THE JOHNS HOPKINS TABELLAE DEFIXIONUM

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Board of University Studies of the Johns Hopkins University in conformity with the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

William Sherwood Fox.

June

1911

CHAPTER I.

THE TABELLAE DEFIXIONUM OF THE

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

---

§1. History and Description.

In the year 1908 the Department of Classical Archaeology of the Johns Hopkins University acquired several tabellae defixionum, popularly known as curse-tablets.(1) The person through whom the acquisition was made possible was unable to give a definite assurance as to their provenience, but stated his belief that they had been found at Rome. Thorough study of the tablets themselves has led to the conviction that they did actually originate in that city. This point will be fully discussed at the proper time.(2)

The tablets were in two distinct divisions. One of these consisted of a nail .127 metres in length, the point of which was cloven into two long sharp splinters each half as long as the whole nail. About the broad head were tightly bound by a thick accumulation of rust many exceedingly thin fragments of lead. On one side twenty-five layers could be counted, and on the opposite side twenty-eight.(3) The greatest width of this mass of

---

(1) A preliminary report of these was published by the present author in the Johns Hopkins University Circular, New Series, 1910, No. 6, pp. 7-10.
(2) Ch. III., § 3.
(3) See Pl. I.

fragments before it was subjected to the chemical treatment to be described shortly, was .051 and the smallest .048 metres.

The other division of the tablets consisted of a promiscuous heap of brittle chips of lead, no two being of the same shape and size. In thickness they varied from one to three millimetres, and in area from one-quarter of a square centimetre to thirty or forty square centimetres. Most of the fragments approximated the smaller area just mentioned. On nearly every one were visible early Roman cursive characters that had been incised with a stilus. The incisions varied considerably in depth and distinctness. Another feature in which there was a very marked lack of uniformity was color. Some pieces were characterized by the normal color of lead; some were reddish, some bluish, and others of a shade midway between purple and brown. A little handling and scrutiny of the material revealed the fact that the variations in thickness and color bore a direct and fairly constant relation to one another. This was invaluable in the subsequent reconstruction of the tablets, as will be shown in a later paragraph. Besides the ground colors peculiar to the several fragments there was a coating of whitish powder and crystals covering the surfaces unevenly and this in certain places made the writing wholly illegible.

For the joint purpose of removing the coating and of accounting for the brittle condition of the lead, the mass on the

nail and selected loose fragments were submitted to the chemists (4) for examination. Their report was that "the layers of the tablets have been changed in large part from metallic lead to compounds of lead by the action of soil or atmosphere or water. The whitish outer coating consists of a basic carbonate of lead, while underneath is another compound, probably litharge. In some instances there is an exceedingly thin layer of unchanged metallic lead." This whitish compound is evidently in part what Wünsch in his description of the Attic tablets poetically calls "the dust of ages". (5)

2. Reconstruction.

The first step toward the reconstruction of the tablets was to select the loose fragments on which even a single stroke of writing was visible, though not necessarily decipherable. The result was two hundred and ten working fragments, one-third of which were very small. Those set aside as useless number apparently about three hundred. Each of the working fragments was deposited in its own separate and numbered envelope. The largest were then deciphered as far as the condition of their surfaces permitted without cleaning by chemical means, and in the process exact facsimiles were drawn on individual cards num-

---

(4) Professor S. F. Acree and Mr. E. K. Marshall, Jr., of the Johns Hopkins University.

(5) Wünsch, Richard, Defixionum Tabellae Atticae, I.G. III. 3, Praef. I.

bered to correspond to the envelopes just mentioned. This process supplied an alphabet and a number of broken lines of text, some of which recurred several times in slightly varied form. The alphabet served as a key to the obscure letters in the smaller fragments still to be deciphered, while the broken lines gave a clue to the general sense and connection of the writing. The recurrence of certain words and groups of words suggested that the fragments represented not one tablet, but several, originally pierced by one and the same nail. The decipherment of the smaller fragments was carried on in the same manner.

The first attempt to assemble the parts in their original relation to one another was made only when the above stage of decipherment was completed. Several features served as guides in this restoration. These are the sense of the text, the uniform relations between color and thickness of the lead, the presence of outer or top edges on a few fragments, and the appearance of writing on the reverse side of a relatively small number. On the other hand, there were many obstacles in the way of complete reconstruction, chief of which were the impossibility of making use of the portion of lead still on the spike and the similarity of outline in the broken edges.

No ¶

Obviously the latter difficulty could not be removed, but the ~~latter~~ former seemed not entirely insurmountable. In the hope that a few fragments might be released from the nail, the chemists'

aid was again sought. By the use of a weak solution of sul - phuric acid they succeeded after several days in loosening nineteen fragments, which, however, proved to be of little value owing to their mutilated condition. As the acid was apparently rendering the lead too brittle to handle, it was thought wise to proceed no further with the experiment; moreover, it seemed improbable that any fragments saved would make a sufficient contribution to counterbalance the loss of so valuable a relic as the nail and its holdings. But in spite of the difficulties the sense of the text, interrupted though it was, soon revealed the fact that we were dealing with five distinct tablets. With this established, the significance of the uniform relation between the color and the thickness of the fragments became obvious. It was found that those belonging to the tablet that will henceforth be designated as Aquillia were very thin and alarmingly fragile and of a purplish-brown hue; those of Plotius were thin and bluish; those of Vesonia were thick and reddish, while those of Avonia were of a similar tinge but somewhat thinner; finally, the fragments of Secunda were thin and of that dull gray shade characteristic of pure lead. The presence in a few instances, of right, left,or top edges made it possible to locate some fragments with absolute definiteness to the right or to the left of the nail or at the beginning of the tablet from which they had been broken. No lower edges were found.

Where writing could be read on both sides it was usually easy to locate a fragment, as the obverse and reverse contexts afforded a sort of double check in their particular zones. After the application of this test it soon became apparent that only three of the tablets were opisthographic.

There now remained two or three dozen fragments too thickly coated with the deposit of lead carbonate to be legible. These the chemists treated with dilute nitric acid which after a very brief immersion readily dissolved the carbonate but did not appreciably affect the body of the layer. In this way the majority of these fragments were made decipherable. The total number read was two hundred and twenty, and all but sixty-two could be located in their proper places with almost absolute certainly. Of this latter group thirty-nine could by the indications of color and thickness of the lead and by the style of handwriting be assigned with some degree of accuracy to the several tablets from which they came, but not to their original contexts.

§ 3. Description of the Reconstructed Tablets.

The facsimiles in black and white which later accompany the text of the curse formulae were made only after reconstruction had been carried as far as conditions permitted. Photographic reproductions would of course be preferable, but owing to the

fragmentary character of the material it was found absolutely impossible to obtain them. The present reproductions represent the actual size of the original tablets. They enable one to estimate with fair exactness the dimensions of the laminae before they were shattered. Were their edges without irregularities it would be possible to estimate their several areas to within a centimetre or two of the correct figures, as the general outlines of the pairs of opposite edges are practically parallel.

In the case of Aquillia the fragments are too few to bear out this statement; yet, if an attempt is made to reproduce in cursive writing its formula as supplemented from the other tablets, it will be found that most of the lines of the text are virtually uniform in length. Towards the end of the tablet some of the lines gradually become shorter, but on reaching their minimum length they return just as gradually to their average dimension. This points to a narrowing of the lamina at this part. In Secunda a fragment from the lower right hand corner shows a slight tapering towards the bottom of the lamina. The experiment of reproducing the formula, however, in letters similar in size and form to those of the original reveals the fact that the left hand edge continues to the very bottom with no marked deviation from the straight line.(6)

---

(6) Very few tabellae defixionum are of greater superficial area than these. Cf. Audollent (Augustus), Defixionum Tabellae Albert Fontemoing, Paris, 1904, Nos. 15 and 271.

To fit the present reconstruction to the broken layers on the nail is quite impossible. Nevertheless, one can determine the original order by comparing the character of the lead on the nail with the well-established character of the lead in the reconstructed tablets. The layers nearest the head of the nail undoubtedly belong to Aquillia; Secunda (7) came next, then Avonia, then Vesonia, and lastly Plotius.

The fragments also tell us how the laminae were originally folded. On only one fold that is visible on the nail does writing appear on the outer, i.e., the convex side. Loose fragments that have been broken at the line of folding have edges that turn slightly in towards the side bearing the text. Both of these observations lead to the inference that in general the tablets were rolled into cylindrical shape with the writing on the inside for protection against abrasion and for concealment from prying eyes; for, should the writing be injured in any way the formula would be of no effect, or, should human eyes read it, counter formulae might be composed or other means resorted to that might bring the evil of the formula back like a boomerang upon its author. The nail when driven into such a yielding material as lead, packed the laminae together and created very

---

(7) Thus designated for lack of a better name.

pronounced lines of folding. Estimating the combined length of all the tablets at 148.3 cm. and allowing for twenty-seven layers, the average width of the folds was 5.5 cm. The widest fragment is one belonging to Vesonia (#12) which measures 8 cm.; some are no wider than 2 cm. These figures seem to indicate the two extremes of width.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

(Only the more important books are here mentioned. The most extensive bibliography is contained in the work of Audollent to be found in the following list).

GENERAL WORKS.

Daremberg et Saglio. Dictionnaire des Antiquités grecques et romaines, Paris, 1892-. (Darem. et Sag.).

De Ruggiero, E. Dizionario Epigrafico di Antichità Romane, Rome, 1908-. (Diz. Epig.).

Klebs, E. Prosopographia Imperii Romani, Saec. I, II, III, Partes tres, Berlin, 1897.

Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart, 1901-. (Pauly-Wissowa).

Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, 3rd. ed., London, 1890.

TABELLAE DEFIXIONUM.

Audollent, Auguste. Defixionum Tabellae quotquot innotuerunt tam in Graecis orientis quam in totius occidentis partibus praeter Atticas in Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum editas, Paris, 1904, (Aud.).

Battle, W. I. Magical Curses written on Lead Tablets. Transactions of the American Philological Association, XXVI, 1895. Proceedings of Special Session, 1894, pp. liv-lviii.

Münsterberg, Rudolf. Zu den attischen Fluchtafeln, Osterreichis Arch. Inst. in Wien. 1904, pp. 141 ff.

Niedermann, M. Remarques sur la langue des tablettes d'execration (Mélanges De Saussure, Paris, 1908) pp. 71 ff.

Olivieri, A. Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica, vii, 1899, pp. 193-8. (Olivieri).

Von Premerstein, Ein Fluchtäfelchen mit Lieberzauber aus Poetovio, Ost. Arch. Inst. in Wien, 1906, pp. 192 ff.

Wünsch, Richard. Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum. Appendix continens Defixionum Tabellae in Attica Regione repertas = Inscriptionum Graecarum III 3. Berlin, 1897. (Wünsch DTA)

Wünsch, R. Antike Fluchtafeln, Marcus und Weber, Bonn, 1907.

Wünsch, R. Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln aus Rom. Leipzig, 1898. (Wünsch, Seth.).

Wünsch, R. Neue Fluchtafeln, Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, 1900, pp. 62 ff.; 232 ff.

Wünsch, R. Review of Audollent's Defixionum Tabellae in the Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, 1905, pp. 1071-82.

Wünsch, R. Review of Walter Rabehl, De Sermone defixionum Atticarum, Dissertation, Berlin, 1906, in Berliner Phil. Wochenschrift, 1907, 1574 ff.

Ziebarth, Erich. Der Fluch im griechischen Recht, Hermes, xxx, pp. 57 ff.

CUSTOMS AND RELIGION.

De-Marchi, Attilio. Il Culto Privato di Roma Antica, Milan, 1896. (De-Marchi).

Frazer, J. G. The Golden Bough, A Study in Comparative Religion, 2 vols., London and New York, 1911.

Gruppe, O. Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte, 2 vols., Munich, 1906, in Müller's Handbuch series. (Gruppe).

Harrison, Jane Ellen. Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion, Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed., 1908.

Marquardt-Mau. Das Privatleben der Römer, Part I, 2nd. ed., Leipzig, 1886. (Marquardt-Mau).

Preller, L. Griechische Mythologie, Vierte Auflage bearbeitet von Carl Robert, Berlin, 1894.

Roscher, W. H. Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie, Leipzig, 1902. (Roscher, Lex.).

Supplements to the above:-

Epitheta Deorum quae apud Poetas Latinas leguntur.

Epitheta Deorum quae apud Poetas Graecos leguntur.

Rouse, W. H. D. Greek Votive Offerings, Cambridge University Press, 1902.

Stengel, Paul. Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer, Munich, 1898, in Müller's Handbuch Series.

Stengel, Paul. Opferbräuche der Griechen, Teubner, Leipzig, 1910 (Stengel, Opf.)

Wessely, C. Griechische Zauberpapyrus von Paris und London (Denkschrift der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien — Philosopisch-historische Classe, XXXVI, 1888, zweite Abtheilung, pp. 27-208).

Wessely, C. Neue griechische Zauberpapyri (Denksch. d. K. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Wien-Phil.-hist. Cl. XLII, 1893, 96).

Wissowa, Georg. Religion und Kultus der Römer, Munich, 1902, in Müller's Handbuch Series. (Wissowa).

LATIN LANGUAGE.

Brock, Arthur. Quaestionum Grammaticorum, Capita duo, Dorpat, 1897.

Corssen, W. Über Aussprache, Vokalismus und Betonung der Lateinischen Sprache, 2 vols., 2nd. ed., Leipzig, 1868.

Georges, K. E. Lexicon der lateinischen Wortformen, Leipzig, 1890. (Georges).

Gildersleeve (B. L.) and Lodge (G). Latin Grammar, 3rd. ed., University Publishing Co., 1898.

Krebs, J. P. Antibarbarus der Lateinischen Sprache, 5th. ed., Basel, 1886-8 (Krebs).

Lindsay, W. M. The Latin Language, An Historical Account of Latin Sounds, Stems, and Flexions. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1894. (Lindsay).

Lommatzsch, E. Article on "Ei für ī auf lateinischen Inschriften der Kaiserzeit", in Archiv. für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik, XV, 1908, pp. 129 ff. (Lommatzsch).

Mohl, F. G. Introduction à la Chronologie du Latin Vulgaire, Étude de Philologie Historique, Paris, 1899. (Mohl).

Neue, Friedrich. Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache, 4 vols. 3rd. ed., Leipzig, 1902-5. (Neue).

Reisig, C. K. Lateinische Syntax neu arbeitet von J. H. Schmalz und Dr. G. Landgraf, Berlin, 1888.

Schneider, E. Dialecti Latinae Priscae et Faliscae: Exempla Selecta. Part I, of Dialectorum Italicarum Aeui Vetustioris Exempla Selecta, Vol. I, Leipzig, 1886. (Schneider).

Schuchardt, H. Der Vokalismus des Vulgarlateins, 3 vols. Leipzig, 1866.

Schulze, Wilhelm. Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen, Berlin, 1904. (Schulze).

Stolz (F) and Schmalz (J. H.). Lateinische Grammatik, Laut- und Formenlehre, Syntax und Stilistik, 4th. ed., in Muller's Handbuch series, Munich, 1910. (Stolz-Schmalz).

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Leipzig. (Thes. Ling. Lat.).

Wölfflin, Über die allitterirenden Verbindungen der lateinischen Sprache, in Sitzungsberichte d. K. bay. Akad. 1881, II, pp. 1 ff.

EPIGRAPHY AND PALAEOGRAPHY.

Cagnat, R. Cours d'Épigraphie Latine, Paris, 1898.

L'Année Épigraphique, Paris.

Carnoy, A. Le Latin d'Espagne d'après les Inscriptions, 2nd. ed., Misch and Thron, Bruxelles, 1906.

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, Vols. I-XV, Berlin, (CIL).

Diehl, Ernst. Vulgärlateinischen Inschriften, Marcus und Weber, Bonn, 1910.

Diehl, E. Pompeianische Wandinschriften und Verwandtes, Marcus und Weber, Bonn, 1910.

Diehl, E. Altlateinische Inschriften, Marcus und Weber, Bonn, 1909.

Ἐφημερὶς Ἀρχαιολογική, 1907, col. 19ff.

Hübner, E. Exempla Scripturae Epigraphicae Latinae, Berlin, 1885.

Pirson, Jules. La Langue des Inscriptions latines de la Gaule, Bruxelles, 1901.

Ritschl, F. Opuscula Philologica, 5 vols., Leipzig, 1878. (Ritschl, Opus.).

Ritschl, F. Priscae Latinitatis Monumenta Epigraphica. (Ritschl, PLME).

Wessely, C. Schrifttafeln zur Älteren Lateinischen Palaeographie, Leipzig, 1898.

EXPLANATION OF SIGNS

EMPLOYED IN THE TEXT

[ ] Includes letters lost through fracture of the lead.

( ) Includes letters omitted through the error of the scribe.

CHAPTER II.

TEXT AND ANNOTATION.

(1)

§1. Plotius.

Lead tablet 31.6 X 11.3 cm. without writing on the reverse. A preliminary transcription with restoration published in The Johns Hopkins Circular, New Series, 1910, No. 6, pp. 8-9.

bona·pulchra proserpina . lut . nis· uxsor

seiue·me· saluiam deicere· oportet·

eripias·salutem·c..... lorem·uires· uirtutes·

ploti· tradas·.....uiro· tuo· ni·possit·cogitati~~onibus~~ onibus

5 sueis· hoc· vita.....illunc·

febri· quartan.e· t.....nae· cottidia.ae

quas·.....uct.....

eu..cant.....usq.....

...s·eripia.....nc· uictimam

10 tibi· trad.....rpi.....e·me

proserpin.....ue·m.....eruos~~iam~~ iam dicere

oportet·me.....rcessitum·canem

tricepitem·qui.....cor·eripiat·polliciar~~us~~ us

illi· te·daturum t.es·uictimas

15 palma....rica.· por.um·nigrum·

hoc·sei·pe...cerit.....

m.....r.....

(1) Although Aquillia by virtue of its occupancy of the first position on the nail should be considered first, we are forced

cum• compote• fe...is• do tibi• cap..

ploti• auon.. ...oserpina• s.....

20 do tibi• fron.....ti• proserpina• saluia

do...b. su.....ploti• proserpin.

saluia do .....s• plo..

proserpina• sa.....

ploti• proser.....s

25 labra• or.....m lin.uam•

dentes p.....ni dicere• possit•

plotius• quid.... ...at• collum• umeros

bracchia• d.git.....ssit• aliquit•

se• adiutare...c.....cinera• cor•

30 pulmones• n.....sentique• quit•

sibi• doleat.....tina• venter• um.licu.

latera .i p...it• dormi re• scapulas

ni• poss.. s.nus• dormire• uiscum•

sacrum• nei• possit• urinam• facere•

35 natis• anum ...ina• genua

.....• tibias pe.....

.....s• ungis• ni• po.....tare• ...

..rt.te• seiue....s• seiue• paruum

scrip..... quomodo• quicqu..

40 legitim..... mandauit• seic

ego ploti• ti.....ado• mando

---

to consider it last owing to its fragmentary condition.

ut• tradas .....nse• februario

.cillunc• mal.....e• exset

...e• disperd.....das• ni• possit•

45 .....s ullum.....ere•

.....re

Text supplemented from the other tablets.

Bona pulchra Proserpina, [P]lut[o]nis uxsor,

seiue me Saluiam deicere oportet,

eripias salutem, c[o]rpus, co[l]orem, uires, uirtutes

Ploti. Tradas [Plutoni] uiro tuo. Ni possit cogitati
onibus

5 sueis hoc uita[re]. Tradas illunc

febri quartana[e], tertia[n]ae, cottidia[n]ae,

quas [cum illo l]uct[ent, deluctent; illunc]

eu[incant, uincant, usque dum animam

eius eripia[nt. Quare ha]nc uictimam

10 tibi trado, Prose[rpina, seiue me,

Proserpina, seiue me Acheruos iam dicere

oportet. Me mittas arcessitum canem

tricepitem, qui [Ploti] cor eripiat. Polliciar
us

illi te daturum tres uictimas---

15 palmas, caricas, porcum nigrum---

hoc sei perfecerit [ante mensem]

Martium. Haec, Proserpina Saluia, tibi dabo

cum compote fecer[is. Do tibi caput]
Ploti Auoni[ae. Pr]oserpina Sa[luia],
20 do tibi fron[tem Pl]oti. Proserpina Saluia,
do [tibi] su[percilia] Ploti. Proserpina]
Saluia, do [tibi palpebra]s Plo[ti].
Proserpina Sa[luia, do tibi pupillas]
Ploti. Proser[pina Saluia, do tibi nares],
25 labra, ori[culas, nasum, lin]gua[m,
dentes Pl[oti], ni dicere possit
Plotius quid [sibi dole]at; collum, umeros,
bracchia, di[gito]s, ni po[ssit aliquit
se adiutare: [pe]ctus, ic[cinera, cor,
30 pulmones, ni [possit senti(re) quit
sibi doleat; [intes]tina, uenter, um[bli]cus],
latera, [ni p[ossi]t dormire: scapulas,
ni possit sanus dormire: uiscum
sacrum, nei possit urinam facere:
35 natis, anum, [femina, genua,
[crura], tibias, pe[des, talos, plantas,
digito]s, ungis, ni po[ssit stare [sua
uirtute. Seiue [plus, seiue parvum
scrip[tum fuerit], quomodo quicqu[id
40 legitime [scripsit], mandauit, seic
ego Ploti tibi trado, mando,

ut tradas, mandes mense Februario
e cillunc. Male perdat, male exset,
male disperdat. Mandes, tradas, ni possit
45 amplius ullum mensem aspicere,
uidere, contemplare.

2. Avonia.

Lead tablet 29 X 11.3 cm., with writing across the back about midway between the upper and lower edges.

A.

.ona•pu.....roserpina•plutoni.

.xsor•seiue .....•deicere•oportet•

eripias•salu....corp.. colorem•uires•

uirtutes au..ia.adas•plutoni•

5 uiro tuo.....onibus•s.....

quicqui. uit.....

febri quart..ae•t.....

quas cum•illa .ucten.....

euincant•uinca.....

10 eius•eripiant• ..are hanc•uictiman

.... trado .....a•seiue•me

....erpina•se.....eruosiam dicere

...rtet•me•m.....cessitum•cane.

.....te.....s cor eripiat

15 .....urum•tres•uictim..

palmas•carica.....grum•hoc•sei•

perfecerit•an.....martium•haec

....ia tibi•dabo cu.•compotem•feceris

do tibi caput auon...s pr...rpina•saluia•d.

20 tibi•frontem auonia.....oserpina•saluia

do tibi· supercilia .....aes· proserpina

..luia· do· tibi· palpe...s auoniaes· proserpi..

.alu.a· do ..bi· pupillas ..onia.s .....

...uia· do· t... oricula....bra .....nasum

25 ..ntes· liguam· auon.....e· possit

...nia· quid· s.bi ...eat .....s

..acchia· digito.....possit· ali....

se adiutare· pec.....nera· cor

pulmones· ni· ..... quit· sentire·

30 quit· sibi· dolea.....ina· uenter·

umblicus· scapul.. latera· ni· po....

dorm.re· uiscum sac.um· ni possi.

urinam· f...re ....s· femina·

anum· gen.....a· tibias· pedes

35 talos .la.....tos· ungis· ni·

..ssit .....su.....te seiue

plus· ....e p..uum ....ptum

fuerit· quomodo· quicqui.....me·

scripsit· mandau....eic· ego· ...niam

40 tibi· trado man.. ut· tradas .....

.ensi februario.....xs..

The remainder of the formula is continued on the back of the tablet, the writing running in the opposite direction to that on the face.

B.

male• disperd.....nd.....adas

nei•po.s.t. ampli..ull..

men.em aspicere•ui....

contemplare.

Text supplemented from the other tablets.

A.

[B]ona pu[l]chra [P]roserpina Plutoni[s]

[u]xsor, seiue [me Saluiam] deicere oportet,

eripias salu[tem, corpu]s, colorem, uires,

uirtutes Auoni[a]e. [T]radas Plutoni

uiro tuo. [Ni possit cogitati]onibus s[ueis hoc]

quicqui[d] vita[re. Protinus tradas illanc]

febri quarta[nae, te]rtianae, cottidianae,

quas cum illa [l]uctent, deluctent; illanc

euincant, uincan[t, usque dum animam]

eius eripiant. [Qu]are hanc uictimam

[tibi] trado, [Proserpin]a, seiue me,

[Pro]serpina, se[iue me Ach]eruosiam dicere

[op]ortet. Me m[ittas a]rcessitum canem

tricipi[tem, qui Auoniae]s cor eripiat.

[Pollicearis illi te da]turum tres uictim[as]---

palmas, carica[s, porcum n]igrum--- hoc sei

perfecerit ante mensem Martium. Haec,
Saluia, tibi dabo, cum compotem feceris.
Do tibi caput Auoniaes. Proserpina Saluia, do
20 tibi frontem Auoniaes. Proserpina Saluia,
do tibi supercilia Auoniaes. Proserpina
Saluia, do tibi palpebras Auoniaes. Proserpina
Saluia, do tibi pupillas Auoniaes. Proserpina
Saluia, do tibi oriculas, labra, nares, nasum,
25 dentes, liguam Auoniaes, ni dicere possit
Auonia quid. sibi doleat; collum, umeros,
bracchia, digitos, ni possit aliquid
se adiutare: pectus iocinera, cor,
pulmones, ni possit quit sentire
30 quit sibi doleat: intestina, uenter,
umblicus, scapulas, latera, ni possit
dormire: uiscum. sacrum, ni possit
urinam facere; natis, femina,
anum, genua, crura, tibias, pedes,
35 talos, plantas, digitos, ungis, ni
possit stare sua uirtute. Seiue
plus, seiue paruum scriptum
fuerit, quomodo quicquid legitime
scripsit, mandauit, seic ego Auoniam
40 tibi trado mando, ut tradas illanc
mensi Februario. Male perdat, male exseat

(On the reverse)

B.

male disperdat. Mandes, tradas,

nei possit amplius ullum

mensem aspicere, uidere,

45 contemplare.

§ 3. Vesonia.

Lead tablet 30.3 X 11.5 cm. with writing on the reverse midway between the ends.

A.

bona•pulch.....a•plutonis•uxsor

seiue•me•s..uia.....e•oportet•eripias•

salutem•c. rpus colorem•uires•uirtutes

maximae•uesoniae•tra....pluton.

5 uiro ... ni•poss.....gitationibus•su.....

quicq.....tinu..tra.....

febri•qu.....anae.....

quas•cum illa•luc.....

eu.ncant•uincan...sque•dum•anima.

10 e... eripiant•q...e•hanc•uictima.

tibi•trad.•p.....ue•me•pros.....

seiue•me.....dicere•oporte....

mitta.....m•canem tr..ep....

qui.....e cor•er..iat

15 polli.....turum•tres uictimas

palm.....um•nigrum

hoc•sei .erf.....te•mense•martium•

ha.c ..... ti.....cum•compote.

fece..s•do tibi•ca....max.m.e•uesoniae

20 p.....pina s.lui. do• tibi frontem

ma.imae.....ae• proserpina s.....

do tibi• super.....esoniaes• proserpina

saluia• do tibi• palpetras• maximae• uesoni..

proserpina saluia• do• tibi• pupillas• uesoniae

25 proserpina• saluia• do tibi• criclas• labras•

nares• nasum• lingua• dentes• maximae

uesoniae• nei• dicere• possit• maxima•

uesonia• quid• sibi• doleat• collum•

umeros bra.....digitos• ni• possit• aliquit

30 se....utar.....inera• cor

pulmone.....t• sentire• quit.....

doleat• i...st....uenter• umb.....

scapulae.....ni.....

uiscu.....n.....rina.

35 face.....

genua...bia.....a pedes

talos.....s• ungis• ni•

possit• sta.....tute• seiue• plus•

seiue• par.....m fuerit•

40 quomod.....scripsit

man.....ax..am

ueso.....

The remainder of the formula is continued on the reverse of

the tablet, the writing running in the same direction as that on the face.

B.

trado m.....nc•

mensi februar.....male•

45 male•perdat.....x.et•

male•disp.rdat•tr.das

ni•possit..mpliu. ullum•

.ensem•aspi.ere uid.re•

contemplar.

Text supplemented from the other tablets.

A.

Bona pulchra Proserpina Plutonis uxsor,

seiue ne Saluiam dicere oportet, eripias

salutem corpus, colorem, uires, uirtutes

Maximae Vesoniae. Tradas Plutoni

5 uiro tuo. Ni possit cogitationibus suis hoc

quicquid uitare. Protinus tradas illanc

febri quartanae, tertianae, cottidianae,

quas cum illa luctent, eluctent; illanc

euincant, uincant, usque dum animam

10 eius eripiant. Quare hanc uictimam

tibi trado, Proserpina, seiue me, Proserpina,

seiue me [Acherusiam] dicere oportet. Me
mittas arcessitum canem tric e pitem,
qui [Maximae Vesoniae cor eripiat.
Pollicearis illi te daturum tres uictimas---
palmas, caricas, porcum nigrum---
hoc sei perfecerit ante mense Martium.
Haec, [Saluia, tibi dabo], cum compotem
feceris. Do tibi caput Maximae Vesoniae.
Proserpina Saluia, do tibi frontem
Maximae Vesoniae. Proserpina Saluia,
do tibi supercilia Vesoniaes. Proserpina
Saluia, do tibi palpetras Maximae Vesoniae.
Proserpina Saluia, do tibi pupillas Vesoniae.
Proserpina Saluia, do tibi oriclas, labras,
nares, nasum, lingua, dentes Maximae
Vesoniae, nei dicere possit Maxima
Vesonia quid sibi doleat: collum,
umeros, bracchia, digitos, ni possit aliquit
se adiutare: pectus, iocinera, cor,
pulmones, ni possit sentire quit sibi
doleat: intestina, uenter, umblicus,
scapulae, latera, ni possit dormire:
uiscum sacrum, ni possit urinam
facere: natis, anum, femina,

genua, tibias, crura, pedes,

talos, plantas, digitos, ungis, ni

possit stare sua uirtute. Seiue plus,

seiue paruum scriptum fuerit,

40 quomodo quicquid legitime scripsit,

mandauit, seic ego Maximam

Vesoniam, Proserpina, tibi

(On the reverse).

B.

trado, mando, ut tradas illanc

mensi Februario. Male, male,

45 male perdat, male exset,

male disperdat. Tradas,

ni possit amplius ullum

mensem aspicere, uidere,

contemplare.

4 Secunda.

Lead tablet 30.4 X 16.5 cm. with writing on the reverse beginning at the lower end. Nothing of this tablet is preserved to the left of the longitudinal axis.

A.

.....seiue• me•

.....c.rpus

.....irt.....i tra.as•

.....us• su..s• hoc•

5 .....tan.e

.....s cu.....uctent•

.....uin.....nt• usque•

.....s...ipia.....re• hanc•

.....tra.....seiue• me•

10 .....dicere•

.....nem•

.....pia....lliciarus

.....lmas•

.....fecerit

15 .....ina• tibi•

.....is• do• tibi•

.....a• do• tibi

.....luia do tibi•

.....luia• do tibi•

20 .....do tibi• pupillas•

.....ares• labra

.....asum•

.....quid.....leat•

.....acch...dig.....possit•

25 .....ect.....nera•

.....sit• sen.....quit•

.....nter.....umblicus•

.....cap.las• ni

.....m• sacrum

30 .....f.....num

.....u.....as• pedes

(On the reverse).

B.

.....ni•

.....tu.....ue

.....um

35 .....q..t• legitime

.....seic ego

.....tibi trado

.....llun..m.nsi

.....o mal...erd.t male

40 .....rd.t m.....das

.....m m....m aspicere

.....

Text supplemented from the other tablets.

A.

[Bona pulchra Proserpina Plutonis uxsor], seiue me
[Saluiam dicere oportet, eripias salutem], c[o]rpus,
[colorem, uires, u]irt[utes .....]i. Tra[d]as
[Plutoni uiro tuo. Ni possit cogitationi]bus su[e]is hoc
5 [quicquid uitare. Tradas illunc febri quar]tana[e],
[tertianae, cottidianae, qua]s cu[m illo l]uctent,
[eluctent; illunc e]uin[cant, uincant, usque
[dum animam ei]us [eripiant. Qua]re hanc
[uictimam tibi] tra[do, Proserpina], seiue me,
10 [Proserpina, seiue me Acherusiam] dicere
[oportet. Me mittas arcessitum ca]nem
[tricipitem, qui .....i cor eri]pia[t. Po]lliciarus
[illi te daturum tres uictimas--pa]lmas,
[caricas, porcum nigrum---hoc sei per]fecerit

15 [ante mensem Martium. Haec, Proserp]ina, tibi
[dabo, cum compotem feceris. Do tibi
[caput .....i. Proserpina Salu]ia, do tibi
[frontem .....i. Proserpina Sa]luia, do tibi
[supercilia .....i. Proserpina Sa]luia, do tibi
20 [palpebras .....i. Proserpina Saluia], do tibi pupillas
[.....i. Proserpina Saluia, do tibi n]ares, labra,
[oriculas, linguam, dentes, n]asum
[.....i, ni dicere possit ....ius] quid [sibi do]leat;
[collum, umeros, br]acc[hia], dig[itos, ni] possit
25 [aliquid se adiutare: p]ect[us, ioci]nera,
[cor, pulmones, ni pos]sit sen[tire] quit
[sibi doleat: intestina, u]enter, umblicus,
[latera, ni possit dormire: [s]cap[ul]as, ni
[possit sanus dormire: uisc]um sacrum,
30 [ni possit urinam] f[acere: natis, a]num,
[femina, gen]u[a, crura, tib]las, pedes,

(On the reverse).

B.

[talos, plantas, digitos, ungis], ni
[possit stare sua uir]tu[te. Sei]ue
[plus, seiue parum script]um
35 [fuerit, quomodo quic]qu[i]t legitime

[scripsit, mandauit], seic ego

[.....] tibi trado,

[mando, ut tradas illunc mensi

[Februario. Male perdat, male

40 [exseat, male disperdat. Mandes, tradas,

[ni possit amplius ullum mensem aspicere,

[uidere, contemplare].

5. Aquillia.

Lead taplet 27 X 15.4 cm. without writing on the reverse.

.....proser...a' pl.....xsor se...

.....ere.....ias' s..utem

.....ae' aqu.....

.....pos.....ationibus.....

5 .....lla....ebri qua..ana.

.....uctent

.....ncant' u.....

.....re hanc

.....tra.....seiue me

10 .....m' dic.....

.....trice.....

.....ciarus

.....mas.....

.....

15 .....

.....

.....pros.....o t..i.....

.....serpin.....d....bi su.....

.....

20 .....ros.....pilla.

.....o t.....

.....

.....

.....

25 .....diuta.....

.....es.....

.....nt.....

.....

.....cum....rum

30 .....f.....

.....s cru.....

.....tos .....

.tare sua.....

seiue paru.....riptum.....

35 .....leg.....psi.

.....se.....

.....das m.....

.....

....erd.....

40 .....

Text supplemented from the other tablets.

[Bona pulchra] Proserpina Plutonis uxsor, se[iue me Saluiam di]cere [oportet, eripias sa]lutem, [corpus, colorem, uires, uirtutes .....]ae Aqui[lliae.

Tradas Plutoni uiro tuo. Ni possit cogitationibus sueis
5 hoc quicquid uitare. Tradas illanc febri quartanae,
tertianae, cottidianae, quas cum illa luctent,
eluctent; illanc euincant, uincant,
usque dum animam eius eripiant. Quare hanc
[uictimam tibi] trado, Proserpina, seiue me,
10 [Proserpina, seiue me Acherusiam dicere oportet.
Me mittas arcessitum canem] tricepitem,
qui .....ae Aquilliae cor eripiat. Polliciarus
[te daturum tres uictimas---palmas, caricas,
porcum nigrum---hoc sei perfecerit ante mensem
15 Martium. Haec, Proserpina Saluia, tibi dabo, cum
compotem feceris. Do tibi caput .....ae
Aquilliae]. Proserpina Saluia, do tibi [frontem .....ae
Aquilliae. Proserpina Saluia], do tibi supercilia
.....ae Aquilliae. Proserpina Saluia, do tibi palpebras
20 .....ae Aquilliae. Proserpina Saluia, do tibi pupillas
.....ae Aquilliae. Proserpina Saluia, do tibi nares,
labra, oriculas, nasum, linguam, dentes .....ae
Aquilliae, ni dicere possit .....a Aquillia quid
sibi doleat: collum, umeros, bracchia, digitos,
25 ni possit aliquid se adiutare: pectus,
cor, iocinera, pulmones, [ni possit sentire
quid sibi doleat: intestina, uenter, umblicus,

latera, ni possit dormire: scapulas, ni
possit sana dormire: uiscum sacrum,
30 ni possit urinam facere: femina,
natis, anum, genua, tibias, crura, pedes,
talos, plantas, digitos, ungis, ni possit
stare sua uirtute. Seiue plus,
seiue parum scriptum fuerit,
35 quomodo quicquid legitime scripsit,
mandauit, seic ego Aquilliam tibi trado,
mando, ut tradas, mandes illanc mensi
Februario. Male perdat, male exseat, male
disperdat. Mandes, tradas, ni possit amplius
40 ullum mensem aspicere, uidere, contemplare.

§ 6. Transcription of fragments which cannot be assigned to their original places.

(a) Probably belonging to Plotius.

	120	129
1	a	ri
2	a	.

(b) Probably belonging to Avonia.

	208
1	se
2	ra

(c) Probably belonging to Secunda.

	52 (Obv.)	52 (Rev.)	87	128	131
1	o ti	u	.	.ru	r..a
2		t	dicere		possit
			e		

	148	157 (Obv.)	157(Rev.)	170	193
1	..s(?)	.u	m	ic	n

(d) Probably belonging to Aquillia.

	54c	56	58	95
1	n	..	[Pros]erpi[na]	ep...u.
2	in	.ua		
3	.			

	114	125	135	137	153
1	o(?)ra	au	....q	.	e
2		.	r	r	ae

	156	163	169	172	175
1	p.	Pro[serpina]	[sei]ue	.	ui
2	..			g	

	177	179	183	185	188	190
1	.	.	m (?)	la	c.	n.
2	r.	e			s	
3		r				

	195	196	199	201	293	204
1	r	ia	ti	m	[po]ss[it]	m

(e) Fragments which cannot be assigned to any tablet.

	59	89	98	112	127
1	.	u	[Proser]pina	.	a
2	.	ta	.pos[sit]	p	

	134	141	145	147	158	162
1	.	pa	.	m	..	ae
2	as	ds		..		
3	..					

	165	166	168	171	189	194
1	a	.m	[po]ss[it]	a...	u	or

	198	200	211	213	214
1	p	.a	po	ui	il

Commentary on Plotius #I.

1. Bona.....uxsor. The manner of addressing the deity in a defixio was deemed of the utmost importance. Care was taken to specify beyond all doubt the exact deity invoked, so that the petition might not fail to reach its destination; and to use suitable language so as to avoid giving offence. Ordinarily, the most familiar name of the deity was thought sufficient; but often the composers of the formulae in their desire to be more explicit were led to employ many exclusive and flattering epithets. As a rule, among both Greeks and Romans the invocation of Proserpina (Κόρη, Δέσποινα, Περσεφόνη, Περσιφόνη, Φερεσοφόνη, Φερσεφόνηα, Φερσεφώνη) was very simple (Cf. Wünsch DTA 101; 102 a, b; 103 a). The Romans, preferring other deities, very seldom appealed to her. The formula Dea Ataecina Turibrig Proserpina per tuam majestatem (Aud. 122) and that of the Johns Hopkins tablets are unusual for their length. This conception of the power of Proserpina is quite Homeric, for Homer represents her as the consort of Hades who along with her husband puts into effect the curses of men upon the souls of the dead (Cf. Il. IX, 457, 569; Od. X, 494; XI, 226; 385-6; 634-5). The epithets bona pulchra suggest Greek and Roman poetry rather than magic; e.g., pulchra (Virg. Aen. VI, 142); Περσεφόνη καλλής (Hom. H. II,

493); casta (~~Ib.~~ Verg. Aen. VI, 402; Sil. Ital. XIII, 546); maxima (Ovid. Met. V, 507); ἀγνή (Hom. Od. XI, 386); coniunx Plutonia (Prudent. con. Sym. I, 367); dominam Ditis (Virg. Aen. VI, 397); νύμφη Ἅιδου (Eurip. Alc. 746). Bona is found only in our tablets. Other deities commonly invoked are Pluto, Dis Pater, Mercurius, Terra Mater, Ceres, ~~and~~ Hecate, Praxidicae and Ge. In late times we actually find the God of the Jews regarded as an infernal deity and addressed as Ἰαω (Aud. 241, 23-27). Often, on the other hand, no deity at all was addressed (cf. Wünsch, DTA 67; 77).

uxsor. cf. exset 43. The use of xs for simple x is no evidence of date. It is a phenomenon that appears in all classes of composition and ranges from the S.C. de Bacch. of 186 B.C. at least to the second century of the Empire. Alongside this spelling is read Maxima with simple x in every instance in Vesonia. This lack of uniformity is very common and may be observed even in such carefully prepared documents as the Monumentum Ancyranum; e.g., sexsiens (III, 24); exstinxeram (VI, 13).

2. deicere. So Avonia 2; elsewhere dicere. Similarly seiue 10-11; 38 (bis); sei 16 ; [illegible]

seic . 40; sueis 5; nei 34; but ni elsewhere in this hand (. 4, 26, 28, 30, 27, 44, 46); and dicere 26. See the other four tablets. These forms are archaic (Lindsay, p. 243; Lomm. pp. 129 ff.; Stolz-Schmalz, p. 31; Georges s. verba) and have therefore a very decided bearing on the date of our tablets; see Ch. III, § 4. For seiue see Aud. 196, 3 = CIL X 1604; CIL I 197, 3 ; 200, 31; 203, 3. Simple sei appears much more commonly than seiue; see note on 16. Deicere and inflections are not rare; e.g., Plaut. Poen. 474; CIL I 1007; 198, 32; 205, col. 2, 28.

Seiue.....oportet. Cf. 10-11. Similarly seiue quo alio nomine uoltis adpellare (Aud. 129 b); Dis pater Veiouis Manes, siue quo alio nomine fas est nominare (Macrobius Sat. III, 9, 10). In this manner of address the magus is seeking for the name that will bind the deity to perform his request to the last word (cf. Gruppe, pp. 883 ff.; Frazer, Golden Bough, ed. 1911; p. 225; Wünsch, Rhein. Mus. LV, 81). In the sphere of religion a similar manner of address is employed, but its purpose is to propitiate, not to bind (cf. Frazer, l.c. and Hor. Sat. II, 6, 20; Ib. Carm. Saec. 14-15; Aesch. Agam. 160 ff.;

Shorey on Hor. Carm. Saec. 15; Milton, P. L. III, 7).

Seiue. Siue or seu (=uel si) is rare and old-fashioned (cf. Reisig § 256). See Pers. I, 67; Prop. IV, 6, 81; Tib. I,6, 21.

. Like siue....siue , seu .....seu it generally follows the logical construction.

me. Here and in 10, 11, 12 we read the only reference to the person in whose interest the curse has been written. In trado (10, 41), mando (41) and in the frequently repeated formula do tibi (17-24) the reference is implied. But nowhere is the person mentioned by name for fear of magic vengeance and of the penalties imposed by law on those detected in resorting to defixiones against their fellows (cf. Aud. p.xliv. ff.). Names are found as a rule only in amatory tablets (cf. Ib. p. xlv. note 1).

Saluiam. An epithet of Proserpina hitherto unattested. It seems to be connected in thought with the petition eripias

salutem, which immediately follows. There is one instance where Saluia is used in the religious sphere as here, viz., nauis Saluia employed in the cult of the Magna Mater (CIL VI, 494). In two other instances religious associations are implied: aquae Saluiae, the name of the Roman fountain, and Urbs Saluia in Picenum whose patron divinity was Salus (CIL IX 5530 = 6078[1]). For the etymology of Saluia consult Schulze, p. 471. Saluia is apparently a translation of Σώτειρα a common Greek epithet of Proserpina; e.g., ναὸς Κόρης Σωτείρας (Paus. III 13, 2); τὴν Κόρην δὲ Σώτειραν καλοῦσιν οἱ Ἀρκάδες (Ib. VIII, 31, 1); χώπως ἀρεῖς τὴν Σώτειραν γεννάιως τῇ φωνῇ μολπάζω (Arist. Frogs 378-9). On coins of Cyzikus is read Κόρη Σώτειρα (Cf. Macdonald, Greek Coins in the Hunterian Collection, II, pp. 265-266, Glasgow, 1901).

3. eripias. Not found elsewhere in the defixiones in this connection; cf., however, auferas (Aud. 250 a 4; 288 b 5; 289 b 6. 16) and apsumatis, desumatis, consumatis (250 a 23-24).

salutem. Cf. ualetudines (Aud. 135 a 9; cf. 195, 3-7); ὑγείαν (sic) (41, 19).

corpus. Also Olivieri I. These are the only cases where the body is specified in the Latin tablets; but σῶμα appears often in the Greek, e.g., Aud. 41 a 9 and b 16; Wünsch 74, 3.

colorem. Cf. Aud. 190, 5. Corpus, colorem — an alliteration found only here.

uires. Cf. note on eripias 3.

uirtutes. Cf. 38. This is without parallel in other Latin tablets. But the Greek afford many similar expressions; e.g., ἀφέλεσθε αὐτοῦ τὴν δύναμιν καὶ τὴν ἀλκήν..... (Aud. 22, 7); συνέχετέ μοι..... τὴν ἰσχὺν..... τὴν δύναμιν (38, 19-21). [illegible]
Contrast uirtus....nec eripi, nec surripi potest unquam (Cic. Parad. VI sub fin.). For the alliteration cf. uirtutem uirium (Q. Curt. IX 7,29); uirtutem uiresque (Tac. Hist. III. 13); also Apul. Met. IV 8; Plaut. Amph. 191.

The condemnation of the victim in this line is plainly general and anticipates the detailed specifications to follow. The writer is fearful of omitting some item that would cause the curse to fail in its all-embracing effects. Salutem re-

fers in general to the condition of the victim, corpus to the entire material frame, colorem to its appearance, and uires and uirtutes together its faculties.

The absence of the conjunction et will be noticed; in fact, no example of either et or ---que is found in any of our tablets. Asyndeton is an occasional characteristic of the curse formulae in general. In the Greek formulae it is much more frequent than in the Latin. In the earlier tablets from Latium (Aud. 133-139) et is more rarely found than it is later. Asyndeton is archaic and is characteristic of religious formulae; magic follows religion. (Cf. Stolz-Schmalz, p. 685).

4. Ploti. From . . 19 we learn that this Plotius was the slave of Avonia, one of the victims involved in these tablets. The gens Plautia or Plotia was a well-known plebeian gens few of whose members ever attained to distinction. O for au was a feature of rustic Latin and of the vulgar Latin of the streets of Rome. That the demagogue Clodius changed his name to this form from Claudius to win public favor is notorious. Under plebian influence Plautius became Plotius. In oriculas .

25 we have a change from auriculas due to the same general causes (cf. Lindsay, pp. 40-41; Stolz-Schmalz, pp. 79-80). This manner of spelling is one among many indications that in these tablets we have to do with the lowest classes of the population. In Aud., 215, 10 appears the name Plotius Hermes.

The name of the victim (cf. note on 1) was regarded as the most important part of the formula, for among the ancients the name was looked on as the person himself. To make the curse fully effective the name had to be written with the utmost clearness; but compare Wünsch DTA 55; 77; 88; 95 and praef. IV. Sometimes the name was itself defixed, as ἀνάδοτε αὐτοῦ τὸ ὄνομα (Aud. 22, 40; and cf. 23; 26, 28; 37, 26; Wünsch DTA 57, 20). To prevent the goddess mistaking another Plotius for the intended victim his social status is mentioned in l. 19----Ploti Auoniae. In ancient medicine the patient's name was occasionally regarded as a valuable adjunct in effecting a cure; e.g., de sanguine ipso qui fluit nomen eius in fronte scribe, cui medendum est (Marc. X 33; cf. XIV 68).

Usually the dat. is used with eripere; the gen. is emphatic: e.g., non pecuniam modo, uerum etiam hominis propinqui sanguinem uitamque eripere conatur (Cic. Pro. Quin. 11). Cf. Ploti 13 where the gen. preceding is even more emphatic.

Tradas Plutoni. There are many different formulae denotoriae employed and these vary according to whether a deity is asked to consign the victims to the lower regions or whether the author of the curse does so directly without such an appeal. The verb trado is used, as it happens, in both cases; e.g., trade Plutoni (Aud. 140, 7) with an appeal to the god, and trado (. 2) where the curser performs the action himself symbolically. In the former class are obligare (247; 251; 253; 268); deligare 217 b6); alligare (217 b 6; 277; 279); and many others. In Greek are δεῖν, καταδεῖν, παραδιδόναι and many others. For complete lists cf. Aud. Ind. pp.474 ff. and Wünsch DTA Ind. pp. 48-49.

4-5. Ni.....sueis. Ni and nei are byforms of ne (cf. under nei 34). Ni possit followed by an infinitive occurs very frequently (26, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 37, 44) in a great variety of connections. Both ne, non and ut non are common in other Latin tabellae (cf. Aud. Ind. p. 480). Thus we read ne uiribus suis.....possint (Aud. 251, 14-15). The Greek equivalent constantly recurring is μή or ἵνα μή with a subjunctive of δύναμαι in a final clause, as in Aud. 234, 4 . 19, 45, 60-61; and 38, 23-24. The imperative of the 3rd person with μή, the nearest equivalent of the Latin subjunc-

tive with ne, appears but rarely; as μὴ δυνάσθωσαν (249 a 12-13).

cogitationibus. Not "thoughts" but "devices". For this manner of completing a word at the end of a line see facsimiles of Plotius 13 and Vesonia 29; cf. Aud. 190, 9. 11.

5. sueis. For spelling see note on 2 and Ch. III, § 4. Cf. nateis sueis (CIL VI, 15676); uoteis sueis (X 3757); infereis (Aud. 199, 6).

hoc uitare. That the victim may not escape the doom prepared is the wish implied in every curse-formula; here only, apparently, is it explicitly expressed. Hoc summarizes; cf. hoc opto: moriare malis exemplis cruciatus et ipse nec te nunc liceat quo me priuasti lumen uidere et tu des poenas... (Not. degli Scavi 1900, p. 578, no. 35).

illunc. To read e(c)illunc as in 43, would overcrowd the space (cf. Neue II, 429). Illunc belongs exclusively to the vulgar sphere and among the authors is confined with rare exceptions to Plautus and Terence; e.g., Plaut. Curcul. 590; Trin. 520; Persa 738; Merc. 272. Belonging as it undoubtedly does to the sphere of conversation it is but rarely found in inscriptions: illunc (CIL IV, 1691); illuc = illud (2013).

6. febri.....cottidianae. Of tertianae only the initial letter and the last three letters are legible; the presence of quartanae and cottidianae makes it easy to complete the word. Of cottidianae the second t is but faintly written.

To consign an enemy to the various manifestations of malaria was common to Greek and Roman alike, e.g., patiatur febris frigus tortionis palloris sudores obripilationis meridianas serutinas nocturnas (Aud. 140, 8-11 = Wünsch, Seth. 1); tercianas quartana (Olivieri IV); .....καὶ φρίκη καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν καθημερινῶς πυρετῷ (Aud. 74, 6; 75, 10-12); cf. 51, 1-2.

In no other Latin tablet is febris cottidiana mentioned. Cf., however, Terence, Hec. 357. For the prevalence of malaria in ancient Greece, see Jones, W. H. S., Malaria and Greek History, pp. 41, 63; and in ancient Italy see Jones, Ross, Elliott, Malaria, chapter entitled "In Ancient Italy". Of the ancient medical authorities on the disease, see Hippocrates, Epid. I. 24-25 (pp. 200, 201 Kühlewein); Celsus III 3, 13, 14, 15; and cf. Plato, Timaeus 86 A. For the periodic fevers as demons, see Hymns of the Atharva-Veda (Bloomfield) I 25; V 22; VII 116; and cf. Cic. De N.D. III, 25; De Leg. II 11.

cottidianae. Correctly spelled thus: cf. Burger under cottidie in Thes. Ling. Lat., and Buechler, Carm. Epig. 231, 3 note.

7. quas. The accusative for the nominative; cf. ὁν = ὁς (Aud. 159 a 53); interquibus = inter quos (106, 6).

illo. After illunc 5 one would expect illoc, and similarly illac in Avonia 8 and Vesonia 8; but in these two instances we actually find illa. By analogy we therefore read illo in this line.

luctent. This word is restored by a comparison of all the tablets. The active lucto is found almost entirely among the old writers according to Priscian VIII 5, 25 p. 797. K. Luctant is read in Non. p. 472 from Ennius IX 339; luctauimus and luctat in Ib. p. 468 from Plaut. Vid. Fr. IX and Terence, Hec. 829; deluctauit (or according to isolated MSS. deluctaui) from Plaut. Trin. 839; luctare in Varro De Ling. Lat. V 10, 61. Only three instances appear later than the Republic and those are all compounds with re-; reluctabat (Apul. Met. IV 20 p. 281); reluctabant (Ib. VII 5 p. 455); a passive reluctatis rebus (Claudian, De Raptu Pros. I 42). It will be observed that these post-Republican examples belong to an author or to a department where one is not surprised to find archaic diction. Luctent would seem to be an evidence of the date of the tablets (cf. ch. III, § 4).

deluctent. At this point occurs the only extensive lacuna common to all the tablets; hence, conjecture is the only means available for the restoration of the original text. On the analogy of the grouping of cognates or synonyms, as in 6, 8, 41, 42, 43-44, 45-46; in Aud. 250 a and b (quoted in note on eripias 3); also in Aud. 16 X 4. 8. 10. 11. 12. 13; deluctent would be very apt in this connection. For the use of delucto cf. the the previous note. Deluctent resembles the English idiom "to fight it out with a person." It would have been hard for the author of the tablets to choose other verbs that would as vividly describe the shivers and delirium of malarial fever as do luctent and deluctent. Cf. Osler, The Principles and the Practice of Medicine, pp. 16, 17.

illunc. As cum illo could not accompany euincant uincant, the direct object must be assumed. The omission of et is in harmony with the prevailing asyndeton. Further, the number of letters in the conjectured words would give the entire line an average length.

8. usque dum. Cf. usque dum per me tibi licuerit. (Cic. in Verr. III, 5); Plaut. Men. 728.

animam. Cf. pertransseas hanimam et ispiritum (Aud. 250 a 17-18); also b 13 and Olivieri III. In the Greek tablets ψυχή is frequently used in such a connection and occasionally along with it are other words connoting the immaterial part of man, as πνεῦμα ψυχὴν διάνοιαν φόνηστιν κίνθηστιν ξοήν (Aud. 41, 9-10). The expression demando ut facias illum mortuum (300 b 3-6) embodies the same sentiment in other words.

9. uictimam. Usually the word refers to an animal as in 14 and Ovid, Am. III 13, 16 (see Wissowa, [illegible] p. 347), but here it refers to a human being. Similarly hostia in Aud. 138 where a woman is the victim. Cf. uictima (Aud. 243, 28). Both words are rare in defixiones.

11. Acheruosiam. Ach- rather than ac-: cf. pulchra 1 and bracchia 28. The syllable is not preserved in any of the tablets. The -uo- seems to be an inadvertent metathesis of the vowels of the diphthong in Ἀχεροούσιος. For inser-

tion of -iam cf. Aud. 49, 3. 4; 18 and 50, 5. 8 and see note on cogitationibus 4.

Just as Salviam 2 anticipates eripias salutem 3, so Acheruosiam anticipates the summons of Cerberus 12-13. This is a new epithet of Proserpina; cf. Stygia (Stat., Theb. IV 526-527); inferna (Verg. Aen. VI 138 and CIL X 7576); ἡ νερτέρα θεός (Soph. Oed. Col. 1548). Cerberus generally appears as the watch-dog of the house of Pluto and Proserpina, as in Apul. Met. VI 19; Verg. Aen. VI 400; Hes. Theog. 767 ff. Sometimes he is definitely located in the region of Acheron, as in Stat. Theb. VIII 513 ff.; Ovid. Met. VII 409 ff; Sil. Ital. III 35; Pomp. Mela I 19, 7; and Acheron often stands for the entire region of Hades as pars pro toto; e.g., Plaut. Most. 499. 509; Poen. 344: see Preller, Gr. Myth. I p. 817. Acheron is mentioned only once elsewhere in the defixiones, Aud. 250 a 11.

12 mittas. No trace of a letter after -a- is found in any of the hands, yet it is natural to suppose that the verb we require here is coordinate with eripias 3; the only possible alternative is to assume mittam, but this, of course,

would not suit the context.

me. Me pro mihi dicebant antiqui (Festus, p.161); cf. templa tescaque me ita sunto (Varro De Ling. Lat. VII 2, 8); Ib. De R. R. III 16, 2; occiperes tute ⟨eam⟩ amare et me ires consultum male (Plaut. Bacch. 565); Ib. 684; si quid me fuerit humanitus (Ennius 125) with which compare si quid mihi humanitus accidisset (Cic. Phil. I 4,10). See Stolz-Schmalz p. 216; Neue II 352; Lindsay, 422; Reichardt, N. Jahrb. für cl. Phil. 139, 110 ff.

12-13. canem tricipitem. Cerberus is often referred to without explicit mention of his name: e.g., formaque trifauci personat insomnis lacrimosae ianitor aulae (Sil. Ital.II 551); tricipitem eduxit, Hydra generatum, canem. (Cic. Tusc. Disp. II 9). Other descriptive compounds of a similar character occur: tergeminus (Prop. [illegible], IV 7, 52; Ovid Tr. IV 7, 16); triformis (Statius Theb. II 53-54). Among the Latin tabellae defixionum there is discovered no other reference of any sort to Cerberus; but in the Greek (Aud. 74, a 5; 75 a 9-10) the epithet φύλαξ is applied to him twice. That Cerberus does not figure more frequently in the tabellae is

strange, in view of his importance in magical operations in general (cf. Roscher, Lex. under Kerberos p. 1134). Suidas cites Τρικάρηνος as an epithet doubtless meant to apply to Cerberus. Under Κόρη the same author writes: εἶχε πρὸ τῆς θύρας κύνα, ὃν ἐκάλει διὰ τὸ μέγεθος Τρικέρβερον.

13. Tricepitem = tricipitem. The mistake of writing e for i, is a very common phenomenon in the inscriptions; but exact parallels to the present case are very rare: conieciant (CIL I 198, 50); accepient (V 6731, 21); arceptorem (in Greek script) = accipitrem (Aud. 270, 3). Without doubt the popular pronunciation sometimes retained the e of the nom. triceps throughout the oblique cases; hence the error in orthography. In the popular spelling of many words there was a confusion of e and i (cf. Lindsay, p. 229).

Ploti This is conjectured on the analogy of [Auoniae]s in Avonia 14. In this and the corresponding passages in the other tablets one would expect either eius or the name of the victim in the genitive. The varying length of the lacunae corresponds with the varying length of the respective names.

cor. Cf. 29. Cerberus was regarded as a devourer of human flesh; cf. qui viscera saevo spargis nostra (humana) cani (Lucan, Phars. VI 702-3); ὠμηστήν (Hesiod, Theog. 311); ἐσθίει ὅν κε λάβῃσι πολίων ἐκτοσθεν ἐόντα (Ib. 772); Philochorus, Fr. 46, Müller.

polliciarus = pollicearis. Vulgar confusion of e and i, especially in unaccented syllables, was very common. Similarly (h)abias (Aud. 228 a6; b6): (h)abiat (270, 8-9); ualiat (223 a16); pariat (CIL I 197, 10). In all these instances i for e precedes a as in polliciarus; but it is found before other vowels as well, e.g. abiegnieis (I 577, col. 2,1).

Likewise unaccented i and u were confused owing to the similarity of the sounds they represented (cf. Lindsay pp. 25 ff.; Stolz-Schmalz, p. 67). The error is most frequently found in superlative endings (cf. Quintil. Inst. I 4. 8 -- medius est quidam u et i litterae sonus, non enim optimum dicimus aut optumum; and Brock, Quaest. Gram., p. 72); but it is also found in other parts of speech than adjectives, as utarus (CIL I 1267 = IX 604); spatiarus (I 1220 - IX 1837); figarus (IV 2082); Caesarus (I 685); Caesaru (696); Castorus (197, 17); hominus (200, [illegible] 60, 63). According to Stolz-Schmalz (p. 199) this is an early phenomenon.

For the manner of completing the word cf. the note on cogitationibus 4.

14. tres uictimas. Here uictimas refers to other than human beings (cf. note on uictimam 9). Doubtless the three victims or offerings enumerated in the next line are to be given one to each mouth of the hell-hound, thus leaving no part of him unpropitiated. Apart from the special reason for three offerings in this case, the numerical trinity is a prominent feature of nearly all charm-formulae and incantations. (Cf. Shakespeare, Macbeth I 3; IV, 1.)

15. palmas. Neither dates nor the other two offerings are recorded as ever having been given to Cerberus. Nor is there elsewhere any memtion of dates as gifts to Proserpina or Demeter. For association of figs and dates cf. hic nux, hic mixta est rugosis carica palmis (Ovid, Met. VIII 674); quid uolt palma sibi rugosaque carica (Ib. Fasti I 185).

caricas. Carica = ficus Carica. Fruit-offerings were characteristic of the Demeter-Proserpina worship (Stengel, Gr. Kult., p. 91; Ib. Opf., p.167; Paus. IX, 19, 4; VIII, 37, 4; 42, 5). The fig was the special fruit of the chthonic cults in general (Gruppe, p. 790). A wild fig marked the place where Pluto went down with Proserpina (Paus. I 38); cf. Paus, I 37, 2.

porcum nigrum. For uictima applied to a pig as here see Ovid. Am. III 13, 16. The swine was characteristic of the chthonic worship in general and of that of Demeter - Proserpina in particular (cf. Gruppe, p. 1178, note 2; p. 38; Ovid. Fasti I 349. 466; Serv. ad Aen. III 118; Macr. Sat. III 11, 10; Varro, De R.R. IV, 9; Hyg. Fab. CCLXVII. Although not always given, black victims were preferred by the chthonic divinities (Stengel, Opf. p. 188; Dittenberger, Syll. 615, 25; Zosimus, Hist. Nou. II 1; CIL XI 1420; Macr. III 9, 11; Val. Max. II 4,5); αὖθι δὲ Γαίῃ πληθουσίῃ χοίροις ὗς ἱρεύοιτο μέλαινα (Eph. Epig. 1891, 134, 11); cf. also Wissowa, . p. 3478. The same is true of male victims (Stengel, Opf. p. 192; Dittenberger, Syll. 615, 17); (Π)ερσεφόνᾳ χοῖρον ἄρσενα (Ziehen, Leg. Sacr. 51).

It will have been observed that these offerings are of

the kind usually given to Demeter and Proserpina. For the food of Cerberus see note on 13; occasionally he was placated with a honey-cake, as in Verg. Aen. VI 417 ff.; Apul. Met. VI. 19 passim; cf. Gruppe, p. 407, notes 4,5.

16. hoc sei perfecerit: Sc. Cerberus. A similar promise of a sacrifice in the event of the petition being granted by the divinity is found in Wünsch DTA 109, 6-7: Μαρνοῦς κακῶς πράξαντος εὐαγγέλια θύσω. For the spelling of sei, see note on 2. It is read also in CIL I 33; 196, 28; 571; 603; IV, 64; 1196; 2430; 4971; 4972; Plaut. Men. 239, 241, and elsewhere. It is not found in any other Latin tabella.

16-17. ante mensem Martium. Time limits for the inception and the consummation of the curse are often imposed. Cf. ni possit amplius ullum mensem aspicere (44-45); pridie idus ianuarias siue idus (Aud. 248 b 5-7); ιανουαδιας (252, 44). Far commoner than the reference to months are references to moments, hours, days, nights, weeks, years, as ab hac (h)ora, ab

hoc nocte (140, 11 = Wünsch, Seth. 1); εξ ακ διη ακ ιουιντο (231, 24); intra annum itusm = istum (129 b 12-13); perducas ad domus Tartareas..... intra dies septe(m) (250 a 13-14); εἰς ἐνιαυτόν (189 b 7); σήμερον (174, 23). In one formula the effect of the curse is expected to be valid for all time, as δητιν εατουρ ιν ουνε τεμπους = detineatur in omne tempus (231, 11-12).

17-18. haec....feceris. Cf. note on hoc sei perfecerit 16. A Roman prayer was frequently a cautious quid pro quo; e.g., Bellona, si hodie nobis uictoriam duis, ast ego tibi templum uoueo (Livy X 19, 17); cf. Ib. I 12, 4; XXII 10, 2 ff., CIL III 1933; Laing (G. J.), Classical Philology, VI 2, pp. 180 ff.

17. Proserpina Saluia. Saluia only can be read in Avonia 18 and Vesonia 18, but a very distinct r together with the demands made by the length of the line compel us to read here Proserpina as well as Saluia.

18. compote(m). The weak pronunciation of m in Latin

is well-known (cf. Lindsay pp. 60-62; Stolz-Schmalz, p.156). In the tabellae m is often dropped before vowels and consonants alike, as colore(m) ficura(m) caput (Aud. 190, 5); fronte(m) supercili (135 a6); Sergia(m) Glycinna(m) (139, 18); uita(m) ualetudin(em) (195, 3). See Aud. Ind. 539 ff. In Avonia 18 we read compotem feceris; but in Vesonia 17 mense Martium.

compotem = me compoten uoti, as in insequere, et uoti postmodo compos eris! (Ovid, Ars Amat. I 486); Nunc me uoti compotem facis (Seneca, Hipp. 718).

do tibi. Do appears only here in the tabellae.

caput. Also in Aud. 134 a7; 135 a3; 190, 6. Cf. Τοίχας κεφαλὴν ἐνκέφαλον πρόσωπον (41 a 16-17); τὴν κεφαλήν (Wünsch DTA 89 a3). In all other than the Johns Hopkins tablets the natural order of the enumeration of the parts is followed very imperfectly.

19. Ploti Auoniae. Sc. serui. It is quite possible that the original was Auoniaes, as in Avonia 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23. The word seruus in such a case as this might be written in full or in abbreviated form, or it might be omitted altogether

as here. In the uasa Arretina (CIL XI 6700-1) the usage varies; but in the tesserae consulares (I 717-776b) seruus is omitted. Cf. Marquardt - Mau, Privatleben d. Röm. I pp. 20-21, and p..21, note 1.

20. frontem. collus os bucas dentes labias mentus oclos fronte supercili (Aud. 135 a6); cf. b4; cerebru frute supercilia os nasu metu bucas (190, 7). The nearest approach to this in Greek is πρόσωπον (Wünsch DTA 171, 3 and 41a 16-17).

21. supercilia. For example, see previous note; ὀφρῦς (Au 41, 17; and Wünsch, DTA 89a 10).

22-23. palpebras, pupillas. Nowhere else than in these tablets, apparently, are these parts of the eye enumerated. The eye as a whole, however, is frequently mentioned, e.g., among the Latin tablets, 134 a8; 135 al. 6; b2; Olivieri I; also see note on frontem 20. Among the Greek occur: ὀφθαλμούς (Aud. 49, 14. 16); τὰ ὄμματα (241, 13-14; 242, 57-58). Cf. ni possit.....aspicere, uidere, contemplare (44-45).

24-26. nares.....dentes. The order of the parts differs from this in Avonia 24-25, Vesonia 25-26, Secunda 21-22; the order in Aquillia is conjectural. The sudden grouping of the remaining parts of the head after the extended and finely detailed enumeration of the preceding parts is plainly resorted to for the sake of brevity. In Aud. 135 a and b all the parts of the body are grouped in the one appeal with little regard for order.

24. nares. Found only here in the Latin tablets; but μυκτῆρες (Aud. 41 a 17).

25. labra. For example, see note on frontem 20; cf. Aud. 190, 8 and labras in Vesonia 25.

oriculas. The sense of hearing is referred to but rarely in the tabellae and then by the verb rather than by the noun. Cf. nec frenis audire possint (Aud. 275, 29-30); nec frenis audiant (280, 15; 281, 15; 282 a25); also ἀκοάς (41, 17).

For spelling of oriculas = auriculas cf. note on Ploti, 4.

Vesonia 25 gives the syncopated form oriclas. Auricula is a popular diminutive of auris. Cf. Orata genus piscis appellatur a colore auri, quod rustici orum dicebant, ut auriculas, oriculas (Festus, p. 182, 13-15 under orata).

nasum. For example, see note on frontem 20; and cf. caput olaus = olfactus (134 a7). The nose and nostrils are in no other tablets mentioned together.

linguam. The tongue is very frequently defixed; as licua (Aud. 134 b2); alligo deligo linguas (217 a4); adligate linguas (218, 6-7); inimicorum meorum linguas aduersus me obmutescant (222 b3-5); ligo oligo (=obligo) linguas illoro medias extremas nouissimas ne quit possint respondere contra (219 a 2-8); καταγράφω ..... γλῶτταν (Aud. 47, 7-9); καταδῶ ..... γλῶτταν καὶ ψυχήν (49, 2. 4. 5. 7. 9. 11. 12. 15); δῆσαι Διονυσίας γλῶσσαν (81 a 3-4); καταδῶ τὴν γλῶτταν (Wünsch, DTA 49; 50); εἴ τι μέλλει ὑπὲρ φίλωνος φθέγγεσθαι δῆμα πονηρόν, ἡ γλῶσσ' αὐτοῦ μόλυβδος γένοιτο. καὶ κέντησον αὐτοῦ τὴν γλῶσσαν (96, 8-16). The faculty of speech is defixed in various other ways also; e.g., os bucas dentes labias (Aud. 135 a5); crus os pedes (b4); os nasu metu bucas labra uerbu (190, 7-8);

ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ στόμα (49, 16); .... φίμωσατον δὲ τὰ στόματα πάντων (15, 24); παραλάβετε τὰς φωνὰς ..... (22, 37; 24, 21; 25, 6-7); παραλάβετε .... τοὺς λόγους (32, 24-25); κατα ῶ καὶ λόγους καὶ ἔργα τὰ Κέρκιδος (5R, 5-6); ἀτελὴς εἴη αὐτὴ καὶ ὅτι ἀν πρὸς Καλλίαν διαλέγειν μέλλῃ καὶ Χαρίαν ὅτε ἀν διαλέγειν μέλλῃ καὶ ἔργα καὶ ἔπη .... (68 a 3-7).

26. dentes. os bucas dentes labias (Aud. 135 a5); manus detes oclos bracia (b 1-2); ὀδόντας (41, 18) occurs only once in the Greek tablets.

26-27. ni dicere possit Plotius quid sibi doleat. Final, not optative, expressing the purpose in defixing the utterance of Plotius in 24-26. Similarly ligo oligo (=obligo) linguas illoro medias extremas nouissimas ne quit respondere contra (Aud. 219 a 2-8); καταδεσμεύσατε τὴν γλῶσσαν τὸν Θυμὸν τὴν ὀργὴν τὴν εἰς ἐμὲ ἔχει τὸν Ἀρτεμίδωρον ὁ Ἀφροδισίαρος, ἵνα μὴ δύνηται μοι. μηδένι πράγματι ἐναντιωθῆνε (28, 19 ff.).

For construction of quid sibi doleat see scio ego quid doleat mihi (Plaut. Mil. Glor. 1325). I find no other example of the indirect question in the defixiones.

27-28. collum, umeros, bracchia, digitos. Objects of do tibi 24. In this group are defixed the members on which a man depends most for assistance; hence, the purpose of ni possit aliquit se adiutare, 28-29.

collum. Cf. collus (Aud. 135 a5); colu (190, 9); καταδήσατε αὐτοῦ τὼν τράχηλων τὰς χεῖρας τοὺς πόδας (15, 19).

umeros. Cf. colu iocur umeros cor (Aud. 190, 9); scaplas umerum neruias (135 a7); καταγράφω ..... ὤμους βραχίονας πῆθος στόμαχον (74, 13-14).

bracchia. In no other tablet is the word spelled thus; cf., however, manus dicitos bracias uncis (Aud. 135 a2); manus detes oclos bracia uenter (b 1-2); 190, 10; βραχίονες

(74, 13; see previous note). Manus is strangely omitted from the list in our tablets, though it is found elsewhere, as 135 a2; b 1; 190, 11; 247, 9. χεῖρες (or χεῖρας) frequently occurs in Greek tablets; e.g., (234, 57; 240, 40; 47, 2. 4. 6. 8); (64, 8. 10). For bearing of the aspirate ch in bracchia on the date of the tablets see ch. III. § 4.

digitos. Cf. braccia digitos manus (Aud. 190, 10-11); 135 a2. For digiti (pedum) see Plotius 37.

aliquit. So quit 30. According to the inscriptions t for d was very common in all parts of the Roman world and at all periods. It belongs to the vulgar sphere. Cf. quit (Aud. 219 a6; 303 I 3; II 4. 6; IV 1. 2; VI 2; CIL V. 3415); aliquit (IX 5860; XII 915).

28-29. ni possit se adiutare. Exact parallels are not to be found; but cf. εἵνα ἀδυνάμους ἀβοηθήτους ποιήσητε (Aud. 161, 28-31 = Wünsch Seth. 22; Aud. 159a 44-45; b27-29; 160, 15-16. 38-39. 88-89);

ἀδυνάτους αὐτοὺς ποιεῖ (Wünsch DTA 98, 5); Aud. 164, 23; 165, 22-23; 166, 12. 32. The Latin defixiones offer no parallels.

29-30. pectus iocinera cor pulmones. Objects of do tibi 24. Here are defixed the organs which were regarded as the seat of the senses; hence the force of ni possit sentire quit sibi doleat 30-31.

pectus. Although only -c- shows here, there is no doubt about the reading, in view of Avonia 28 and Secunda 25. Cf. natis um[l]icus pectus mamilas (Aud. 135 a4); uenter mamila pectus osu (b2-3); pectoris ....cor .... (142 b9); βραχίονας στῆθος στόμαχον (74, 13-14); μαστοὺς ... στῆθος (75 b 1-2). For pectus as the seat of perception, oculis pectoris aliquid haurire (Ovid, Met. XV 63); also Quint. X 7, 15.

[io]cinera. The first syllable is lacking in all our tablets and must be supplied by conjecture. The only example in the defixiones is iocur (Aud. 190, 9) and in this sphere

iocinera rather than iecinora is almost certainly required. For the great variety of orthography and inflection of this word see Neue I pp. 837-839. In the Greek defixiones ἧπαρ occurs, as in Aud. 42 b3; 156, 42; 252, 8-9; 253, 15. For iocur (or iecur) as seat of the affections and passions cf. non ancilla tuum iecur ulceret ulla puerue. (Hor. Epist. I 18, 72); also Ib. Odes I 13, 4: Juv. I 45.

cor. See note on cor 13. Cf. iocur umeros cor fulmones itestinas vetre (Aud. 190, 9-10); 250 a24; 270, 11. 19; αἴσθησιν ζοὴν καρδίαν (41, 10 - 11); 42 b3; 51, 3; Wünsch DTA 89 b7; 93 a4; b3. For cor as the seat of understanding see quicquam sapere corde (Plaut. Mil. Glor. 336); Cic. Phil. III 6, 16.

pulmones. So fulmones - pulmones (Aud. 190, 9); πνεύμονας καρδίαν ἧπαρ (42 b3); σῶμα πνεῦμα ψυχὴν διάνοιαν φρόνησιν (41 a9); 78, 5.

30 - 31. ni possit sentire quit sibi doleat. For sentire the original has sentique. Cf. Avonia 29-30; Vesonia 31-32. For construction of quit sibi doleat see note on 26-27. Here quit, but quid 27; see also under aliquit 28. The same word even in the same composition is sometimes spelt with both d and t; e.g., apud (Aud. 139, 4) and aput (9).

31 - 32. intestina uenter umblicus latera. Objects of do tibi 24. The parts here defixed represent the front and sides of the body, and scapulas 32 the back. A man sleeps reclining on sides, front or back; hence the pertinency of ni possit dormire 32; and ni possit sanus dormire 33 (on which see note).

intestina. Cf. corfulmones itestinas uetre (Aud. 190, 10); uiscera interania (250 a24); ἔντερα (75 b 2); ὑπογάστριον (74, 14 - 15).

uenter. Here we should expect uentrem, as in Aud. 190, 10, where we read uetre. But the use of the word as a neuter is not unparalleled; e.g., Aud. 135 a3. 8; b2. 3. 5. There is no other authority for the neuter than this very limited vulgar usage. In Greek we find κοιλίαν (42 b4); στόμαχον (74, 14); τὴν γαστέρα (Wünsch, DTA 89 a4). From the point of view of anatomy uenter was as loosely used as is our English word belly. Cf. note on intestina.

umblicus. The reading of the final s in Secunda 27 establishes the original text without a doubt. As in the case of uenter a limited vulgar usage is the sole authority for its use as a neuter; e.g., umlicus (Aud. 135 a4); b6; cf. ublicu (190, 11). By the ancients the navel was regarded as the middle point of the body; e.g., corporis centrum medium naturaliter est umbilicus (Vitruv. III 1, 3); cf. however, Varro, De Ling. Lat. VII 17. See Gruppe, pp. 723 ff.

latera. So latus (Aud. 134 b6); laius - latus (b 1). The plural is not found elsewhere in the tabellae. The Greek equivalent is found nowhere in the Greek tabellae.

32. ni possit dormire. Cf. ni possit sanus dormire 33. Similarly νοὺ ποσσιτ δορμειρέ (Aud. 267, 19 - 20); ουθ..... νον δορμιαθ (bis) (270, 4-7); auferas somnum, non dormiat Maurussus (250 a4-5); cf. 265 a8-9; 266, 7; ὕπνος δ' ἀπέστω γλυκύθυμος ὀμμάτων (Arist. Clouds 705-6); Shakespeare, Macbeth, I 3. The sentiment is not expressed anywhere in the Greek tablets.

scapulas. Cf. scapulae in Vesonia 33. Elsewhere in the tabellae only in Aud. 135 a7 where scaplas is read. Cf. στόμαχον νῶτον ὑπογάστριον (74, 14-15). Scapulae was sometimes used for tergum, as pars pro toto; e.g., scapulas praebere uerberibus (Seneca, De Ira, III 12); cf. Plaut. Cas. 955-6; Truc. 793; Ter. Phor. 76.

33. ni possit sanus dormire. In sanus there is space between s and n for one letter only which must be a in this connection. "So that he may not sleep a healthy sleep". This doubtless refers to the delirium of the fevers (cf. Celsus III 3, 13, 14, 15).

33 - 34. uiscum sacrum. Object of do tibi 24. The connection with nei possit urinam facere is obvious. Usually not uiscus -i (or perhaps uiscum -i), but uiscus -eris; the word is most commonly used in the plural. Viscus = uterus in Nemes. Cyn. 124, 132; Quint. X 3, 4; Ulp. Dig. XLVIII 8, 8; = testes in Petr. CXIX, 20; Plin. N. H. XX 13, 51 § 142. Referring to the epithet ἱερόν in ἱερὸν ὀστέον (cf. os sacrum) the Thes. Gr. Ling. offers this among other suggestions as to its origin - "quod in ea aliquid sacri arcanique insit". In uiscera interamia (Aud. 250 a24) the word is used in a general sense only; only here and in our tablets is it found in the defixiones. Cf. cunus (Aud. 135 b6); αἰδοῖον (42 b5); τύλ[ον] (74, 17); Τὰς ψωλὰς ..... Τοὺς Κύσθους (Wünsch DTA 77 b1-2; 5-6).

34. nei possit urinam facere. Cf. si in lecto..... ... urinam faciat; (Ulp. Dig. XXI 1, 14); Colum. VI 30, 3. 4; Pliny, N. H. VIII, 68. The only parallel to this is where the uisica = uesica is cursed in Aud. 190, 11 .

nei. Appears only here and Avonia 43 and Vesonia 27. This is an old form of the classical ne (Lindsay, p. 244). For its bearing on the date of the tablets see ch. III, § 4. See also notes on seive, deicere 2 , and ni 4.

35 - 37. natis .....ungis. Objects of do tibi 24. Ni possit stare 37 shows the immediate purpose in defixing the parts of the legs.

natis. Elsewhere among the tabellae only in Aud. 135 a4 — pedes femus uenter natis umlicus ; for other examples see Cat. XXXIII 7; Hor. Ep. VIII 5; Juvenal VI 612. Cf. ungis 37. On the spelling see Lindsay, p. 404 and Neue I, p. 383 ff. In the Greek tablets we find πωκτόν (Aud. 42 b5); πωκτά (75 b2); τὴν π[υ]γὴν (Wünsch, DTA 89).

anum. Found only here.

femina. Cf. femena cenua crura talos planta ticidos

(Aud. 190, 11); femus (135 a3); μηρούς (42 b5; 74, 16). Only in these passages from the tabellae are the thighs defixed. For the inflections of femus see Neue I, pp. 834ff.

genua. Only here and Aud. 190, 12 where it is spelled cenua.

36. crura. -a (Auonia 34; Vesonia 36); -u- (Secunda 31); cru - (Aquillia 31). Similarly crura (Aud. 190, 12; see note on femina); crus only (135 a8); crus os pedes (b4). In the Greek occur: καταδήσατε τὰ σκέλη καὶ τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τὴν καρδίαν Βικτωρικοῦ τοῦ ἡνιόχου (241, 17); καταδῆσον αὐτῶν (sc. τῶν ἵππων) τὰ σκέλη (241, 12); cf. 239, 46-48; 240, 55-60. Only in the above passages are the legs defixed.

tibias. Only here and in κνήμας (Aud. 42 b6) is this part of the leg mentioned in a curse.

pedes. pedes femus (Aud. a3); crus os pedes frontes uncis dicitos (b 4-5); 247, 12; 250 b12; 252, 41 (Greek script); πόδας (15, 19; 47, 2 . 6 . 8; 49, 3. 13. 16). The feet of both men and horses are very frequently defixed in Latin and Greek tabellae alike.

talos. Occurs elsewhere only in Aud. 190, 12 (see note on femina); τὰ τφυρά (15, 20) is the only instance in the Greek tablets.

plantas. In Avonia 35 after talos is read - la- . The next part of the leg in order is planta, as in crura talos planta ticidos (Aud. 190, 12-13) the only other passage in the defixiones where the word is found.

The heel is defixed once only in the Greek: μηροὺς πρωκτὸν.... κνήμας πτέρνας (Aud. 42 b6).

37. digitos. The toes are rarely defixed; ticidos (Aud. 190, 13 on which see previous note) and ἄκρα ποδῶν δακτύλους (42 b7) are the only examples.

ungis. Uncis (pedum) occurs in Aud. 135 b5 (see note on pedes); in a2 uncis = ungues manuum, as probably ὄνυχας (42 b15 and 75 b1). For acc. in -is see note on natis 35. In pronunciation there was a tendency to make gu sound like simple g, as seen here and in ungentari(us) (CIL I, 1065); ungentario (1268); exsenyium - exsanguium (Aud. 251, col. 2, 13); see Lindsay, p. 301; Stolz-Schmalz, p. 109 .

37-38. ni possit stare sua uirtute. The following are the readings for uirtute: --rt-te (Plotius 38); -----te (Avonia 36); ---tute (Vesonia 38); ---tu-- (Secunda 32). The word is here the equivalent of uiribus, as in deum uirtute est te unde hospitio accipiam (Plaut. Mil. Glor. 676); uirtus in infirmitate perficitur (Vulg. II Cor. 12, 9) where uirtus translates δύναμις ; cf. Vulg. Ps. 85, 8. There is no exact parallel of ni possit stare elsewhere among the defixiones, though we may regard as quasi-parallels the oft-repeated wishes expressed by cadat or cadant respecting both horses and drivers mentioned in tablets 272-284 of Audollent's collection.

38 - 43. Seiue plus .....ecollunc. These lines show that this formula belongs to the very limited class of counter-charms. In Audollent's collection there are only two; ἀνατίθημι δὲ καὶ τὸν κατ' ἐμοῦ γράψαντα ἢ καὶ ἐπιτάξαντα (4 a 7 ff.); γράφω πάντας τοὺς ἐμοὶ ἀντίκα ποιοῦντες μετὰ τῶν ἀώρων (14).

39. scriptum fuerit. Sc. a Plotio; cf. scripsit mandauit (sc. Plotius) 40. Scribo as used here is a literal translation of γράφω or καταγράφω which are frequently employed as synonyms of δῶ and κατα δῶ , as in Aud. 4 a7 ff. and 14 (see previous note); καταγράφω ἔργα πράξιν κ.τ.λ. (47, 4); καταγράφω Εὐαγόραν Χεῖρας πόδας κ.τ.λ. (6 ff.); also 67, 5; 74; 75; 76; 84, 5. 9; 87. Describo (or perhaps ascribo) is used in this sense in 134 a8. Scribo is therefore in this passage a synonym of defigo, trado, do, commendo, ligo and its compounds, mando, or any other verbs of defixing.

39 - 40. quomodo.....mandauit; seic.....mando. "In what manner he (Plotius) has according to the laws of magic composed any curse (against me) and entrusted it to writing; in like manner do I consign and entrust him to thee." Cf. the previous note. There is a very close parallel structurally in Aud. 139, 1-6: Quomodo mortuos qui istic sepultus est nec loqui nec sermonare potest, seic Rhodine ....mortua sit nec loqui nec sermonare possit. Cf. 98, 2; 111-112, 5-19. The same construction is found in Greek: e.g., Aud. 241, 15-18. Wünsch, DTA 107, contains two clauses guarding against the machinations of the victims hostile to the writer or inspirer of the tablet.

39. quicquid = aliquid; cf. tu, si quid erit de ceteris, (sc. scribe) de Bruto utique quidquid (Cic. ad Att. XIV 12 3). See Stolz-Schmalz, p. 626; Wölfflin Sitzb. B. Acad. 1882, p. 446 ff. The word is used similarly in Avonia 6 and Vesonia 6.

40. legitime. That the rules of defixiones were known as leges is shown by uti nos eas ..... deuotas

consecratasque habeatis ollis legibus quibus quandoque sunt maxime hostes deuoti (Macr. Sat. III 9, 10). Nomen delatum (Aud. 196) is legal phraseology.

mandauit. Similarly mado (Aud. 195, 7; 297, 4); demando (268, 2; 286 b2; 290 b2; 291 a7); commendo (190, 1. 5; 139, 12).

seic. See under seiue, deicere 1. 2. This rare spelling of sic occurs also in Aud. 139, 3. 9 = CIL I 818.

41. Ploti. This must be for Plotium; cf. Auoniam in Avonia 39 where the context is parallel. The Latin tabellae contain many instances of the omission of final -m after -u; e.g., Crispu (Aud. 219 a 10); eximiu (Greek script) (241, 10); ilu - illum (219 a1); lucru (135 a9); tauru (247, 16.18); but nowhere do I find an instance where the entire syllable -um is dropped.

trado mando. cf. tradas mandes 42; mandes tradas 44; aspicere uidere contemplare 45-46. Only in our tablets are these words found side by side. This accumulation of synonyms is characteristic of defixiones; also of early prayer-formulae (Stolz-Schmalz, p. 669).

42. mense Februario. But mensi in Avonia 41; Vesonia 44; Secunda 38. Cf. 16-17; 45 and Ch. III, § 4.

43 ecillunc. e— is conjectural. What is probably the upper half of a c appears immediately before -illunc and too close to it to belong to another word. Between the c and the original left-hand edge there is room for one more letter and one only. The word seems to be a hitherto unattested collateral form of eccillum with one c omitted. But this is not surprising as the non-gemination of c and other consonants is very common in the tabellae and in vulgar inscriptions in general; e.g., buc(c)as (Aud. 135 a5); oc(c)idas (286 b6. 8; 287); Suc(c)es(s)a (227, 3). We read eccille (Apul. Met. LIII 513); eccilli (Ib. LXXIV 550); eccillum (Plaut. Merc. 435; Persa

247. 392 (ecillum P); Pseud. 911; Trin. 622 (ecillum P); Curcul. 278). Eccillunc would be a combination of ecce + ille + ce (cf. illunc 5); one or other of the demonstrative constituents, therefore, is superfluous. Since redundancy is one of the commonest characteristics of plebeian speech, we shall have to account for ec(c)illunc on the ground of the plebeian origin of the tablets. Cf. Krebs, I pp. 441-2; Neue II p.987.

43-44. male .....disperdat. Here is another accumulation of synonyms as in 7. 8. 40. 41. 42. 44. 45-46. The effect is something like the English "May he most miserably perish." Probably in popular speech these three verbs were used interchangeably to signify "to perish." Perdat and disperdat seem to owe their intransitive use in this passage to the analogy of pereo, as perdiam=perdeam for peream in Plaut. Poen. 884. The presence of exse(a)t in this same sentence would make the parallel between perdo as an intransitive and pereo very close.

exse(a)t. The omission of a is probably a lapsus

stili. Cf. exiat = exeat (Aud. 250 b15).

44. mandes. The readings for this are: --nd--(Avonia 42); m----- (Secunda 40). Mandes is the only word that satisfies all conditions. After mandes, tradas supply illunc as in 4.

44 - 46. ni possit.....contemplare. "So that he may not see another month more."

46. uidere, contemplare. That only these two words stand in the last line is evident from indications that the tablet tapers suddenly at the lower edge. In the facsimile it can be noticed that the writing of the last three or four lines is crowded.

2. deicere. Cf. Plotius 2.

4. Auoniae. The lacuna is not large enough to permit reading a Greek genitive as in 14. 19. 21. 22. 23. 25.

This woman is the owner of Plotius, the victim mentioned in the tablet just annotated (cf. Plotius 19). More closely than this we cannot identify her. She belonged to the plebeian gens Auonia (or Aonia) most of whose representatives were located in Rome, as the inscriptions show (see Thes. Ling. Lat. under Auonius (Aonius) and Ch. III, § 3). Gen. not dat.; cf. Plotius 4.

5. hoc. In no surviving portion of any of the tablets does one read hoc and quicquid together. In this passage, as in Vesonia 5, there is ample room both to complete sueis and to read hoc in the same line. In Secunda 4 hoc is the final word of the line and quicquid must be read in order to give the next line an average length. That quicquid is not found in Plotius is probably due to the error of the copyist.

6. quicqui[d]. Here an adverbial acc.; Cf. Plotius 39 and note.

6. protinus. This is conjectured on the basis of ---tinu-, the reading in Vesonia 6; without it the line would fall short of average length. It does not occur in the other three tablets. Should we attempt to read it into Secunda 5 and Aquillia 6, it would be necessary to omit quicquid, as these two lines will not permit the addition of two words each.

illanc. Acc. fem. required here, as in 8. 40 and Vesonia 8. 43. Cf. illanc Aquillia 5 and illunc Plotius 5.

14. Auoniaes. Sc Auonia 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 25 and Vesonia 22. Greek genitives, as might be expected in a sphere of composition introduced into Rome through the Greeks, are of frequent occurrence in the Latin tabellae: e.g., Plotiaes (Aud. 134 a5); Veneries, Venerioses (129 a6-8); Aselles (140, 5, 14. 15. 18); Σεπτιμες = Septimes (270, 13).

18. Saluia. Here we cannot read Proserpina Saluia as in Plotius 17.

compotem. Cf. compote in Plotius 18.

1.25. liguam. Cf. liguas (Aud. 219 a12-13); ligua (303 I 2, 4); II. 2. 5; V 6; VI 5. The omission of the n is probably not a lapsus stili, but rather a faithful representation of a vulgar pronunciation; for we know that before guttural and dental mutes n was frequently dropped (cf. Lindsay, p. 66). Even in the Monumentum Ancyranum appears iro uicias - prouincias in one passage (V 11 Mommsen).

31-32. Ni possit dormire is not repeated in Plotius and also lacks the adjective sana.

40. illanc. On the analogy of e(c)cillunc (Plotius 43) we should expect eccillanc, but space forbids so long a form.

41. mensi. But mense Plotius 42. See Lindsay, p. 390; Stolz-Schmalz, p. 210.

43. nei. Cf. Plotius 34.

Commentary on Vesonia.

4. Maximae Vesoniae. This name is not found once in all the inscriptions containing the names of members of the gens Vesonia. In all the Roman inscriptions of this class only four women are mentioned: Vesonia L. l. Callutuche (sic) (CIL VI 6136); Vesonia Proba (20638); Vesonia L. l. Athenais (28623); Vesonia Cn. f. Procula (28624). The fact that in Maxima Vesonia the individual name is written as a praenomen is of prime importance in dating the tablets (cf. Ch. III, § 4); for range of the gens Vesonia see ch. III § 3.

6. protinus. Only ---tinu- can be read; the remainder of the word is conjectured. If the victim were to be handed over forthwith to the fevers, the granting of the wish by the end of February would practically be assured.

13. mitta[s]. In Avonia 13 m- only. The second person is suggested by tra[das] 4, and polli[ciarus] 15 (supplied from Plotius 13).

17. mense Martium. Cf. note on compote in Plotius 18.

18. Saluia. Not Proserpina Saluia as in Plotius 17.

22. Vesoniaes. Only one Greek genitive in Vesonia; cf., however, note on Avonia 14.

23. palpetras. = palpebras. Found only in this tablet; either a vulgar form or due to a lapsus stili.

25. oriclas. Vulgar form of auriculas; cf. note on Plotius 25. Similarly cornicula became cornicla (Mohl, p. 161); oculos, oclos (Aud. 135 a6; b2); scapulas, scaplas (135 a7). See Lindsay, pp. 170 ff.; Stolz-Schmalz, pp. 170-171.

labras. Nowhere else than in this tablet is the word thus inflected. Labra has here been wrongly regarded as a noun of the first declension. We have other instances of confusion of gender and inflection: e.g., uenter=uentrem 32; uiscum=uiscus 34 ; umblicus=umbilicum 32 . Cf. notes on Plotius.

26. lingua. For dropping of final m cf. note on compote in Plotius 18. Similarly licua=lingua (134 b2); ficura=figura (190, 6); filia (228 a4).

27. nei. Cf. note on Plotius 34.

33. scapulae. The writer of the tablet probably forgot that the series of nouns in pectus .....umblicus 30-32 were actually accusatives, though also nom. in form.

ni possit dormire. Cf. note on Avonia 31-32.

42. Proserpina, tibi. Tibi alone is read in the oth-

er tablets, but here it will not suffice, as a number of illegible strokes show that much more than tibi was written. Proserpina is conjectured. Although unique in this context of the formulae it suits perfectly and fills the space available.

43. illanc. Cf. note on Avonia 40.

44. There is space between Februario and male for another male. We read it against the single appearance of male in the other tablets in this context, because it is contrary to the custom of these tablets to leave so large a space absolutely blank.

Commentary on Secunda.

3. .....i. That this is a genitive singular of a man's name we know for a certainty from illunc in l. 38. It is thus parallel with Ploti in Plotius 4. The length of this and other lines where the victim's name occurs regularly in the formula indicates pretty clearly that as a rule only the gentilicium is employed.

15. The length of the line does not allow one to read Saluia before Proserpina; moreover, nowhere in all the formulae is that order observed.

23. ....ius. Assumed on the basis of the gen. in i in 3.

28-29. ni possit dormire: scapulas. The mistake of Plotius is repeated here. Sanus must be read.

35. quicquit. Only here can the last letter be made out. It may be that t was written similarly in all the other tablets; nevertheless, in them we have assumed the regular ending in d.

37. The mere nomen is too short for the lacuna. Probably the original was either a phrase like Ploti Auoniae in Plotius 19 or consisted of praenomen and nomen together.

Commentary on Aquillia.

3. .....ae Aquilliae. That we are here dealing with

a woman's name consisting of an individual name and nomen is certain from the letters visible and from the context. We assume the order just mentioned on the analogy of Maxima Vesonia, yet we cannot deny that Aqu... may belong to an individual name such as Aquila or Aquilina; cf. CIL VI 12253-4. The nomen, Aquillia, is by far the commonest of those beginning in Aqu., and in the majority of instances where it is found in inscriptions from the city of Rome (the place of origin of the tablets) it is spelled with two l's; see Thes. Ling. Lat. under Aquillius (or Aquilius). Nearly all of the women of this gens mentioned in the Roman inscriptions are freedwomen.

5. quicquid . Cf. note on Avonia 6; quicquid is better attested than protinus

15. Proserpina. The line is too short unless the reading of Plotius 17 be assumed.

27. Quit or quid must be read in this position by reason of the -nt- of intestina being immediately beneath pulmones of the next line above; otherwise there will be a gap unaccounted for.

36. Aquilliam. The length of the line indicates that one part of the name only is employed here as in Vesonia 22,24.

CHAPTER III.

§ 1. Palaeography of the Tablets.

All five tablets represent a type of cursive script not far removed from the early capital. When this type is compared with the handwritings of other periods that are brought together in Plate VIII, its primitive character becomes still more evident, even after due allowance is made for conspicuous differences that must result when wax or papyrus is substituted for lead. Beneath all these variations due to material the typical hand of a period is clearly visible.

Papyrus presented the easiest surface for writing, as the freedom and frequency of long curved strokes testify; moreover, it allowed the writing-point to turn at a sharp angle from a down-stroke to an up-stroke without being lifted; as in S in col. III. On lead free curves are few in number and up-strokes are very weak. The slight angular up-turns to be noticed on E, I, P, T, especially in the Johns Hopkins tablets, are not, strictly speaking, up-strokes, but are accidents due to careless lifting of the stilus for the next down-stroke. Writing on lead of all periods shows how difficult it was for the writer to control his stilus at a sharp turn, or in describing more than a very small arc of a circle. As a rule, when the standard form of letter called for a large arc the writer sketched it in a broadly angular fashion by lifting his stilus two or three times.

The number and form of the strokes varied with the relative hardness of the lead. Sometimes where one would expect a curved stroke, the stilus has suddenly shot forward over an unusually hard or glazed spot in the metal and engraved a long straight stroke. At other times the point has met a hard granule of stone with the result that what was intended to be a straight line has become a curve. The style of writing on wax is about midway between that on papyrus and that on lead; that is to say, it is marked by only an average number of curves and up-strokes. The graffiti of Pompeii were written on the most unyielding of all the materials chosen to receive writing. In them up-strokes are almost wholly wanting and it is evident that curves were impossible except on a very large scale, for the granular surface of the walls offered too great a resistance to the metal point. The writing of the graffiti is even more cramped and angular than any found on lead. But, beneath all these differences due to the materials the typical hands of the various periods can be distinguished. Applying this conclusion specifically to our tablets, we find that with all their peculiarities of handwriting they nevertheless show, even without the detailed analysis which follows, their close kinship with all cursive writing of the first century B. C. on lead, papyrus, wax or wall.

In our tablets A is the most variable letter of the entire

alphabet. Stripped of its eccentricities it reduces itself to four types ---  . These are older forms than a very large number of those found in the Pompeian wax-tablets and are apparently about contemporary with those in columns I, II, III, IV. But other letters are more conclusive for date than this. (Cf. the tables in Cagnat, Cours d'Épigraphie Latine, 3rd. ed., p. 3).

B resolves itself into two types. One is manifestly a copy of the capital, as in the first line of Plotius and Vesonia, where for obvious reasons all the letters are written with much more than ordinary care. The other type --- --- is shown by a comparison with the letter in other alphabets to be confined to handwriting of the first century B. C. The concave upper portion of the right-hand stroke differentiates it from the later cursive form ---  --- which is easily mistaken for a D . But the early form cannot be so mistaken. This letter therefore points with considerable probability to the first century B. C. as the period to which our tablets belong.

C varies just as we should expect a curve to do on this material. The form with two strokes seen in columns III--X, does not occur in our tablets, and, as it is found on lead only in the later period, it may have been developed on papyrus.

D clings closely to the capital in form, —  . Save in one or two instances, and those accidental, the left-hand

stroke is perpendicular, while the right-hand stroke extends in a regular curve from a point to the left of and above the other stroke to a point to the right of and below it, thus describing a quadrant. The minuscule d is formed by converting the left-hand stroke into a loop and the right into a straight line which gradually assumed the perpendicular. This letter, therefore, is a good indicator of period.

E and F are uniformly ||| and ||| , and are of no value in dating, as consultation of the tables will show.

G is almost uniformly G , its variations being accidental. This points to a date at least as early as the Pompeian wax-tablets.

H exhibits consistently the pure capital form. All of its lines are practically straight, and show none of the minuscule tendency seen even as early as the handwritings of columns III and IV. This letter may be classed with B and D for purposes of dating.

I varies greatly in height, but there is no connection between this variation and the quantity of the vowel.

K appears nowhere in the tablets.

As a rule the lower stroke of L rises above the horizontal. In late handwriting the tendency was for it to drop. In column I we must understand a faint up-stroke or an attempt at an up-stroke baulked by the unyielding surface of the wall, im-

mediately preceding the visible down-stroke. The process of making this kind of L is seen with great distinctness in many instances in all our tablets.

M generally appears in the capital form with such modifications as the material would cause. In three tablets an occasional ||||| is noted.

N shows natural variations of the capital only. This letter and M are of no service in determining date.

The two-stroked O - () , ((— which is found in our tablets, is normal for all periods. The latter form may be attributed to haste rather than to material.

The loop of P is never written; the letter is always ⊢. This would point to a period prior to the second century A. D.

Of Q our tablets give only the cursive form, --- ⌒ ---, never the modified capital, --- Q . Both forms are early, as Plate VIII shows.

R is as a rule a hastily written capital, but sometimes shades off towards the purely cursive form without fully attaining it.

S is uniformly made with only one stroke. It seems to be a little earlier than the forms of S in columns III and IV.

T, V, and X fail to exhibit any noteworthy peculiarities.

Y and Z do not occur.

In none of the five tablets is a ligature employed. This

is characteristic of the defixiones and doubtless results from the desire to make the words complete. The Sethian tablets are an exception to the rule (cf. Wünsch, Seth. pp. 53, 55), but even here the ligatures are few and simple.

In nearly every instance the words are clearly divided from one another by points situated a little above the line. Although unnecessary, this kind of punctuation is frequently observed even at the end of a line. On the other hand, the two words of the oft-repeated phrase do tibi are seldom divided. Wider spacing between words than between letters of the same word also helps to distinguish the different words.

Among the palaeographical peculiarities of the tablets may be classed the syllabic division of words at the end of a line, as in Plotius 4, 13, and Vesonia 29. Very similar is the method of correcting an omission, as in Plotius 11.

§ 2. Number of Hands.

The handwriting of the several tablets is almost our sole criterion for determining the probable number of hands employed in their production. Examination shows that the same hand wrote Avonia, Vesonia, Plotius and Aquillia, although the script is not absolutely uniform. Avonia and Vesonia differ

very little from one another. They are carefully and evenly written throughout. Plotius and Aquillia, on the contrary, manifest a great lack of care. The notable variation in size, slant, and alignment of the letters indicates a certain amount of haste. The hand, however, is the same (cf. with Avonia and Vesonia, e.g., Plotius 25-42, a passage written with more than usual care; and with Aquillia, the most careless part of Plotius, namely, 10-16).

The relation of Secunda is by no means as easy to determine. Only a small portion of the tablet has survived. It shows fewer free curves and towards the end degenerates to a mere scrawl. Nevertheless, taken as a whole, the hand is evidently the same as before. It is true that the writing is very much larger, but it was quite possible for a man to adopt a new size of handwriting in beginning a new tablet or a new page, as is shown by the enlarged hand uniformly maintained for seven lines on the reverse of Vesonia. A comparison of this with the best writing of Secunda makes it plain that the two handwritings are of equal proportions, and, moreover, exhibit in almost every point the same characteristics. With this conclusion compare the remark of Wünsch: "Die Hand eines Zauberer ist auch überall da im Spiele, wo ein Fund mehrere Tafeln mit demselben ausführlichen magischen Apparat vereingt...."(1)

---

(1) Seth. p. 76, note 1.

There are, on the other hand, several features of the formulae which tend to divide the tablets into groups in a striking way and which may have some connection with the question now under discussion. In Avonia and Vesonia we find scapulas (or scapulae) in its natural position; both probably have protinus and neither repeats the expression ni possit dormire. On the other hand, Plotius, Aquillia and Secunda, show scapulas out of its logical position, omit protinus, and repeat ni possit dormire with the addition of sanus or sana, as the case may be.

These discrepancies find their most plausible explanation in the assumption that the author first wrote Avonia and Vesonia, when he was fresh and unwearied, for they exhibit the best handwriting and contain fewest errors; that he next wrote Plotius and Aquillia (or in reverse order), omitting protinus, misplacing scapulas, repeating ni possit dormire, and at the same time allowing the writing to degenerate somewhat; and that last of all he wrote Secunda, where the mistakes of Plotius and Aquillia are repeated and the increasingly careless writing manifests the writer's weariness in a long task and his growing impatience as he approached the end.

§ 3. Provenience.

Positive testimony is lacking to show exactly where the Johns Hopkins tablets were written, but the appearance of the nomina gentilia, Vesonia and Avonia, and the peculiar cast of the formulae, all point to Rome.

The gens Vesonia, as was pointed out in the commentary on Vesonia, was known over a wide region of the Roman world. The name is found once in a Spanish inscription (CIL II 1509; eleven times in Campania and vicinity (IV 273; 830; 3471; (3477; 3478; 3480; 3481; 3482; 4512)[3]; 4012; 4678; 5918; X 170; 901; 3091 bis); six times in Apulia and Samnium (IX 898 ; 2020; 2021 bis; 2421 bis); once in Northern Italy (V 961); twelve times in Rome (VI 6136; 10407; 20638 ter; 28621 bis; 28622; 28623 bis; 28624; XV 3668); once in Gallia Narbonensis (XII 5690-128). In brief, the name is found by far the most frequently in Central Italy.

In the second place a peculiar cast of the formulae links them with formulae the provenience of which is certain. Formulae written in one locality are, as a rule, very similar in most particulars; while there may be many individual differences in spelling and in the order of the expressions employed, yet there still remain the ear-marks of the local school of magi. For example, formulae from Cyprus have such strong mutual resemblances that these, in the absence of other evidences,

---

(3) Numbers in brackets refer to one individual.

would be sufficient to identify a tablet from that island;[5] and the same is true of the tablets from Carthage;[6] Hadrumetum,[7] and fourth century Rome.[8] The mutual resemblances among formulae from other localities are less marked, but are nevertheless far from being imaginary; e.g., the Cnidian[9] and the Attic[10] formulae.[11] In addition to these there is a group of three tablets from Latium[11a] whose formulae not only resemble one another, but are very similar to the formulae of our tablets. The feature common to all is the painfully detailed list of bodily members of the several victims concerned. This is found to some extent in other groups, but in none but the group from Latium does it receive such careful attention. Audollent assigns all three tablets to the second century of the Christian era,[12] a period at least two centuries later than that in which our tablets originated. But the chronology of these tablets has less bearing in the present connection than the fact that all possess in common a characteristic feature which stamps them as a local group. It seems therefore likely

---

(5) Cf. Aud. 22-37.
(6) Cf. Aud. 234-242.
(7) Aud. 272-274; 275-284; 286-291; 292-294.
(8) Cf. Aud. 159-187.
(9) Aud. 1-13.
(10) Wünsch DTA 64-73.
(11) Cf. Aud. p. xlv.
(11a) Aud. 134, 135, 190.
(12) Cf. Aud. Indices, p. 556; Schneider, no. 389.

that our tablets represent an early type of which the later formulae are degenerate offspring.[13]

Still clearer and more definite indications are furnished by the range of the gens Avonia which is known only from epigraphical sources. The name (including the form Aonia) occurs in thirty-six inscriptions from Rome, in three from Old Latium, and in only five from all other localities together. (Cf. Thes. Ling. Lat. under Avonius and Aonius). Its presence in our tablets points with strong probability to the conclusion that they were written in Rome.

§4. Date.

The only evidence bearing on the date to which the tablets should be assigned is that furnished by the text itself, especially the type of the alphabet, the use of the aspirate ch, of ei for ī, of lucto for the deponent luctor, and finally the order of words in the name Maxima Vesonia.

The alphabet has been so fully discussed in §1 that only a summary of its special features needs to be given here. The letters may be divided into three grades according to their importance in this connection. First, there are those letters that have practically no value - C, E, F, I, M, N, O, Q, T, V, X; second, those that indicate the time within cer-

---

(13) "Dissentire praecipue defixiones fateor quae locis aetateque separatae a diversissimis exaratae sunt hominibus, dum contra arta quadam adfinitate ne dicam cognatione fere coniunguntur quae conscriptae simul fuerunt; diuisos nihilominus regione quanquam re et tempore proximos titulos aut contra loco uicinos aetate longinquos non miraberis omnino non consonare." Aud. p. xcvii.

tain broad limits - A, G, L, P, R; and third, those that determine the period within comparatively narrow limits - B, D, H, S.

The letters of the second group alone warrant the assertion that our tablets are earlier than the wax tablets of Dacia; but those of the third group set the limit back fully a century. In fact they probably antedate the hands represented in columns III and IV of Plate VIII and at the same time fall between the periods represented by the hands in columns I and II. B and H are particularly decisive letters. Alphabetical peculiarities, therefore, not only fix the terminus ad quem at 100 A. D., but point to the period between 75 and 25 B. C.

The use of the aspirate ch in pulchra and bracchia sets the terminus a quo not earlier than 105, and, in all probability not earlier than 75 B. C.; for only one example of an aspirated consonant is noted prior to the period 105-95.(14) The phenomenon fluctuates between 95 and 55, but after the latter date is practically constant.(15)

The phenomenon of ei for Ī appears in our tablets in sei, seiue, seic, sueis, nei, deicere. The first four words appear uniformly thus, but the last two appear generally as

---

(14) C.I.L. I 541; VI, 331.
(15) Ritschl, Opus. IV, p. 765; Schneider, p. 131.

ni and dicere. The absence of ne is noteworthy.

In the department of defixiones, every tablet where this spelling is found is assigned to the first century, B. C. The following words occur: eimferis (Aud. 137, 1); infereis (199, 6); nisei (197, 3; seiue (196, 3); quei (139, 11); seic (139, 3; 9); tibei (139, 13). In his note on infereis Audollent accounts the spelling as one of the reasons for assigning the tablet in which it is found to the first century, B. C.

Beside this we place the testimony of the Pompeian private inscriptions which likewise belong to the vulgar sphere. Here Lommatzsch (18) has collected the instances that manifestly belong to the Empire and finds only eighteen. "This," he says, "beside the great mass of extant inscriptions is a vanishingly small number." His final conclusion (p. 137) embracing official and private inscriptions together is, that the use of ei for ī in the inscriptions of the Empire is limited to a few quite definite instances, especially the plural endings of the second declension; and, though frequent at the beginning of the Empire, it soon declines to the extent of practically disappearing, except in a few fossilized words, as heic, sei, seiue, seic,

So far then as sueis, sei, seiue, seic and nei are concerned there is nothing to suggest a period earlier than the

---

(18) pp. 132-133.

reign of Augustus, but deicere and nei occurring three times each as against dicere six times and ni fourteen times point back to a period of transition. In accurately dated inscriptions deicere dies out with the Lex Iulia Municipalis (19) of 45 B. C., where we find only deicet (8) and deicere (110) as compared with many occurrences of the later form. In this inscription ni is found once (136) and niue once (131); nei and neiue ten times all told, while examples of ne and neue are too numerous to count. These facts, too, point to a period of transition and to the decided predominance of ne and dicere over the earlier forms. In the Cenotaphia Pisana, of 13 A. D., nei and neiue have disappeared and only ne, neue, and ni, niue remain, while the Momentum Ancyranum of the next year shows only ne. Doubtless had the Pisan inscriptions been under Imperial direction the forms ni and niue would not have appeared at all. Now Ritschl (21) has observed that ni occupied a middle position in time between nei and ne. In other words, ne was the form employed almost exclusively in the fifth century of the city; then nei appeared, followed closely by ni. In the seventh century the three forms are used side by side; but in the eighth, ni forms drop out, nei forms appear but seldom,[22] and ne forms become established as the standard. The almost exclusive use of ni in our tablets is, therefore, clear warrant for assign-

---

(19) CIL I, 206.
(20) CIL, XI, 1420-1.
(21) Opus. II, pp. 624 ff.
(22) Cf. Lommatzsch.

ing them to a period not far removed from the Lex Iulia Municipalis, say, not later than 25 B.C.

The use of lucto in the active voice points with considerable probability to the first century B.C. The latest appearance of lucto uncompounded is a passage in the De Lingua Latina of Varro which was written before 43 B.C.[23] Only the compound relucto appears after the end of the Republic and that only three times and under circumstances where we should expect to find archaic diction.[24] The testimony of Priscian relative to the antiquity of the active lucto is that it was used only by the very early authors.[25] In our tablets, therefore, we have one of the latest recorded examples of this verb which disappears from extant literature before 40 B.C.[26]

Mommsen, in a note on CIL I, 1063, makes this remark: "Insunt in hoc cum quibusdam notis altioris antiquitatis ut sunt nomen proprium muliebre primo loco positum (Marta Postumia, Saluia Seruia) et orthographica quaedam (liberteis, meeis Antiocus)". Our tablets exhibit the first of these phenomena in the name Maxima Vesonia, and possibly in Aquillia.[26a] It is

---

(23) V 10, 61.

(24) See Schanz, Römische Litteraturgeschichte, 3rd. ed., VIII, 1, II, p. 441.

(25) "Praeterea plurima inueniuntur apud uetustissimos, quae contra consuetudinem uel actiuam pro passiua uel passiuam pro actiua habent terminationem, ut....lucto pro luctor...." VIII 5, 25. K.

(26) Cf. note on Plotius 7., and Neue III 53.

(26a) See Aquillia 3.

well known that in the earlier Republic a daughter's name was made up of her father's gentilicium and an individual name used as a praenomen; e.g., Secunda Valeria, Maxsuma Sadria, Prima Pompeia. This praenomen was not abbreviated like the masculine praenomen, but was written in full. Its use was, however, optional and resembled in that respect the masculine cognomen. In the later Republic it became customary to drop the praenomen altogether and employ simply the gentile name, e.g., Antonia, Caesonia, Calpurnia, Cornelia, Iulia. About the end of the Republic the custom changed again and the individual names were once more used, not as praenomina, however, but as cognomina; e.g. Vitellia Rufilla, Caecilia Metella. This became the established custom for the Empire.[28] Now the name Maxima Vesonia belongs to the older type while Avonia conforms either to the optional method of dropping the praenomen in the earlier period or to the customary usage of a somewhat later period. The mixed usage doubtless indicates a period of transition, which must be placed several years earlier than 25 B.C. and probably even earlier than the year 40. At all events our tablets are earlier than Aud. 130 (CIL I 818) which is dated 50 - 10 B.C.; there we read Sergia Glycinna.

---

(27) Cf. Marquardt-~~Mommsen~~ Mau, p. 17, which we have substantially translated.

(28) See also Mau in Pauly-Wissowa under cognomen, IV, p. 229.

In short, all the lines of evidence point clearly to the first century B.C. as the period in which the Johns Hopkins tablets were written. The character of the alphabet employed and the use of ei for ī show that they are not later than 25 B.C., and the appearance of the aspirate ch indicates a time not much earlier than 75 B.C. The active lucto could scarcely have appeared ~~before~~ after 40 B.C., nor is it likely that the names Maxima Vesonia and Avonia could have been used together ~~before~~ after that date. We are therefore justified in concluding that the tablets were written in the month of February (as the formulae state) during a year of the period between 75 and 40 B.C., the actual date probably being nearer to 40 than to 75.

VITA.

William Sherwood Fox was born in Throopsville, N. Y., June 17, 1878. His elementary and High School education was received in Erie and Pittsburg, Pa., and Toronto, Canada. In 1896 he entered McMaster University of the last named city, where for four years he pursued the special courses in the classical languages. He there obtained the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1900 and five years later that of Master of Arts (extra-mural). In the autumn of 1900 he was appointed Professor of Latin and Greek in Brandon College, Brandon, Manitoba, which position he held until 1909. During this period he was granted two years' leave of absence for the purpose of further study. The first year, 1902-03, was spent in the University of Geneva, Switzerland, and Athens, Greece; and the following year in Johns Hopkins University. At the termination of his residence in Brandon in 1909 he resumed his studies in Johns Hopkins, selecting as his subjects Classical Archaeology, Greek and Latin. For the year 1909-10 he was Fellow by Courtesy, and for 1910-11 University Fellow in the department of Classical Archaeology.

Acknowledgments are due to Professor H. L. Wilson at whose suggestion the present subject was undertaken, and to Professors B.L.Gildersleeve, K.F.Smith, D.M.Robinson, C.W.E.Miller, W.P. Mustard for their invaluable advice and assistance. Their unfailing courtesy and many kind attentions will always be most gratefully remembered.