

Two Unpublished Magical Amulets in Ankara

Melih ARSLAN* – Yavuz YEĞİN** – Richard GORDON***

Introduction

From earliest times, the great majority of protective amulets (phylacteries) actually applied in the Graeco-Roman world, mainly for healing specific ailments but also for protection against unspecified dangers, were made of perishable or degradable substances such as herbs or animal-parts, which have not survived.¹ In the Archaic and Classical periods in Greece, however, some, especially those for pregnant or nursing women, children and other endangered groups such as sex-workers and epileptics, were made of durable substances, including shells, bone, leather, clay or glass beads, or metal.² The aim here was always implicit, its recognition depending upon the type of non-verbal consensus typically found in small-scale communities. At all times, however, ritualised utterances might be employed, by themselves or in addition to gestures, such as spitting into one's chest, for the same purpose to allay an immediate danger.³ With the hesitant spread of literacy in the Greek world, more formal ritualised utterances, such as the Getty hexameters, probably from Selinous (Sicily) and analogous documents from Himera and Epizeph-ryrian Locri, or the Phalasarna text from Crete, intended to protect groups, property or farms, might by the later fifth and fourth century BCE, even be inscribed on lead.⁴

* Melih Arslan, Classical Archaeologist-Numismatist, Hacı Bayram Veli University, Ankara (arslanmelih06@hotmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2152-1564>).

** Dr. Yavuz Yeğın, Ardahan University Department of Archaeology, Ardahan (yavuz.yegin002@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7901-6352>).

*** Prof. Dr. Richard Gordon, Max-Weber-Kolleg für kultur- und sozialwissenschaftliche Studien, Universität Erfurt, Postfach 90 02 21 99105 Erfurt (richard.gordon@uni-erfurt.de; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3129-0309>).

We would like to thank Yüksel Erimtan for permission to publish the Anguipede gem and Selma Ünal for her help. Y. Yeğın extends his thanks to Dr. Stephen Mitchell, Dr. Roy D. Kotansky, Dr. Philipp Pilhofer, Dr. Jaime Curbera and Humberto Deluigi for advice regarding the Greek inscriptions; R. Gordon thanks to Árpád Nagy for helpful comments. We also extend our gratitude to our student Oğuzhan Erdoğan for his help with Photoshop for the images we have used.

¹ Martini 1977; Scarborough 1986; Gaillard-Seux 1998a; Ducourthial 2003; Faraone 2010; Bonet 2014.

² Gaillard-Seux 1998b; Dasen 2003. Commonly employed substantives include: περίαμμα, περίαπτων, φυλακτήριον (first attested in the early Empire), προβασκάνιον, *amuletum*, *fascinum*/*-us*, *ligaturum* (post-Classical). The most usual way of referring to the social use of such objects, however, was by means of a verb, e.g. περιάπτω, προσδῶ, περιδεσμῶ/εύω, φέρω (especially of stones), (*ad*)*alligare* (often as a past participle passive), *affigere*, or simply *porto*, *habeo*, *gero* ... : Gordon 2019, 699. There have been attempts to distinguish between amulets and phylacteries, but the terms are used here as synonyms.

³ Faraone 2009.

⁴ Hexameters: Faraone – Obbink 2013; Himera: SEG 50, 2000, 1001; Locri: SEG 49, 1999, 1360; Phalasarna: SEG 42, 1992, 818 (mid-4th- mid-3rd cent. BCE). On the development of the Ephesia grammata, Bernabé Pajares 2013.

In the Hellenistic, but more especially the Roman period, however, new sources of information, increased personal wealth, especially in cities, and intensified craft-specialisation prompted extensive recourse, not merely to more durable substances, including valuable ones such as precious metals and semi-precious stones, but also to the use of writing as a means of defining intentions and amplifying claims.⁵ In other words, as C. A. Faraone has recently made clear, it was the media signifying the desire for protection that changed more or less radically in this period, mainly thanks to the spread of scriptural literacy and the desire to communicate the intention of such objects as a social act. A further development was a tendency to simplify rituals of protection, which the inscribed objects often simply replaced. Perhaps even more important than the mere increase in the media available was the development of more or less detailed written recipes, of the kind that survive in Pliny's *Natural History*, the Greek magical papyri, the *Lithika*-tradition, the *Cyranides*, or the late-antique medical writers, and their collection into compendia or collections, which served to communicate the relevant knowledge to an extent and with an accuracy rarely achieved in the world of Archaic and Classical cities and villages.⁶

C. A. Faraone's insistence on the interrelationship of materiality and literacy in driving the expansion of amuletic forms is extremely valuable. By implication, the need to acquire knowledge of a range of potential media and especially access to literacy played into the hands of ritual specialists, who found in this form of materiality an ideal means of signalling their superior expertise with regard to ritual communication with the other world. The production of textual phylacteries on precious metals such as gold and silver sheet is an excellent illustration of the experimental dynamism of such claims by such specialists,⁷ a development which at the same time offered wealthier clients an investment that fitted their own sense of their social status.⁸ Conceptually, however, we can distinguish the two trajectories. On the one hand, as we see from the impressive numbers of Christian textual amulets on papyrus and parchment, a tradition that continues well into the medieval period, the text, especially if already sanctioned elsewhere in the discursive field, might take decisive precedence over the material base.⁹ On the other, the materiality of the base may be accorded a major role in establishing the authority sought by a specific amuletic tradition.¹⁰ To these we may add a third form of communication, of major importance in the present context, the expressive use of iconography.

⁵ Faraone 2018; also Kotansky 1991.

⁶ On the *Lithika* literature, see Hopfner 1926; Halleux 1970-71; Nagy 2012, 85-87. Extracts from the text ascribed to Socrates and Dionysius, *Orphei lithika kai kerygmata*, are translated in Faraone 2018, 274-75. After the conquest of the Achaemenid Empire by Alexander, the Babylonian science of stones had a direct influence upon the Greek tradition of *Lithika*, through Sudines (*šum-iddin*) and Zachalias, and an indirect one thanks to the numerous 'Magian' books of *mirabilia* known to us mainly through Pliny *Hist. Nat.* 36: Halleux – Schamp 1985, xiii-xxxiv.

⁷ E.g. the development of the 'vanishing act' on amuletic gems (progressive subtraction of the letters of a magical name or word in order to indicate a visual imperative): Faraone 2013.

⁸ Kotansky 1994; Kotansky 2019.

⁹ De Bruyn 2010; De Bruyn 2017; medieval: Skemer 2006; Skemer 2015.

¹⁰ In general, see Frankfurter 2019; specifically, on amuletic stones: Zwierlein-Diehl 1992, 41-49; Mastrocinque 2011; Dasen – Nagy 2019, 410-411.

The tradition that most perfectly combines all three of these features is that of ‘magical amulets’, the tradition to which the two amulets here presented belong. This is an exclusively modern term defined structurally by material, shape and engraving, and formally by the co-presence of image, text and unrecoverable signs (*charaktères*).¹¹ The category is however polythetic, in as-much as one or two of these criteria may be absent: for example, the second case here concerns a gem that lacks an image but has appropriate structural features and two of the three formal criteria. In historical terms, the genre represents a fusion of the Hellenistic Greek glyptic tradition in jewellery, based on the intaglio, and the weighty tradition of amulet-production, largely for the protection of mummies, in Pharaonic Egypt.¹² The great majority of these amulets were intended to be worn on the body as ring-stones or as pendants. It is estimated that at least 5000, if not more, examples of this type of magical amulet are currently held in museums around the world.¹³ The tradition was clearly created in late-Hellenistic Egypt but reached its full development only in the second-third century CE, and evidently spread from there to glyptic centres in the eastern Mediterranean and perhaps also in the West.¹⁴ As far as one can tell from museum catalogues, which are not very reliable as regards true provenances (since the great majority of known examples have always derived from the antiquities market), relatively few such amulets have been found in the area of modern Turkey,¹⁵ although it is quite likely that many of the items that came onto the European antiquities market in the late nineteenth century actually derived from the illegal plundering of tombs in western Turkey at the time of the ‘Myrrhina craze’ of the 1880s. Generally speaking, the images engraved on the stones are of two types: traditional or semi-traditional Greek or Egyptian divine images, such as Zeus, Herakles, Aphrodite, Isis, Sarapis and Harpocrates, and new schemes that can sometimes be traced to Egyptian theological and astronomical sources.¹⁶ Major exceptions are the Anguipede scheme, as in the first case here, and the Mounted Rider motif, especially Solomon, which is evidently Judeo-Syrian, if ultimately based on a Classical Greek model.¹⁷ A major feature of the genre is its dynamic capacity for innovation and variation, drawing upon the transculturality of the contemporary magical tradition, with its various ‘dialects’.¹⁸ In the early days of learned study, in the Early Modern period, such amuletic gems were called ‘Basilidian’, for the Gnostic thinker Basilides, later ‘Gnos-

¹¹ Nagy 2012, 206-210; 2015, 87-91; Dasen – Nagy 2019, 407. *Charaktères* reject the limitation of script to a fixed set of forms (*signifiants*) but claim to retain a communicative intention, in that they supposedly forge a direct linguistic link with the Other World.

¹² Fusion: Zwierlein-Diehl 2007, 210-212; Egypt: Müller-Winkler 1987.

¹³ The best overview is now to be gained through The Campbell Bonner Gem Database (CBd): www2.szepmuveszeti.hu/talismans/, which currently carries almost 4800 gems with brief commentary.

¹⁴ A further well-known problem concerns post-antique efforts at continuing or amplifying the ancient tradition.

¹⁵ For example, the catalogue of the Yüksal Erimtan collection contains only two magical gems in our sense (Konuk – Arslan 2000, 190-91 nos. 166, 167 = CBd 1149, 1150), the thousands of Zeugma seals likewise only two (very unusually, so far as we know, used as seals): Önal 2010 = CBd 1573, 1574 (1574 is known from two impressions: Nagy 2019, 205, n. 183 with further references).

¹⁶ E.g. Bonner 1950; Nagy 2002a.

¹⁷ Cf. e.g. Philipp 1986; Zwierlein-Diehl 1992; Michel 2001; 2004; Mastrocinque 2014.

¹⁸ Nagy 2015, 214-215.

tic'; though there have been sporadic attempts to revive this term,¹⁹ it is adequate neither to the range of applications of these amulets nor to the diverse theological inspirations they draw upon.²⁰

The amulets

Both amulets published here are held by museum-collections in Ankara, but in neither case is the provenance known.²¹

1. *Anguipede amulet with invocation of the names of God on the reverse (Fig. 1)*

Erimtan Archeology and Arts Museum, Ankara.

Inv. No. 1232. Dimensions: 40 x 21 x 4 mm.

Material: Heliotrope (green jasper with red veining). Profile F4 (Henig-Whiting).

Original pendant setting in silver. On the reverse, a deep scratch partly obliterates the first letter of the inscription. Date: second or third century CE. Proposed no. in CBd: 4773.



Fig. 1

a) Obverse (Fig. 1a): Frontal view of the cock-headed Anguipede facing right and wearing a cuirass ('Muskelpanzer'), holding a long whip in his right hand, and shield in his left. The lower trunk is concealed by a tunic bearing military *ptyrges*, while the snake-legs incline in opposite directions.²² The shield is inscribed with the name *ia/w* (Ιάω), the god of Israel.²³ The figure is

¹⁹ Mastrocinque 2002; Mastrocinque 2004; Mastrocinque 2007 (more recently, however, he seems to have stopped using this term); Kotansky 2006, 69-70.

²⁰ Nagy 2012, 88-89; Dasen – Nagy 2019, 434-35.

²¹ Thanks are due to both museums for permission to publish these items and for providing the photos.

²² For a general description of the scheme and its variants, see Nagy 2019, 189-191.

surrounded by seven stars (the seven ancient planets), indicating heaven, and characterise the Anguipede as kosmokrator (master of the universe).²⁴ The cutting is relatively skilled and the details carefully delineated.

b) The reverse (Fig. 1b and 2) carries an inscription in Greek consisting simply, as so often, of three common names of the God of Israel, found in various combinations in such magical amulets:



[[E?]]ιάω,
Σαβαώ,
Ἄδωνή.

Fig. 2

The cutter has begun the list too far to the right and therefore had to squeeze the W of IAW into the corner. He seems also to have begun the word with an E (?), but then partly erased it.²⁵ Ἄδωνή for Ἄδωναῖ is excessively rare, found only, so far as we know, in Mastrocinque no. 214 (an astrological talisman), but cf. Delatte 1927, 474 l.26 Ἄδωναῖ (D. accents Ἄδωναῖ), from the 'Magical Treatise of Solomon' contained in *Cod. Par.* 2419 (f.218 verso), XV cent.

Commentary

a) Obverse. The origins of the Anguipede scheme have always provoked discussion. Almost two decades ago, Á. Nagy, combining a number of earlier suggestions, proposed that it is an iconic rebus (a pictogram) representing one name of the Hebrew god on the basis of the Hebrew stem *gbr*. Depending on the vowels inserted, this stem can mean a cockerel, the male body, a warrior, the (snake-legged) Giants, and the adjective mighty (*gvurah*), yielding the name The Mighty

²³ Another gem (brown glass) in the Yüksel Erimtan collection also shows the Anguipede with his shield inscribed IAΩ (CBd 1149). There are numerous examples of the shield carrying the same legend, see e.g. CBd nos. 42, 119, 587, 593, 594, 601, 620, 624, 841, 1201, 1368, 1947, 2336, 2475, 2477, 2481, 2545, 2738, 2742, 3146, 3486. No. 2735 (old engraving) has *ai/w/ai* in the shield, cf. 2742 (*aiw*); 119 (*iaew*); 3482 (*iawi*); 1734 and 2625 have *iaw* in the field round the Anguipede; 1647 has φρ/ηρ in the shield, i.e. Φρῆ, the later Greek name of the Egyptian sun-god Re (cf. Nagy 2019, 198). Nagy 2019, 193 found 161 examples of *iaw* written on the shield; CBd lists 197 examples of *iaw* on the shield, in the field or on the reverse of cock-headed Anguipede amulets.

²⁴ Cf. CBd 589, 993, 1453, 1758, 2477, 2740; 2475 and 3488 have just one star, 1369 two.

²⁵ The form EIAW is very occasionally found on magical amulets, e.g. CBd 415; EWAI: 2172, cf. PGM 13a 2 (Byzantine, Christian). Variations on the name, though not this one, are extremely common; Nagy 2019, 196 n. 112. The surviving traces do not however readily suggest any Greek letter, and the treatment of the surviving serif is noticeably different from any of the others in the text, however we explain the fact.

One (*ha-gyurah*).²⁶ This solution has been disputed,²⁷ but A. Nagy has recently published an important defence of his claim, based on a fairly complete statistical survey of the 708 examples in the Campbell-Bonner data-base, as against the 362 listed by S. Michel in 2004.²⁸ His explanation that the Anguipede represents the God of Israel can now surely be accepted as the most plausible account. Nevertheless, this does not necessarily mean that the scheme was not also capable of inspiring divergent individual evocations. The wide scatter of the 87 more-or-less-established provenances (only three examples, all of them late-antique, have certainly been found in Egypt) suggests that individual items may well have been produced all over the Empire wherever there was a glyptic workshop.²⁹ In only 54 cases does the specialist indicate the intended purpose of the amulet, sometimes for healing but also for many others.

b) Reverse. The writing on the reverse comprises three names of the God of Israel: Ἰάω (Iaô = Yahweh/Yahuda); Σαβαώ (= Sabaô(th)), Ἀδωναῖ (=Adônai). A fair minority (67) of Anguipede amulets carry just the iconographic scheme and the names of God, as here.³⁰ We can find no parallel among them to this collocation on the reverse. In the few cases in which all three names appear on Anguipede gems, they are found in the field of the obverse,³¹ accompanied by other names such as Abrasax or Semesilamp(s),³² or they are distributed between the field on the obverse and the reverse, or a combination of these.³³ The identical grouping to our case on the reverse is however found on a very small number of other types, and also occurs in the magical papyri, though again often complemented by other names, especially Abrasax.³⁴

2. Chalcedony amulet requesting protection from danger (Fig. 3)

Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara.

Inv. 35-301-97. Dimensions: 42 x 37 x 4 mm.

Material: brownish-yellow chalcedony (cf. CBd 1712). Profile A4 (Henig-Whiting).

Date: second or third century CE. Slight irregularities on the rim where the stone was removed from its setting.

²⁶ Nagy 2002b.

²⁷ E.g. by Bohak 2008, 197-198.

²⁸ Nagy 2019; Michel 2004, 239-249 + others mentioned elsewhere.

²⁹ Nagy 2019, 203-207. Twenty-six of them (23%) were found in the Judeo-Syrian area.

³⁰ Nagy 2019, 200.

³¹ CBd 605: Adwnai, Iaw, Sabawθ.

³² E.g. CBd 587 (field: *Iaw*, Σαβαωουο; rev. *Adwnai*; *Semesilamps*); 3488 (this order, but Michael and the seven vowels added).

³³ CBd 594 (field: *Iaw*, *Sabaw*; rev. *Abrasax*; *Adwnai*).

³⁴ CBd 414; 1831; PGM IV 1485; VIII 96, also 'Christian': 21.29; complemented: e.g. PGM III 76, VII 220-21; XII 285; XXXVI 350.



Fig. 3

The obverse contains six lines of Greek and an additional line containing three rather unimagi-
native *charaktêres*.

There are at least two possible ways of resolving this text:

- 1) Γαῖα (καὶ οὐ τε) Ἡ(λιος), σῴσατε ἀπὸ παντὸς κινδύνου Δῖο/ν ὃν ἔτεκε/ν Χρυσήϊς,
tr. “Earth and sun (?), save from all danger Dion whom Chryseis bore”, or
- 2) Γαῖα {η} σῴσατε ἀπὸ παντὸς κινδύνου Δῖο/ν ὃν ἔτεκε/ν Χρυσήϊς,
“Earth, save (pl.) Dion son of Chryseis from every danger”.

As regards the final ‘letter’ of l. 3, the photo makes clear that the supposed I is not a mistake or even a letter, since it is too far away from the preceding K to be considered as such, and not properly aligned. It is rather to be understood as damage caused by the gouging of the stone out of the ring that once held it, or as a slip of the wheel. It would therefore be best not to print {ι} in the text but ignore it.

Commentary

Ll. 1-2: The first two lines present several difficulties. An appeal to Earth in a protective amulet would be extremely unusual. Jaime Curbera suggested (pers. comm.) to one of the authors that the following H might stand for Ἡλιε. This would be more convincing if one could cite parallels both for such an abbreviation and for the omission of καὶ or τε. On the other hand, the suggestion does raise the possibility that the appeal is based on oath- or asseverative formulae, which often combine sun and earth,³⁵ especially in appeals for justice in Asia Minor.³⁶ We might therefore have an interesting case of personal re-appropriation of a well-known invocatory scheme into another context. Even a reference to Earth alone might hint at such a local re-appro-

³⁵ E.g. *Iliad* 3, 276-78, 19, 258-59; Aesch. *Supp.* 890-94; *Sept.* 16-20; Eur. *Hipp.* 601; *Electr.* 867; IG II/III² 12568/9 (Athens, 160-175 CE); E. Bernard, *I. métriques de l'Égypte* (1969) 175. 9-10.

³⁶ Cf. already Cumont 1923; Nilsson 1962, 508-509 etc.

priation.³⁷ Note the predominantly poetic form Gaia, attested by numerous verse funeraries, but unusual in normal invocatory contexts.³⁸ Note however that the P in Χρυσήϊς (l.6) is quite similar to the first letter of the text, which likewise has a small transverse bar at the angle of the Γ.³⁹

The great advantage of reading (καὶ) Ἡ(λιε), however, is that it would explain the plural form σώσατε. An alternative hypothesis runs as follows. It seems clear from the very poor mise-en-page that the cutter was either illiterate or knew virtually no Greek, and must have been copying from a text, presumably written out in a single line in front of him, so that he had to decide himself on the word-division. Given the word σώσατε, this original text must have appealed to at least two deities. Because the surface available here was so small and the cutter was using the wheel ('Flachperlzeiger'), it was necessary for this commission to shorten the text. The supervisor of the workshop erased part of the original text, but unfortunately forgot both to erase H and to change σ|ώσατε to σώσον. The H might thus originally have been the first letter of an alternative name of Gaia (ἦ καὶ ...), or of Ἡλιε followed by the name of another divinity common in such contexts, such as Selene, Ouranos, rivers or water-sources.⁴⁰

Ll. 2-4: A further hint at a written antigraph is the manner in which the wish for protection is expressed, which recalls e.g. the recipe/amulet P.Mich. inv. 193 = PGrMag LXXI.6-8: ... φύλαξόν μοι ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ πράγματος, ὃν ἔτεκεν ἡ δῖνα.

As for the reference to protection from danger, the text seems to imply a deliberate syncopation of a fuller catalogue of wishes, such as that found in *Cyranides* 1.7 ll. 115-20, extolling the efficacy of amulets based on the plant *érryngos* or *érrungion* in ensuring success and protection: ὁ γὰρ φορῶν τοῦτο τὸ φυλακτήριον ἔξει ἀγαθὰ ὅσα οὐ προσδοκᾷ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἔσται ἔντιμος πανταχοῦ, νικῶν ἐν πᾶσιν ἔργοις καὶ λόγοις, ῥυόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς κινδύνου καὶ δαιμόνων καὶ φαρμακείας καὶ πάσης κακουργίας, καὶ ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν, πάντα τὰ κακὰ ἀποστρέφει, πάντα δὲ τὰ ἀγαθὰ προξενεῖ. Another verbal parallel is offered by [Hipp.] Ἑρμηνεία, Lex. 1: ... καὶ φυλακτήριον ἔστιν παντὸς κακοῦ, κινδύνου, πολέμου, θαλάττης, μαγιῶν. The 'Orphic' *Lith. kerygm.* 20.19-23 offers a similar promise: Ἐκ τε γὰρ πολεμίων καὶ μάχης ἀβλαβῆ τὸν φοροῦντα διαφυλάττεσθαι καὶ μακρὰν δέ τινα κατ' ἔρημον στελλομένῃ πορείαν, καὶ φυλακτήριον εἶναι καὶ παντὸς κακοῦ ἀποτρόπαιον, καὶ κινδύνους δὲ διαδιδράσκει ληστῶν. Analogous formulae in the Graeco-Egyptian formularies are almost always directed against malign spirits or their manifestations; general protection against danger seems to be characteristic rather of the lithic tradition.

Ll. 4-6: The name Dios is common in central and eastern Asia Minor (LGPN Vc, 122). Chryseis, derived from the Greek word for gold, occurs on an inscription from Neoclaudiopolis in Paph-

³⁷ CBd lists no magical amulet addressed to Gê or Gaia, and Gaia is never invoked in the extant magical papyri.

³⁸ Cf. the Athenian cult of Gê Themis (*IG* II/III² 5130.9-10); more loosely, Diod. Sic. 3.2.1; Plut. *Quaest. conviv.* 704b9-10.

³⁹ This might justify reading Παῖα, which would turn the text into an invocation of Rhea/Mêter, who is addressed in *Hymn. Orph.* 14.12-14 as σωτήριος, and asked to ensure the votaries' prosperity and protect them from illness. Preisendanz' Index indeed lists Ποιή as a divine name, but the text at *PGM* VII 385 prints προηη as a vox magica. We therefore doubt that this reading can be admitted here.

⁴⁰ Cf. Nilsson 1967, 141-142.

lagonia (LGPN Vc, 451). It of course alludes to the daughter of Chryses in the Iliad, who was taken as part of his booty by Agamemnon.⁴¹

Ll. 5-6: The specification of the client's mother is a clear reference to a standard practice of Graeco-Egyptian magic. Even though the address to Gaia implies a quite different, non-Egyptian religious context, the author of the text, both by using this device and by resort to the (banal) *charaktères*, has tried to increase the illocutionary force of the amulet, no doubt to compensate for the fact that there is no image on what might have been the recto, either because the client could not afford to pay more or because the workshop disposed of no appropriate model designs.

L. 7: The *charaktères*.

The second and third of these are among the most frequent forms of these signs.⁴² Δ is rather less common but still among the 32 basal signs in this system. Magical amulets carrying only *charaktères* (excluding Chnoubis-signs and KKK) on one face are not uncommon, but are outnumbered by combinations of *voces* and *charaktères* (or vowel signs).⁴³ But a mere set of three common items suggests that the composer of this amulet was no great expert.

Conclusion

The two magical amulets published here constitute a small addition to the rather small number of such items known to have originated in Roman Asia Minor, even though the precise provenances are not known for certain. The Anguipede heliotrope, though a fine example, is not in itself very significant, since it belongs to by far the largest single type of these amuletic gems. The aniconic chalcedony, on the other hand, despite its poor handling and mise-en-page, is more interesting, in that it apparently appeals to a poetic Gaia not otherwise known as a mighty protector from danger, except in cases of distress, where invocations usually also appeal to a range of other 'elemental' deities - a tradition that is, as Franz Cumont pointed out, rather well evidenced in Asia Minor - and seems to belong to a tradition of appeals for help against danger known not from the magical papyri but from the Lithic tradition represented especially by the *Cyranides*. At the same time, the authors attempted to gain further authority by displaying awareness of the Graeco-Egyptian magical tradition identifying individuals by the mother rather than, as in the real world, the father.

⁴¹ Iliad 1.369, 439 etc.

⁴² Gordon 2014, 257-272.

⁴³ A small selection: CBd 58, 105, 338, 363, 389, 816, 975, 3928, 4017. The incidence of these in museum collections varies directly in proportion to the interest in these signs of the original collectors. On the Chnoubis type, see Dasen – Nagy 2014.

Bibliography

- Bernabé Pajares 2013 A. Bernabé Pajares, *The Ephesia Grammata*: Genesis of a magical formula, in: C. A. Faraone – D. Obbink (eds.), *The Getty Hexameters: Poetry, Magic and Mystery in Ancient Selinous*, Oxford 2013, 71-95.
- Bohak 2008 G. Bohak, *Ancient Jewish Magic*, Cambridge 2008.
- Bonet 2014 V. Bonet, *La pharmacopée végétale dans l'œuvre de Pline l'Ancien* (Coll. Latomus 346), Brussels 2014.
- Bonner 1950 C. Bonner, *Studies in Magical Amulets, chiefly Graeco-Egyptian* (Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series 49), Ann Arbor 1950.
- Cumont 1923 F. Cumont, *Il Sole vindice dei delitti ed il simbolo delle mani alzate*, *Memorie della Pontificia Accademia romana di Archeologia*, ser. 1, 1923, 65-80.
- Dasen 2003 V. Dasen, *Les amulettes d'enfants dans le monde gréco-latin*, *Latomus* 62/2, 2003, 275-289.
- Dasen – Nagy 2014 V. Dasen – Á. M. Nagy, *Le serpent léontocéphale Chnoubis et la magie de l'époque romaine impériale*, *Anthropozoologica* 47.1, 2014, 291-314.
- Dasen – Nagy 2019 V. Dasen – Á. M. Nagy, *Gems*, in: D. Frankfurter (ed.), *Guide to the Study of Ancient Magic* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 189), Leiden 2019, 416-455.
- De Bruyn 2010 T. S. De Bruyn, *Papyri, parchments, ostraca and tablets written with Biblical texts in Greek and used as amulets: A preliminary list*, in: T. J. Kraus – T. Niklas (eds.), *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approaches* (Texts and Studies for New Testament Study), Leiden 2010, 145-189.
- De Bruyn 2017 T. S. De Bruyn, *Making Amulets Christian: Artefacts, Scribes, and Contexts*, Oxford 2017.
- Delatte 1927 A. Delatte, *Anecdota Atheniensiâ 1: Textes grecques inédits relatifs à l'histoire des religions* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège [sic] 36), Liège-Paris 1927.
- Ducourthial 2003 G. Ducourthial, *Flore magique et astrologique de l'Antiquité*, Paris 2003.
- Faraone 2009 C. A. Faraone, *Stopping evil, pain, anger and blood: The Ancient Greek tradition of protective iambic incantations*, *GRBS* 49, 2009, 227-255.
- Faraone 2010 C. A. Faraone, *A Socratic Leaf-Charms for Headache* (*Charmides* 155B-157C), *Orphic Gold Leaves*, and the Ancient Greek Tradition of Leaf Amulets, in: J. H. F. Dijkstra – J. E. A. Kroesen – Y. B. Kuiper (eds.), *Myths, Martyrs and Modernity: Studies in the History of Religions in honour of Jan N. Bremmer* (Numen Supplement 127), Leiden 2010, 145-166.
- Faraone 2013 C. A. Faraone, *Vanishing acts: Deletio morbi as speech act and visual*

- design on ancient Greek amulets. *Bulletin of the Institute for Classical Studies* (Suppl. 115), London 2013.
- Faraone 2018 C. A. Faraone, *The Transformation of Greek Amulets in Roman Imperial Times*, Philadelphia 2018.
- Faraone – Obbink 2013 C. A. Faraone – D. Obbink, *The Getty Hexameters: Poetry, Magic and Mystery in Ancient Selinous*, Oxford 2013.
- Frankfurter 2019 D. Frankfurter, Magic and the Forces of Materiality, in: D. Frankfurter (ed.), *Guide to the Study of Ancient Magic (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 189)*, Leiden 2019, 659-677.
- Gaillard-Seux 1998a P. Gaillard-Seux, À propos des livres XXVIII-XXIX-XXX de l'histoire naturelle de Pline l'Ancien, *Latomus* 57.3, 1998, 625-633.
- Gaillard-Seux 1998b P. Gaillard-Seux, Les amulettes gynécologiques dans les textes latins médicaux de l'Antiquité, in: C. Deroux (ed.), *Maladie et maladies dans les textes latins antiques et médiévaux. Actes du V^e Colloque International «Textes médicaux latins» (Bruxelles, 4-6 septembre 1995)* (Collection Latomus 242), Brussels 1998, 70-84.
- Gordon 2014 R. L. Gordon, *Charaktères* between Antiquity and Renaissance: Transmission and Re-invention, in: V. Dasen – J.-M. Spieser (eds.), *Les savoirs magiques et leur transmission de l'Antiquité à la Renaissance. Colloque Fribourg 17-19 mars 2011 (Micrologus' Library 60)*, Florence 2014, 253-300.
- Gordon 2019 R. L. Gordon, Amulets in the Roman empire: The *longue durée* of a Diversified Knowledge-Practice, *JRA* 32, 2019, 698-703.
- Halleux 1970-71 R. Halleux, Fécondité des mines et sexualité des pierres dans l'antiquité, *Revue Belge de Philologie* 48, 1970-71, 16-25.
- Halleux – Schamp 1985 R. Halleux – J. Schamp (ed.), *Les lapidaires grecs: Lapidaire orphique; Kérygmes lapidaires d'Orphée; Socrates et Denys; Lapidaire nautique; Damigéron-Évax* (Collection Budé), Paris 1985, (Repr. 2003).
- Hopfner 1926 T. Hopfner, s.v. Λιθικά, *RE* 13, 1926, 747-769.
- Kotansky 1991 R. D. Kotansky, Incantations and prayers for salvation on inscribed Greek amulets, in: C. A. Faraone – D. Obbink (eds.), *Magika hiera: Greek magic and Religion*, New York 1991, 107-137.
- Kotansky 1994 R. D. Kotansky, *Greek Magical Amulets: The inscribed gold, silver, copper and bronze lamellae, 1: Published texts of known provenance. Text and commentary (Papyrologica Coloniensia 22.1)*, Opladen 1994.
- Kotansky 2006 R. D. Kotansky, s.v. Amulets, in: W. J. Hanegraaff (ed.), *Dictionary of Gnosis and Western Esotericism*, Leiden 2006, 60-71.
- Kotansky 2019 R. D. Kotansky, Textual Amulets and Writing Traditions in the Ancient World, in: D. Frankfurter (ed.), *Guide to the Study of Ancient Magic (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 189)*, Leiden

- 2019, 507-554.
- Konuk – Arslan 2000 K. Konuk – M. Arslan, *Ancient Gems and Finger-Rings from Asia Minor: The Yüksal Erimtan Collection*, Ankara 2000.
- Martini 1977 M. C. Martini, *Piante medicamentose e rituali magico-religiosi in Plinio*, Rome 1977.
- Mastrocinque 2002 A. Mastrocinque (ed.), *Gemme gnostiche e cultura ellenistica*, Bologna: Pátron, 2002.
- Mastrocinque 2004 A. Mastrocinque (ed.), *Sylloge gemmarum gnosticarum*, 1. *Bollettino di Numismatica (Monografia 8.2.1)*, Rome 2004.
- Mastrocinque 2007 A. Mastrocinque (ed.), *Sylloge gemmarum gnosticarum*, 2. *Bollettino di Numismatica (Monografia 8.2.2)*, Rome 2007.
- Mastrocinque 2011 A. Mastrocinque, *The Colours of Magical Gems*, in: C. Entwistle – N. Adams (eds.), *‘And These the Gems of Heaven’: Recent Research on Engraved Gemstones in Late Antiquity*, London 2011, 62-68.
- Mastrocinque 2014 A. Mastrocinque, *Les intailles magiques du département des Monnaies, Médailles et Antiques*, Paris 2014.
- Michel 2001 S. Michel, *Die magischen Gemmen im Britischen Museum*, 2 vols., London 2001.
- Michel 2004 S. Michel, *Die magischen Gemmen*, Berlin 2004.
- Müller-Winkler 1987 C. Müller-Winkler, *Die ägyptischen Objekt-Amulette (Orbis Biblicus Orientalis, ser. arch. 5)*, Freiburg- Fribourg 1987.
- Nagy 2002a Á. M. Nagy, *Gemmae magicae selectae. Sept notes sur l'interprétation des gemmes magiques*, in: A. Mastrocinque (ed.), *Gemme gnostiche e cultura ellenistica*, Bologna 2002, 153-179.
- Nagy 2002b Á. M. Nagy, *Figuring out the Anguipede ('snake-legged god') and his relation to Judaism*, *JRA* 15, 2002, 159-172.
- Nagy 2012 Á. M. Nagy, *Daktylios pharmakites: Magic healing gems and rings in the Graeco-Roman world*, in: I. Csepregi – C. Burnett (eds.), *Ritual Healing Magic, Ritual and Medical Therapy from Antiquity until the Early Modern Period (Micrologus Library 48)*, Florence 2012, 71-106.
- Nagy 2015 Á. M. Nagy, *Engineering Ancient Amulets: Magical Gems in the Roman Imperial Period*, in: D. Boschung – J. N. Bremmer (eds.), *The Materiality of Magic*, Paderborn 2015, 205-240.
- Nagy 2019 Á. M. Nagy, *Figuring out the Anguipes gems, bis: A statistical overview*, in: K. Endreffy – Á. M. Nagy – J. Spier (eds.), *Magical Gems in their Context: Proceedings of the International Workshop held at the Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest, 16-18 February 2012 (Studia Archaeologica 229)*, Rome 2019, 179-216.
- Nilsson 1962 M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 2², Munich 1962.
- Nilsson 1967 M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 1³, Munich 1967.
- Önal 2010 M. Önal, *Deities and cultures meet on the seal-impressions in Zeug-*

- ma (Bollettino di Archeologia Online), Rome 2010.
- Philipp 1986 H. Philipp, *Mira et Magica: Gemmen im Ägyptischen Museum der staatlichen Museen (Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Schloß Charlottenburg)*, Mainz 1986.
- Scarborough 1986 J. Scarborough, *Pharmacy in Pliny's Natural History: Some Observations on Substances and Sources*, in: R. French – F. Greenaway (eds.), *Science in the Early Roman Empire: Pliny the Elder, his Sources and Influence*, London 1986) 59-85. Repr. in Scarborough 2010 no. 9.
- Scarborough 2010 J. Scarborough, *Pharmacy and Drug Lore in Antiquity: Greece, Rome and Byzantium (Variorum Collected Studies CS904)*, Aldershot 2010.
- Skemer 2006 D. C. Skemer, *Binding Words: Textual Amulets in the Middle Ages*, University Park PA 2006.
- Skemer 2015 D. C. Skemer, *Magic Writ: Textual Amulets worn on the Body for Protection*, in: A. Kehmel – D. Panagiotopoulos (eds.), *Schriftträger-Textträger: Zur materialen Präsenz des Geschriebenes in frühen Gesellschaften. Internationales Kolloquium Textträger – Schriftträger (Materiale Textkulturen [Schriftenreihe des SFB 933] 6)*, Heidelberg 2010, Berlin 2015, 127-150.
- Zwierlein-Diehl 1992 E. Zwierlein-Diehl, *Magische Amulette und andere Gemmen des Instituts für Altertumskunde der Universität zu Köln (Papyrologica Coloniensia 20)*, Opladen 1992.
- Zwierlein-Diehl 2007 E. Zwierlein-Diehl, *Antike Gemmen und ihr Nachleben*, Berlin 2007.

Ankara'dan Yayınlanmamış İki Sihirli Amulet

Öz

C. A. Faraone'nin muskalar üzerine son dönemlerde yaptığı çalışmalar bu tür eserlerin Yunan ve Roma Dönemlerinde hem kişileri hem de grupları çeşitli kötülöklere karşı korumadaki stratejik önemini işaret etmektedir. Yarı değerli taşlar üzerine kazılan ve kültürler arası güç gösterisini de vurgulama amacı taşıyan bu sihirli imgeler öncelikli olarak Geç Hellenistik Dönem Mısır'ında ortaya çıksa da asıl güçlü yayılımını Doğu Akdeniz dünyasında Roma Dönemi'nde kazanmıştır. Bu çalışmada biri Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi'nde diğeri ise Erimtan Arkeoloji ve Sanat Müzesi'nde yer alan iki sihirli amulet ele alınmaktadır. Birinci örneğin ön yüzünde literatürde horoz kafalı Anguipede olarak adlandırılan figürün iyi bir örneği bulunur. Aynı nesnenin arka yüzünde ise bu eserlerde sıklıkla karşılaşılan Yahudi tanrılarının üç ismi bulunur: "Tao, Sabao, Adonai". İkinci amulet herhangi bir ikonografi sunmamakla birlikte içerik olarak ilginç bir Yunanca yazıtı sahiptir: "Yeryüzü ve güneş (?), Chryseis'in dünyaya getirdiği Dion'u tüm tehlikeden korusunlar". Söz konusu yazıt üç sihirli karakter ile sonlanmaktadır. Yazıt, tanrıça Gaia'nın bu nesneyi taşıyan kişiyi kötülöklere korumasına vurgu yapmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın iki önemli amacı bulunmaktadır. Bunlardan biri A. M. Nagy tarafından organize edilen Campbell Bonner Database'nin dijital veri tabanına önemli bir katkı sunmaktır. Aynı zamanda söz konusu amuletlerin Türkiye'de daha fazla tanınmasına katkı sağlamaktır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Muska, Sihirli Gemler, Anguipede (Abraxas), Gaia, Roma Dönemi.

Two Unpublished Magical Amulets in Ankara**Abstract**

The recent synthesis of Roman-period amulets by C. A. Faraone has highlighted the significance of such artefacts in strategies of personal and group protection and healing throughout Greek and Roman antiquity. A specific group of such amulets, on semi-precious stones engraved with images, intercultural words of power, and special signs, was created in late-Hellenistic Egypt, but spread into the eastern Mediterranean mainly in the Roman period. This paper publishes two such magical amulets, one in the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations and the other in the Erimtan Museum of Archaeology and Art, both in Ankara. The first carries a fine example of the cock-headed Anguipede figure on the obverse, and, on the reverse, three of the Judaic names of God most commonly found on amulets in this tradition. The second gem offers no iconography but an interesting Greek inscription, followed by three special signs, appealing to the goddess Gaia (Earth) to protect the wearer. The paper has two main aims: to contribute to the aim of completing the digital Campbell Bonner Magical Gems database, organised by Á.M. Nagy in Budapest, which has taken the study of these gems to a new level, and to make these amuletic gems better known in Turkey.

Keywords: Amulet, Magical Gems, Anguipede (Abraxas), Gaia, Roman Period.