorentina,” *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 33 (1961): 216–18; *PGM P18*; P.J. Sijpesteijn, “Ein Vorschlag zu *PGM II 18*,”

Theotokos, and all ...”⁹⁹ The amulet contains another element which both enriches and complicates its interpretation. It begins with a recitation of the Sanctus: “† Holy, holy, holy Lord Sabaoth; full are heaven and earth of [...] glory.”¹⁰⁰ Although the lines are difficult to read, they resemble the early form of the Sanctus in both the Egyptian and Syrian-Antiochene traditions.¹⁰¹ Whereas later versions of the Sanctus in the Egyptian anaphoras of St Mark/St Cyril and St Basil conclude with “of your holy glory”,¹⁰² the earliest form in Egypt – attested by the fourth-century anaphora preserved in P.Monts.Roca inv. 154b-155a¹⁰³ and two other witnesses,¹⁰⁴ the mid-fourth-century *Euchologion* attributed to Serapion of Thmuis,¹⁰⁵ and the Dêr-Belizeh papyrus (fifth or sixth century)¹⁰⁶ – concludes simply with “of your glory,” and the earliest form in the Syrian-Antiochene tradition – attested by the anaphora in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (fourth century),¹⁰⁷ the homilies of John Chrysostom (fourth century),¹⁰⁸ and a homily attributed to Asterios Sophistes (fourth century)¹⁰⁹ – concludes with “of his glory.” Unfortunately, the poor quality of the third line of the amulet prevents one from determining which of these early forms – “your glory” or “his glory” – the writer followed.¹¹⁰ Thus, while both the use of the Sanctus as an invocation and the appeal to “the prayers and intercession of the ever-virgin mother, the *Theotokos*” indicate that the writer of the amulet was familiar with the liturgy of the church, exactly which liturgical tradition – Egyptian or Syrian-Antiochene – is less clear.

Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 52 (1982), 246; F. Maltomini, “Osservazioni al testo di alcuni papiri magici greci. (III.),” *Studi classici e orientali* 32 (1982), 235–41 at 239. Both Sijpesteijn and Maltomini revised the reading of lines 1–3.

⁹⁹ PGM P18.12–17, with Naldini, “Due papiri cristiani,” 217: ἵασι[α]ι κ(αὶ) τὴν / φοροῦσα τούτο τὸ θεῖον / φυλακτῆριον ἐν τῇ ἐπικειμ(ένη) / αὐτῇ νόσω, εὐχαῖς κ(αὶ) πρεσβείᾳ / τῆς εὐπαρθένου (read: ἀεπαρθένου) μητρ[ό]ς, τ[ῆ]ς / θεοτόκου κ(αὶ) πάσης [...]

¹⁰⁰ Cf. PGM P18.1–3, with Sijpesteijn, “Ein Vorschlag,” 246, and Maltomini, “Osservazioni,” 239: † ἅγιος ἄγι[ος ἄ]γιος κύριος / Σαβαωθ πλήρ[η]ς ὁ] οὐρανὸς κ[αὶ] / ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης [...]

¹⁰¹ See B.D. Spinks, *The Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 117–119; R.F. Taft, “The Interpolation of the Sanctus into the Anaphora: When and Where? A Review of the Dossier. Part II,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 58 (1992), 83–121 at 84–106.

¹⁰² Cuming, *Liturgy*, 37–39, with 69–74 and 120. Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora*, 146–47 (v. 24), with 263–65. The earliest known attestation of this later form of the Sanctus in Egypt is an inscription of the El-Moallaqa church in Old Cairo, dated 7 May 735; see Hammerstaedt, *Griechische Anaphorenfragmente*, 187–99 (Inscr. Copt. Mus. Cairo inv. 753.2–3); cf. J.L. Fournet, “L’inscription de l’église Al-Mu‘allaqa. Quelques corrections,” *Bulletin de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale* 93 (1993), 237–44; L.S.B. MacCoull, “Redating the Inscription of El-Moallaqa,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 64 (1986), 230–34, with “Corrigenda,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 71 (1988): 74.

¹⁰³ R. Roca-Puig, *Anàfora de Barcelona i altres pregàries: Missa del segle IV* (2d ed; Barcelona: Grafos, 1996), 11; S. Janeras, “Sanctus et Post-Sanctus dans l’anaphore du P.Monts. Roca inv. no 154b-155a,” *Studi sull’Oriente Cristiano* 11 (2007), 9–13; M. Zheltov, “The Anaphora and Thanksgiving Prayer from the Barcelona Papyrus: An Underestimated Testimony to the Anaphoral History in the Fourth Century,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 62 (2008), 467–504 at 471. The text of the second half of the Sanctus is anomalous in this papyrus: πλήρης σου ὁ οὐρανὸς τῆς δόξης σου. Other extant fragments of the anaphora have or suggest the more usual version: πλήρης σου ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης σου. Cf. Janeras, “Sanctus et Post-Sanctus,” and Zheltov, “The Anaphora,” 475 (154b.20–21 comm.), 489 n. 73. I was not able to consult the prior publications of Zheltov noted at Janeras, “Sanctus et Post-Sanctus,” 11 n. 10.

¹⁰⁴ P.Vindob. G 41043 verso: Treu and Diethart, *Griechische literarische Papyri*, 68–69, no. 36; J. Henner, “Mortem tuam annuntiamus... Anaphorenfragmente der Wiener Papyrussammlung im Kontext der eucharistischen Liturgie der altägyptischen Kirche,” *Dipl.-Arb.*, Vienna, 1993, 69–79 (*non vidi*); Hammerstaedt, *Griechische Anaphorenfragmente*, 156–60. Copt. Lov. 27: Th. Lefort, “Coptica Lovaniensia,” *Le Muséon* 53 (1940), 1–66 at 22–24; S. Janeras, “L’original grec del fragment copte de Lovaina num. 27 en l’Anàfora de Barcelona,” *Miscellània litúrgica catalana* 3 (1984), 13–25.

¹⁰⁵ See now M.E. Johnson, *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 249; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1995), 46–47 (Prayer 1). For the date of the collection see 280–81.

¹⁰⁶ See now Hammerstaedt, *Griechische Anaphorenfragmente*, 174 (P. Dêr-Belizeh fol. II recto 23–24).

¹⁰⁷ *Apost. Const.* 8.12.27 (SC 336, 192).

¹⁰⁸ John Chrysostom, *In illud: Vidi Dominum*, hom. 1.3 (PG 56, 100); cf. F. van de Paverd, *Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiocheia und Konstantinopel gegen Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts. Analyse der Quellen bei Johannes Chrysostomos* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 187; Rome: Pontificium Institutum orientalium studiorum, 1970), 285–86.

¹⁰⁹ Asterios Sophistes, hom. 29.10, in M. Richard (ed.), *Asterii Sophistae Commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt accedunt aliquot homiliae anonymae* (Symbolae Osloenses, Fasc. suppl. 16; Oslo: A.W. Brøgger, 1956), 233. The scholarly discussion about the identity of Asterios and whether he is here referring to the Sanctus in the anaphora, reviewed by Taft, “The Interpolation of the Sanctus. Part II,” 96–106, is not crucial to my argument.

¹¹⁰ Maltomini, “Osservazioni,” 239; Sijpesteijn, “Ein Vorschlag,” 246, supplies σου.

P.Oxy. LXXV 5024,¹¹¹ on the other hand, clearly draws on the liturgical tradition of St Mark. This strip of parchment, assigned to the late sixth or early seventh century, preserves a prayer for salvation ending in a petition for the flooding of the Nile similar to that found in the anaphoral intercessions of St Mark.¹¹² There are traces of folds, which suggest that the parchment may have been carried as an *aide-mémoire* or an amulet.¹¹³ The prayer concludes with an appeal to the Lord through the intercessions of Mary: “through the intercession of the woman who bore you, we beseech you, Lord, good and abounding in mercy, hear us and have mercy on us.”¹¹⁴

Finally, *SB XVIII* 13602,¹¹⁵ a parchment assigned to the seventh century, appeals to Christ to relieve a woman of her afflictions “through the intercessions of your holy martyr George” and “through the intercessions of our Lady, the all-glorious *Theotokos* and ever-virgin Mary.”¹¹⁶ This amulet is instructive because, although it contains a more developed Marian formula, the writing deviates from standard orthography and a few of the epithets – δεσποίνης and θεοτόκου – presented some difficulty to the scribe.¹¹⁷ The text illustrates how by this relatively late date (the seventh century) the practice of appealing to Mary was, on the one hand, elaborate and formulaic, and, on the other, living and personal.

In addition to these amulets that appeal to Christ through the intercessions of Mary, we have several amulets from the fifth or sixth century that appeal directly to her. Although these amulets do not mention the intercessory function of Mary, they still confirm that she was addressed as a source of help and protection.

Suppl. Mag I 26, a papyrus with traces of folding, assigned to the fifth century, opens with the prayer: “Having received grace from your only-begotten Son, stop the discharge, the pains of the eyes of Phoibammon, son of Athanasios.”¹¹⁸ The prayer is striking in that it explains the source of Mary’s power, and does so in unusual terms; “only-begotten Son” is typically used in relation to God the Father. Moreover, the prayer is expressed in choliambic trimeters, an indication of the studied character of the request and of its debt to a literary culture.¹¹⁹

Echoes of a wider culture can also be observed in *PGM* P15b.¹²⁰ When this papyrus, assigned to the fifth or sixth century, was unfolded, it revealed a few leaves of a plant, identified as trefoil, used for menstrual periods, intermittent fever, and three-day fever.¹²¹ After appealing to archangels for protection against a “headless dog,”¹²² the text calls upon Mary to do what she had promised and heal the woman bearing the amulet: “O *Theotokos*,

¹¹¹ *P.Oxy.* LXXV 5024. Although the parchment is published in the Oxyrhynchus series, it and *P.Oxy.* LXXV 5023 may not have been found there; see *P.Oxy.* LXXV, p. 8.

¹¹² *P.Oxy.* LXXV 5024.14–17 comm.; Cuming, *Liturgy*, 26, 111–13. The petition for the flooding of the Nile in the Egyptian anaphoras of St Basil and St Gregory is worded differently; see Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora*, 170–73, Gerhards, *Die griechische Gregoriosanaphora*, 42. For a detailed survey of feasts or prayers for the flooding of the Nile in eastern liturgies, see K. Treu, “Liturgische Traditionen in Ägypten (zu *P.Oxy.* 2782),” in P. Nagel (ed.), *Studia Coptica* (Berliner Byzantinistische Arbeiten 45; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1974), 43–66; cf. H. Engberding, “Der Nil in der liturgischen Frömmigkeit des Christlichen Ostens,” *Oriens Christianus* 37 (1953), 56–88.

¹¹³ See *P.Oxy.* LXXV, p. 8. On the difficulties of determining the purpose of items simply on the basis of folding, see de Bruyn and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets and Formularies,” 172–73.

¹¹⁴ *P.Oxy.* LXXV.18–23: ταῖς πρεσβεΐαις / τῆς δεκουσης (read: τεκούσης) <σ>ε / ἵκετεύομέν σε, ἄγα- / θε πολλοιευςπλαγ- (read: πολυεύσπλαγ-) / χνε κ(ύρι)ε· ἐπάκου-/ σον ἡμῶν κ(αι) ἐλ(ήσον).

¹¹⁵ W. Brashear, “A Christian Amulet,” *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 3 (1988), 35–45; *SB XVIII* 13602; W. Brashear, *Magica Varia* (Brussels: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1991), 63–70.

¹¹⁶ Brashear, *Magica Varia*, 64, ll. 8–10, 12–16: διὰ τῶν πρεσ- / βίων (read: πρεσβειῶν) τοῦ ἁγίου σου μαρτηρος (read: μάρτυρος) Γεωργίου ... διὰ τῶν πρεσ- / βίων (read: πρεσβειῶν) τῆς ‘ δεξετουσης μ [[.....]] / τῆς δεσπηνης (read: δεσποίνης): υμων (read: ἡμῶν) τῆς παν- / νενδοξου (read: πανενδόξου) θεωτωγουκου (read: θεοτόκου) καὶ ἀει- / παρθένου Μαρίας. Regarding δεξετουσης μ [[.....]] Brashear, 68, comments: “It appears that the writer was attempting to correct something erroneously written into δεσποίνης, gave up, crossed out the rest of the line and recommenced in the following line.”

¹¹⁷ See n. 116.

¹¹⁸ W. Brashear, “Vier Berliner Zaubertexte,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 17 (1975) 25–33 at 30–31, ll. 1–6; *SB XIV* 11494; *Suppl. Mag.* I 26; G. Ioannidou (ed.), *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Literary Papyri in Berlin (P. Berol. inv. 21101–21299, 21911)* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1996) 240, no. 206: ρ λαβοῦσα χάριν ἐκ τοῦ / μονογενοῦς σου υἱοῦ / στήσον τὸ ρεῦμα, τοὺς / πόνους τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν / Φοιβάμμωνος, υἱοῦ Ἄθα- / νασίου.

¹¹⁹ D. Jordan, “Choliambic for Mary in a Papyrus Phylactery,” *Harvard Theological Review* 84 (1991), 343–46.

¹²⁰ J.E. Quibell, “A Greek Christian Invocation,” *The Academy* 1128 (1893), 550; *PGM* P15b.

¹²¹ *PGM* P15b intro., citing Dioscorides, *De mat. med.* 3.109.

¹²² *PGM* P15a-b intro. takes κυνὸς ἀκεφάλου to refer to ἀκέφαλοι, miaphysites who repudiated Peter Mongus, the miaphysite patriarch of Alexandria, after he accepted emperor Zeno’s *Henoticon*; it thus dates the papyrus after 482. M. Meyer and R. Smith (eds.), *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1994), 48, no. 24, interprets the phrase as referring to a headless power. The latter seems more plausible to me, given the purpose of the amulet.

incorruptible, undefiled, unstained mother of Christ, remember that you have said these things. Again heal her who wears this.”¹²³ The alpha-privative epithets ascribed to Mary recall the language of hymns and sermons,¹²⁴ as does the appellation “mother of Christ.”¹²⁵ The specific appeal – “remember that you have said these things” – suggests that Mary had been consulted and heard from in an oracle or a dream or some other medium.

Less regular, but for that reason indicative of the position attributed to Mary, is an invocation in *P.Köln VIII 340*. Assigned to the fifth or sixth century, the text on one side of this papyrus consists of a row of seven staurograms, John 1, 1–11, and several invocations. On the other side are two *orantes* and a short, poorly preserved text in a different hand but from the same period.¹²⁶ The invocation immediately following the opening verses of the Gospel of John has been reconstructed as follows: “I call upon you, God – and Mary the *Theotokos* – Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, that you send your angel to heal the one who wears this adjuration and chase from him all sickness and all infirmity.”¹²⁷ The appeal to Mary has been interjected,¹²⁸ a more regular form of the invocation is attested in another amulet from the sixth or seventh century: “I call upon you, God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you send forth your angel on the one who wears this.”¹²⁹ There are supralinear strokes above “Mary” and “... *tokos*, an extension of the method used to indicate *nomina sacra*.¹³⁰ Both the interjection and the supralinear strokes are irregular, but for that reason they attest to Mary’s role and importance as a source of help.

Finally, two early witnesses of uncertain or disputed significance should be noted. One is *P.Bon. I 9*,¹³¹ the concluding fragment of a prayer: “[in the most blessed name] of the holy *Theotokos* and ever-virgin Mary and the holy Longinus, the centurion, one holy Father, one holy Son, one Holy Spirit. Amen, amen, amen.”¹³² It has been suggested that the papyrus was an amulet against diseases of the eye and injuries on account of the mention of Longinus, who was invoked in such circumstances.¹³³ Only the end of the first word of the fragment has been preserved, suggesting the above reconstruction.¹³⁴ Nevertheless, it is sufficient to rule out an appeal to the intercessions of Mary and Longinus. The papyrus was initially assigned to the third or fourth century, an estimate that was subsequently revised to the fourth or fifth century.¹³⁵ Is it significant that this, the earliest of the invocations we have discussed thus far, appears to be made in the name of Mary rather than through her intercessions? Possi-

¹²³ *PGM P15b.8–10*: θεοτόκε, ἄφθαρτε, ἀμίαντε, ἀμόλυντε μήτηρ / Χριστοῦ, μνήσθητι, ὅτι σὺ ταῦτα εἶπες. σὺ / πάλιν θεράπευσον τὴν φοροῦσαν. ἀμήν.

¹²⁴ Cf. Romanus Melodos, *Cant.57*, str. 19.3 (P. Maas and C.A. Trypanis [eds.], *Sancti Romani Melodi cantica: cantica genuina* [Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1963], 495): σὲ καθικετεύω ταῖς πρεσβείαις τῆς μητρός σου, τῆς ἀφθάρτως τεκούσης σε; *Cant.10*, str. 20.4 (SC 110: 70): τὴν μήτραν ἀμίαντον; *Cant. 11*, str. 2.10–11 (SC 110: 90): ἦν ἐβλάστησα ἐκ κόλπων ἀμιάντων; *Cant. 13*, str. 12.3 (SC 110: 146): τὴν ἀμόλυντον παρθένον. Ps.-Proclus, *hom. 6.17.7*, F.J. Leroy, *L’homilétique de Proclus de Constantinople* (Studi e Testi 247; Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1967) 323: τὸν ἄφθαρτον νυμφίον; on its authenticity, see Leroy, *L’homilétique*, 292–94, and M. Aubineau, “Bilan d’une enquête sur les homélies de Proclus de Constantinople,” *Revue des Études Grecques* 85 (1972): 572–96 at 589–92. Ps.-Chrysostom, *In annuntiationem beatae virginis* (PG 50, col. 796): νυμφοτόκε ἀμίαντε; cf. Geerard, *Clavis patrum graecorum*, 2, 545, no. 4519. Ps.-Epiphanius, *Homilia in laudes Mariae deiparae* (PG 43, col. 497D13): Ἁγία μήτηρ ἀμόλυντε; cf. Geerard, *Clavis patrum graecorum*, 2, 335, no. 3771. Theodorus Studita, *Homilia in nativitatem Mariae* (PG 96: col. 696A7): Χαῖρε, ἀμόλυντε; cf. Geerard, *Clavis patrum graecorum*, 3, 532, no. 8119. On the application of alpha-privative epithets to Mary see N. Constatas, *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity: Homilies 1–5, Texts and Translations* (Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 66; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003), 61 n. 55.

¹²⁵ Of thirty-eight instances of μήτηρ Χριστοῦ in *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, twenty are in hymns: one in Romanus Melodos, *Cant.18*, str. 18.1 (SC 110, 302) and the remainder in *Analecta Hymnica Graeca*.

¹²⁶ See *P.Köln VIII 340*, p. 83, 86, 94–95. In a forthcoming paper my colleague Jitse Dijkstra argues that there are only two figures, a male *orans* and a female *orans*. See the digital image at http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/NRWakademie/papyrologie/Karte/VIII_340.html (February 2013).

¹²⁷ *P.Köln VIII 340* side *a*, fr. A, 33–46: ... ἐ[πικαλοῦ-] / μέν (read: ἐπικαλοῦμαί; cf. ll. 33–34 comm.) σε, θ[(εόν), καὶ τὴν θεο-] / τόκον Μαρία, π[(ατέ)ρα] / τοῦ κ(υρίου)υ {κν} <καί> σωτήρ[ος] / [ἡ]μῶν Ἰ(ησο)ῦ Χ(ριστο)ῦ, ὄπ[ω-] / [ς] ε[κ]καποστίλης (read: ἐξαποστειλής) / τὸν ἄγγελόν σου / ἐπὶ τὸν (read: τῶν) ἡματων (read: ἱαμάτων) / {τον} ἐπὶ τὸν φο[...] / τα τὸν ὀρκισμὸ(ν) / τοῦτο(ν) κ(αὶ) ἀποδιώ- / ξης (read: ἀποδιώξης) ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ πᾶ- / σαν νό[σον] κ[αὶ] πᾶ[σαν] / μαλακ[κίαν]...[...

¹²⁸ See *P.Köln VIII 340* side *a*, fr. A, 34–35 comm., 35 comm.

¹²⁹ Treu and Diethart, *Griechische literarische Papyri*, 23, no. 10; cf. *P.Köln VIII 340* side *a*, fr. A, 33–43 comm.

¹³⁰ The scribe uses the supralinear stroke somewhat indiscriminately, however; cf. *P.Köln VIII 340* side *a*, fr. A, 38 comm.

¹³¹ A. Vogliano, “Papiri Bolognesi,” *Acme* 1 (1948), 195–231; *P.Bon. I 9*.

¹³² *P.Bon. I 9.1–8*:]αρτατον τῆς ἁγίας / θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρ- / [θ]ένου Μαρίας καὶ το(ῦ) / ἁγίου Λογγίνου το(ῦ) / ἑκα[τον]τάρχου εἶς / Πατή[ρ] ἅγιος εἶς Υἱὸς / ἅγιος ἐν Πνεῦμα <α> ἅγιον / ἀμήν ἀμήν ἀμήν.

¹³³ *P.Bon. I 9* intro.

¹³⁴ *P.Bon. I 9.1* note: εἰς τὸ ὄνομα μα- / [κ]άρτατον κτλ.

¹³⁵ *P.Bon. I 9* intro.

bly, if the assigned date is correct. But a similar formula appears in a liturgical fragment for the Feast of the Assumption assigned much later to the seventh or eighth century.¹³⁶ The fragmentary opening of *P.Bon.* I 9 should not be freighted with too much meaning.

More problematic is *PGMP5a*, an amulet against fever prepared for a certain Aria, assigned to the fourth century.¹³⁷ At the end of the text one finds several names written around a cross: “Jesus, Father, Son, Mother, Christ / $\alpha \omega$ / Holy Spirit / Abrasax.” “Jesus” and “Christ” are written in larger characters as *nomina sacra* in the genitive. In the line above and to the right is a gap sufficient for five characters followed by iota and sigma. *PGM 5a* here supplies $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ and translates the subsequent lines as “[Power] of Jesus Christ. Father, Son, Mother, Holy Spirit, $\alpha \omega$, Abrasax.” In a recent re-edition Megali de Haro Sanchez leaves the text of the gap unresolved, and translates the subsequent lines as “Father of Jesus, Son, Mother of Christ, $\alpha \omega$, Holy Spirit, Abrasax.”¹³⁸ However, the reading “Power of Jesus Christ” is warranted.¹³⁹ One can make out the lower left corner of delta at the beginning of the gap and the upper right tip of mu at the end of the gap; the intervening space is sufficient for five letters. Moreover, the same phrase appears, along with three staurograms each with $\alpha \omega$, in the invocation of another amulet against sickness.¹⁴⁰ The smaller writing of “Father, Son, Mother, Holy Spirit, Abrasax” relative to the *nomina sacra* suggests that they should be read as a group. The centre of the group is the cross with “ $\alpha \omega$ ”, which appears to have been written before the words “Father, Son, Mother, Holy Spirit, Abrasax” and encircling points were added.¹⁴¹ The question is, what are we to make of “Father” and “Mother” on either side of “Son”? It has been suggested that “Mother” refers to the Holy Spirit.¹⁴² But then why is the Holy Spirit named in the next line? One could see here a reference to the triad Father, Mother, and Son that is characteristic of Sethian gnosticism.¹⁴³ But the correspondence is not exact, since here “Mother” follows rather than precedes “Son.”¹⁴⁴ The lines remain a puzzle. However, they do not present an unambiguous appeal to Mary, the mother of Christ.

To summarize, appeals to Mary and to her intercessions begin to appear in Egyptian amulets in the fifth century, and they use formulaic language associated with liturgical prayers. In amulets that appeal to Mary’s intercessions, the earlier the assigned date, the simpler the epithets, though the sample is small. It is not Mary’s intercessions alone that are sought; those of other saints are also invoked. Nevertheless, appeals addressed directly to Mary in other amulets indicate her importance and role as a protector, already in the fifth century.

Two chronological aspects of the material should be considered. First, the dates of the above texts have been assigned on paleographical grounds, which is inevitably subjective and imprecise. Still, in the absence of further studies questioning the assigned dates, it is best to accept the current estimates. Second, it is possible that the chronological distribution of the texts reflects not so much increasing appeals to Mary in Egypt as the growing establishment of the church in Egypt. Documentary evidence of the church in Egypt is much scarcer in the fourth century than after the middle of the fifth century.¹⁴⁵ This pattern can also be observed in the corpus of Greek amulets from Egypt containing Christian elements; relatively more of them are assigned to the fifth or sixth centuries.¹⁴⁶ There are, however, a few formularies and amulets assigned to the fourth century that refer to Mary in

¹³⁶ *P.Amh.* I 9(b). Papaconstantinou, *Le culte des saints*, 139, assigns *P.Bon.* I 9 as well as *P.Amh.* I 9(b) to the seventh or eighth century, but does not explain why.

¹³⁷ *P.Oxy.* VI 924; *PGM P5a*; M. de Haro Sanchez, “Le vocabulaire de la pathologie et de la thérapeutique dans les papyrus iatromagiques grecs. Fièvres, traumatismes et « épilepsie »,” *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 47 (2010), 131–53 at 135–36.

¹³⁸ de Haro Sanchez, “Le vocabulaire,” 135.

¹³⁹ Thus, leaving aside the series of vowels written vertically at the left and right edges of the text, ll. 14–15 read as follows: $\delta[\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha]\mu\iota\varsigma / \text{Ἰ}(\eta\sigma\omicron)\acute{\upsilon} \text{πατῆρ υἰός μήτηρ Χ}(\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron)\acute{\upsilon}$.

¹⁴⁰ *Suppl.Mag.* I 22.1. On the invocation of divine power more generally, see A.D. Nock, “Studies in the Graeco-Roman Beliefs of the Empire,” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 45 (1925), 84–101 at 85–95.

¹⁴¹ One of the five points observed by de Haro Sanchez is the lower left corner of delta; in addition, there is a point between the eta and rho of πατῆρ and below the alpha of $\text{πν}(\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu)\alpha$.

¹⁴² Meyer and Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic*, 39.

¹⁴³ A. Böhlig, “Triade und Trinität in den Schriften von Nag Hammadi,” in B. Layton (ed.), *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, vol. 2, *Sethian Gnosticism* (Studies in the History of Religions 41; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981), 617–34; J.D. Turner, *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition* (Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi. Section études 6; Leuven: Peters, 2001), 60–64.

¹⁴⁴ Cf., e.g., *Ap. John* (NH II,1, 9.10–11; BG 2, 19; NH III,1, 13.15–16); *Gos. Eg.* (NH III,2, 47.9; NH IV,2, 50.25–26).

¹⁴⁵ R.S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 289–93, esp. 293.

¹⁴⁶ See de Bruyn and Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets and Formularies,” 174.

other (mainly christological) contexts.¹⁴⁷ This suggests that the absence of amulets appealing to Mary in the fourth century is not merely a function of the relative scarcity of documentary and semi-literary evidence of Christianity in Egypt from the fourth century, and that the presence of amulets appealing to Mary in the fifth or sixth centuries reflects a devotional trend. Evidence of appeals to Mary for help begins to appear in Christian literature in the latter half of the fourth century, and is more plentiful and widespread during and after the fifth century.¹⁴⁸ The texts we have considered above do not contradict this wider observation.

CONCLUSIONS

None of the fourth-century witnesses to the anaphora, within Egypt and elsewhere, refer to Mary (or any other saint by name) or appeal to her (or their) intercessions in the commemorations. An explicit commemoration of Mary was introduced into the diptychs at Constantinople toward the end of the fifth century, but it was not associated with an appeal to her intercessions. In all likelihood Egyptian anaphoral commemorations of Mary appealed to her intercessions already in the sixth century, but the earliest evidence we have of such appeals is in a seventh-century Sahidic version of the anaphora of St Basil (MS Lefort Copt s.n.).

However, the earliest appearances of appeals to the intercessions of Mary in the major anaphoral traditions cannot be our only point of reference. Liturgical sources are often conservative; they preserve texts from an earlier period. While they attest to the continued use of older traditions – as H. Brakmann has remarked, liturgies were written down to be used, not to be archived¹⁴⁹ – they do not register concurrent changes or variations in liturgical or devotional practice.

At this point the witness of amulets is particularly precious, above all *PGM P5b* and *Suppl. Mag I 26*, both of which are assigned to the fifth century. *PGM P5b* includes a fully developed formula of appeal to the intercessions of Mary and other saints revered in Oxyrhynchus. It demonstrates that even if in anaphoral commemorations the earliest appeals for intercessions refer only to Mary, appeals to a series of intermediaries beginning with Mary are attested elsewhere already in the fifth century. Moreover, the formula of appeal suggests that by that time the practice was well established and liturgical in nature. *Suppl. Mag I 26*, for its part, shows that people appealed directly to Mary for help in the fifth century. In addition, the stylized form of appeal, as with the formula in *PGM P5b*, suggests that the practice was well established and liturgical in nature.

This leads us to a crux in discussions of the emergence of the cult of Mary. Were these forms of appeal already present in the fourth century or earlier? We can no longer turn to *P. Ryl. III 470*, since recent paleographical examinations now favour a much later date for this papyrus.¹⁵⁰ Nevertheless, on the basis of the amulets alone I would suggest that appeals to the intercessions of Mary were probably already an aspect of Egyptian devotion in the fourth century. It is more plausible to me that the developed formulae found in fifth-century amulets reflect a practice that was already achieving liturgical expression in the fourth century, than that these formulae were introduced in the fifth century and rapidly disseminated thereafter. However, this provisional hypothesis must be accompanied by several caveats. First, as we have already noted, dates assigned on the basis of paleographical assessments are not unassailable. If the amulets in question are reassigned to the sixth century, the hypothesis is weakened. Second, we have amulets assigned to the fourth century that refer to Mary, but none of these appeals to her or to her intercessions.¹⁵¹ This silence begs explanation.

¹⁴⁷ W. Brashear and R. Kotansky, “A New Magical Formulary,” in P. Mirecki and M. Meyer (eds.), *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 141; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 3–24. S. Eitrem and A. Fridrichsen, “Ein christliches Amulett auf Papyrus,” *Forhandlinger i Videnskabselskabet i Christiania* (1921) 3–22; S. Eitrem, “A New Christian Amulet,” *Aegyptus* 3 (1922) 66–67; *P. Osl.* I 5; *SB VI* 6584; *PGM P3*, with R. W. Daniel, “Some ΦΥΛΑΚΤΗΡΙΑ,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 25 (1977) 150–3. C. Wessely, “Neue griechische Zauberpapyri,” *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Classe* 42 (1893), 1–96 at 65–7; *PGM P10*.

¹⁴⁸ See now S. Shoemaker, “The Cult of the Virgin in the Fourth Century: A Fresh Look at Some Old and New Sources,” in Maunder, *Origins of the Cult*, 71–87; cf. Bardy, “La doctrine de l’intercession,” 6–19, and Jourjon, “Aux origines,” 43–48.

¹⁴⁹ Brakmann, “Neue Funde,” *Actes du IV^e Congrès copte*, 422; Brakmann, “Zwischen Pharos und Wüste,” 345.

¹⁵⁰ See nn. 16–18 above.

¹⁵¹ *PGM P10.43–44* would appear to be an exception, a long spell that in one of its adjurations mentions “the angels who stand in the presence of our Lady.” However, the date is disputed – Wessely assigns the hand to the fourth century, but Preisendanz to the sixth – and the allusion to Mary is an editorial reconstruction: τοὺς ἀγγέλους ἀγγέλ[ου]ς τοὺς [έσ-] / τῶτας ἐνώπιον τῆ[ς] δεσποίνης ἡμῶν]. The papyrus has deteriorated since Wessely transcribed it; he read a delta, now missing, at the end of l. 44 (τῆς δ[ε]), which would appear to support the

In the end, the liturgical and paraliturgical evidence is, in and of itself, not decisive; it is suggestive but lacunose. A wider consideration of textual discourses, social milieux, and geographic locales is called for, as indicated by the papers in this volume. Moreover, in making inferences from textual and material evidence, unevenly distributed as it is, recourse to theory is inevitable.¹⁵² Even so, whatever theory is brought to bear on the evidence, it must account for the absence, thus far, of amulets appealing to Mary prior to the fifth century – an absence that is all the more intriguing inasmuch as amulets were the product of textual traditions, local expertise, and popular demand, all of which are aspects of devotional practice.

EXCURSUS: FORMULAIC INVOCATIONS IN DOCUMENTS

Our sources of evidence for Christian invocations are not limited to liturgies and prayers. Christian invocations also appear in late antique documents. At the end of the sixth century the emperor Maurice required that legal documents begin with a christological invocation.¹⁵³ The first instance appears in Egypt in 591. Maurice's successor Phocas replaced the christological invocation with a trinitarian one, but under Heraclius the formula used by Maurice was restored in Lower Egypt and Arcadia, while the trinitarian formula continued to be used in Upper Egypt. In the Arsinoite and the Herakleopolite nomes in Lower Egypt the christological and trinitarian invocations refer also to Mary and sometimes the saints. Christological invocations referring to Mary appear in documents dated to the first decade of the seventh century; trinitarian invocations referring to Mary appear in documents dated to the second half of the seventh century. The references to Mary take several forms, but in each case the wording is relatively consistent, as one might expect with legal formulae imposed by imperial decree. Mary is invoked as "our Lady the *Theotokos*," "our Lady the holy *Theotokos*," or "our Lady the holy *Theotokos* and ever-virgin Mary."

While these invocations attest to the official use of standard epithets to refer to Mary, they do not appeal to her intercessions. There are, however, a few fragmentary sixth- or seventh-century documents that do appeal to Mary's intercessions. They concern, or appear to concern, marital matters. In two fragments one cannot tell whether the formula with which the text begins was an invocation or a prayer.¹⁵⁴ In two other fragments the text appeals explicitly to the prayers of Mary. There are slight variations in the wording. One fragment appeals to "the prayers of the holy *Theotokos* ... the Forerunner ...";¹⁵⁵ "holy" is added above the line. The other fragment appeals to "the prayers and intercessions of the holy ... fair-virgin Mary and the ... and John the martyr and the whole"¹⁵⁶ The epithet "fair-virgin" is unusual. It is otherwise unattested in documentary papyri.¹⁵⁷ It is ascribed to Mary in a

reconstruction. Cf. Wessely, "Neue griechische Zauberpapyri," 65–67 and PGM P10. An image of the papyrus can be found at H. Förster, "Alltag und Kirche," in J. Henner, H. Förster and U. Horak (eds.), *Christliches mit Feder und Faden: Christliches in Texten, Textilien und Alltagsgegenständen aus Ägypten. Katalog zur Sonderausstellung im Papyrismuseum der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek aus Anlaß des 14. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie* (Nilus 3; Vienna: Österreichische Verlagsgesellschaft, 1999) 46–47, no. 36.

¹⁵² So, e.g., McGuckin, "The Early Cult of Mary," 1–5; Johnson, "*Sub tuum praesidium*," 250–52; cf. L.M. Peltomaa, "Towards the Origins of the History of the Cult of Mary," *Studia Patristica* 40 (2006), 75–86.

¹⁵³ The following summary relies on R.S. Bagnall and K.A. Worp, "Christian Invocations in the Papyri," *Chronique d'Égypte* 56 (1981), 112–33. See also R.S. Bagnall and K.A. Worp, "Christian Invocations in the Papyri: A Supplement," *Chronique d'Égypte* 56 (1981), 362–65.

¹⁵⁴ (1) CPR I 30 frg. 1; Grundz.Mitt. 290; BL I 117; J.M. Diethart and K.A. Worp, "CPR I 30 Frgm. i wiederentdeckt," *Chronique d'Égypte* 57 (1982), 138–40 at 138–39 (sixth century?). (2) Diethart and Worp, "CPR I 30 Frgm. i wiederentdeckt," 139–40; SB XVI 12398 (sixth or seventh century).

¹⁵⁵ *P.Leid.Inst.* 74.2–3 (sixth century), with BL X 116 (cf. the review of *P.Leid.Inst.* by J. Gascou, *Bibliotheca orientalis* 51 (1994), 333–37 at 336 = 551–55 at 554):] . [. .] . [.] . κείαν εὐμ[[η]]᾽ν᾽ε᾽ιαν / [π]ρεσβ᾽ε᾽ίας τῆς ᾽άγιας θεοτόκου / [καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας καὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ προδρόμου] / ..μικὰ The text supplied by the editor in the lacuna is not translated.

¹⁵⁶ S. Daris, "*Kalliparthenos* Maria," *Aegyptus* 73 (1993), 33–37 at 36, ll. 1–3; SB XXII 15209 (end of sixth century):]εὐχαίς καὶ πρεσβ[ε]ίας τῆς ᾽άγιας δεσποίνης ἡμῶν τῆς / [θεοτόκου καὶ] καλλιπαρθένου Μαρίας καὶ τοῦ [᾽άγιου Ἰωάννου τοῦ προδρόμου] / [καὶ βαπτιστοῦ] καὶ μάρτυρος Ἰωάννου καὶ παντὸς τοῦ [χόρου τῶν ᾽άγιων μαρτύρων The text supplied by the editor in the lacunae is not translated.

¹⁵⁷ According to a search of the Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri, 19 January 2011.

treatise attributed to Cyril of Alexandria,¹⁵⁸ but the attribution is highly doubtful; the epithet, along with other vocabulary in the treatise, is not found in Cyril's undisputed works.¹⁵⁹

A few observations are warranted here. First, the practice of appealing to the intercessions of Mary (along with others) in documents was not limited to marital matters, nor to Egypt. A similar appeal to the intercessions of Mary, John the Baptist, and all the saints concludes an account of various trading activities found in Palestine.¹⁶⁰ Second, the appeals are not addressed exclusively to Mary; they continue with appeals to the intercessions of John the Baptist, specific saints, or all the martyrs and saints. The intercessory function of Mary is not unique to her, though she is ranked first and foremost among the company of saints whose intercessions are sought. Third, the sequence of epithets applied to Mary in the marital documents is similar to the sequence of epithets applied to her in other documentary formulae of invocation. Finally, while all these documents shed light on formulaic ways of referring to Mary, they do not help us determine when appeals to Mary's intercession first arose in liturgical and paraliturgical texts in Egypt, since the documentary evidence is relatively late (sixth or seventh century).

¹⁵⁸ *Contra eos qui Theotocon nolunt confiteri* 18 and 26, in E. Schwartz (ed.), *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* 1,1,7 (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1929), p. 27, l. 19 (cf. PG 76, 277B): θεοτόκος δὲ πάντως καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ καλλιπάρθενος; p. 30, l. 32 (cf. PG 76, 285C): τοῦτον τὸν ἀληθινὸν υἱὸν δεικνύσαν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι τὸν ἐκ τῆς καλλιπαρθένου τεχθέντα.

¹⁵⁹ See G.M. de Durand, "Excursus III," in *Cyrille d'Alexandrie, Deux dialogues christologiques* (SC 97; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1964), 522–24, *pace* Daris, "Kalliparthenos Maria," 37, l. 2 comm.

¹⁶⁰ *P.Ness.* III 89 (late sixth or early seventh century).

