
ON THE LETTER EA 35 AND THE QUESTION OF THE EXISTENCE OF ORNITHOMANCY IN ANCIENT EGYPT

Francisco L. Borrego Gallardo
(Universidad Autónoma de Madrid)

RESUMEN

En la carta de Amarna EA 35 el soberano de Alashiya solicita al rey de Egipto, entre otras cosas, el envío de augures. Ello ha llevado a plantear la cuestión de la existencia de la ornitomanía en el Egipto antiguo, para la cual las posiciones académicas mayoritarias consideran que se trata de una práctica importada a Egipto durante el Bronce Reciente. En este estudio, el análisis del pasaje en cuestión desde una óptica ornitológica permite plantear la posibilidad de que la especie mencionada fuera el buitre leonado (Gyps fulvus), y no tanto un águila, la opinión prevalente hasta ahora. Asimismo, la contextualización de esta práctica adivinatoria a la luz de nuevas fuentes y de perspectivas algo distintas de las adoptadas hasta ahora permite afirmar la probable existencia de prácticas ornitománticas autóctonas en un contexto más amplio de omnia animales anteriores al Reino Nuevo y que se podrían haber visto enriquecidas con el contacto con culturas de Oriente Próximo a partir de ese periodo.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Cartas de Amarna, EA 35, Egipto, ornitomanía, buitre leonado (Gyps fulvus).

ABSTRACT

In Amarna letter EA 35 the ruler of Alashiya requests the king of Egypt, among other things, to send augurs. This has led to the issue of the existence of ornithomancy in ancient Egypt, which is considered by most scholars to be a practice imported into Egypt during the Late Bronze Age. In this study, the analysis of that passage from an ornithological perspective raises the possibility that the species involved was the Griffon vulture (Gyps fulvus), and not an eagle, the prevailing opinion so far. Furthermore, the contextualisation of this divinatory practice through new sources and perspectives different from those adopted so far allows affirming the probable existence of indigenous ornithomancy practices in a wider context of animal omnia predating the New Kingdom, which may have been enriched by contact with Near Eastern cultures from that period onwards.

KEYWORDS

Amarna letters, EA 35, Egypt, ornithomancy, Griffon vulture (Gyps fulvus).

No one can doubt the importance of Maria Giovanna Biga's contributions to the understanding of the history and culture of the Ancient Near East. Especially from Tell Mardikh, her knowledge and work have reached distant lands. From the Dugurasu of the Eblaite texts that she knows so well and has helped so much to identify as the Egypt of the Early Bronze Age, here is a modest present in recognition of her unselfishness and the esteem in which we hold her.

The highly interconnected world of the Near East in the Late Bronze Age allowed for a fertile exchange of objects, beliefs and knowledge through the coexistence and

mobility of specialists such as craftsmen¹, physicians² and scribes³ between the courts of the great and small kings. Among them were also people who today we usually classify as ritualists rather than technicians, such as, for example, those skilled in divinatory techniques.

1. EA 35 and the raptor-diviner

In the cuneiform diplomatic correspondence of the Amarna archive, one of the most remarkable letters is EA 35, written by the king of Alashiya to the Egyptian monarch and currently kept in the British Museum⁴. In it, after the usual formal greetings (ll. 1-9), the sovereign of Alashiya refers to the shipment of 500 talents of copper, asking his Egyptian counterpart not to worry about a smaller quantity than usual, which he justifies by saying that a plague (the “Hand of Nergal”) is in his kingdom, having killed many men, including staff dedicated to the work of copper (ll. 10-15). If Pharaoh needs copper, he says, he has only to say so (ll. 16-18). Next, the ruler of Alashiya requests silver from the ruler of Egypt in exchange for giving him what he requests (ll. 19-22). After that, comes the passage that is the subject of this paper, where the monarch of Alashiya asks the king of Egypt, in addition to “sweet oil”, to send a specialist in divination by birds of prey (ll. 23-26). Then the Egyptians are asked to settle an outstanding payment for the shipment of wood (ll. 27-29) and the return of the property of a herald who died in Egypt (ll. 30-34). He is also told not to worry about the Egyptian herald’s prolonged stay on the island, and that one of his younger wives has died of the plague, requesting that he send a messenger with his own to bring him a welcome gift for the Pharaoh (ll. 35-42), and again asking for silver with promises of reciprocity, expressing that he always treats him with greater deference than the Hittites or the Babylonians (ll. 43-53). The letter ends with the wishes that shipments in both directions will arrive as hitherto (ll. 54-55).

As noted above, one of the most striking aspects of this document is the request to the Egyptian king for a specialist in bird divination. The transcription of that passage of the letter (ll. 24-26) is as follows⁵:

ŠEŠ-ia | 2 DUG *ku-ku-bu uš-še-er-an-ni* ŠEŠ-ia | ù 1 LÚ.MEŠ *ša-i-li Á-MUŠEN.MEŠ uš-še-ra-an-ni*

The most important translations offered so far for these lines are the following:

and send me, my brother, 2 *kukkubu*-containers of “sweet oil,” my brother, and send me one of the experts in vulture augury.⁶

¹ Moorey 2001. In a letter from Hattushili III to Kadashman-Enlil II (CTH 172; Beckman 1996: 137) the former asks for a sculptor to be sent, and to avoid a refusal, he is recalled that there were precedents where these professionals were sent back to their court of origin. A different case is in clauses of treaties where the parties undertake to return fugitive professionals (*e.g.* those of Mursili II with Targasnalli of Hapalla (CTH 67, § 6; Beckman 1996: 66) and with Kupanta-Kurunta of Mira-Kuwaliya (CTH 68, § 22; Beckman 1996: 75) and that of Muwattalli II with Alaksandu de Wilusha (CTH 76, § 15; Beckman 1996: 86), or that of the indictment of Madduwatta by Arnuwanda I (CTH 147, § 6; Beckman 1996: 146).

² *E.g.* a letter from Ramesses II to Hatushili III (KBo 28.30; Edel 1976: *passim*; Edel 1994: I, 178-181; II, 270-272; Beckman 1996: 131-132 (with further examples)) or another from Hattushili III to Kadashman-Enlil II (CTH 172; Beckman 1996: 136).

³ Ferrara 2016.

⁴ BM 29788. Among the most relevant and recent references, *vid.* Hellbing 1979: 21-37; Moran 1992: 107-109; Liverani 1999: 417-418; Kassianidou 2009; Rainey 2015: 340-343 and 1379-1381.

⁵ Rainey 2015: 342.

⁶ Moran 1992: 107.

E olio profumato, fratello mio, mandamene due contenitori, fratello mio, e mandami un augure!⁷

and of the best oil, my brother, send me two *kukubu* jars, my brother, and send me one of the experts on vulture divination.⁸

In particular, the professional required by the court of Alashiya (1 LÚ.MEŠ *ša-i-li* Á-MUŠEN.MEŠ) has been understood as “un augure” (Liverani) or, more literally, as “one of the experts in vulture augury” (Moran) or “one of the experts on vulture divination” (Rainey), as well as “one man who performs divination with eagles”, “augur” (bird-omen diviner)⁹ or “eagle interpreter”¹¹. Although its general meaning seems clear, it is worth examining it briefly.

The first term, 1 LÚ.MEŠ *ša-i-li*, does not pose translation problems, since its final element, *ša’ilu*, is commonly used with the sense of “diviner”¹². Hence, it is common for it to have also the senses of “asker” or “dream interpreter”¹³. The second one, Á.MUŠEN = *erû*, on the other hand, is more controversial. Several scholars understand it as “augury” or “eagle-augury”¹⁴, although it is primarily an ornithonym. Both Moran and Rainey first suggest translating it as “vulture”¹⁵, although both recognise that it could also be “eagle”. This second option is the preferred translation in standard lexicographical works¹⁶. In neither case is it specified which species it might be. McEwan, for his part, suggests that it could also be the Egyptian vulture (*Neophron percnopterus*), a species that flies over Cyprus¹⁷ on its migration to and from Egypt¹⁸, although he did not rely on ornithological studies to make such an interpretation. Potential etymologies of the Akkadian term in other Afro-Asiatic languages, mainly Semitic, from **arw/y-/awr-*, with a common semantic core of “bird of prey”, relate it mainly to other birds of prey, such as vultures and bearded vultures, and a lesser extent to passerines, such as corvids, especially ravens¹⁹.

Beyond McEwan’s brief indication, it is striking that there is little interest in identifying the species or family of raptors to which this ornithonym might refer. Although it seems clear that it could be a diurnal bird of prey, ornithological data are needed to better elucidate the question²⁰. When looking for possible candidates, one should bear in mind that there are several possibilities: 1) a family or species known in Cyprus but not in Egypt; and 2) a family or species known in both Cyprus and Egypt. In theory, it may be more appropriate to identify species common to both areas, as this would allow for a better orientation of the interpretation of the diviner asked for in a territory that was foreign to him. On the other hand, to make reliable interpretations of *omina*, it is more likely, leaving aside the role of migratory birds as harbingers of the seasons (*vid. infra*), that the species were resident. Therefore, it is useful

⁷ Liverani 1999: 418.

⁸ Rainey 2015: 343.

⁹ Reiner 1989: 110.

¹⁰ Black *et al.* 2000: 348.

¹¹ McEwan 1981: 62.

¹² Reiner 1989: 110-112.

¹³ Black *et al.* 2000: 348 (*šā’ilu(m)*).

¹⁴ Moran 1992: 109, n. 6; Rainey 2015: 1380.

¹⁵ This is also agreed by McEwan (1981: 62), who compares it to the meaning of the Hebrew *nešer*.

¹⁶ Oppenheim 1958: 324-325; Black *et al.* 2000: 80.

¹⁷ Recently, the identification between Alashiya and (at least a large part of the island of) Cyprus no longer seems to be in doubt. *Vid. e.g.* Knapp 2008: 300-307.

¹⁸ McEwan 1981: 62, n. 29.

¹⁹ Kogan and Militarev 2004: 145-146.

²⁰ The possibility that the term simply described large birds of prey of the family Accipitridae cannot be completely ruled out.

to list the native diurnal raptor species known for both areas, differentiating between resident and migratory to establish probable candidates (Table 1)²¹. It is also relevant to consider whether the native resident birds live in areas distant from the Nile Valley (and therefore less likely to have been used in divinatory practices), whether the migratory birds also breed in their wintering grounds and whether their passage is anecdotal or accidental (vagrant).

FAMILY <i>species</i>		CYPRUS (ALASHIYA)		EGYPT	
		Resident	<i>Migratory / passage</i>	Resident	<i>Migratory / passage</i>
EAGLES	<i>Accipiter brevipes</i>	—	○	—	○
	<i>Accipiter gentilis</i>	●	—	—	◇
	<i>Accipiter nisus</i>	—	○	—	○
	<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	—	◇	■	—
	<i>Aquila fasciata</i>	●	—	■	—
	<i>Aquila heliaca</i>	—	○	—	○
	<i>Aquila nipalensis</i>	—	—	—	○
	<i>Aquila rapax</i>	—	—	—	◇
	<i>Aquila verreauxii</i>	—	—	■	—
	<i>Buteo buteo</i>	●	—	—	○
	<i>Circaetus gallicus</i>	—	○	—	●
	<i>Circus aeruginosus</i>	—	○	—	○
	<i>Circus cyaneus</i>	—	○	—	○
	<i>Circus macrourus</i>	—	○	—	○
	<i>Circus pygargus</i>	—	○	—	○
	<i>Clanga clanga</i>	—	◇	—	○
	<i>Clanga pomarina</i>	—	○	—	○
	<i>Haliaeetus albicilla</i>	—	◇	●	—
	<i>Haliaeetus vocifer</i>	—	—	—	◇
	<i>Micronisus gabar</i>	—	—	—	?
<i>Pernis apivorus</i>	—	○	○	○	
<i>Terathopius ecaudatus</i>	—	—	●	—	
VULTURES	<i>Aegypius monachus</i>	?	?	—	○
	<i>Gypaetus barbatus</i>	—	◇	●	—
	<i>Gyps fulvus</i>	●	—	●	○
	<i>Neophron percnopterus</i>	—	○	●	—
	<i>Torgos tracheliotos</i>	—	—	●	—

²¹ The data have been taken from <http://birdlife.org> [08/25/2022]. Also, on these species, *vid.* Cramp *et al.* 1980; Houlihan 1986; Goodman & Meininger 1989; Ferguson-Lees & Christie 2001.

HAWKS	<i>Aquila fasciata</i>	●	—	■	—
	<i>Buteo rufinus</i>	●	—	●	○
	<i>Hieraetus pennatus</i>	?	?	—	○
	<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>	—	○	■	○
KITES	<i>Elanus caeruleus</i>	—	—	●	—
	<i>Milvus aegyptius</i>	—	—	●	—
	<i>Milvus migrans</i>	—	—	●	○
	<i>Milvus milvus</i>	—	—	—	○
FALCONS	<i>Falco biarmicus</i>	—	◇	○	—
	<i>Falco cherrug</i>	—	○	—	○
	<i>Falco columbarius</i>	—	○	—	○
	<i>Falco concolor</i>	—	◇	—	●
	<i>Falco eleonora</i>	—	○	—	○
	<i>Falco naumanni</i>	—	○	—	○/●
	<i>Falco pelegrinoides</i>	—	—	●	—
	<i>Falco peregrinus</i>	●	—	●	○
	<i>Falco subbuteo</i>	—	○	—	○
	<i>Falco tinnunculus</i>	●	—	●	—
	<i>Falco vespertinus</i>	—	○	—	○

Table 1. Species of raptors in Cyprus and Egypt. Key: ● = native, breeding; ○ = native, non-breeding; ◇ = vagrant; — = not attested; ■ = native, outside the area of the Nile Valley (Sinai, deep desert areas); ? = native, without further information.

Some data might change concerning ancient times.

From the data in the table, 24 out of 46 species are native to the two areas (neither vagrant nor far from the Nile Valley), either as migratory or resident birds. It seems reasonable to leave aside the 8 falcons common to both areas, as in Akkadian they seem to have been designated as *ka(s)sūsu*²² (*ḥašmar* in Kassite²³) or *surdû*²⁴ (*sūr-du*^{mušen} in Sumerian and *sūr(-du)*^{mušen} in Eblaite²⁵), and as *nš* or *šiy* in Ugaritic²⁶ or maybe *'ayyatum* in Eblaite²⁷, all of them quite different from the ornithonym of EA 35 and its possible etymon. Of the remaining 16 species, mostly eagles but also some hawks and vultures, it is striking that in both areas there is hardly any concordance in native resident species or even among breeding species, with the only exceptions being the Griffon vulture (*Gyps fulvus*) and the Long-legged buzzard (*Buteo rufinus*) (*vid. infra*). Although the recurrence in certain migratory species makes it possible that the required diviner was a specialist in that class of birds, it is more likely that the species involved was resident in both cases. In this sense, it

²² Oppenheim 1971: 256-257; Black *et al.* 2000: 150.

²³ Oppenheim 1956: 142; Black *et al.* 2000: 111.

²⁴ Reiner 1984: 407-408; Black *et al.* 2000: 329.

²⁵ Bonechi 2000: 274.

²⁶ *E.g.* Watson 2007: 100 and 107.

²⁷ Bonechi 2000: 255.

is easier to know the ethology of resident species than of migratory ones, and thus to know their possible usual and anomalous behaviour, and they are also more easily observable throughout the year to make predictions.

As for the Long-legged buzzard, it is only a casual breeding resident in Egypt, being more common as a migrant²⁸. The migratory nature of hawks and eagles, among other reasons, explains why these birds of prey do not seem to have played a significant role in Pharaonic hieroglyphic writing, culture, and religion before the Macedonian conquest²⁹. The Griffon vulture, although nowadays a species that is practically no longer resident in Egypt, but migratory, until a few decades ago was a resident species and was breeding in large populations³⁰. This clarifies its notable presence and importance in the Egyptian religious and cultural sphere. Furthermore, the idea put forward by McEwan that the bird in EA 35 was the Egyptian vulture seems unlikely, since in Cyprus it is a migratory bird of passage and is not even a nesting bird, making it less likely to be used for augural practices. It should also be noted that carrion-eating raptors such as vultures are commonly associated with death-related events in various cultures of the ancient world, such as battles³¹. Therefore, it is feasible to think that the request for an expert in interpreting *omina* based on the behaviour of vultures had to do with the situation described in EA 35: the “Hand of Nergal”, which had decimated the population of the island. Hypothetically, it is possible that, in the opinion of the senders of the letter, studying the behaviour of these raptors was a way of knowing how the situation was going to unfold, and, as Liverani indicates, not so much as a magical procedure against the plague, as Hellbing suggested³².

2. Bird divination in ancient Egypt?

The foregoing analysis of the passage of EA 35 allows us to raise again the question of the existence of ornithomancy in Pharaonic Egypt within the general framework of its divinatory practices.

2.1. Introductory remarks

Bird divination³³, especially concerning raptors, has been recognised as an existing divinatory practice in various cultural spheres of antiquity, such as those of Greece, Etruria, and Rome³⁴. For the Ancient Near East, this type of divination has been attested, for instance, among the Hittites³⁵ and, most notably, in the Mesopotamian *Šumma ālu*³⁶.

As for ancient Egypt, the prevailing opinion so far has been that expressed by the Egyptologist H. Brunner, who considered the existence of augurs to be possible, even though, in principle, there was no further information in Egyptian sources. This, in his opinion, was because divination was not a concept specific to the Egyptian worldview

²⁸ Goodman & Meininger 1989: 189.

²⁹ Brunner-Traut 1975; Vernus & Yoyotte 2005: 354. The only common hieroglyph that seems to represent a species of the Accipitridae family is the Long-legged buzzard (𓆎, G4) (Houlihan 1986: 44; cf. Vernus & Yoyotte 2005: 357).

³⁰ Cramp *et al.* 1980: 76; Houlihan 1986: 40. Cf. Vernus & Yoyotte 2005: 418-427.

³¹ Dillon 2017: 14. In this regard, it is worth recalling the presence of vultures in iconic documents, both from Egypt (e.g. the *Battlefield Palette*, BM EA 20791 + Ashmolean 1892.1171: www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/Y_EA20791 (with references) [08/20/2022]) and the Near East (e.g. the *Vulture stela*, Louvre AO 50 etc.: www.collections.louvre.fr/en/ark:/53355/cl010121794 (with references) [08/20/2022]). Cf., moreover, Psalm 79.2.

³² Hellbing 1979: 29-37; Liverani 1999: 418 (n. 13).

³³ Under this term I include the varied set of techniques and procedures that go by various names both in ancient treatises and texts and in recent studies, such as ornithomancy, ornithoscopy, ornithocritics, oionoscopy, etc.

³⁴ E.g. Johnston 2008: 128-130; Haase 2010; Dillon 2017: 139-177.

³⁵ E.g. Sakuma 2014.

³⁶ Freedman 1998-2017.

and could therefore be due to a Mesopotamian influence³⁷; this idea has been shared by most scholars who have studied EA 35³⁸. However, the publication of new documents, a different analysis of already known documents, and the examination of sources and certain cultural-historical processes hitherto overlooked concerning this issue allow for a different approach to the existence of ornithomancy in ancient Egypt.

Ancient Egyptian divination constitutes a set of practices³⁹ very unevenly known in its typological, diatopic and diachronic aspects. By far the best-known methods are oracular procedures and oneirocritics. Other types, especially those relating to *omina* involving animals, are much more poorly known, although the publication of new documents and more detailed and nuanced studies are gradually providing a better understanding of the richness and diversity of divinatory procedures, especially animal *omina* and, among these, those relating to birds. Since no archaeological or iconographic evidence has been identified so far, the existing documentation is limited to texts.

2.2. Bird *omina* in Ancient Egypt: new evidence and perspectives

In a paper published just over fifteen years ago, J. F. Quack drew attention to the large amount of unpublished textual material relating to divination in Egypt, challenging the “relatively widespread belief that they [= *omina* and divination] were of small importance for the Egyptians, at least before the Late Period”⁴⁰, as shown by the recently published evidence for the existence of lecanomancy⁴¹ and necromancy⁴² before that period, to which can be added the evidence for the First Millennium BCE for animal *omina* (*vid. infra*), uranomancy / brantomancy (very probably taken from the Mesopotamian sphere but possibly with Egyptian antecedents)⁴³, and abacomancy / amathomancy (sand divination)⁴⁴. In addition to some unpublished examples presented by this scholar and the possible antecedents of animal *omina* —which go back at least to the beginning of the Middle Kingdom⁴⁵— a different look at some already known sources allows looking for evidence of a divinatory use of birds before the middle of the First Millennium BCE.

One testimony indicated by Quack is a set of fragments of a demotic manuscript, possibly copied from an earlier hieratic text, dated to centuries I-II AD from Soknopaïou Nesos, now among several different collections and still unpublished. Originally very lengthy, it may have contained around a thousand different *omina*, many of which are related to animals, similar in style and content to the terrestrial *omina* found in the Akkadian *Šumma ālu*. Besides mammals, reptiles, insects and arachnids, allusions to owls —bearers of evil influences—, ravens, and pigeons are preserved among the birds⁴⁶. Other fragmentary manuscripts, *Papyrus Mil. Vogl. inv. Dem. 93*⁴⁷, *Papyrus Berlin P 15680*⁴⁸

³⁷ Brunner 1977.

³⁸ E.g. McEwan 1980: 62; Liverani 1999: 418.

³⁹ The most comprehensive and general perspective remains to a large extent that of von Lieven (1999), to which can be added several recent works, such as that of Quack (2006) (*vid. infra*).

⁴⁰ Quack 2006: 175.

⁴¹ Demichelis 2002; cf. Quack 2006: 175.

⁴² Ritner 2002.

⁴³ Collombert 2014.

⁴⁴ Quack & Ryholt 2019b.

⁴⁵ This is, for example, the episode of the gazelle in inscription no. 110 from Wadi Hammamat, from the reign of Mentuhotep IV (Coyat & Montet 1912: pl. xxix). On this event as an animal *omen*, *vid. e.g.* Vernus 1995: 73; von Lieven 1999: 106.

⁴⁶ Quack is currently preparing its edition and publication. A summary can already be found in Quack 2006: 175-178; 2010: *passim*, and in von Lieven 1999: 106.

⁴⁷ Quack & Ryholt 2019c; 2017b.

⁴⁸ Zauzich 2012; Quack & Ryholt 2019c: 271.

and *Papyrus Cairo CG 50138 + 50139*⁴⁹, although fragmentary, seem to consist of animal *omina* manuals of which the part relating to the contact and interactions of geckos with women has been preserved. To them should be added the similar fragment of *Papyrus Heidelberg D 785*, relating to shrew mice⁵⁰, *Papyrus BM EA 10238*, on dung beetles and their dung balls⁵¹, and *Papyrus Cairo CG 50141*, focusing on the behaviour of dogs⁵². Overall, in such treatises, as Quack himself has stated, “[t]he relevant behaviour of the animals is quite in line with their normal acts. Movements, and sometimes voice, play a major role”, as well as feeding behaviour and body contact with human beings⁵³, elements attested in the ornithomancy of several cultures⁵⁴. The interpretations of the *omina* as a whole cover a wide range of everyday situations (economic, judicial, family, health, travel, etc.)⁵⁵. There are also remains of other similar manuscripts, very fragmentary, which have so far been taken for oneirocritical manuals for their similarities to these treatises on dream interpretation in format, range of life situations and hermeneutic procedures⁵⁶.

When addressing the issue of the existence of ornithomancy in ancient Egypt, the presence of birds in dreams has not been considered, nor has the high degree of intertextuality between treatises of animal *omina* and oneirocritics⁵⁷. The manual of dream interpretation in *Papyrus Chester Beatty III*⁵⁸ is, among the known testimonies⁵⁹, the best studied and published and is, moreover, contemporaneous with the letter EA 35. In it, it is indicated in several instances that the sleeper may come to see one animal, which is usually interpreted as a good sign. Among these⁶⁰ is mentioned the vision of birds such as a crane (r^o 2.3) or an ostrich (r^o 8.11 [bad]), as well as actions related to them, such as catching birds (r^o 7.28), copulation with a kite (r^o 8.10) the snaring of birds (r^o 8.22), all of which are bad. Later similar documents also mention birds⁶¹, among other animals⁶². One is the demotic *Papyrus*

⁴⁹ Spiegelberg 1932: 98-102, pl. lix; Prada 2017a: *passim*, esp. 285-287 and 288-290; Quack & Ryholt 2019c: 271.

⁵⁰ Spiegelberg 1925: 9-11; von Lieven 1999: 106; Quack & Ryholt 2019c: 271.

⁵¹ Jasnow 1997; von Lieven 1999: 106; Quack 2006: 178-179.

⁵² Spiegelberg 1932: 103, pl. lix; Prada 2017a: *passim*, esp. 287-288.

⁵³ Quack 2006: 175-176 (caption from p. 176); 2010: 80-83.

⁵⁴ *Vid. supra* (for the Ancient Near East and the Graeco-Roman world) *et infra* (for the Arabs).

⁵⁵ Quack 2006: 177-178.

⁵⁶ Quack 2006: 178-179.

⁵⁷ For the relations between the two sets: Quack 2006: 179.

⁵⁸ Gardiner 1935: 9-23, pl. 5-8 and 12. The most relevant and comprehensive references are von Lieven 1999: 110; Szpakowska 2003: 66-122.

⁵⁹ Other documents, mainly from the First Millennium BCE, are explained by von Lieven 1999: 112-114; Quack 2006: 179-184.

⁶⁰ *Papyrus Chester Beatty III* r^o 3.12 (quadrupedal), 3.13 (dead bull), 3.14 (doubtful), 3.18 (donkey), 4.3 (big cat), 5.11 (crocodile). In other cases, the animal is used as a metaphor (e.g. r^o 4.2, where a man's face is like a leopard's one). They also appear as the object of an action by the sleeper (e.g. r^o 4.1 (killing a snake), 4.8 (killing a bull), 4.16 (cutting up a bull), 5.10 (cutting up a female hippopotamus), 5.16 (copulating with a cow), 5.17 (eating the meat of crocodile), 6.3 (bringing in cattle), 7.3 (copulating with a *ḥdrt* animal [bad]), 7.5 (eating the meat of cattle), 7.8 (eating a catfish), 7.10 (removal of a calf [bad]), 8.20 (fattening cattle [bad]), 9.16 (copulating with a sow [bad]), 9.27 (keeping monkeys [bad]), 9.28 (bringing mice from a field [bad]), 10.6 (eating the meat of cattle [bad]) and 11.22 (following a flock of billy-goats). Inversely, the animal may be the agent of an action suffered by the dreamer (e.g. r^o 7.18 (dog's bite [bad]) and 7.19 (snake's bite [bad])).

⁶¹ It is known from several copies and fragments in European and American collections; the section devoted to birds is preserved in *Papyrus Vienna D 6104* (Prada 2012a: 172-173, esp. 173; 2012b: 326).

⁶² E.g. in *Papyrus Berlin 29009* a beetle is mentioned (Quack 2006: 180). In *Papyrus Jena 1209* is referred to the suckling of several animals (among them an ibis) by human beings (Prada 2012a: 170-171) and just the opposite in the v^o of *Papyrus Carlsberg 14* (Prada 2012a: 171). In *Papyrus Carlsberg 649 + P. CtYBR inv. 1154 + PSI inv. D 78* appear several animals, some of them as food (frag. 1, 2.x+4-5 and y+2-10; frag. 2, 2.3-20), and there is a section devoted to eggs of different kinds (frag. 5, x+5-11; frag. 6, x+2-6), maybe including birds, such as pigeons (?) (frag. 6, x+3) (Quack & Ryholt 2019a: 195-196, 197, 198, 203, 204-206, 210-213 and 215-217).

Carlsberg 490 + PSI inv. D 56; in a fragment, very lacunary, besides other animals⁶³, are mentioned a vulture (frag. 9, x+5: $\text{r}(j)n^1-n^3w nry$ [...] “[if] a vulture [...]”) and an ibis (frag. 9, x+8: $[(j)n-n^3w] hb$ [...] “[if] an ibis [...]”)⁶⁴. This example, unfortunately fragmentary, draws attention to the probable mention of vultures in EA 35.

Other testimonies that have not been considered in discussing this issue are the compilations of calendrical *omina*. One, attested on the recto of a writing board in a private collection and probably from Deir el-Bahari⁶⁵, is particularly relevant for several reasons. Firstly, it has been dated to the middle of the Eighteenth Dynasty, around the reign of Thutmose III. Thus, it is a document that predates EA 35 by more than a century. Secondly, it is important because of its content. It is organised not by specific days but by months and it contains events of various kinds and their significance. The first one, corresponding to the first month of *ḥt*, after a first *omen*, shows the only one in which animals are featured in the whole document (r^o 2-3):

jr jw wt n šj swš=f ḥr=k nwh=f | fdq(.w) dd.ḥr=k jw=tw r dḥr nn wn m(w)t m t3 pn r-dr=f

If a ram comes up to a pig and crosses in front of you, with its leash | cut off, then you will say: “There will be sickness, (but) there will be no death in this entire land!”

It is interesting to note that the prediction, as throughout the text, is not personal but relative to the community, as the interpretation refers to diseases that affect the whole country. This is reminiscent of the background of EA 35 and its description of the effect of the “Hand of Nergal” on Alashiya.

Some decades ago, D. Meeks drew attention to the role of certain birds as “time markers”. The clearest case is that of migratory birds, whose arrival coincides with the beginning of the annual flooding of the Nile, announcing it conspicuously and clearly⁶⁶. Rather than an *omen*, their presence can be characterised as a sign of the imminence or beginning of a process, as is the case in several cultures around the world, where birds operate as harbingers of the seasons⁶⁷. It cannot be ruled out, however, that the characteristics of the first arrivals of migratory birds (identity of the first species to arrive, their behaviour, their number, their course, etc.) could have been interpreted as *omina*.

In a somewhat different way, it is relevant to analyse a passage from the story of Wenamun (*Papyrus Moscow 120 2.64-70*)⁶⁸. After his encounter with the Chief of Byblos, Tjekerbaal, Wenamun sees from the seashore a group of eleven Tjeker ships arriving to arrest him and impede his return to Egypt for stealing their silver. As he sees a group of migratory birds passing by and heading towards Egypt, he is deeply distressed. This seems to manifest as an *omen* of death and disintegration, which, together with the difficult events that the

Papyrus Carlsberg 14 + P. CtYBR inv. 4530 + PSI inv. D 76 includes specific sections on the birth of animals (frag. F, 1-15), the consumption of sacred animals (frag. C, 12-17; frag. D, 1-10, x+1 and x+10), snakes (frag. A, 16-21; frag. C, 1) and crocodiles (frag. I, 1-12; frag. J, x+2) (Quack & Ryholt 2019a: 221-227, with references). Besides, several sections are devoted to animals of different species in the oneirocritic manual known by several copies already mentioned (Prada 2012a: 173).

⁶³ Quack & Ryholt 2019a. Firstly, dreams in which someone is seen on an animal are mentioned (frag. 1, 10-15 and 16), and later several species are described in contexts that are much less well preserved and difficult to understand (frag. 3, x+2-3; frag. 8, x+12; frag. 9, x+6 and x+9-10).

⁶⁴ Quack & Ryholt 2019a: 189, 191-192 and 194.

⁶⁵ Vernus 1981: 89-106 and 119-120, fig. 1-2, pl. 5; Fischer-Elfert 2005: 101-103 and 162-164; Bresciani 2007: 487-489.

⁶⁶ Meeks 1990: 38-43. Cf. Goelet 1983; Roquet 1985: 119-122.

⁶⁷ E.g. Serjeantson 2009: 338. Cf. e.g. the case of kites as harbingers of a new season in the Greek culture, as in Aristophanes' comedy *The Birds* (*Av.* 713-714).

⁶⁸ Gardiner 1932: 73.13-74.9; Burkard & Thissen 2009: 47-57.

protagonist experiences, leads him to strong despair, even more marked by his separation from his homeland, where the birds are heading⁶⁹:

*jw=j hpr hms.tw {r} rmw jw p3 sh3-s'w(t) n(j) p3 wr j[.y] n=j r-bnr | jw=f dd n=j jh r=k jw=j dd
n=f nn bw jr=k ptrj n3 g3sw j.jr jrj sp 2 n h3y r Km(t) | ptrj st jw=w n3y r qbh s3'.tw jh jy jw=j d(y)
h3'.tw hr nn bw jr=k ptrj n3 jw | r ddh=j 'n jw=f smj jw=f dd.tw=f n p3 wr jw p3 wr hpr {r} rmw
m dr n3 mdt j.ddw n=f jw=w | mr jw=f djt jw n=j p3y=f sh3-s'(t) r-bnr jw jn=f n=j jrp msh 2 j3yr 1
jw=f djt jn.tw | n=j T(3)-n(j)t-njw w'(t) hs(t) n(j) Km(t) jw=st m-djw=f r dd hsj n=f m dj t3y h3tj=f
shrw jw=f h3b n=j | r dd wnm swrj m d3y t3y h3tj=k shrw jw=k sdmj p3 nb ntj jw=j dd.tw=f n dw3w*

I sat down weeping, and the secretary of the Chief ca[me] out to me, | and he said: “What is about you?”. I said to him: “Do you not see the migratory birds who have descended twice to the Black (Land)? | Look at them, travelling to the cool waters! Until when will I be abandoned here? Do you not see those who come | to imprison me again?”. He went and said it to the Chief, and the Chief wept because of the words said to him, for they were | painful. He caused his secretary to come out to me; he brought to me two jugs of wine and one sheep. He caused to bring | to me Tanetniut, a songstress of Egypt who was with him, saying: “Sing for him! Do not allow his heart to obsess upon the affairs”. He sent a message to me, | saying: “Eat and drink! Do not allow your heart to obsess upon the affairs; you will hear all that I will say tomorrow”.

Several details are remarkable in the context of this paper. One is that the painful emotions are not only felt by Wenamun, but also by Tjekerbaal. It is not clear whether this is motivated by the protagonist’s despair —for he is partly responsible— or because he interprets the passage of migratory birds in the same way in this context. If this second option is the case, it is consistent with EA 35 in the fact that individuals from different cultural backgrounds could participate in an interpretation of the same event understood as an *omen*. In that sense, the setting where this episode takes place is not Egyptian, but one where individuals of Egyptian, Gublite, Tjeker and, later in the text, Alashian origins converge. Although the first interpreter of the possible *omen* of the migratory birds is Egyptian (Wenamun), who is also a priest⁷⁰, other agents of different cultural backgrounds participate in the same environment.

2.3. Bird *omina* in Ancient Egypt: complementary evidence

For the issue of the existence of ornithomancy in ancient Egypt, it is also worth considering some sources that have only been partially explored, such as the classical authors, or not at all, such as ethnographic data. Both types are likely to provide interesting information.

2.3.1. Classical authors

Among the studies devoted to divination in ancient Egypt, frequent mention has been made of Herodotus’ affirmation (2.82.2) that

They [= the Egyptians] have discovered more omens than anyone else in the world. When one happens, they write it down and wait to see what the outcome is, and if anything similar ever happens again in the future, they think that the same result will follow.⁷¹

⁶⁹ On the first half of this passage and its probable meanings: Pérez-Accino Picatoste 2005 (with references).

⁷⁰ It should be noted that the evidence presented above, far from being a collection of “popular” elements, comes from written testimonies and, therefore, from a literate and high culture context, many of which, moreover, were from the priestly sphere. Cf. *sim*. Quack 2010.

⁷¹ Translation by Waterfield 1998: 126.

Although Herodotus' assertion is certainly exaggerated, its background seems to be accurate: at the time when he presents the reality of Egypt (*ca.* 455 BCE), there should have been a good number of divination methods and treatises elaborated for this purpose⁷², as recent works on the subject, already mentioned, make clear⁷³.

While Herodotus hardly describes the case of divine oracles (2.83), Diodorus Siculus (1.70.9) points to the existence of hepatoscopy, also alluded to by Cicero (*Div.* 2.28), but not confirmed by Egyptian sources⁷⁴. However, the late date of this testimony and the very probable Mesopotamian influences throughout the First Millennium BCE⁷⁵ make it not a completely impossible option, at least for the time when these authors wrote their works. Moreover, among the Roman authors, the Egyptians stand out, above all, for having invented divination by the stars, in rivalry with the Mesopotamians (Cic., *Div.* 1.1, 1.93), but not by birds, whose invention is attributed to the Carians (Plin., *HN* 7.203). For his part, Aelian (*NA* 6.33) records that the Egyptians possessed a kind of magic (μαγεία) which enabled them to bring down birds from the sky⁷⁶, but without referring to any kind of augury from them⁷⁷.

2.3.2. Ethnographic data

One source not considered when discussing the divinatory practices of the ancient Egyptians are some ethnographic testimonies referring to the Nile Valley and surrounding areas. Although this is a body of evidence that should be handled with great caution and for comparative purposes, it can guide or inspire certain reflections.

Firstly, outside the Nilotic sphere, in the pre-Islamic and Muslim Arabian environment, ornithomancy (*iyafa*) is a discipline with a long tradition, already recognised in classical antiquity (*e.g.* Cic., *Div.* 1.94). It is based on the observation of the flight characteristics, voice, name, and position of birds, both from spontaneous and induced omens. Likewise, the presence or irruption of certain species could be ill-fated⁷⁸.

The funeral laments (*ʿidid*) of Upper Egypt, in turn, include some motifs in which birds appear as *omina* of death. These include the song of the “raven of ill-intent” (*inniyya*) and the “raven of misfortune” (*inneb*) as an announcement of death, as well as the shriek of a flock of birds at the moment of a man's ascent or that of an owl, a kite or a raven after it. The protest of the sparrows twittering or weeping above the bier or twittering on a branch above it as a way of scolding the washer of the corpse is also recorded⁷⁹. In a somewhat different way, not so much as an *augurium* but as a *signum*, there is the song of a sparrow or a turtledove as a protest or mourning during the washing of the corpse⁸⁰. Likewise, the passage of certain rare migratory birds is interpreted as a *signum*: it may appear as a turtledove that does not leave the house after the deceased has gone, or as an “Iraqi goose” that alights on the grass after

⁷² *E.g.* Lloyd 2007: 297.

⁷³ Von Lieven 1999; Quack 2006.

⁷⁴ Von Lieven 1999: 107.

⁷⁵ Note the well-known Babylonian and later Greek influence on Egyptian astrology and zodiac from the second third of the First Millennium BCE.

⁷⁶ This recalls some demotic tales where the magic of certain sacred books allows, among other wonders, to enchant the sky or understand the language of birds, as, for example, *Setne I* (*Papyrus Cairo CG 30646* 3.13-14, 3.35-36, 3.40-4.1 (Agut-Labordère & Chauveau 2011: 22-23 and 25-26; Hoffmann & Quack 2018: 148 and 150-151 (both with references)).

⁷⁷ The case of the prodigy recorded by Arrian (*Anab.* 3.3.1-5) that two ravens guided Alexander the Great on his way to the oasis of Siwa through the Libyan Desert, thus enabling him and his retinue to arrive safely at the site of the famous oracle, could in principle well be of Greek rather than Egyptian tradition.

⁷⁸ Fahd 1966: *passim*, esp. 432-455; 2006: 57-58.

⁷⁹ Wickett 2010: 250 (II) and 258 (XX).

⁸⁰ Wickett 2010: 251 (V).

having left the brood, or as another from Tunisia that comes to Egypt to drink⁸¹. As can be seen, this last example is strikingly reminiscent of Wenamun's passage already mentioned.

If these parallels are considered, the great distance in time between Pharaonic Egypt and the time when these laments were collected, from the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries, has to be born in mind. Nevertheless, the convergence of motifs and their close consonance with literary and religious texts are remarkable.

3. Discussion and conclusions

Letter EA 35 suggests the existence of experts in the interpretation of animal *omina*, especially bird divination, in Late Bronze Age Egypt. The analysis carried out on the letter raises the possibility that the ruler of Alashiya requested the Egyptian king to send a diviner of *omina* of raptors, probably Griffon vultures, since this is a resident native species present in both Cyprus and Egypt. Although we cannot rule out the possibility that the ornithonym in the letter refers to large raptors in general, the epidemic context on the island at the time the letter was written and sent suggests that it is more likely to refer to this carrion-eating raptor, which is deeply rooted in the cultural universe of the ancient Egyptians and associated in the Egyptian and Near Eastern contexts with death.

A question that arises from the analysis of EA 35 is why the request for this type of diviner is made to the Egyptians and not to other kingdoms with a —presumably— longer tradition in the interpretation of animal *omina*, such as Babylonia, at least since Old Babylonian times. The first plausible answer is that Alashiya would have done so, but there is no surviving record of it. In this sense, in another passage of the same letter, the Alashians emphasise the preferential treatment they say they have always given to the Egyptians over the Hittites and Babylonians (ll. 49-50), which could well be a way of making the Egyptians more favourable to their requests. Doubts remain, however, for this statement is not connected with the request of a diviner, but with the request for silver. Be that as it may, the point is that Alashians requested bird diviners from the Egyptians, of whose existence at that time they should have been aware.

Thus, if there is no doubt about the existence of Egyptian bird divination at least since the end of the Eighteenth Dynasty, other questions emerge: Is it an earlier practice or, as has been suggested, one specific to the “cosmopolitan” environment of the Egyptian court at the time of Amenhotep III? Is it a genuinely Egyptian divinatory procedure, or was it inspired by the Near Eastern environment or taken directly from it? The Egyptian evidence concerning animal *omina*, in particular involving birds, is lacunary and largely unpublished. So, it does not yet allow to affirm in a completely clear and unambiguous manner the existence of augurs as such in ancient Egypt. However, the search for them may have been approached incorrectly. Unlike in the Greek and, above all, Etruscan and Roman world, in ancient Egypt birds as *signa* of *omina* do not seem to have been the subject of their own, separate discipline, but rather to have been incorporated into the whole interpretation of animal *omina*.

It is noteworthy that from the beginning of the Middle Kingdom animals seem to have operated as *signa* of *omina*. The next clear evidence for that is the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty writing board, dating from a time of great expansion abroad. It is plausible that this artefact is a copy of somewhat earlier menological practices —similarly, there are already hemerological testimonies from the Middle Kingdom⁸²— and, therefore, before that time a more intense and fluid exchange of knowledge and specialists. Furthermore, a passage in the *Papyrus Ebers* (97.13-15) records a cledomantic (or human *omen*) practice, which

⁸¹ Wickett 2010: 258 (XX).

⁸² *Papyrus UC 32192*: von Lieven 1999: 97; Collier & Quirke 2004: 26-27.

could also date back to that period⁸³. Contacts with the Near East in terms of knowledge and written culture seem to have been particularly intense during the late Middle Bronze Age, as attested by the —admittedly very scarce— cuneiform testimonies found at Tell el-Dab'a (Avaris), the Hyksos capital⁸⁴, and do not exclude the possibility of inspiration in divinatory practices, albeit with an adaptation to local circumstances⁸⁵ and fauna. However, although there was probably an impulse or inspiration for the configuration of these practices, it does seem clear that there appears to have been a previous substratum. Furthermore, this practice as an established activity could not have come about, either as an autochthonous development or inspired from outside, without a set of specific historical, sociological, and religious circumstances and processes, such as the “great ideological mutation” in Egypt from the New Kingdom onwards as expressed by P. Vernus. In essence, it is a reconfiguration of the relations between men and deities, whereby the gods intervene in human affairs to a much greater degree than before. Hence, it is no coincidence that it is from the New Kingdom onwards that religious experiences and practices related to dreams, oracles, divine punishments, and various divinatory practices are recorded⁸⁶.

The documentation concerning animal *omina* from the First Millennium BCE suggests that they mostly consist of a type of divination in which the signs are interpreted after the event has occurred or the *signum* has manifested. In some cases, there does seem to have been some kind of prior consultation, of a rather oracular type, as in the case of the dung beetles mentioned above or the oracles of sacred animals. In this sense, the lack of a clear definition of what is meant by ornithomancy or the enunciation of its modalities has largely conditioned the idea that the ancient Egyptians lacked this divinatory procedure or that they had necessarily imported it from elsewhere. Thus, perhaps less relevant to the question is whether the Egyptians invented these practices or whether they established them on their own. From the point of view of religion and divinatory procedures, what is relevant is that the Egyptians did have, at least from the Eighteenth Dynasty, but possibly earlier, a discipline related to unravelling and correctly interpreting animal *omina* and, among these, birds, to deal with everyday reality and the challenges they faced as individuals and as a society.

Bibliography

Agut-Labordère, D.; Chauveau, M., 2011, *Héros, magiciens et sages oubliés de l'Égypte ancienne. Une anthologie de la littérature en égyptien démotique*, Paris.

Beckman, G., 1996, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, Atlanta.

Bietak, M.; Forstner-Müller, I.; van Koppen, F.; Radner, K., 2009, “Der Hyksos-Palast bei Tell el-Dab'a. Zweite und dritte Grabungskampagne (Frühling 2008 und Frühling 2009)”, *Ägypten und Levante* 19, pp. 91-119.

Black, J. A.; George, A. R.; Postgate, J. N., 2000², *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*, Wiesbaden.

Bonechi, M., 2000, “Noms d'oiseaux à Ébla : les rapaces”, in D. Parayre (ed.), *Les animaux et les hommes dans le monde syro-mésopotamien aux époques historiques*, Lyon, pp. 251-281.

Bresciani, E., 2007⁴, *Letteratura e poesia dell'antico Egitto. Cultura et società attraverso i testi*, Torino.

⁸³ Von Lieven 1999: 107.

⁸⁴ Van Koppen & Radner *apud* Bietak *et al.* 2009: 108 and 115-118, fig. 21-22; Mynářová 2015: 89-91.

⁸⁵ Cf. Noegel 2006 (for a Mesopotamian *inspiration* in Egyptian oneirocritics and its hermeneutic procedures based on paranomasia).

⁸⁶ Such intervention of deities in human lives seems to have occurred before, albeit to a much lesser degree.

- Brunner, H., 1977, "Vogelschau in Ägypten", *Göttinger Miszellen* 25, pp. 45-46.
- Brunner-Traut, E., 1975, "Adler", in W. Helck and E. Otto (eds.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie. Band I. A-Ernte*, Wiesbaden, pp. 64-65.
- Burkard, G.; Thissen, H. J., 2009, *Einführung in die altägyptische Literaturgeschichte II. Neues Reich. Zweite Auflage*, Berlin.
- Collier, M.; Quirke, S., 2004, *The UCL Lahun Papyri: Religious, Literary, Legal, Mathematical and Medical*, Oxford.
- Collombert, P., 2014, "Omina brontoscopiques et pluies de grenouilles", in M. Depauw and Y. Broux (eds.), *Acts of the Tenth International Congress of Demotic Studies. Leuven, 26-30 August 2008*, Leuven, pp. 15-26.
- Couyat, J.; Montet, P., 1912, *Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât*, Le Caire.
- Cramp, S.; Simmons, K. E. L.; Gillmor, R.; Hollom, P. A. D.; Hudson, R.; Nicholson, E. M.; Ogilvie, M. A.; Olney, P. J. S.; Roselaar, C. S.; Voous, K. H.; Wallace, D. I. M.; Wattel, J., 1980, *Handbook of the Birds of Europe, the Middle East and North Africa. The Birds of the Western Palearctic. Volume II. Hawks to Bustards*, Oxford.
- Demichelis, S., 2002, "La divination par l'huile à l'époque ramesside", in Y. Koenig (ed.), *La magie en Égypte : à la recherche d'une définition*, Paris, pp. 149-165.
- Dillon, M., 2017, *Omens and Oracles. Divination in Ancient Greece*, Oxon-New York.
- Edel, E., 1976, *Ägyptische Ärzte und ägyptische Medizin am hethitischen Königshof. Neue Funde von Keilschriftbriefen Ramses' aus Boğazköy*, Göttingen.
- Fahd, T., 1966, *La divination arabe. Études religieuses, sociologiques et folkloriques sur le milieu natif de l'Islam*, Leiden.
- Fahd, T., 2006, "Islam. Adivinación", in J. Servier (dir.), *Diccionario Akal crítico de esoterismo*, Madrid, pp. 49-59.
- Ferguson-Lees, J.; Christie, D. A., 2001, *Raptors of the World*, London.
- Ferrara, S., 2016, "Writing Away: Mobility and Versatility of Scribes at the End of the Bronze Age", *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 35 (3), pp. 227-245.
- Fischer-Elfert, H.-W., 2005, *Altägyptische Zaubersprüche*, Stuttgart.
- Freedman, S. M., 1998-2017, *If a City Is Set on a Height. The Akkadian Omen Series Šumma Alu ina Mele Šakin*, 3 vols., Winona Lake.
- Gardiner, A. H., 1932, *Late-Egyptian Stories*, Bruxelles.
- Gardiner, A. H., 1935, *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum. Third Series. Chester Beatty Gift*, London.
- Goelet, O., 1983, "The migratory geese of Meidum and some Egyptian words for 'migratory bird'", *Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar* 5, pp. 41-60.
- Goodman, S. M.; Meininger, P. L. (eds.), 1989, *The Birds of Egypt*, Oxford-New York.
- Haase, M., 2010, "Augury", in H. Cancik and H. Schneider (eds.), *Brill's New Pauly. Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World. Antiquity. Volume 15. Tuc-Zyt. Addenda*, Leiden-Boston, 1011-1012.

- Hellbing, L., 1979, *Alasia Problems*, Göteborg.
- Hoffmann, F.; Quack, J. F., 2018², *Anthologie der demotischen Literatur*, Berlin.
- Houlihan, P. F., 1986, *The Birds of Ancient Egypt*, Warminster.
- Jasnow, R., 1997, “A Demotic Omen Text? (P. BM 10238)”, in J. Van Dijk (ed.), *Essays on Ancient Egypt in Honour of Herman Te Velde*, Groningen, pp. 207-218.
- Johnston, S. I., 2008, *Ancient Greek Divination*, Chichester.
- Kassianidou, V., 2009, “‘May he send me silver in great quantities’ EA 35”, in D. Michaelides, V. Kassianidou and R. S. Merrillees (eds.), *Egypt and Cyprus in Antiquity. Proceedings of the International Conference. Nicosia, 3-6 April 2003*, Oxford, pp. 48-57.
- Knapp, A. B., 2008, *Prehistoric and Protohistoric Cyprus. Identity, Insularity, and Connectivity*, Oxford.
- Kogan, L.; Militarev, A., 2004, “New etymologies for common Semitic animal names”, in G. Takács (ed.), *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam W. Vycichl*, Leiden-Boston, pp. 144-154.
- von Lieven, A., 1999, “Divination in Ägypten”, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 26 (1), pp. 77-126.
- Liverani, M., 1999, *Le lettere di el-Amarna*, 2 vols., Brescia.
- Lloyd, A. B., 2007, “Book II”, in O. Murray and A. Moreno (eds.), *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*, Oxford, pp. 219-378.
- Moran, W. L., 1992, *The Amarna Letters*, Baltimore.
- Moorey, P. R. S., 2001, “The Mobility of Artisans and Opportunities for Technology Transfer between Western Asia and Egypt in the Late Bronze Age”, in A. J. Shortland (ed.), *The Social Context of Technological Change. Egypt and the Near East, 1650-1550 BC*, Oxford, pp. 1-14.
- Mynářová, J., 2015, “Egyptians and the Cuneiform Tradition. On the Palaeography of the Amarna Documents”, in E. Devecchi, G. G. W. Müller and J. Mynářová (eds.), *Current Research in Cuneiform Palaeography. Proceedings of the Workshop organised at the 60th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Warsaw 2014*, Gladbeck, pp. 89-102.
- Noegel, S. B., 2006, “On Puns and Divination: Egyptian Dream Exegesis from a Comparative Perspective”, in K. Szpakowska (ed.), *Through a Glass Darkly. Magic, Dreams & Prophecy in Ancient Egypt*, Swansea, pp. 95-119.
- Oppenheim, A. L. (ed.), 1956, *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Volume 6. H*, Chicago.
- Oppenheim, A. L. (ed.), 1958, *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Volume 4. E*, Chicago.
- Oppenheim, A. L. (ed.), 1971, *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Volume 8. K*, Chicago.
- Pérez-Accino Picatoste, J. R., 2005, “Llorando con las aves”, in J. Cervelló Autuori, M. Díaz de Cerio Juan and D. Rull Ribó (eds.), *Actas del Segundo Congreso Ibérico de Egiptología. Bellaterra, 12-15 de marzo de 2001*, pp. 243-251.
- Prada, L., 2012a, “Classifying dreams, classifying the world: ancient Egyptian oneiromancy and demotic dream books”, in H. Abd El Gawad, N. Andrews, M. Correas-Amador, V. Tamorri and J.

Taylor (eds.), *Current Research in Egyptology 2011. Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Symposium. Durham University 2011*, Oxford-Oakville, pp. 167-177.

Prada, L., 2012b, “Papyrus Berlin P. 8769: A New Look at the Text and the Reconstruction of a Lost Demotic Dream Book”, in V. Lepper (ed.), *Forschung in der Papyrussammlung. Eine Festgabe für das Neue Museum*, Berlin, pp. 309-328.

Prada, L., 2017a, “Divining Grammar and Defining Foes: Linguistic Patterns of Demotic Divinatory Handbooks (with Special Reference to P. Cairo CG 50138–41) and a Note on the Euphemistic Use of *hft* ‘Enemy’”, in R. Jasnow and G. Widmer (eds.), *Illuminating Osiris. Egyptological Studies in Honor of Mark Smith*, Atlanta, pp. 277–301.

Prada, L., 2017b, “Dreams, rising stars, and falling geckos: divination in Ancient Egypt”, *Egyptian Archaeology* 51, pp. 4-9.

Quack, J. F., 2006, “A Black Cat from the Right, and a Scarab on Your Head. New Sources for Ancient Egyptian Divination”, in K. Szpakowska (ed.), *Through a Glass Darkly. Magic, Dreams & Prophecy in Ancient Egypt*, Swansea, pp. 175-187.

Quack, J. F., 2010, “Präzision in der Prognose oder: Divination als Wissenschaft”, in A. Imhausen and T. Pommerening (eds.), *Writings of early scholars in the ancient Near East, Egypt, Rome, and Greece. Translating ancient scientific texts*, Berlin-New York, pp. 69-91.

Quack, J. F., 2017, “‘Assur will suffer:’ Predicting Disaster in Ancient Egypt”, in G. J. Schenk (ed.), *Historical Disaster Experiences. Towards a Comparative and Transcultural History of Disasters Across Asia and Europe*, Cham, pp. 189-206.

Quack, J. F.; Ryholt, K., 2019a, “Manuals on Dream Interpretation”, in J. F. Quack and K. Ryholt (eds.), *The Carlsberg Papyri 11. Demotic Literary Texts from Tebtunis and Beyond*, Copenhagen, pp. 185-242.

Quack, J. F.; Ryholt, K., 2019b, “A Ptolemaic Manual on Sand Divination”, in J. F. Quack and K. Ryholt (eds.), *The Carlsberg Papyri 11. Demotic Literary Texts from Tebtunis and Beyond*, Copenhagen, pp. 243-268.

Quack, J. F.; Ryholt, K., 2019c, “A Manual on Animal Omina: Lizards and Women”, in J. F. Quack and K. Ryholt (eds.), *The Carlsberg Papyri 11. Demotic Literary Texts from Tebtunis and Beyond*, Copenhagen, pp. 269-272.

Rainey, A. F., 2015, *The El-Amarna Correspondence. A New Edition of the Cuneiform Letters from the Site of El-Amarna based on Collations of all Extant Tablets*, 2 vols., Leiden-Boston.

Reiner, E. (ed.), 1984, *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Volume 15. S*, Chicago.

Reiner, E. (ed.), 1989, *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Volume 17. Š. Part 1*, Chicago.

Ritner, R. K., 2002, “Des preuves de l’existence d’une nécromancie dans l’Égypte ancienne”, in Y. Koenig (ed.), *La magie en Égypte : à la recherche d’une définition*, Paris, pp. 285-304.

Roquet, G., 1985, “Migrateur et flamant rose dans l’Égypte dynastique et copte: milieu, image et signe”, in *L’animal, l’homme, le dieu dans le Proche-Orient ancien. Actes du colloque de Cartigny 1981*, Louvain, pp. 111-130.

Sakuma, Y., 2014, “Analyse hethitischer Vogelflugorakel”, in J. C. Fincke (ed.), *Divination in the Ancient Near East. A Workshop in Divination Conducted during the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Würzburg, 2008*, Winona Lake, 37-51.

Serjeantson, D., 2009, *Birds*, Cambridge.

Spiegelberg, W., 1925, “Demotica I”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1925 (6), pp. 3-49.

Spiegelberg, W., 1932, *Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire. Nos 50023-50165. Die demotische Denkmäler. III. Demotische Inschriften und Papyri*, Berlin.

Szpakowska, K., 2003, *Behind Closed Eyes. Dreams and Nightmares in Ancient Egypt*, Swansea.

Vernus, P., 1981, “Omina calendériques et comptabilité d’offrandes sur une tablette hiéroglyphique de la XVIII^e dynastie”, *Revue d’Égyptologie* 33, pp. 89-124.

Vernus, P., 1995, “La grande mutation idéologique du Nouvel Empire: une nouvelle théorie du pouvoir politique. Du démiurge face à sa création”, *Bulletin de la Société d’Égyptologie - Genève* 19, pp. 69-95.

Vernus, P.; Yoyotte, J., 2005, *Bestiaire des pharaons*, Paris.

Watson, W. G. E., 2007, “Additional Names for Animals in the Ugaritic Texts”, *Historiae* 4, pp. 93-116.

Wickett, E., 2010, *For the Living and the Dead. The Funerary Laments of Upper Egypt, Ancient and Modern*, Cairo.

Zauzich, K.-T., 2012, “Das demotische ‘Buch des Geckos’ und die Palmomantik des Melampous”, in V. Lepper (ed.), *Forschung in der Papyrussammlung. Eine Festgabe für das Neue Museum*, Berlin, pp. 355-373.

