



B 20953

GNOMON

KRITISCHE ZEITSCHRIFT
FÜR DIE GESAMTE
KLASSISCHE ALTERTUMSWISSENSCHAFT

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

MARTIN BENTZ · RUTH BIELFELDT
PETER EICH · HANS-JOACHIM GEHRKE
CHRISTOPH HORN · MARTIN HOSE
JOSEPH MARAN · KATHARINA VOLK
PAUL ZANKER

SCHRIFTFLEITUNG

MARTIN HOSE (VERANTWORTLICH) UND
OLIVER SCHELSKE

Online-Ausgabe auf
elibrary.chbeck.de



90. BAND

Sonderdruck

HEFT 7

VERLAG C.H.BECK MÜNCHEN

riographie und betont (Résumés, S. 369): «Es konnte gezeigt werden, daß die römischen Historiker in der stilistischen Ausgestaltung isokrateischen Vorbildern folgen, in der Stoffanordnung jedoch von der dramatisch-mimetischen Richtung beeinflußt sind. Das Postulat des Duris, 'nicht hinter den Ereignissen zurückzubleiben', haben sie in seinem Sinne beherzigt». Diese Aussage trifft jedoch in ihrer kategorischen Form schwerlich zu. Denn eine mimetische Darstellungsweise findet sich beispielsweise nicht bei den meisten frühen Annalisten. M. Simon, 'Douris et le récit livien de la mort d'Alexandre le Molosse' (S. 273–289), weist überzeugend nach, daß der Bericht des Livius (VIII 24) durch mehrere Züge durideischer Geschichtsschreibung charakterisiert ist. M. de Franchis, 'L'épisode de Sophonisbe chez Tite-Live (30, 12–15): un morceau d'histoire tragique?' (S. 303–328), beantwortet die von ihr gestellte Frage negativ und lehnt die These ab, daß dem Bericht des Livius über die Tochter Hasdrubals und die Gemahlin des Syphax, die sich nach dessen Sturz 203 v. Chr. durch Gift das Leben nahm, eine *fabula praetexta* zugrundeliege. D. Briquel, 'Un événement capital de l'histoire de Rome, la bataille de Sentinum: le témoignage de Douris et ses limites' (S. 291–301), zeigt, daß diese Schlacht der Römer gegen die Samniten und ihre Verbündeten 295 v. Chr. bei Duris (F 56 a und b) nur einen marginalen Rang einnahm. So war bei ihm von der *devotio* des P. Decius Mus, die von anderen Quellen hervorgehoben wird (vgl. F 56 b), offenbar nicht die Rede. Im Unterschied dazu meint Ch. Guittard, 'Douris et la tradition de la devotio des Decii' (S. 329–339), daß von den drei *devotiones* der Decii in den Jahren 340 (Schlacht von Veseris), 295 (Schlacht von Sentinum) und 279 (Schlacht von Ausculum) wenigstens diejenige von Sentinum bei Duris Erwähnung fand (vgl. Résumés, S. 371).

Insgesamt hinterläßt der vorliegende Sammelband, der am Ende noch Résumés der einzelnen Abhandlungen enthält (S. 361–372), einen zwiespältigen Eindruck. Positiv ist hervorzuheben, daß der geistesgeschichtliche Hintergrund und das Werk des Duris eingehend analysiert werden, während sich die bisherigen Monographien auf die Analyse der historischen Schriften beschränken. Ferner wird das Nötige zur äußeren und inneren Biographie des Duris gesagt. Weiterhin verdient die Tatsache Anerkennung, daß sein Nachleben bei römischen Autoren wie Caesar, Cicero und Livius aufgezeigt wird. Dagegen überzeugen die Abhandlungen zu F 1, welche die Bedeutung von *mimesis* und *hedone* zu klären suchen, mit Ausnahme der Ausführungen von A. Cozzoli, nur wenig. Schließlich fehlen bedauerlicherweise ein Stellen-, Autoren- und Literaturverzeichnis.

Berlin

Klaus Meister

*

Magali De Haro Sanchez (Ed.): *Écrire la magie dans l'antiquité*. Actes du colloque international (Liège, 13–15 octobre 2011). Liège: Presses Universitaires de Liège 2015. 360 S. 15 Taf.

The present volume, which comprises a focused collection of studies on the relationship between magic and writing, is based on a colloquium that took place at the Université de Liège in 2011. It is a most welcome addition to the several edited volumes on magic that have appeared over the past few decades. In addition to

sixteen essays, which are grouped into three parts, the volume includes a short introduction, a set of 'concordances', abstracts, a bibliography, indices (a general index and an index of proper names), and fifteen plates.

The first part ('Écrire la magie: Supports et mise en texte') constitutes a series of philological and methodological essays concerned with the relationship between magic and ancient scribal activity. Anna Monte ('Un manuale di magia greco a Berlino: il Papyrus Berolinensis Inv. 5026') provides an autopsy of this Papyrus (PGM II), revising prior readings of the manuscript. Raquel Martin Hernandez ('Two Requests for a Dream Oracle, Two Different Kinds of Magical Handbook') devotes her attention to the quality of magical handbooks. She conducts a comparative analysis of the texts and formats of two requests for oracles to the god Bes, which are found in two different handbooks (PGM VII and PGM VIII). Diletta Minutoli ('*Exempla* di vari supporti scrittori contenenti testi magici provenienti da Antinoupolis') edits for the first time three magical objects, which date between the fifth and sixth centuries C.E. and were uncovered in Antinoupolis: (1) a phylactery, which was designed to protect a house; (2) a lead *lamella*; and (3) a vegetal object inscribed with *charaktères*. Nathan Carlig and Magali de Haro Sanchez's essay ('Amulettes ou exercices scolaires: sur les difficultés de la catégorisation des papyrus chrétiens') connects their recent work in identifying school texts/writing exercises and iatromagical amulets respectively in ancient papyri. They develop criteria for identifying amulets and writing exercises and then apply those criteria to select artifacts. Tonio Sebastian Richter ('Markedness and Unmarkedness in Coptic Magical Writing') attempts to disentangle 'meaningful' and 'non-meaningful' textual and physical elements in Coptic magic through a close analysis of several previously edited texts. Finally, Anna van den Kerchove ('*Le Livre du grand traité initiatique* (Deux livres de Ieou): dessins et rites') investigates the relationship between ritual and writing in the *Books of Jeu*, paying particular attention to its several schemes (*schémas*), which juxtapose schematic drawings and text. She argues that the schemes worked in dialogue with text and ritual in different ways (e.g., as an extension of the ritual and to create a new ritual space).

The second part ('Écrire et transmettre la magie: genres et traditions') focuses on the transmission of various traditions and genres in magical formulae. Sydney Aufrère ('Ched à la chasse aux serpents. Noms magiques d'ophidiens sur un groupe de cippes d'Horus de l'Époque libyenne') analyses the relationship between word and image on seven Horus-Cippi from the 'Libyan' period that depict *inter alia* Ched the Savior shooting arrows at snakes, which are accompanied by magic names. Pierre Koemoth ('Écrits et écritures magiques dans les scènes de psychostasie du *Livre des Morts* égyptien') investigates the weighing of the soul tradition (*psychostasy*) in Pharaonic Egypt, which reflects an increasing emphasis on the written word in Egyptian magic. Lucia Maddalena Tissi ('L'innologia magica: per una puntualizzazione tassonomica') examines the so-called magical 'hymns' in the Greek Magical Papyri, which she correctly notes are often neglected in scholarship. Tissi then offers a definition of 'magical hymns', raises questions about their classification as a genre, and argues for the prior oral transmission of certain hymns. Salvatore Costanza ('Manuali su papiro di *observationes* divinatorie e diffusione del sapere magico') provides a study of

Greek divinatory papyri in the Hellenistic and Roman periods – with particular attention to hieroscopies, palmomancies, and ceraunomancies – highlighting the proliferation of certain dimensions of ‘magical thinking’ (e.g., the law of similarity) during this period. M. Erica Couto-Ferreira (‘Agency, Performance and Recitation as Textual Tradition in Mesopotamia. An Akkadian Text of the Late Babylonian Period to Make a Woman Conceive’) offers an analysis of the performative terms used by healing practitioners and (female) clients in ancient Mesopotamian rituals in order to highlight the relationship between ritual agency and performance. Patricia Gaillard-Seux’s essay (‘Sur la distinction entre médecine et magie dans les textes médicaux antiques (I^{er}–VI^e siècles)’) examines the nexus of magic and medicine in the treatises of ancient ‘doctors’, such as Galen and Caelius Arelianus. Gaillard-Seux shows that, because *physika* applied to a wide range of practices that extended beyond sympathies and antipathies in ancient medical practice, doctors could on occasion proscribe ‘natural’ remedies or amulets as solutions to their patients’ ailments.

The essays in the third part (‘Écrire et prononcer la magie: mise en contexte’) examine the relationship between the written and verbal dimensions in magical rituals. Fritz Graf (‘Magie et écriture: quelques réflexions’) reflects on the relationship between oral and written domains in ancient magic, emphasizing the distinction between the optional and essential uses of writing in magical contexts. Sabina Crippa (‘Les savoirs des voix magiques. Réflexion sur la catégorie du rite’) builds on her prior publications on the relationship between ‘voice’ (*voix*) and magic, focusing here on how ‘sound sequences’ (*séquences sonores*), such as the *voces magicae*, in the Greek Magical Papyri worked in dialogue with other ritual elements (e.g., images and words) in transmitting diverse forms of knowledge. Michaël Martin (‘Parler la langue des oiseaux: les écritures «barbares» et mystérieuses des tablettes de défexion’) constructs a provisional typology of the kinds and uses of *noms barbares*, which are found on the *defixiones*. Finally, Athanassia Zografou (‘Les formules d’adjuration dans les Papyrus Grecs Magiques’) provides a detailed analysis of ὀρκίζεῖν (and its cognates) and the ὀρκίζω σε formula in the Greek Magical Papyri, examining the deities associated with adjurations and situating this phenomenon within the contexts of Jewish mysticism and Greek divine oaths. She demonstrates *inter alia* that, while ὀρκίζεῖν and cognates were used in exorcisms, they are found more frequently in appeals to supernatural entities in the Greek Magical Papyri.

These essays – both independently and collectively – usefully illuminate diverse conjunctions of magic, writing, and materiality. Also, the beautiful plates, indices, abstracts, and bibliography make this volume very user friendly.

Nevertheless, a few critical remarks are in order. For instance, although some of the studies (e.g., those of Martin Hernandez and Richter) engage with the relationship between magic and material supports, the volume would have benefited from a more synthetic essay (or discussion in the introduction) that frontally bridges the study of magic with scholarship in the history of the book (e.g., the work of Roger Chartier). As several of the studies illustrate, the cluster of objects we deem ‘magical’ deploy a wide range of textual formats on diverse media. How do such material supports work with the words on the page in order

to construct ritual efficacy? Conversely, how does 'magic' contribute to our understanding of the history of the book, reading, and scribal habits?

In addition, while the category 'magic' is the subject of discussion and critique in several essays (to varying degrees of sophistication), other scholarly constructs are insufficiently problematized. De Haro Sanchez and Carlig's clear-cut distinction between amulets and writing exercises is noteworthy in this regard. De Haro Sanchez and Carlig (in the tradition of T. de Bruyn and others) reasonably emphasize the need to take handwriting and material traits into consideration when identifying the primary functions of small biblical objects. Nonetheless, their analysis of amulets and writing exercises presuppose that these categories reflect completely separate phenomena in antiquity. In my estimation, this essay would have benefited from a more critical discussion of the relationship between these papyrological categories vis-à-vis ancient social existence, especially since they highlight the deep penetration of 'magic' into the quotidian experiences of late antique Egyptians («Dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine et byzantine, la magie fait partie du quotidien des habitants, qu'ils la pratiquent ou qu'ils côtoient ceux qui la pratiquent» [69]) and the difficulties endemic to identifying a particular object as an amulet or a writing exercise. In light of the fact that we are dealing with a social context in which *inter alia* demonic struggle and concerns for healing informed a wide range of practices and ideas, especially as it relates to the uses of the 'Bible', how should we conceive of the distinction between 'education' and 'magic' – and, by extension, writing exercises and amulets – as it pertains to small biblical manuscripts? Can we really assume that an ancient 'writing exercise' based on LXX Ps 90, which was cited (in part) on several Greek objects certainly used as amulets (e.g., PSI VI 719 and BKT VI 7.1) and whose contents deal with God's protection, was completely devoid of apotropaic significance for the scribe/student? Although some objects were created specifically to be suspended around the body for the purposes of protection, healing, etc. and others with the *primary* goal of writing practice, the complex dimensions of writing and biblical piety in late antique Egypt make it likely that many artifacts probably served both 'educational' and 'magical' functions simultaneously. Consequently, the strict dichotomy that de Haro Sanchez and Carlig impose onto these discursive domains limits the heuristic value of the criteria they establish and the persuasiveness of the conclusions they draw about specific examples (esp. P. Schøyen I 16). Of course, these scholars are by no means alone in erecting such clear-cut boundaries between the categories amulets and writing exercises. Nevertheless, an essay expressly devoted to amulets and writing exercises would have been an ideal venue for reflecting upon the extent to which the presumed 'separateness' of standard papyrological rubrics (e.g., amulet, devotional aid, and writing exercise) is framed by inherited Christian sensibilities and the outmoded distinctions between 'magic', 'religion', and 'science' of colonial thinkers, such as Sir James Frazer.

Furthermore, some of the individual conclusions presented in the essays are insufficiently grounded. For instance, Richter's study usefully draws attention to the relationship between 'markedness' and 'unmarkedness' in Coptic magic as it relates to 'writing styles' and 'intertextuality'. Yet, his contention about 'marked' and 'unmarked' dimensions of materiality requires more nuance. He argues

through a statistical analysis of the materials used in Coptic magic that, because papyrus and parchment were frequently deployed in magical (and non-magical) contexts, these materials were not 'marked' as 'magical'; however, this abstract, statistical argument conflates the categories 'common' (or 'shared') with 'generic' and does not take into consideration the explicit emphasis on papyrus ($\chi\alpha\rho\tau\eta\varsigma$) in select Coptic magical texts, such as Brit. Lib. Or. 5986 and Munich Coptic Papyrus 5. While it is reasonable to assume that, for many Coptic practitioners, papyrus and parchment were probably not 'marked' as magical, there are several Coptic texts that need to be investigated in greater detail before an all-encompassing statement about the '(un)markedness' of materiality is in order.

These criticisms notwithstanding, the editor should be congratulated for assembling a collection of interesting essays that will be valuable for scholars of ancient magic.

Munich

Joseph E. Sanzo

*

Jean Philopon, *Traité de l'Astrolabe*. Texte établi et traduit par **Claude Jarry**. Paris: Les Belles Lettres 2015. CLXXXVIII, 73 S. 47 €.

Der zwischen 520 und 540 n. Chr. in Alexandrien für Nicht-Fachleute (3,12) geschriebene didaktische Astrolab-Traktat des Philosophen und Theologen Johannes Philoponos, eines Schülers des Ammonios, gilt als der älteste erhaltene seiner Art und hat eine merkwürdige Editions-geschichte (Liste der Ausgaben und Übersetzungen CLXXXIIIf). Heinrich Hase (und nicht sein Vetter, der berühmte Byzantinist Karl Benedikt)¹ hatte sich in seiner *Editio princeps* im Rheinischen Museum (1838/39, Separatdruck 1839) nur auf drei Pariser Handschriften gestützt, im wesentlichen auf den Cod. Paris. suppl. gr. 55 aus dem 16. Jh.² Danach wurde die Beschäftigung mit diesem und verwandten Texten eine Do-

¹ Die Abkürzung der Vornamen «K.B.» (IX u.ö.) verweist irrtümlich auf Karl Benedikt bzw. Charles Benoît Hase (1780–1864, vgl. ADB 10, 1879, 525–527). Sie werden unbesehen aus der Edition von A.P. Segonds 113f übernommen. Dieser setzt sie als selbstverständlich voraus, obwohl er das Titelblatt des Separatdrucks selbst faksimiliert hat (Segonds 137): «editit H. Hase, marmorum Dresdensium regius custos». Es handelt sich um Heinrich Hase (1789–1842, vgl. NDB 8, 1969, 18f, ausführlicher im Internet). – K.B. Hase hat seinem Vetter H. Hase griechische Handschriften zugänglich gemacht, als dieser ihn 1817/1818 in Paris besuchte, vgl. K.A. von Hase, 'Unsre Hausherren. Geschichte der Familie Hase in vier Jahrhunderten', Leipzig 1898, 136. Segonds hat die von I. Ševčenko (1971) angeprangerten negativen Eigenschaften des älteren auf den jüngeren Vetter übertragen. Die Vermutung von P. Tannery (1888, 260), «que Hase aura cru inutile de copier lui-même le manuscrit A et aura laissé ce soin à quelqu'un à qui il croyait pouvoir se confier», könnte sich auf K.B. Hase beziehen, so daß dieser immerhin seine Hand im Spiel hatte. Der Autor hat den Irrtum von A.P. Segonds inzwischen bemerkt und seinen Fehler eingesehen: BMCR 2016.07.08 Anm. 1. Da er sich nur auf die unvollständige Biographie von H. Hase bezieht, verkennt er, daß H. Hase seinen Vetter tatsächlich in Paris besucht hat.

² Geschrieben von Konstantin Paleokappa. Die falsche Angabe IX,-4 «du XVII^e siècle» geht auf einen Irrtum von Hase zurück, vgl. A.P. Segonds (1981), 114f, dagegen richtig LXXXIII,7 und LXXX,7 «milieu du XVI^e siècle».