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Volvala barchin heman la lavolvola dramme pagloni – Anemolius
(“Gladly I share what is mine, not ungladly accept what is better.”)

Shortly after I submitted to the editors the manuscript of the preceding article, 1 Jaime Curbera, now preparing a new bibliography of the lead defixiones of Sicily, brought to my attention what seemed a possible example from Himera, of which M. T. Manni Piraino printed a drawing and a description some years ago. 2 I am particularly indebted to Dr. Curbera, for it provides another witness to the ἔντοξοι from Selinous, Phalasarna, and Lokroi Epizephyrioi. I reproduce the drawing and description here: 3

Cinque frammenti di una laminetta di piombo molto sottile. Si conserva parte del bordo superiore originario (framm. 1–2) e del bordo di destra (framm. 1a). La laminetta reca incisa una lunga iscrizione sulla faccia anteriore (A), mentre su quella posteriore (B) corrono poche lettere: apografi, fig. 36, 261 A–B. Prima metà V sec.

Di quello documento debbo forzatamente limitarmi a dare un primo, approssimativo apografo: benché molti segni appaiano abbastanza chiaramente identificabile, non sono riuscita tuttavia a dare un senso compiuto al complesso dell’iscrizione, che potrebbe anche non essere greca. Nel dubbio mi pare opportuno presentarla senza commento in attesa di ulteriore approfondimento.

1 Three texts from Lokroi Epizephyrioi, ZPE 130 (2000) [this volume] 95–103. I would thank Prof. Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones for the interest that he has taken in the verses discussed there and below.


3 In the reproduction below, fr. a has been brought closer to fr. b+c+d+e than in the publication. Dimensions go unrecorded in the description.
There is a photograph (tav. CXV, n. 10) that also accompanies the announcement, but it serves only to show that the inscription must have been extremely difficult to read. Its text indeed makes no sense until one notices that it is a garbled version of the lines discussed in the preceding article. The inscription itself has obvious mistakes, but is not to be ruled out that, given the poor legibility, there are also some inaccuracies in the drawing. Here I give my transcription of this last, along with a “corrected” version, marking my changes with double underscoring.

I have made no sense of what I transcribe here as lines 2 and 3 of Side a. They are upside down in relation to line 1 and may even not have been intended as part of the same text.

### Side a:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ακεκικ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 | ωι[?]ιασαδεδ[?]=ομιολ[ | ωι[?]ι αια e(ν)δε[?]O άμολ[γη]οι vac.?
| 3 | οσ[?]πασκα | οσ[?]πανλι[ |
| 4 | τοιδοναστερα | τοι δ' όνο[μα] Τεραφ[γος]
| 5 | αλημουσιοκτ/α | ἀνεμόλοδο(ς) άκτ/α.
| 6 | ο[?]ο |  | ὦ[?]ο τ[α]λ[α]
| 7 | σακτα |   |

### Side b:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>δεκεκεθεκα[.]αμοδα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>]πρπνε[ι[?]πρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>] κεφας[_[</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ b1 \text{ δε} = \delta\] κεκ(δ)θε(ς)ι ορ κεκ(δ)θε(ς)ι

The inscription with its congeners:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Himera | a1Ακικι κατακικι | Ακικι κατακικι και vac.?
| Selinous | 13Ακτι κατακτι κατακτι | κατακτι και vac.?
| Phalasarna | 6Ακτι κατακτι κατακτι | κατακτι και vac.?
| Lokroi   | 2[—']α1Ακτι κατακτικι | κατακτι και vac.?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Himera | 3ΟΣΔ[?][ΠΑ] ε(κ) καιπτο | οσδ[πτο] ε(κ) καιπτο προς (?) 14δε άμολγην
| Phalasarna | ατι [κεκο] λαικον καιπτο | ατι [κεκο] λαικον καιπτο
| Lokroi   | — c.3 ατι κατακτικι | κατακτικι η[κ]αιπτο

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Himera | 3|  | άνεμολοδο(ς) άκτη.
| Phalasarna | 7και δ' ήνομα | Φαλασαρνα άνεμολοδο(ς) άκτη.
| Lokroi   | — λΟ | άνεμολοδο(ς) άκτη.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Selinous | 18Ομηοι[κ]ι ήνομα δε | ομηοι[κ]ι ήνομα δε
The dialect of the inscription is West Greek (but ad øvo(μ)ει4). Letters are occasionally omitted, some omissions probably explicable as phonetic (e.g. a2 ε(ν)δη[ζ]Ο, a3 ε(ξ) κάποιο), others not (e.g. a4 øvo(μ)α, a6 •Οκ(β)τοι). Spelling and letter forms suggest a 5th-century date for the tablet from Himera. They could no doubt as easily belong to the second as to Prof. Manni Piraino’s proposed first half of the century, but here I do not insist. In any case, the Carthaginian destruction of the city in 409 (D.S. 13.59–62, Str. 6.272) gives the inscription a secure terminus ante quem.

The inscription is not arranged according to metrical stichoi, but between C and D there are three letters that are hard to assign to either verse; they may be lectional notes, as assumed for the —ΑΟC of Lokroi 3,5 which may be intended to separate verses. Conceivably the ΩC of the OCA[λ]ΠΑ of Himera 3, occurring just after verse A, is another such lectional note.

The texts begin with what seem to be the so-called Ephesia Grammata,6 which Hesychios (s.v.) reports in the form αεκκι κατασκι λίς (αεκκι cod.) τετραζ δενομενεως αασια. The first literary mention of them is by the comic poet Anaxilas (PCG fr. 18; see notes by Kassel and Austin), c. 350, but we do not know the form in which he knew them. Up to now, the lead tablets from Selinous, Phalasarna, and Lokroi Epizephyrioi, also of the 4th century, have given the first epigraphical attestations, but the tablet from Himera, with its 5th-century date, is earlier.

Each of the four inscriptions has its corruptions; the oldest witness is by no means the best, but it allows some observations about the text and raises questions. Editors of the inscription from Phalasarna, for example, have bracketed the second κατασκι of its line 6 as being an inadvertent dittography, but it now apparently finds some support in the [?]υ[κ]ων[κ?]) of Himera α1 and the [?]υκκι of Lokroi 2. In fact, with the second κατασκι (read κατασκι?) retained, the line from Phalasarna could, without much forcing, be read as a hexameter.

After the word Τετραζκο(ε) of B the Lokrian text has —ΑΟC, and after the restored δην ἁμολγοι of A it has room for another such dash and c. 3 letters. If these dashes and letters are indeed meant to separate verses, then we should look for meter underlying B. The αεκκι αεκκι βιοτι of Selinous 14 and Phalasarna 6, even though the αεκκι of the Hesychian codex gives the first word some allure, is difficult, in both meter and sense (whom does the verb ἐλαύνετε address?). Does the ΩC of Himera now point to a different and perhaps sounder tradition? Or should we assume ΩC (lectional note) and ἀττ‘ς or ἀττ‘ς? Without αεκκι, the opening words would sin less against the meter. Τετραζκο or -κος at the end of a verse is of course metrically impossible, and the τοι δ ’ονομα of Selinous 15 (and of Phalasarna 6 and Lokroi 3?) is problematic, but now we can easily see the origin of τοι: a scribe must have had a model without ἀγς or ἀς’ (cf. ἀγς[κ]τε at Selinous 17 vs. the ἀκτι/ά and ἀκτη of the other witnesses) and have assumed the article τοι instead of the West Greek pronoun τοι. This means that in the texts from Selinous and possibly elsewhere we have a phrase with the West Greek pronoun followed by a very similar phrase with the Attic-Ionic. Is one offered as an alternative to the other? It may be significant then that the second phrase does not occur in the text from Himera. But the recognition of an alternative phrase, if this is what it is, does not solve the problem of the meter: the corruption is no doubt more radical, with the Selinuntine ΦΗΔ[-·‰·] τετραζκορ ἄγετε, itself impossible, presumably the remnant of a once better text.

Verse D does scan, even if the Lokrian witness is no doubt more corrupt than I have assumed in my restoration of it. The faults from Himera, in any case, are instructive. The inscription is in an awkward phrase, if this is what it is, does not solve the problem of the meter: the corruption is no doubt more radical, with the Selinuntine ΦΗΔ[-·‰·] τετραζκορ ἄγετε, itself impossible, presumably the remnant of a once better text.

---

4 If, as I have assumed (Three texts, 100), the verses originally had a form “hors dialecte”, the loss of μ, presumably through a scribal error, would have occurred before the verses were converted to West Greek: our scribe would have been confronted with ΟΝΟΑ.

5 Three texts, 99.

6 Three texts, 97, n. 11.
reason why. The AKTA for κατά of Himera a7, for example, evidently originated as a scribe’s miscopying, but comparison with the KTA in the same place in Phalasarna 17 suggests that the two mistakes are part of the same corruption. Similarly, the AMΩΔΑ of Himera b1 and the ὄμολος(?)δομ of Lokroi 4 also suggest a common, corrupt source. The inscription from Himera shows that by the 5th century the original was old enough, and indeed had become widely enough disseminated, for its tradition already to have accumulated errors, many of them scribal.