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THREE TEXTS FROM LOKROI EPIZEPHYRIOI

Felice Costabile has put us into his debt by producing, in his recently founded *Minima Epigraphica et Papyrologica*, editions of four texts inscribed on lead, *Defixiones* da Locri Epizefiri: nuovi dati sui culti, sulla storia e sulle istituzioni (2 [1999] 23–77). It is his Nos. 1–3, which he presents for the first time, that concern us here. They are all quite important, for reasons not stated in the publication. (The editions are from photographs rather than autopsies, and dimensions of the inscriptions were not available.)

1. An Archaic Inscription

The first (24–29), from the area known as Centocamere, has a one-line text in archaic letters, which Prof. Costabile prints as [---]ελ Θαιβαβα and assigns, on the basis of the letter forms, to the 6th century. He remarks (24f.) that one cannot be certain whether the tablet is actually a *defixio*. Despite the lack of recorded dimensions, he observes that the photograph has a cloth background that allows an estimate of c. 6 x 6 cm for the tablet and c. 2 cm for the height of the letters themselves, which would be rather large, therefore, in relation to those of *defixiones*. I myself would consider the tablet to be a label of some kind, its letters, especially if the estimate of the size is correct, probably intended for other than private reading.

As for the ending -ελ, given the archaic date of the inscription, ε could have the value η, as Prof. Costabile notes, citing the Ερβηλ of *SupplMag* II 58.3 as an example of a word in -ηλ in a magical text. This last is an ostracon from Egyptian Thebes of the 4th or 5th century of our era, on which Ερβηλ occurs in an invocation of Yahweh: Ιαω Ερβηλ ιο Πακερβηης, with Ιαω Σεβασαθ Αθονει Απρααξις a few lines below it. The ending -ηλ is in fact a feature of magical texts that are much later than our Lokrian inscription, and in them it is part of an angelic or other divine Hebrew name (*e.g.* Μιχαηλ, Ιανηλ). In an archaic Greek text, -ελ with this significance would be remarkable.

Can the transcription be correct?

Fig. 1: New lead tablet (my tracing) Fig. 2: Terracotta sherd from Lokroi Epizephyrioi Fig. 3: Terracotta sherd from Sardis

The published photograph yields the tracing shown here (Fig. 1) and allows a readingἘν Θαιβαβα, without anything necessarily lost at the left- or right-hand edge. The shape of Θ is uncommon: one expects the usual circle but with a tail rather than a bisecting vertical, but the surrounding letters guarantee the reading. An early cult of Kybele at Lokroi Epizephyrioi is known from a graffito (Fig. 2),

---

1 I am grateful to Prof. Costabile for sending me the first two volumes of the journal, and I know that readers will join me in wishing the enterprise every success. The journal is distributed by “L’Erma” di Bretschneider, Via Cassiodoro 19, I–00193 Rome.

2 In my own tracings here and below, dotted lines are those that I cannot be sure I see. They are not restorations.

Of the second text (29–42) we have seven fragments (a–g), also from Centocammere, inscribed in a 4th-century hand.9 Prof. Costabile notes that a and b join and contain a phrase much like one inscribed on two 4th-century lead tablets, from Phalasarna in Crete and from Selinous in Sicily,10 and that g has the

4 For the dating, based on that of Corinthian pottery among which it was found, see J. de la Genière, De la Phrygie à Locres Épizéphyrienne: les chemins de Cybèle, MEFRA 97 (1985) 693–718, p. 694.
6 EPRO 50 (Leiden 1977–89).
7 Supra n. 4.
9 The writer’s treatment of the letter O is of palaeographical interest. As is normal on soft metal tablets and papyri, O is made with two basically downward, curled strokes, concave towards one another, usually touching and sometimes crossing one another at the extremities. From the excellent photographs we can see that when the strokes overlap, it is the left-hand stroke that breaks through the right, displacing the lead indentation; in other words, here it is the right-hand stroke that is made first. Prof. Costabile’s enlarged photograph of g (38) splendidly illustrates this displacement of the right-hand stroke by the left. I have not been able to show this in the tracings, but we can see a hint of it in the O of COI in b 3: after making the right-hand stroke the scribe, without lifting the stylus, moves it back up to the top of the letter to make the left. So too in the O’s of CAITOYYA in b 7: in each it is the left-hand stroke that is extended towards the beginning of the next letter. I cannot accept Prof. Costabile’s assumption (32) of different hands and divergent dates for the fragments: “Paleograficamente i frammenti a,b,c possono ascriversi al V secolo per la presenza del kappa e per l’assenza delle vocali lunghe eta ed omega, rese con E ed O. Il kappa mi sembrerebbe tuttavia un attardamento e tenderei a datare i tesi e iscrizioni attorno alla metà del V secolo, se non perfino nella seconda metà. La grafia assai più evoluta ed il sigma a quattro tratti (Σ) escludono comunque un’attribuzione al VI secolo, proponibile invece per l’iscrizione precedente. Il fr. d potrebbe essere un po’ più tardo ed ascriversi al V–IV secolo. I fr. e,g sono di età ellenistica e comunque non anteriori al IV secolo.” The letter that Prof. Costabile would read as Ω I myself would read as O, its shape that of the O of COI mentioned above, although it may be O or I, one corrected from the other. But even if the letter is in fact Ω, its context, αΟη after an intralinear dash (infra p. 5), need not imply anything archaic, for here it may be a numeral: αΟη = 291.
10 Phalasarna: E. Ziebarth, Neue attische Fluchtafeln, NachrGött (1899) 105–31, no. 1; R. Wünsch, Neue Fluchtafeln, RhM 55 (1900) 62–85, pp. 73–85, though based on Ziebarth’s inaccurate transcription, is useful for the establishment and understanding of the text. See my The inscribed lead tablet from Phalasarna, ZPE 94 (1992) 191–94, and C. Brixhe and A. Panayotou, Le plomb magique de Phalasarna 1C II–XIX 7, Hellenika Symmikta. Histoire, linguistique, épigraphie 2 (= Études d’archéologie classique 8) (1995) 23–38, for later bibliography and for two independent editions, from autopsy. Both editions include line-drawings. Those of Brixhe and Panayotou are larger and are reproduced more clearly than mine, but the Selinuntine parallels show that there is less space between their fragments III and IV than they assume; this affects the
word ὀξιο[τ], which is also in those texts. He concludes that the text of his fragments belongs to the same type of composition. He considers those two tablets, and therefore the fragments, however, to be defixiones. These they are not, in any usual sense of the word: the texts of the two tablets consist of ἐφωδαῖ, here basically hexametric verses, many of them obscure, that refer to mystical bliss and end in promises of protection from magic.\(^\text{11}\) At least five of the new fragments, as I shall show here, come from a poem (or poems) with verses like those preserved on the lead tablets from Phalasarna and Selinous.\(^\text{12}\) Whether such texts were part of communal ceremonies or were used by individuals as protective devices, for the diffusion of such ancient ἐφωδαῖ the new Lokrian fragments constitute the most important epigraphical evidence to come to light in many years.

The text as published (32f.):\(^\text{13}\)

First I give my own tracings and transcriptions, from the published photographs, of the individual fragments. Again, the dimensions go unrecorded in the publication; it is unfortunate, therefore, that for the photographs, which appear at different magnifications, the printed scales, when included, are all, misleadingly, of the same size. I have not succeeded in bringing the tracings into any uniform magnification. The line numbers for the placed fragments are those of the inscription that I reconstruct (infra p. 100).


\(^{12}\) It is of interest that excavations of the sanctuary of Malophoros at Selinous have yielded numerous female votive terracotta figurines, many evidently imported from Lokroi Epizephyroi: see G. Zuntz, Persephone. Three essays on religion and thought in Magna Graecia (Oxford 1971) 173–77; Kingsley, op.cit. (supra n. 10) 271.

\(^{13}\) P. 33: “Con i segni ò Ò si indica l’interlinea con il rigo superiore. Il segno – indica il segmento paleograficamente usato con valore magico di troncamento (paragraphos rettilinea).”
The placed fragments:

```
| 2 | ἔτεκε | ἀμφικτίονα| ῥήματος |
| 3 | ἱτικό- — ἀπόκ | αποθεώυον |  
| 4 | ἱ | ἡμετρεῖον — ἱστορίαν |
| 5 | ἵ | ἦμαικον ἄρηκτος |
| 6 | ἱ | ἀποθεύον | ἴστονερ |
| 7 | ἱ | ἱκανὸν | ὑποτοῦν | |
| 8 | ἦ | ἐνθεὼμ | ἔμμαθε |
| 9 | — — — — |
```

Fig. 4. f, c+a+b

The unplaced fragments:

```
| 1 | [ἐτεροκ] |
| 2 | [ἐτεροκ] |
| 3 | [ἐτεροκ] |
| 4 | [ἐτεροκ] |
| 5 | [ἐτεροκ] |
| 6 | [ἐτεροκ] |
| 7 | [ἐτεροκ] |
| 8 | [ἐτεροκ] |
```

Fig. 6: d

```
| 1 | η | η | η |
| 2 | η | η | η |
| 3 | η | η | η |
| 4 | η | η | η |
| 5 | [ἐτεροκ] |
```

Fig. 7: e

3 of corr. from (or to) ζ!?, but cf. shape of o in [κος — 4] : tops of two verticals δ begun as τ? κ: lower end of diagonal sloping to right 5 : low horizontal Lines 5-6 efface an earlier text: τ?δεικνύει, ἵππομο : ε or σ, δ or τ 6 τι: left-hand end of high horizontal 7 : lower end of diagonal rising to right 8 ν: diagonal rising to right vertical, upper part obscure 9: diagonal, sloping to right? θ or γ λ or μ

```
| 1 | η | η | η |
| 2 | η | η | η |
| 3 | η | η | η |
| 4 | η | η | η |
| 5 | [ἐτεροκ] |
```

Fig. 5. g

1 φ begun as ε ζ, δ, or ζ? 2 λ begun as δ, ε (ε would be correct) ζ or λ? 5 κ: upper tip of vertical 6 [ε or λ]

```
| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 7 | 1 | 1 |
```
Here I reproduce the text of lines 6ff. of the Phalasarna tablet (supra n. 10), showing in bold letters the parts represented by the fragments from Lokroi. Raised numbers are those of the lines of the Phalasarna tablet itself. Underlined letters were seen by their first editor, Erich Ziebarth, but are now lost.

\[ J\] 6 Ακόλχι Κατακκί Κατακκί Λαωιάν \[ένδαειαν \]έν ἄμολογία
\[ K\] αίγα βία εκ κηποὺ \[ ἐνσάουντε] 
\[ L\] Σοί δ' δύνα 
\[ M\] Ολβίος[ξ] ὁι κ' ἄτα δὲ εἰ 
\[ N\] Κ[{"\"text\"":null}] ΦΡΕ\[{"\"text\"":null}] ΛΥΤΟ["\"text\"":null] (vac.?) \[έξη] μακάρων 
\[ O\] «Τραξ \[Τετραξ \[Τετραγος.]»

\[ P\] Δαμναμ[ξ] ναμ[ξ] vac. ἀδάμα 
\[ Q\] ὁς κ' μὲ έξινται καὶ οἱ κακὲ 
\[ R\] ἰερεκόπτ[ξ] ο[ν]α[ν]
\[ S\] 11ο μὲ καταχρη[ξι]ο[ν] δηληθητοι, οὔτε ἐπηνικτι[ξ]
\[ T\] οὔτε πατοί[ξ] ἐπατωμη, [ξ\[ς\]] τορ ἀπάντων. [ξ]

K τῶν δ' Selinous M δὴ N καὶ φρεσίν αὐτὸς conj. G. B. D'Alessio, ZPE 97 (1993) 290 ὁ[ξ] δ' δαν Brixhe and Panayotou, supra n. 10 Q οἱ (or ὁίς) κακὰ κόλλαβα (or κόλλαβο δοῦ "give evil cakes?" R extra metrum. Materia magica? ἀμιαντὸν H. Lloyd-Jones per epist. ἵλειοντος S = ὁ or P. Maas, Hesperia 13 (1944) 36f.; = ὁ Wünsch, supra n. 10 δῆλησαι (i) δῆλησες conj. S. Eitrem, NordTidskr 4 (1922) 132 ἐπέντυκτον conj. Maas: "will not harm me with an ungent, nor with an offering" (to the dead? see LSJ s.v. έπιφέρον I.2) T ποτοί ἐπαγωγῆ; Meter defective c.π. or ζ[ς] τορ πάντων?

This is enough to show that f 2, with its ατας of κατακκι, stands just at the left of the ακανθανδαιαν[ξ] in α+β 2, and that the [ξετηριξης] of g 3 followed α+β 3 in the original inscription. Beneath g 7 there is a blank, which occupies the space that corresponds to the inscribed c+β+α 8-9; therefore g stood at the right of c+α+β. I have not been able to place d and e in relation to the other fragments and cannot rule out the possibility that they come from another inscription. If they do and if that inscription contained ἔποδαι as here, the │ σινετά of d 4 suggests that the subject may have been similar.

There is a curious feature in 3 and 4, the intralinear dash. It evidently serves to separate the individual verses – or rather groups of verses, for there is no such dash in 4 between ἀκτια and the verse that begins ὁλβιος. Our writer would have had a written model, no doubt; if it or its exemplar was arranged according to stichoi, these dashes would have stood at the left or the right of the column of text. I have no explanation for the αος (corr. from or to αις?) after the dash in 3. Are the letters the remnant of a lectional note?14 It may be more than mere coincidence that there are some of the same apparently meaningless letters, this time αος, adjacent to the dash in 4. In my reconstruction of the inscription I have arbitrarily assumed that a dash with a few letters stood also before the verse that begins Ακόλχι κ' ατας.[ξι] in line 2.

\[ f \]
\[ a \]
\[ b \]
\[ g \]

\[ 1 \]
\[ 2 \]
\[ 3 \]
\[ 4 \]
\[ 5 \]
\[ 6 \]
\[ 7 \]
\[ 8 \]
\[ 9 \]

14 A number? αος = 271, αις = 211. May the α that I have bracketed at the end of the Phalasarna text be a numeral?
The poem on the Lokrian tablet ended in line 8, somewhere between c+a+b and g. The horizontal at the bottom of c+a+b, which was evidently meant to mark the end of the text, presumably stood in the original only under the part of 8 that was actually inscribed.

Lokroi 2–5 basically correspond, then, to Phalasarna J–Q, which in spots are clearly corrupt but which I have supplied above simply to show the general shape of the Lokrian inscription. The Lokrian hexameter after Phalasarna J, however, had the letters |νεκαπολλ[|, which do not match anything in this part of the Phalasarna text; nor are the letters in g 1 found in what precedes Phalasarna J.

What follows Lokroi 5 does not match the rest of the verses from Phalasarna. The little that I have been able to supply in 6 and 7 comes from the Selinuntine text: |Ε Δίως μ νέοιδ (for -κατ’) ἐκάτοιο Φ[ and [ού]κ ἄν δειλήκαιτ’ [οὐδείς] οὐδ’ αἱ πολυφάρ[, respectively. We see in Lokroi 7, then, a multiple assurance of protection of the kind that we find in Phalasarna S–T. We may compare Demeter’s promise in lines 227f. of her Homeric Hymn:

Θερέψι κοι μιν ἐξόπλε, κακοφραδίηι τιθήνης
οὐτ’ ἀρ’ ἐπηλυκεὶ δηλήσεται οὐθ’ ὑπόταμον.

Here I reconstruct, for 2 through the first part of 7, what I can of such a text, arranged in stichoi. I have arbitrarily printed the dashes at the left of the stichoi, and, as arbitrarily, have used ε’ and ο’ for η’s and ο’s in the lacunae, without claiming consistency; in the reconstructed inscription above, there is room for about five letters – i.e. for a dash and about three letters before A. In B, G–J these (lectional?) letters may have preceded rather than followed the dashes, as assumed here. My Τραχ restored in C below (Τρεξ in Phalasarna L) reflects the preserved Τραχ of F. The corruption in D is no doubt worse than I have assumed here.

C [—+O]<C> Κοὶ δ’ ὄνιμ[α Ττρεξ ——][πλ] (plus more?) ἀνεμδίλω[ι] ἀκτῆ.
F "Τραχ Τετ[ξ Τεττακς]."
G [—+c.3] Δαμναμεν[ει], δόματον δὲ κακὸς ἀ[κόντως ἀνάγκαι].
H [—+c.3] "Ος κε με ε[ίναται] και οί κα[ί κόλλοθε θάσ].
I [—+c.3] —ινΈ—ν δὲ τε Διός μνάςατο [νι] ἐκάτοσοι φ ——
K Οὐ καὶ δαλέκατον οὐδ’ α[ι πολυφάρμακα ——]

D ἀμαζιτῶν «ιῶ»  Ι μνήκαιι δ’ (for -κατ’) ἐκάτοιο Φί Selinous  K [ού]κ ἄν δειλήκαιτ’ [οὐδείς] οὐδ’ αἱ πολυφάρ[Selinos

The part of the Selinuntine inscription with what corresponds to K is arranged according to stichoi and shows that the οὐ καὶ δαλέκατον of Lokroi K begins a hexameter. The ἄριος immediately before, which would end the preceding verse, is therefore awkward, metrically. Is the text corrupt here? It has, to be sure, corruptions elsewhere. The ending ἄμαζιτῶν of D (cf. κατ’ ἀμαζίτων «ιῶ» at Phalasarna M) makes no sense; nor does meter allow the second ν of μνάςατον in I (cf. μνήκαιι, also awkward, here in the Selinuntine text); and the cluster θξαβπλβει[θ σι]θ κατ’ [θ ολ ι κ ο] in 8 is obviously impossible.15

Prof. Costabile (supra n. 9) has noted the absence of η and ο in a+b. For example, in 7 (K) the verb is δαλέκαστο (Att.-Ion. δῆλος). Unless a vowel follows |νεκαπολλ[] in d 4, we have another ε there. On the other hand, η’s are the only possible transcriptions in g 1 and g 3 (C). Unless οι in H (Phalasarna Q) represents οί, the fragments preserve only one instance of ο where Attic-Ionic spelling would have οω,

15 The καὶ φρακιν of E (φρακιν αὐSelinous), on the other hand, manifestly better than the Κ[Ι][ΦΡΕΓΙΑΛΥΤΟ] of Phalasarna N, supports G. B. D’Alessio’s correction of this last: see app. crit. ad loc.}
Three Texts from Lokroi Epizephyrioi

i.e. the κακὸς of G. In C, we have not Τραξ as in Phalasarna O but Τραξ; the fragments preserve no other word that might require ξ. Τραξ may be merely a different pronunciation of the vocable, itself no doubt intentionally mysterious, but if χ here is the “spelling” of ξ, it may, like ε.ο for η.σ, reflect an alphabet that was used some time before the texts at Phalasarna, Selinous, and Lokroi Epizephyrioi were inscribed in the 4th century16 and it may have its implication for the date of the composition of the verses. The Phalasarna text also, we may note, shows traces of earlier spelling, δiples for δη (M), κήπο (K), ο for οῦ (?S); the η of ἐπηνίκτησι (S) may well have arisen as a clumsy updating of a text without η’s.

As for the dialect, Claude Brixhe and Anna Panayotou (36 [supra n. 10]) have remarked that if the Phalasarna tablet were not known to be from Crete, it would have occurred to no one to examine its text for Cretan dialect features, for it shows little other than the occasional Dorism (e.g. ἀνάγκας in P) and one phrase with psilosis (κατ’ ἀματίτον in M, N):17 “la langue utilisée pour ce genre de documents ressortit à toute une tradition qui la place souvent hors dialecte.” For this reason such features as ὑμημο in B, C (Att.-Ion. ἀναμο) beside Att.-Ion. κοι in C, μνάκειτο in I (Att.-Ion. μνη-), and δαλλέκατο and ε(λ) in K (Att.-Ion. δηλ-, ε(λ)) are worth noting in the Lokrian inscription. Whatever the use of these ἐπωδαξί, here we have them in West Greece.

3. A Judiciary Curse Tablet

No. 3 (42–53), in a 4th- or possibly early 3rd-century hand, from the area known as Parapezza, outside the ancient city, is clearly a defixio, with a judiciary curse. The published photograph, tracing, text, and translation:

---

16 For example, early Lokrian ξ is usually written +; see L. H. Jeffery, op. cit. (supra n. 3) 104.
17 In the Selinuntine inscription, these passages are lost.
Prof. Costabile identifies Thesta as the sister of Dionysios I, tyrant of Syracuse, and discusses the significance of the presence of the prytanis, an official previously unattested at Lokroi Epizephyrioi, for the constitution of the city. In 2 the name Yãll{o}ian in this spelling would be a hapax, with or without the O, which, he explains, is not, however, a letter but the representation of a magical knot.

From the published photographs (two, taken under different angles of light) I have been able to derive

The first line has three men's names, all banal. Of interest are the generalizing phrases that follow. In the second line we have the passive participle ἀντανταθεὶν, from ἀνταντάω, a verb first attested
here; it is the denominative of a noun known only from Hesychios, ἀνταντάνει ἐπίβουλον, ἀντίδικον:\footnote{18} In the εἰ (W.Gr. αἱ) and the ἄμιν (Att.-Ion. ἦμιν) of the third we have a mixture of Koine and West Greek.\footnote{19} The εἰ τίς, in any event, invites a finite verb. I have assumed the Koine ἀντα[ντα][ι] (W.Gr. -τίς;\footnote{20} ἦ[π] cannot be read), but I should not rule out ἀντα[ντα][ι] (sc. ἐκτιν). The last word, ἄμιν, implies a plurality of defigentes, which finds a parallel in \textit{DTWü} 77, with its opening verb καταδοόμεν.

The curse tablet, for its part, confirms Hesychios’ text, emended by its latest editor, K. Latte, to ἀντάται, on the basis of the \textit{hapax} ἀντάται at \textit{SGDI} 5105.23 (a treaty between Gortyn and Knossos, early IIb). The ending of Hesychios’ ἀνταντάνει presumably means that he knew the word only in this non-Ionic form. His gloss and the new inscription should alert editors of new judiciary curse tablets to the possibility of ἀντανταζεί among the personnel of law-courts where the dialect was not Ionic.

Athens

David Jordan

\footnote{18} It is possible, but not yet provable, that another compound of ἀντάω has a legal meaning, in the phrase μετὰ τὴν κατακεραύνια δόξατε ἐπὶ άπω τοῖς καντράκασι at \textit{BGU} 361 ii 8 (IIb). LSJ, perhaps correctly, define the verb προσκεντάω, a \textit{hapax}, as “appear in court”.

\footnote{19} This is no problem; C. D. Buck, \textit{The Greek dialects} (Chicago 1955) § 134c: “The substitution of εἰ for αἱ belongs to the earliest stage of Attic (κοινῆ) influence in the West Greek dialects.”

\footnote{20} Buck, \textit{op. cit.} § 41.