

1 **Some Remarks on the Pig in the Egyptian pBrooklyn**
 2 **47.218.156, x+IV, 1¹**
 3

4 *This article examines the Egyptian pBrooklyn 47.218.156, x+IV, 1.*
 5 *Specifically, it addresses the question of the meaning of the pig. The*
 6 *explanation recently proposed by Theis with a Sethian creature is further*
 7 *expanded. The solution offered here lies in a connection to the aspect of*
 8 *impurity. The principle is well-known in Egyptian literature. A comparison*
 9 *with Akkadian literature supports this explanation.¹*

10 **Keywords:** *Egyptian literature – pBrooklyn 47.218.156, x+IV, 1 – impurity*
 11 *of the pig*

14 **Introduction**

17 This article takes a new approach to the Egyptian pBrooklyn 47.218.156,
 18 x+IV, 1. The following lines aim to elucidate the meaning of an ominous pig in
 19 greater detail. Previous research has rarely addressed this topic. However, there
 20 seems to be some recent movement in this area. A definite breakthrough, however,
 21 has not yet been achieved. The emphasis here is placed on the aspect of impurity.
 22 Comparison with Akkadian literature provides the necessary clarity.

24 **Material**

27 The manuscript must first be briefly described. The most important
 28 technical data can be summarized as follows: Its provenance points to the city
 29 of Elephantine, located on the southern border of Egypt. The same origin
 30 applies to other hieratic magicala from the Wilbour Lot. Based on palaeographic
 31 criteria, the text can be dated to the 26th dynasty (Verhoeven 2001, 304-328).
 32 Converting to modern dates, this corresponds to the 6th century BC. The
 33 division of Egyptian history into dynasties goes back to the Hellenistic writer
 34 Manetho, who compiled the annals of his own land for the Ptolemaic rulers (for
 35 Manetho cf. Helck 1956, *passim*; Hornung 2012, sp. 1-6). The Greek occupiers
 36 were thus made aware about the achievements of this ancient civilization.
 37 Posterity coined the term „Saitic Renaissance“ for that era, a time of
 38 rediscovery of historical heritage and the larg-scale, faithful copying of
 39 artworks from the past. The modern name for this cultural phenomenon was
 40 borrowed from the capital city of the time. Some of the pieces created at that
 41 time, are, even to experts, virtually indistinguishable from the older models.
 42 Similar trends can be observed in Mesopotamia at that time. The intellectual
 43 climate thus dominated the entire Near East. The much-discussed Axial Age
 44 casts its long shadows before it. The name Karl Jaspers as its founding father
 45 should be recalled in this context. The papyrus under consideration likely

¹Thanks for some supporting information go to Yannick Wiechmann, Bonn.

1 originates from a temple library, which deviates from the usual pattern due to
 2 the absence of manuscripts from the normal temple cult (Quack 2021, 392).
 3 The content deals with the threat to the king posed by various evils. The
 4 manuscript, as a small piece of supplementary information, belongs to the most
 5 important accounts of multi-headed Bes figures. The dwarf god Bes was
 6 primarily invoked for the protection of pregnant women and newborns. The
 7 crucial text reads as follows:

8
 9 „**dd** mdw ‘**h**=**tn** (sic!)² **d3<ii>** **d3<ii>.t** **h̄dr.t** **š̄r.t** ‘**m3m.t** **n.t** **imn.tt** **śnd**
 10 **nb** ‘ **nb** **n** **iwiw** **mwt** **mwt.t** **śhm.(t)** **d3<ii>** **d3<ii>.t** **h̄ft(i)** **h̄ft(i.)t** **nti**
 11 **iw=śn** **r** **ii** **r** **Pr-3** ‘**nḥ** **wd3** **śnb** **m** **grḥ** **m** **hrw** **nw** **nb** **n** **r'** **nb**“ (Sauneron 1970,
 12 23; x+IV, 1)

13
 14 „Words to be spoken: You shall stand still, adversary (and) adversary-
 15 woman, pig, door-guardian, devourer of the west, every³ fear, every influence
 16 of a dog, dead man (and) dead woman, adversary (and) adversary-woman, foe
 17 (and) foe-woman, who might act against the Pharaoh by night and day, every
 18 hour of the day.“

19

20

21 Discussion

22
 23 The explanation of the meaning of the pig is of utmost importance here.
 24 The greatly abbreviated statement places considerable obstacles in the way of
 25 the task. The individual puzzle pieces must be fitted together to form the most
 26 convincing overall picture possible. Contemporaries faced fewer challenges,
 27 who had the advantage over their modern-day descendants of possessing the
 28 necessary prior knowledge. They were so deeply rooted in their own cultural
 29 environment that this ability can safely be assumed. Today's interpreter is more
 30 or less reliant on conjecture. The only glimmer of hope is to coax one or two
 31 secrets from the text. In this sense, the following remarks are intended only as a
 32 working hypothesis.

33 Research has recently rediscovered this topic. In a new edition of the
 34 papyrus, Theis (2025, 89) seeks to define the pig as a Sethian creature. The
 35 term, derived from the fratricidal god Seth (to the god Seth cf. still Te Velde
 36 1977, *passim*), refers to all kind of evil powers. The pig thus acquires an
 37 extremely dubious character. The next lines start the attempt to get a little bit
 38 beyond Theis. The interpretation is retained here, but a somewhat different
 39 cause is sought. The opportunity will be used below to further clarify the

²The emendation of Theis 2025, 89, who adds „=tn“ behind „h“ and cancels „n.t“, is unnecessary if one understands „nt“ as a defective spelling of „tn“.

³The rendering of „nb“ as „irgendein“ by Theis 2025, 90, is far to weak and should therefore be rejected. The present author can not completely avoid the suspicion that this translation was inspired by Coptic.

1 background of the motif. The new thing about this approach is that the context
 2 is also taken into account. The method has the advantage that previously
 3 unconsidered material can be made usable for analysis.

4 In the next few lines, particularly importance is given to the aspect of
 5 impurity. The concept behind it is by no means new. The Egyptian idea of the
 6 uncleanness of pigs can also be found in other texts. A brief overview of the
 7 relevant sources is provided below. The already illusory claim of completeness
 8 should not even be made. However, the examples mentioned can be considered
 9 representative. The impurity of pigs is also encountered in the calendar omens
 10 from the New Kingdom (Vernus 1981, 91), where are reports of a boar whose
 11 proximity causes an illness. The Book of the Dead is the next example which is
 12 part of the funerary literature of the New Kingdom and was intended to protect
 13 the non-royal deceased from the dangers of the afterlife. The content is made
 14 up of around 190 spells. Knowledge of the topography there should be
 15 conveyed as a further task. The Book of the Dead represents, in chronological
 16 order, the third largest text corpus of this type after the Pyramid Texts of the
 17 Old Kingdom and Coffin Texts of the Middle Kingdom. The postscript to BD
 18 125 contains the requirement for soil that no pig has stepped on (Lapp 2008,
 19 286a-287a). The containment from the pig should be kept away from the
 20 deceased. The line can even be extended to Late Antiquity. The decisive
 21 example consists of the Greek-written decree of the strategos of Ombos and
 22 Elephantine, which dates from the year 248/249 AD (Eide/Hägg/Pierce/Török
 23 1988, 977). The inscription is on the wall of the pronaos of the temple of
 24 Mandulis in Kalabscha. The decree is directed against the pig owners of
 25 Kalabscha, who should keep their animals out of the temple. The uncleanliness
 26 of the pig can also be imagined as a reason here. The Egyptian idea of the
 27 impurity of pigs is – incidentally – already mentioned by Herodotus (Herodot
 28 II, 47; for Herodotus cf. Erbse 1991, *passim*; Dewald/Marincola 2006, *passim*;
 29 Rengattos 2001, 338-380). The “father of history” could have heard about it
 30 from one of his Egyptian informants. The message dates only a little later than
 31 pBrooklyn 47.218.156. Herodot’s long-standing bad reputation as a historian
 32 has now significantly rehabilitated. The message must therefore definitely be
 33 taken serious. The explanation would – said again – also make a good sense
 34 with the pig motif in pBrooklyn 47.218.156, x+IV, 1. The example there can
 35 thus be placed in a larger context. The procedure should be methodologically
 36 permitted. The interim result is that impurity also plays the main role in its
 37 case. The aspect fits well into the ranks of the other evil forces and is not a
 38 foreign body at all. As likely as this solution is, it remains hypothetical for
 39 now. To be absolutely sure, you have to look for further arguments

40 In my opinion, the correct understanding can not be found by considering
 41 the passage in isolation. The meaning only becomes really clear when the
 42 passage „nb n iwiw“ „every influence of a dog“ is included in the analysis.
 43 The connection between pig and dog – to put it in another way – must not be
 44 brutally severed. The fact that these two animals were chosen is not based on
 45 mere arbitrariness. In truth, it is almost certain that a very specific calculation
 46 lies behind it. The alleged misplacement of the pig, which Theis (2025, 89)

1 speaks of, meets with fierce resistance because of the clearly predetermined
2 agenda (for the pig see Fischer-Elfert 2014, 43-50; Redding 2024, *passim*). The
3 decisive prerequisite is the aspect of that same impurity, resulting from the
4 status as commensally animals and scavengers. The remnants of humanity's
5 throwaway society served as a food source for both animals. The religious and
6 ritual background of the dog is not even acknowledged by Theis in any
7 commentary. However, the role of the canine is most easily explained in the
8 manner just described. The following argument might also help a small step
9 further: The dog's impurity is also reflected in other Egyptian texts, primarily
10 an inscription from the temple of Isis at Philae (Philae III, 70; for this passage
11 cf. Kühnemund 2021, 626). The passage in question certainly offers itself as a
12 source. The dog is mentioned there in a row with other typhonian apparitions
13 that could desecrate the temple. The text dates to the Greco-Roman period,
14 meaning the time gap remains within reasonable limits. The difference is only
15 three quarters of a millennium, which is not very much by Egyptian standards.
16 Oral tradition, which played an important role in many ancient culture, should
17 also not be underestimated in such cases. The temple of Philae was visited by
18 the southern Nubians as a pilgrimage until the 6th century AD and was only be
19 closed under the Byzantine Emperor Justinian I. as the last Egyptian religious
20 building. Other explanations are all ruled out upon closer examination. The
21 dog-like form of demons only appear in Late Antiquity, which is why it must
22 be rejected for anachronistic reasons in such an early text as this one. The idea
23 of an older precursor seems highly improbable. The dog was at least partly in
24 bad reputation in Egypt, as can be seen from the comparison of the subjugated
25 enemies with this animal. The development already began in the Middle
26 Kingdom. The heyday saw this perspective in the war reports of the Pharaohs
27 of the New Kingdom. The impurity of the dog can – by the way – also be
28 observed in Palestine, where reference can be made to the Persian period dog
29 bureals in Askelon (Borowski 2002, 420). The admittedly late evidence is
30 compensated for by the Roman bishop Kallist's paraphrase of Gen 7, 1-3,
31 where the dog also appears among the unclean animals on Noah's Arkh
32 (Hausamann 2001, 142). The message about this paraphrase comes from
33 Hippolyte. As to the best of my knowledge, the word „„influence“ only ap-
34 pears in this instance directly next to the dog. The context suggests that it refers
35 to something negative. The nuance apparently needs not to be enhanced by a
36 complementary adjective. In this case you may be dealing with a certain
37 sociolect or idiolect. The existence of technical languages in Egypt has been
38 sufficiently proven, with the soldier's language playing a special role (for the
39 special idiom of soldiers cf. Breyer 2002, 53-56; Breyer 2011, 448; Schneider
40 2008, 181-205; Jansen-Winkel 2016, 274). The series could be supplemented
41 by a reference to the language of metal craftsmen (Fecht 1996, 247ff.;
42 Bojowald 2018, 260-263) or butchers (Grunert 2001, 43-57). The expression
43 „„ „influence“ in our text would then belong to the magical language. The
44 possibility is not excluded that the word refers to the uncleanliness of the dog.
45 The solution appears to be the most convincing given all the remaining

1 uncertainties. The theory that was initially put forward so blatantly now needs
 2 to be further substantiated.

3 The text itself leaves the reader in the lurch during further interpretation.
 4 The statement returns again in the same text, but a different pig name is chosen
 5 and the dog is omitted. The text passage is therefore even darker at first glance,
 6 so no help can be expected from this side. To my knowledge, no one has dared
 7 to thoroughly interpret this passage in the past. The reason for the change in
 8 pig names is not immediately obvious. In the absence of a better alternative,
 9 poetic freedom or the well-known principle of “variatio delectat” could be
 10 considered as the cause. In any case, the meaning does not seem to change. The
 11 assumption is that both pig names refer to the same animal. However, the last
 12 word on this topic may not have been spoken yet. The question should be
 13 deferred here until further notice. If you still want to make progress, an
 14 interdisciplinary comparison with Akkadian literature would be worthwhile.
 15 This could shed even more light on the obscurity. The same scenario can be
 16 observed in Akkadian texts, where dogs and pigs also appear together as waste
 17 consumers (Cooper 1996, 51). The connection is there secured on a sufficiently
 18 broad basis. The similarity is immediately apparent. The situation there is
 19 therefore suitable as support. For the sake of completeness, it should be said
 20 that the pig was only considered unclean relatively late in Sumerian-Akkadian
 21 literature (Guichard/Marti 2013, 48-49). However, this does not change the
 22 fundamental matter. Additionally, the pig was not decried as unclean in all
 23 oriental cultures. The Hittites, for example, saw no problem in using the pig as a
 24 sacrificial animal in magical rituals (McMahon 2023, 227). The reservations
 25 about the pig do not seem apply to the Aegean world, as the excavations from
 26 Nopigeia-Drapanias show, for example (Chahoud/Vila 2023, 280). The
 27 osteological findings speak for themselves in this regard. The phenomenon can
 28 nevertheless be transferred to the Egyptian passage without hesitation. The
 29 explanation also serves very well here. The details are discussed in more detail
 30 below.

31

32

33 Conclusion

34

35 The text in pBrooklyn 47.218.156, x+IV, 1 shudders at the contamination
 36 caused by the impurity of the two condemned animals. The Egyptian's
 37 thoughts had always revolved around the problem of purity and impurity
 38 (Quack 2013, 115-158). If this line of reasoning is justified, it becomes evident
 39 that the magical power of the word protects the king from a very real danger.
 40 The proposal is by no means isolated. Theis also explicitly acknowledges the
 41 possibility of a threat from worldly powers. Viewed from this angle, the king
 42 should then be protected from a possible illness caused by the transmission of
 43 the pig's miasmas. The passage from the calendrical omens could have a pilot
 44 function for this. The validity of this explanation remains to be seen, since
 45 illnesses are not explicitly addressed in pBrooklyn 47.218.156, x+IV, 1. It
 46 seems possible that they were subject to a certain taboo, with complete

1 marginalization depriving them of their harmful effects. The descriptions were
 2 apparently sufficient for those initiated into the matter. If this is too specific,
 3 the interpretation can also be generalized somewhat. The Egyptian king was
 4 surrounded by a semisacred aura, from which all impurity had to be kept away.
 5 The dirt would therefore be understood in a purely physical sense. The gist of
 6 the statement can also be grasped more or less accurately in this way. The
 7 decision between these two alternatives is left to the reader.

8 The fact cannot be emphasized strongly enough, that pigs and dogs are
 9 note mentioned in such close proximity anywhere else in Egyptian literature. In
 10 this case, a Semitism could be fictionally considered on the basis of the much
 11 better confirmed Akkadian examples. Semitic influence could also be inferred
 12 from the use of the loanwords „ḥdr.t“ (for this word cf. Theis 2011, 85) „pig“
 13 and „š̄r.t“ (for this word cf. Hoch 1994, 273 (Nr. 390); for the possible
 14 connection to Arabian “s̄l” cf. Vittmann 1998, 285) „door-gurdian“. The fact
 15 that Egyptian magical incantations occasionally show Semitic influence
 16 (Bojowald, in preparation) could also be called a support. However, the entire
 17 circumstantial process is on weak ground. In truth, such a conjecture would not
 18 only be unprovable, but also extremely unlikely. The assumption of a non-
 19 Egyptian origin of the motif is – formulated even more sharply – completely
 20 wrong. The reason for this reluctance lies in the following consideration: the
 21 motif has a longer history in Coptic (von Lemm 1923, 150; Nagel 1983, 117;
 22 Pearson/Vivian 1993, 72-73; Lanzillotta/van der Vliet 2023, 196;
 23 Balestri/Hyvaternat 1955, 115; for the combination of dog and pig in Coptic cf.
 24 recently Bojowald 2024, 171-175), which significantly increases the chances of
 25 an autochthonous origin, even in Egypt. The sight of stray dogs and pigs
 26 rummaging through the village and urban garbage heaps must have been part
 27 of everyday life on the banks of the Nile as well. In this case, we are therefore
 28 dealing with a pan-Oriental phenomenon. Incidentally, Dosoo (2022, 532) and
 29 Peled/Saar (in press) share this same opinion. The Akkadian example has al-
 30 ready been mentioned above. The assumption of a survival in Coptic is
 31 therefore unnecessary. The term “survival” serves as a designation for the
 32 pharaonic remains in late ancient Christian Egypt (Behlmer 1996, 567-590;
 33 Krause 1985, *passim*, Zentler 2011, *passim*). The phenomenon has given rise to
 34 its own branch of science called “survival research” (Morenz 1963, 54-59).
 35 The targeted search would probably yield further material. However, the cur-
 36 rent amount is definitely sufficient as an initial basis. The Coptic evidence
 37 itself covers a period of approximately one thousand years. Coptic marks the
 38 most recent stage of Egyptian; today’s church service uses the Bohairic dialect
 39 as its liturgical language (Loprieno/Müller 2012, 102-144). The motif’s history
 40 can now be traced in Egypt for almost three millenia. The lack of even older
 41 examples is likely due to the randomness of transmission. The methodlogical
 42 difficulties of this approach are known but are accepted. The evidence base
 43 could therefore still shift, meaning this is only a snapshot in time. The proposal
 44 presented here may also aid the interpretation of the contemporaneous
 45 inscription of the statuette Paris Louvre, E 11554, 49f, where, however, only a

1 pig without a dog appears. This brief reference should suffice. The detailed
 2 treatment of the topic would go far beyond the scope of this article. Perhaps
 3 someone else will take up this suggestion.

4 Finally, this new development necessitates a partial modification of my
 5 own remarks in an earlier work (Bojowald 2024, 174). Despite their cautious
 6 formulation, the words there could have unintentionally given the impression
 7 that pharaonic literature in such cases was limited to mentioning only the dog.
 8 According to the above, this exclusivity is no longer accurate. The situation has
 9 changed thanks to the fortunate discovery of the missing link. The pair of pig
 10 and dog is now also documented in literature for Pharaonic Egypt. If the ideas
 11 presented here are correct, the number of Egyptian evidence for the impurity of
 12 pigs continues to increase. The phenomenon is often encountered in a sacred or
 13 ritual sphere. In this respect, a consistent pattern emerges. The quantity is still
 14 manageable, so every new example is welcome. In this way, the flexible term
 15 “Sethian” by Theis is simultaneously made concrete and precise. The
 16 publication generates a certain profit for this reason alone. The future will
 17 show whether this will remain just one evidence or whether more will be
 18 added. To close with a little anecdote, we should remember Schenkel’s well-
 19 known bon mot that one secure evidence counts more than a thousand
 20 uncertain one. In this sense, the above comments may be understood as a
 21 preliminary sketch.

22
 23
 24 **References**

25
 26 Balestri, I./Hyvaternat, H. (eds.) (1955). *Acta Martyrum I*, CSCO 43, Scriptores
 27 Coptici 3. Louvain: Peeters Verlag
 28 Behlmer, H. (1996). Ancient Egyptian Survivals in Coptic Literature, in: A. Loprieno
 29 (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms*, Leiden: Brill Verlag, 567-
 30 590
 31 Bojowald, St. (2018). Zu einer innerdemotischen Parallele für die übertragene
 32 Verwendung von *mśdr* “Ohr=Henkel” in P.Berlin 6848, 1/21, *AfP* 64/1, 260-263
 33 Bojowald, St. (2024). Kleine Beiträge zut koptischen Literatur III, *OrChr* 107, 163-
 34 181
 35 Borowski, O. (2002), Animals in the Religions of Syria-Palestine, in: B. J. Collins
 36 (ed.), *A History of the Animal World in the ancient Near East*, HdO Section One,
 37 The Near and Middle East 64, Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill Verlag, 405-424
 38 Breyer, Fr. A. K. (2002). Psammetik II, der alte Haudegen – zu einer
 39 soldaten sprachlichen Wendung in der Shellal-Inschrift, *SAK* 30, 53-56
 40 Breyer, Fr. A. K. (2011). Egyptological remarks concerning daxamunzu, Ä+L LXX,
 41 445-451
 42 Chahoud, J./Vila, E. (2023), Man, Animal, and Gods: Animal Remains as Indicators
 43 of Beliefs in the Ancient Near East, in: N. Laneri/Sh. R. Steadman (eds.), *The*
 44 *Bloomsbury Handbook of Material Religion in the Near East and Egypt*, London:
 45 Bloomsbury
 46 Cooper, J. S. (1996). Magic and M(is)use: Poetic Promiscuity in Mesopotamian
 47 Ritual, in: M. E. Vogelzang/H. L. J. Vanstiphout (eds.), *Mesopotamian Poetic*

1 *Language*. Sumerian and Akkadian Cuneiform Monographs 6, Proceedings of the
 2 Groningen Group for the Study of Mesopotamian Literature Vol. 2. Groningen
 3 Dewald, C./Marincola, J. (eds.) (2006), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*,
 4 Cambridge: University Press

5 Dosoo, K. (2022) Suffering Doe and Sleeping Serpent: Animals in Christian Magical
 6 Texts from Late Roman and Early Islamic Egypt, in: J.-Ch. Coulon/K. Dosoo
 7 (eds.), *Magikon Zoon: Animal et magie dans l'Antiquité et auch Moyen Age*,
 8 *ANimal and Magic from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*. Paris, 495-544

9 Eide, T./Hägg, T./Pierce, R. H./Török, L. (1998). *Fontes Historiae Nubiorum, Textual
 10 Sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region Between the Eighth Century BC
 11 and the Sixth Century AD, Volume III, From the First to the Sixth Century AD*.
 12 Bergen: John Grieg AS

13 Erbse, H. (1991). *Fiktion und Wahrheit im Werk Herodots*, Göttingen

14 Fecht, G. (1996). Der beredte Bauer: die zweite Klage, in: P. der Manuelian (Ed.),
 15 *Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson, Volume I*, Boston, 227-260

16 Fischer-Elfert, H.-W. (2014). Der Ritt auf der Sau: kulturgeschichtliche Anmerkungen
 17 zum demotischen Ostr. D. 70 in der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, in: S. L.
 18 Lippert/M. A. Stadler (Hrsg. unter Mitarbeit von Ulrike Jakobeit), *Gehilfe des
 19 Thot, Festschrift für Karl-Theodor Zauzich zu seinem 75. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden:
 20 Harrassowitz Verlag

21 Grunert, St. (2001), Sprachen Schlächter schlechter?, Rufen und Reden aus dem Grab
 22 des Anchmahor in Saqqara, *GM 186*, 43-57

23 Guichard, M./Marti, L. (2013). Purity in ancient Mesopotamia. The paleo-babylonian
 24 and neo-assyrian Periods, in: Chr. Frevel/Chr. Nihan (eds.), *Purity and the
 25 Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient
 26 Judaism, Dynamics in the History of Religion* 3. Leiden – Boston: Brill Verlag,
 27 47-113

28 Hausamann, S. (2001), *Alte Kirche, Zur Geschichte und Theologie in den ersten vier
 29 Jahrhunderten, Band 1, Frühchristliche Schriftsteller, „Apostolische Väter“,
 30 Häresien, Apologeten*, Neukirchen – Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag

31 Helck, W. (1956). *Untersuchungen zu Manetho und den ägyptischen Königslisten*,
 32 Berlin: Akademie Verlag

33 Hoch, J. E. (1994). *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third
 34 Intermediate Period*. Princeton: University Press

35 Hornung, Chr. (2012), Manethon, in RAC Band 24, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag,
 36 Sp. 1-6

37 Jansen-Winkel, K. (2016). Der Nubienfeldzug Psametiks II. und die Stele von Shellal, in:
 38 S. L. Lippert/M. Schentuleit/M. A. Stadler (Hrsg.), *Sapientia Felicitas, Festschrift für
 39 Günther Vittmann zum 29. Februar 2016*, CENiM 14, Montpellier

40 Krause, M. (1985). Zum Fortwirken altagyptischer Elemente im Koptischen, in:
 41 *Ägypten – Dauer und Wandel, Symposium anlässlich des 75jährigen Bestehens
 42 des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo am 10. und 11. Oktober 1982*,
 43 SDAIK 18, Mainz: Philipp von Zabern

44 Kühnemund, M. (2021). *Die rituelle Reinheit in den Tempeln der griechisch-
 45 römischen Zeit, Teil 2: Anhang*, SSR 34. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag

46 Lanzillotta, L. R./van der Vliet, J. (2023). *The Apocalypse of Paul (Visio Pauli) in
 47 Sahidic Coptic, Critical Edition, Translation and Commentary, With an appendix
 48 by J. van Lent*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae Volume 178. Leiden –
 49 Boston: Brill Verlag

50 Lapp, G. (2008). Totenbuch Spruch 125, Totenbuchtexte 3, Basel: Orientverlag

1 Loprieno, A./Müller, M. (2012). Ancient Egyptian and Coptic, in: Z. Frajzyngier/E.
 2 Shay (eds.), *The Afroasiatic Languages*, Cambridge: University Press, 102-144
 3 McMahon, Gr. (2023), The Materials of Hittite Magic and Religion, in: N. Laneri/Sh.
 4 R. Steadman (eds.), *The Bloomsbury Handbook Of Material Religion in the Near
 5 East and Egypt*, London: Bloomsbury

6 Morenz, S. (1963). Fortwirken altägyptischer Elemente in christlicher Zeit, in:
 7 *Koptische Kunst. Christentum am Nil, 3. Mai bis 15. August 1963 in Villa Hügel*,
 8 Essen, 54-59

9 Nagel, P. (1983), *Das Triadon, Ein sahidisches Lehrgedicht des 14. Jahrhunderts*,
 10 Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg Wissenschaftlicher Beitrag 1983/23
 11 (K 7), Halle

12 Pearson, B./Vivian, T. (with the assistance of Donald B. Spanel) (1993). *Two Coptic
 13 Homilies attributed to Saint Peter of Alexandria, On Riches, On the Epiphany*,
 14 Unione Accademica Nazionale Corpus dei Manoscritti Copti Letterari. Rom

15 Peled, I/Saar, O. P. (in press). Spells for separation from Mesopotamia to the Cairo
 16 Geniza

17 Quack, J. Fr. (2013). Conceptions of Purity in Egyptian Religion, in: Chr. Frevel/Chr.
 18 Nihan (eds.), *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient
 19 Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism, Dynamics in the History of Religion*
 20 3. Leiden – Boston: Brill Verlag, 115-158

21 Quack, J. Fr. (2021). Neue Fragmente zum Handbuch der Religion und Mythologie
 22 des Delta (pBrooklyn 47.218.84), in: Ph. Collombert et al. (Eds.), *Questioner le
 23 Sphinx, Mélanges offerts à Christiane Zivie-Coche, Vol. I*, BdE 178. Kairo, 391-
 24 406

25 Redding, R. W. (2024), *A View from the Herd, Cattle, Sheep, Goats and Pigs in
 26 Pharaonic Egypt, A Primer for Egyptologists and Archaeologists*, Archaeology
 27 5, Atlanta

28 Rengattos, A. (2011), Herodot, in: B. Zimmermann (Hrsg.), *Handbuch der
 29 griechischen Literatur der Antike, Band 1, Die Literatur der archaischen und
 30 klassischen Zeit*, München, 338-380

31 Sauneron, S. (1970). *Le papyrus magique illustré de Brooklyn (Brooklyn Museum
 32 47.218.156)*. New York

33 Schneider, Th. (2008). Fremdwörter in der ägyptischen Militärsprache des Neuen
 34 Reiches und ein Bravourstück des Elitesoldaten (Papyrus Anastasi I 23, 2-7),
 35 *JSSEA* 35, 181-205

36 Te Velde, H. (1977). *Seth, God of Confusion, A Study of his Role in Egyptian
 37 Mythology and Religion*, PdÄ. Leiden: Brill Verlag

38 Theis, Chr. (2011) Hdr.t – Erdwolf oder Schwein, Ein Vergleich von Archäologie und
 39 schriftlichem Material, *ZÄS* 138, 79-88

40 Theis, Chr. (2025). *Der polymorphe Bes, Untersuchungen zu Entwicklung, Devianz
 41 und Tradition eines mehrköpfigen Wesens im Alten Ägypten*, *ZÄS* Beihefte Band
 42 17. Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter Verlag

43 Verhoeven, U. (2001). *Untersuchungen zur späthieratischen Buchschrift*, OLA 99,
 44 Leuven: Peeters Verlag

45 Vernus, P. (1981). Omina calendriques et comptabilité d'offrandes sur une tablette
 46 hiératique de la XVIIIe dynastie, *RdE* 33, 89-124

47 Vittmann, G. (1998). Rezension zu James E. Hoch, *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts
 48 of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*, Princeton, New Jersey 1997,
 49 *WZKM* 87, 277-288

50 von Lemm, O. (1923). *Das Triadon, Ein sahidisches Gedicht mit arabischer
 51 Übersetzung*, St. Petersburg

1 Zentler, M.-A. (2011). *Ägyptischer Himmel in koptischer Erde. Pagan-altägyptische*
2 *Reminiszensen (Survivals) im spätantiken, koptischen Christentum*, Tübingen:
3 Mohr Siebeck

ONLY FOR REVIEW